

ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW COUNCIL

Report to the School Reform Commission

**Academic Accountability and Early Literacy
in Challenging Fiscal Times in the
School District of Philadelphia**

November 21, 2013

Accountability Review Council

James E. Lyons, Sr., Ph.D., Chair
Edmund R. Becker, Ph.D., Member
Constance L. Hollinger, Ph.D., Member
Gerald Tirozzi, Ph.D., Member
Marlene Weinstein, Member
Judith A. Winston, Esq., Member
Kenneth K. Wong, Ph.D., Executive Advisor
Neil S. Fleming, Ph.D., Assessment Consultant

Executive Summary

Over the last decade, the Accountability Review Council (ARC) has served as an independent entity that assesses key reform initiatives and their impact on student achievement in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). The ARC summarizes its findings and recommendations in an annual report to the School Reform Commission (SRC). All ARC reports are available to the public on the SDP website.

At the start of the 2013-14 school year, the SRC and the Superintendent face the ongoing and daunting challenges of raising student achievement and containing the escalating fiscal deficit. The current fiscal crisis faced by the District is the first of six major concerns the ARC will address in this report. The other concerns are Accountability Review in a Period of Fiscal Retrenchment; Data Integrity and the Implementation of Stronger Accountability Measures; Making Strategic Investments; Uneven Academic Progress in the School District of Philadelphia; and, as a special research topic for this year, Broadening High Quality Early Childhood Education in Philadelphia.

Shared Responsibility to Address Fiscal Crisis

The causes and consequences of the current fiscal crisis in SDP have been well documented. The ARC does not believe it necessary to repeat that chronology here. However, as an independent, statutory entity charged with evaluating the progress of school reform in the District, the ARC is deeply concerned about the ability of the District to sustain basic education quality for all students given the current fiscal crisis.

Bridging the enormous fiscal gap requires shared responsibility among key city, state, and of course, district stakeholders. If this financial gap is not closed, ARC foresees not just a failure to deliver high quality education, but a significant amount of backsliding that will erode much of the progress made to date. Instead of building on the millions of dollars already invested, the SDP will need millions more just to get back to where the District is now. The taxpaying public must recognize that the most responsible and cost effective approach is to sustain successful efforts.

Accountability Review in a Period of Fiscal Retrenchment

In 2003, when the ARC was created, the Philadelphia School District appeared to be on the verge of establishing a transformative school reform effort through the work of the newly formed School Reform Commission and a broad set of options for school children in Philadelphia through privately managed and District-run public schools. Today, far from being in the forefront of school reform which has at its core delivering high quality education to every student and improving student achievement, the SRC and the Philadelphia School District seem destined to deliver to a substantial number of children only the most basic services.

Over the next year, ARC will focus on identifying the specific measures by which the District will be assessed in meeting its Action Plan objectives. ARC will be asking for

the benchmarks the District has identified as “starting points” for judging improvement, the resources the District has identified and secured to implement the education aims of its Action Plan. Equally important, ARC will examine how resources are deployed and the results of implementation of the initiatives described in the Action Plan to determine if the SRC and the District have done what they have committed to do in its public statements.

Data Integrity and the Implementation of Stronger Accountability Measures

Since its creation 10 years ago, ARC has urged the District to strengthen its position on accountability and transparency. ARC recognizes the SDP has taken steps to institutionalize procedures that guard against irregularities at the school and classroom levels.

ARC’s unease about the District’s ability to assess adequately student achievement has been heightened by cheating allegations. Reports on extensive cheating raise a fundamental question about whether ARC can continue to rely solely on SDP trend-line PSSA data on academic proficiency in evaluating whether the District is meeting its promise of accountability for raising student achievement.

Further, as mentioned in several of its annual reports, ARC sees the need for SDP to implement a system of data accountability that uniformly applies to both charter schools and SDP schools. This is an urgent issue because the charter enrollment caps have been lifted by the state supreme court. With the possibility of unlimited growth of charter schools on the horizon, SDP must develop a unified set of standards that will govern the assessment of school performance, student enrollment and attendance, student suspension and expulsion, school climate, and parental satisfaction across all schools operating with public funds in the District.

Making Strategic Investment

In early 2013, the Superintendent shared with ARC and members of the public his plans to promote leadership development by strengthening principal leadership with a system of standards and accountability. ARC believes the Superintendent's strategic approach, if effectively implemented, holds substantial promise. However, while ARC applauds the proposed leadership reform agenda, the current fiscal circumstances of the District suggest that reform may have to take a "back seat" to simply providing a barely adequate educational experience to students by ensuring that every student has a functioning school to attend, a credentialed teacher in every classroom and a credentialed principal in every school.

Uneven Academic Progress in the School District of Philadelphia

ARC supports a clear resolution on the alleged test cheating. This report also summarizes SDP performance in three sets of measures: (1) PSSA reading and mathematics scores; (2) high school graduation rates for various subgroups; and (3)

NAEP TUDA assessment for SDP and in comparison with other urban districts. Using these multiple measures, SDP shows uneven improvement across different subjects and grades. There is room for substantial improvement, especially in comparison with other urban districts.

Broadening High Quality Early Childhood Education (ECE) in Philadelphia

SDP ECE services seemed to have narrowed the reading gap for their students when compared with their non-ECE peers in the year or two immediately following the Pre-K services. Early identification of reading needs form the basis for early intervention, which may result in better reading achievement and reducing remediation cost in later grades. By the time students took the PSSA in the third grade, the benefits of ECE in reading proficiency tended to fade. ARC believes that SDP has not fully capitalized the benefits of ECE in implementing reading strategies during Kindergarten through third grade.

We urge the SRC and the Superintendent to implement assessment-based intervention strategies in the early grades so that students who enter Kindergarten and first grade with strong reading skills do not lose ground. A more focused support system is necessary to ensure the learning transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten and the early elementary grades. K-2 teachers need to be fully engaged in student assessment of reading readiness. Diagnostic findings must be used to inform reading instruction across all early elementary grades on an ongoing manner in SDP. Full implementation of these practices will contribute to the District's aspiration of ensuring that all children become a proficient reader by the end of their third grade.

Key Issues in Accountability Review

This report has identified several key areas of focus for ARC through next year. Among the top issues are:

- ARC will focus on identifying the specific measures by which the District will be assessed in meeting its Action Plan objectives. ARC will examine how resources are deployed and the results of implementation of the initiatives described in the Action Plan to determine if the SRC and the District have done what they have committed to do in its public statements.
- ARC sees the need for SDP to implement a system of data accountability that uniformly applies to both charter schools and SDP schools. The lack of data transparency among charter schools is especially troubling from an accountability standpoint. ARC is hopeful that all charter schools will become part of the data accountability system in the near future.
- There is an urgent need to review and redesign the state funding formula so that resources are equitably distributed to meet the needs of the students in

Philadelphia. As SRC Commissioner Joseph Dworetzky pointed out, state and local financing of charter schools may unfairly deprive District-run schools and students enrolled in them critical education resources.

Background

In fall of 2001, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania asserted its intention to take control of the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) to improve management and academic achievement. To avert the perception of a “hostile” takeover of SDP, the Governor of Pennsylvania and the Mayor of Philadelphia entered into a unique partnership to jointly manage SDP. The reform legislation enacted by the Commonwealth created the five-member School Reform Commission (SRC) and also mandated the establishment of an “independent assessment and reporting center” to evaluate the outcomes of the district’s reform efforts. The statutory obligation to establish an assessment and reporting center was fulfilled by SRC when it created the Accountability Review Council (ARC), an independent entity composed of national experts charged with monitoring the District’s reform efforts.

Over the last decade, the Accountability Review Council (ARC) has served as an independent entity that assesses key reform initiatives and their impact on student achievement in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). The ARC summarizes its findings and recommendations in an annual report to the School Reform Commission (SRC). All ARC reports are available to the public on the SDP website.

At the start of the 2013-14 school year, the SRC and the Superintendent face the ongoing and daunting challenges of raising student achievement and containing the escalating fiscal deficit. The current fiscal crisis faced by the District is the first of six major concerns the ARC will address in this report. The other concerns are Accountability Review in a Period of Fiscal Retrenchment; Data Integrity and the Implementation of Stronger Accountability Measures; Making Strategic Investments; Uneven Academic Progress in the School District of Philadelphia; and, as a special research topic for this year, Broadening High Quality Early Childhood Education in Philadelphia.

Shared Responsibility to Address the Fiscal Crisis

The causes and consequences of the current fiscal crisis in SDP have been well documented (Paul Socolar, *Questions and Answers About the District’s Budget*, The Philadelphia Notebook, October 2013, Vol. 21, No. 1). The ARC does not believe it necessary to repeat that chronology here. However, as an independent, statutory entity charged with evaluating the progress of school reform in the District, the ARC is deeply concerned about the ability of the District to sustain basic education quality for all students given the current fiscal crisis.

Bridging the enormous fiscal gap requires shared responsibility among key city, state, and of course, district stakeholders. If this financial gap is not closed, ARC foresees not just a failure to deliver high quality education, but a significant amount of backsliding that will erode much of the progress made to date. Instead of building on the millions of dollars already invested, the SDP will need millions more just to get back to where the

District is now. The taxpaying public must recognize that the most responsible and cost effective approach is to sustain successful efforts.

However, ARC recognizes that these shared responsibilities have not yet been fully exercised on behalf of the Philadelphia School District and the SDP is forced to move forward in the absence of sufficient funds. Specifically, the SDP is grappling with a \$300 million shortfall expected to grow to \$1 billion in five years. Debt service is already required to pay the interest and principal for \$2.2 billion in general obligation bonds issued directly by the SDP. Additionally, another \$1.1 billion in debt was issued through the State Public School Building Authority for which the SDP is also obligated to pay interest and principal. The cumulative effects of attempts to manage this crisis can only be devastating both to the education offered in SDP schools and to all the citizens and businesses in Philadelphia. Regardless of neighborhood or affiliation with public schools, all Philadelphians benefit from effective, sustained investment in high quality public education. All suffer the consequences when public education cannot do its job.

ARC believes that the SDP has taken bold steps to address forthrightly the fiscal crisis. ARC commends the serious effort of the superintendent to engage the community in understanding the tough decisions required to conform the District's educational program and practices to the realities of its fiscal bind. For example, 2,200 SDP positions have been eliminated. These include teachers, assistant principals, counselors, security personnel, arts and sports teachers, and Early Childhood Education (ECE) professionals. In all, there has been a 15% reduction in SDP staff. Central office personnel have been reduced by almost 45%. Although these were difficult decisions, they were not without considerable controversy and concern throughout the school community. For example, at the August 22, 2013 SRC public meeting, ARC members heard parents who expressed concerns about split-grade classrooms for their children. Budget cuts have resulted in about 100 split-grade classrooms throughout the District.

Further, as of this writing, negotiations continue between the District and four of the unions providing critical services to the school district including, most notably the teachers' union. Concessions are sought to free-up additional funds to restore aspects of SDP operations. However, the theme of shared responsibility and shared sacrifice to ensure students have more than just an adequate education is strained by an outdated state funding formula and taxing policies by the Commonwealth. Tension between state and local governmental entities also contributed to the fiscal problem. Therefore, significant relief from the District's fiscal woes appears unlikely in the near future.

Accountability Review in a Period of Fiscal Retrenchment

For the ARC, the current restraints governing teaching and learning in the District require a reconsideration of what accountability review means and on what basis should the SRC and the Philadelphia School District be evaluated or held accountable. Among the many questions ARC will continue to ask in the coming months are - Has the District's limited authority to obtain all available resources to deliver quality education to students in

Philadelphia been vigorously exercised? Are the funds being deployed in a manner that is transparent and designed to deliver results consistent with the Superintendent's Action Plan? What objective evidence is available to demonstrate that the intended results have been or are being achieved?

In 2003, when the ARC was created, the Philadelphia School District appeared to be on the verge of establishing a transformative school reform effort through the work of the newly formed School Reform Commission and a broad set of options for school children in Philadelphia through privately managed and District-run public schools. Today, far from being in the forefront of school reform which has at its core delivering high quality education to every student and improving student achievement, the SRC and the Philadelphia School District seem destined to deliver to a substantial number of children only the most basic services. Teachers, some with over 30 students in their classrooms, will likely spend an inordinate amount of time merely seeking order given the number of students in their charge. Principals are operating with a significantly downsized professional staff in their building.

If the principal's attention is diverted, more often than not simply to help teachers maintain order or deal with issues previously handled by other professionals, who will then perform the important educational tasks that are traditionally within the realm of the principal? Who will evaluate teacher effectiveness, provide the leadership in the school community, and work with parents and the community to support student learning? Simply put, who will be held accountable for ensuring that the school reform initiatives outlined in Superintendent Hite's Action Plan v.1.0 are carried out effectively?

The Superintendent's Action Plan rightly identifies teachers and principals as the key drivers for raising student performance:

- *For teachers, the center of our enterprise, this plan outlines not only high expectations, but high degrees of support as we strive to make the craft of teaching more professional.*
- *For principals and school leadership teams, we strive to help in focusing your time and energy around the right work at the right time.*

At the system level, the Action Plan states that the reform effort is based on two equally important "Anchoring Goals":

- *Anchor Goal 1: Improve academic outcomes for students in all the schools we manage and in the charter schools we authorize;*
- *Anchor Goal 2: Ensure the financial stability and sustainability of the District.*

However, the current fiscal retrenchment is likely to limit the District's efforts to accelerate its academic progress. The District will be severely tested over the next several years in maintaining its assertion that:

*The School District of Philadelphia does not have the luxury to set its education agenda without regard for financial implications and sustainability, nor can it be successful if financial decisions are divorced from educational impact. This new era in management of the District means that **every decision must be both educationally and fiscally sound.** [Emphasis added.]*

The ARC views this declaration as the heart of its efforts to evaluate accountability in the Philadelphia School District in this period of fiscal retrenchment. In addition to the broad set of questions asked earlier in this Report, ARC also intends to seek answers to the following set of questions - Will every decision made by SRC and the Superintendent be both educationally and fiscally sound? Can the District achieve simultaneously progress in both academic and financial terms? These criteria in measuring progress should be made manifest in strategic investments that directly affect teaching and learning. They should be made transparent in the SRC's decision making in authorizing new charter schools and closing low performing charter schools. They should also be made apparent in policies on teacher hiring, retention, and compensation. To evaluate the District's progress, ARC needs to access data from the entire system, including District operated and charter schools, on issues pertaining to student achievement, schooling opportunities, and leadership.

Over the next year, ARC will focus on identifying the specific measures by which the District will be assessed in meeting its Action Plan objectives. ARC will be asking for the benchmarks the District has identified as "starting points" for judging improvement, the resources the District has identified and secured to implement the education aims of its Action Plan (Anchor Goal #1). Equally important, ARC will examine how resources are deployed and the results of implementation of the initiatives described in the Action Plan to determine if the SRC and the District have done what they have committed to do in its public statements.

Recognizing that the SRC and the District are not in full control of the means by which quality education can be delivered to the children of Philadelphia, ARC will pay attention to the role of other actors at the state, local, and community levels. The lack of a fair and equitable state funding formula has been an issue of public concern. The District's growing debt service obligation has further contributed to the fiscal crisis in SDP. Further, whether students show up in school may also be related to neighborhood safety and social environments. The way the SRC and the District address these critical issues will form a significant basis for determining its accountability for improved teaching and learning.

Data Integrity and the Implementation of Stronger Accountability Measures

Since its creation 10 years ago, ARC has urged the District to strengthen its position on accountability and transparency. ARC recognizes the SDP has taken steps to institutionalize procedures that guard against irregularities at the school and classroom levels. In this regard, the 3-tiered system developed to ensure test protocols and integrity is a good and commendable step forward. In addition, ARC understands that data integrity issues will be addressed in part by an independent study, which aims at reconfiguring and re-evaluating the Student Performance Index (SPI), the system that has been in place since 2009 for collecting and analyzing data for measuring academic progress.

ARC's unease about the District's ability to assess adequately student achievement has been heightened by cheating allegations. Reports on extensive cheating raise a fundamental question about whether ARC can continue to rely solely on SDP trend-line PSSA data on academic proficiency in evaluating whether the District is meeting its promise of accountability for raising student achievement. An immediate concern is whether the decade of trending up that we observed in past reports was in fact due to cheating and not entirely to actual achievement. Indeed, the Superintendent's *Action Plan v1.0* recognized that the more secure testing environment tended to associate with a decline of 8.7 percentage points in PSSA math proficiency scores and a drop of 7.1 percentage points in PSSA reading proficiency scores in 2012. Given the complexity of these issues, ARC will continue to monitor efforts undertaken by the SRC and the Superintendent to ensure data reliability and integrity.

Further, as mentioned in several of its annual reports, ARC sees the need for SDP to implement a system of data accountability that uniformly applies to both charter schools and SDP schools. Charter schools currently enroll one-third of all students attending public schools in the District and many seek to increase the number of students they serve by challenging the imposition of enrollment caps by the SRC. This makes even more urgent the development of a unified set of standards to govern the assessment of school performance, student enrollment and attendance, student suspension and expulsion, school climate, and parental satisfaction across all schools operating with public funds in the District.

The lack of data transparency among charter schools is especially troubling from an accountability standpoint. Charters were created and publicly funded in large part because of the role they were intended to play in education reform. Parents and students were to have more choice and charters were given the flexibility to innovate and share successful teaching and learning practices with other public schools. Without complete access to data from charter schools, parents are not able to make fully informed choices about where their children might benefit most. Moreover, according to at least one School Reform Commissioner speaking for himself, state and local financing of charter schools may unfairly deprive District-run schools of critical education resources. (Joseph Dworetzky, "Analyzing the Role of Charter School Funding in the District's Budget Problems." The Philadelphia Notebook, September 19, 2013.) This suggestion of unfair

financing of charter schools has been challenged by the executive director of the Pennsylvania Coalition of Public Charter Schools (Fayfich, “Blame for District’s Budget Woes Misdirected at Charters.” The Philadelphia Notebook, September 27, 2013), the fact that charters are publicly financed in any amount should result in the same level of data transparency and accountability to the public at large as is required and provided by District-run schools.

ARC is encouraged that new efforts have been initiated by SDP to ensure greater charter school accountability. Particularly promising is the proposed universal enrollment system where all parents can access all types of schools. ARC sees promise for increased transparency in the ongoing collaborative work that is spearheaded by the Great Schools Compact, and the development of a comprehensive policy on charter schools. Creating a unique identifier for students in all types of publicly funded schools, including charter schools, will strengthen the accountability system in the district. In particular, all publicly funded schools face similar educational challenges. For example, a longitudinal study on charter schools in Pennsylvania that was conducted by the Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) in 2011 found that, “Special Education students enrolled in both traditional public and charter schools perform significantly worse than students not receiving special education services.” A follow up report in 2013 found that a substantial percentage of the charter schools in Pennsylvania were low performing, including many that are located in Philadelphia. Low performing charter schools in Philadelphia seemed to have contributed to academic deficiencies in Pennsylvania’s charter sector. The 2013 report also found that students who enrolled in cyber charter schools performed worse than their peers in traditional public schools.

In light of these common educational challenges across all types of schools, ARC is hopeful that all charter schools will become part of the data accountability system in the near future and funding formulas will be closely examined and adjusted, if necessary, to ensure financial equity among all publicly supported schools. Given the importance of this issue in meeting the public’s expectations on accountability, ARC will continue to monitor the progress of the SDP efforts to ensure data transparency in charter schools.

Making Strategic Investment

In early 2013, the Superintendent shared with ARC and members of the public his plans to promote leadership development by strengthening principal leadership with a system of standards and accountability. Resources will be sought from organizations such as the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to facilitate these efforts. Superintendent Hite has further suggested that a highly effective principal pipeline can greatly benefit from a multi-pronged strategy. Such a strategy would include a more focused mentoring and support system for principals; efforts to nurture and sustain a professional learning community that encourages sharing of insights and experience among principals; and enhancement of skills focused on change management and managing people. The District is also making strategic investments elsewhere. For

example, the Superintendent is supporting the investment of additional resources to expand Philadelphia's most innovative "model schools," including the Science Leadership Academy (see Benjamin Herold in Education Week; "Philadelphia seeks salvation in lessons from model school" Education Week, posted in The Philadelphia Notebook, September 26 2013).

ARC believes the Superintendent's strategic approach, if effectively implemented, holds substantial promise. However, while ARC applauds the proposed leadership reform agenda, the current fiscal circumstances of the District suggest that reform may have to take a "back seat" to simply providing a barely adequate educational experience to students by ensuring that every student has a functioning school to attend, a credentialed teacher in every classroom and a credentialed principal in every school.

Another critical area for strategic investment is literacy. ARC recognizes the need for SRC to make policy trade-offs in this current climate of fiscal stress. Literacy, however, must not be undermined even in these tough economic times. A good example of the type of literacy initiatives that deserve continuing support is early literacy. In the latter part of this report, ARC discusses findings from our review of the evidence on early childhood education and reading proficiency in the SDP.

Uneven Academic Progress in the School District of Philadelphia

As our annual reports have indicated, there has been slow but steady measurable progress in meeting the state's academic proficiency standards during 2002 through 2011. However, student achievement in PSSA has declined in recent years. In assessing overall academic progress in the District, ARC does not include charter schools due to lack of complete information. Further, ARC uses multiple measures to evaluate SDP academic progress. This section of the report summarizes SDP performance in three sets of measures: (1) PSSA reading and mathematics scores; (2) high school graduation rates for various subgroups; and (3) NAEP TUDA assessment for SDP and in comparison with other urban districts. Using these multiple measures, SDP shows uneven improvement across different subjects and grades. As the data indicate below, there is room for substantial improvement, especially in comparison with other urban districts.

However, before discussing the recent outcomes of each of these measures, it is important that ARC acknowledge the serious questions that have arisen in recent years regarding the integrity of the scores on the PSSA. Extensive test cheating, if proven, could potentially dampen public trust in the test results and undermine the claim that SDP has made steady progress in student achievement. Consequently, ARC strongly encourages SDP to be fully transparent about the investigation results of the alleged cheating. ARC also recommends SDP take decisive action to prevent cheating in the future. The implementation of the three-tiered monitoring plan for PSSA test administration is clearly a first step in the right direction. A clear resolution on the alleged test cheating is essential.

PSSA Scores

SDP academic performance experienced a decline since 2012. This decline reversed the decade-long trend of seemingly steady academic progress:

- In PSSA Reading, the percentage of students scoring at the level of Advanced or Proficient for all tested grades combined increased from 23.9% to 51.6% between 2002 and 2011, but declined in 2012 to 44.8% and then in 2013 to 42.3%
- In PSSA Mathematics, the percentage of students scoring at the level of Advanced or Proficient for all tested grades combined increased from 19.5% to 57.8% between 2002 and 2011, but declined in 2012 to 51% and then in 2013 to 47%.

High School Graduation Rates

SDP high school students have improved their graduation rates since the reform started in 2001. The 9th grade cohort of 2008-09 (those in 9th grade for the first time in 2008-09) had an on-time graduation rate of 64 % in 2012 (graduated in 4 years). This represented a steady improvement over the last 7 years, when only 52% of the 9th grade cohort of 2001-02 graduated on time in 2005. Also, dropout rates have slightly declined for 9th grade cohorts between 2003-04 and 2008-09 (those first-time 9th graders who graduated on time in 2007 through 2012).

Minority students have made measureable progress in their on-time graduation rates between the graduating class of 2011 and the class of 2012.

- Latino males visibly improved their on time graduation rates from 43% to 54%
- Dropout rates for Latino males significantly dropped from 48% to 34%
- African American males increased their on time graduate rates from 53% to 57%
- Latino females improved from 57% to 59%, while African American females maintained their on time graduating rate at 69%.

However, substantial racial and gender gaps remained for the graduating class of 2012:

- 54% of Latino males and 57% of African American males graduated in 4 years as compared to 65% of White males and 75% of Asian American males
- 59% of Latino females and 69% of African American females graduated in 4 years as compared to 82% of Asian American females and 72% of White females
- Female students, when compared with their male peers, maintained higher graduate rates across all racial and ethnic groups
- Among racial and ethnic groups, Latino males and Latino females experienced much higher dropout rates, 38% and 28% respectively.

NAEP Assessment

SDP schools were clearly not as competitive as their peers in other urban districts. A review of the National Assessment of Educational Progress-Trial Urban District Assessment (NAEP-TUDA) suggests much room for improvement when SDP is compared with other large urban districts. NAEP-TUDA is a nationwide assessment given to a representative sample of students in 21 urban districts. SDP started participating in TUDA with the 2009 assessment. Every 2 years, reading and mathematics are assessed at grades 4 and 8. Considering the statistical significance of the 2011 NAEP scores by grade and by subject, SDP falls within the lower middle group in the NAEP-TUDA sample:

- On 4th grade mathematics, SDP performed lower than 13 of the other 20 districts
- On 8th grade mathematics, SDP performed lower than 13 of the other 20 districts
- On 4th grade reading, SDP performed lower than 16 of the other 20 districts
- On 8th grade reading, SDP performed lower than 13 of the other 20 districts.

The NAEP-TUDA assessment also shows substantial achievement gaps among racial/ethnic and socio-economic groups in SDP in 2011:

- On 4th grade mathematics, the White/Hispanic gap is 10 score points, the White/Black gap is 13 score points, and the income group difference is 28 score points
- On 8th grade mathematics, the White/Hispanic gap is 25 score points, the White/Black gap is 21 score points, and the income group difference is 28 score points
- On 4th grade reading, the White/Hispanic gap is 26 score points, the White/Black gap is 22 score points, and the income group difference is 22 score points
- On 8th grade reading, the White/Hispanic gap is 25 score points, the White/Black gap is 20 score points, and the income group difference is 31 score points.

Finally, the NAEP-TUDA assessment suggests some improvement in SDP in overall student achievement in math and reading in both 4th and 8th grade between 2009 and 2011. Most subgroups improved as well:

- Black students gained in their math NAEP proficiency from 10 to 12 percent in 4th grade and from 8 to 14 percent in 8th grade.
- Latino students improved their reading proficiency from 5 to 10 percent in 4th grade and from 9 to 13 percent in 8th grade.
- However, students who were eligible for free and reduced priced lunch experienced a decline in their proficiency from 17 to 13 percent in math and from 11 to 9 percent in reading in 4th grade.

- Interestingly, 8th grade students who qualified for free and reduced price lunch improved their proficiency in math from 13% to 15% and in reading from 11 to 13 percent.

Broadening High Quality Early Childhood Education in Philadelphia

Early Childhood Education in SDP

In his *Action Plan v1.0*, Superintendent Hite and his leadership team identified early literacy as a District priority. It stated:

Equip our young learners with the skills and experiences they need to begin and stay on track in school by enhancing and implementing a District-wide Comprehensive Literacy Framework and working with our partners to increase the number of high quality pre-K seats across the city (*Action Plan v1.0*, p.12)

The district provided early childhood education (ECE) services to about 10,000 eligible students, or only 50% of the eligible children, in 2012-13. ECE services included 6,149 children in Head Start (income threshold at or below the poverty line), 650 children in Bright Futures (income threshold up to 3 times the poverty level), and about 2,500 children in child care facilities provided by community partners.

Like many programs in the SDP, the ECE program faces financial challenges. During FY 2009-2013, the District's ECE total budget was increased by 16.5%. In FY 2012-13, ECE had a total budget of \$68.5 million from state and federal sources, including \$38.8 million federal Head Start grant, \$11.8 million state supplemental Head Start grant, and \$17.9 million Title I grant to the SDP. However, due to an anticipated lack of growth in federal Title I funding and due to sequester, the SDP's Title I grant is expected to decline from \$17.9 million to \$8.5 million for ECE starting in FY 2013-14. The budget gap could result in cutting services for as many as 500 children. To maintain the service level, the district proposed to restructure Head Start services. A key feature of the proposed policy change was to transfer 2,000 ECE seats from SDP to highly qualified community partner agencies, namely those that were certified by the Commonwealth at KEYSTONE STARS Level 3 or higher (STARS stands for Standards, Training/Professional Development, Assistance, Resources, and Support). Levels 3 and 4 exceed the basic licensing standards with more effective use of research-based practices. This transfer was projected to save \$8 million on personnel cost since SDP Head Start teachers are compensated based on the collective bargaining agreement. However, it remains to be seen if community partner agencies can accommodate the enrollment growth given their current limited capacity.

Early Childhood Education and Reading Achievement in SDP

This section of the ARC report focuses on the extent to which participation in ECE programs is associated with the students' reading achievement in spring 2012. Using "backward mapping," ARC analyzed reading achievement data for SDP third grade

students in 2011-12 who also had an ECE record in the District in 2007-08. We also used the same student matching approach to analyze SDP student reading performance in Kindergarten, first grade, and second grade.

In analyzing the association of Early Childhood Education (ECE) with reading performance in later grades, ARC examines several issues:

- *Did students who had ECE experience perform better than their peers who did not have ECE experience?*
- *Were there differences in the percentage of ECE students who performed well in reading at the Kindergarten, first, second and third grade levels?*
- *Were there differences in the percentage of students who performed well in reading across different types of ECE programs in the district?*

ECE Students and Reading Performance in K-2

Table 1 examines the yearly reading levels (K through 2nd grade) for students who attended SDP ECE programs in 2007-08. The analysis included SDP students who enrolled in Head Start (i.e. family income met federal guidelines on poverty), Bright Futures (i.e. family income up to 3 times the federal poverty definition), Comprehensive Early Learning Center (CELC, family income up to 2 times the federal poverty definition), and Pre-K Counts (i.e. no income restriction). The analysis also compared the SDP ECE students with their peers who did not attend SDP ECE programs but later enrolled in SDP elementary grades. This latter group is categorized as “no pre-K program in SDP.” It should be noted that some of the students in this group were likely to have received some form of ECE services, including high quality ones, from private and/or other sources. But SDP did not keep any record of their non SDP ECE experience. Equally important, SDP did not keep reading level data for students in K through 2nd grade in charter schools. In short, Table 1 only examines SDP students.

Table 1 shows three different reading proficiency levels for students in K through 2nd grade in SDP schools, including “At Target” or proficient, strategic intervention needed, and intensive intervention needed. Student placement in one of the reading levels is determined by teacher evaluation of student progress using individual reading tests as provided by the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA). Using DRA’s Comprehensive Rubric, teachers assessed students’ effective demonstration of various reading behaviors that are associated with each of the reading levels. Among the reading skills assessed are “listening behaviors” (e.g. listens for meaning in stories and conversations), “speaking behaviors” (e.g. uses language for a variety of purposes), and “concepts of print” (e.g. matches sounds to letters and demonstrates comprehension of read aloud stories).

On reading proficiency in K-2, ARC makes several observations (see Table 1):

- Students in Kindergarten, first grade, and second grade who experienced ECE outperformed their peers who did not attend ECE programs.
- In Kindergarten, 71%, 63%, 60%, and 58% of the students who attended Bright Futures, CELC, Head Start, and Pre-K Counts respectively were reading At Target. In contrast, only 48% of the students who did not attend ECE were reading At Target.
- In first grade, 69%, 59%, 52%, and 58% of the students who attended Bright Futures, CELC, Head Start, and Pre-K Counts a year earlier respectively were reading At Target. In contrast, only 47% of the students who did not attend ECE were reading At Target.
- In second grade, 73%, 64%, 59%, and 56% of the students who attended Bright Futures, CELC, Head Start, and Pre-K Counts two years earlier respectively were reading At Target. In contrast, only 55% of the students who did not attend ECE were reading At Target.
- In Kindergarten, first grade, and second grade, a higher percentage of students who did not attend ECE were classified as in need of intensive intervention in reading than their peers who had experienced ECE. For example, in second grade, 30% of the students who did not attend ECE were classified as in need of intensive intervention. Only 14%, 16%, 25%, and 28% of the students who had experienced Bright Futures, CELC, Head Start, and Pre-K Counts respectively were in need of intensive intervention.

Third Grade PSSA Reading: Comparing SDP and Charter Students

Table 2 examines both SDP students and charter school students in their 3rd grade PSSA reading proficiency. PSSA reading achievement was summarized by four levels, namely advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. This analysis included SDP students in 3rd grade during 2011-12 who also had an ECE matching record in SDP during 2007-08. This group totaled 2,899, which is very closely matched with the total number of ECE students in SDP that we identified in Table 1 (i.e. 2,912). Table 2 also includes 3rd grade students who attended charter schools in 2011-12. SDP did not have information on reading levels for charter students prior to 3rd grade. Third grade PSSA offers the earliest opportunity to compare SDP students with their charter school peers on reading proficiency.

On 3rd grade PSSA reading proficiency, ARC makes several observations (see Table 2):

- The School District of Philadelphia enrolled a total of 2,899 third graders who had ECE experience and who took the PSSA in 2011-12. Charter schools enrolled a total of 933 students who took the PSSA in 2011-12. Although SDP did not maintain the ECE record for charter students, charter students who attended ECE were likely to have high reading achievement. For these two groups of students overall (i.e. combining 2,899 and 933), 48% of them performed at the proficient and advanced levels in reading in PSSA. Only 35% performed below basic proficiency.
- In charter schools, there were 933 third graders who took the PSSA in 2011-12. For these charter students, 55% performed at the proficient and advanced levels in reading in PSSA. Only 28% performed below basic proficiency.
- In district schools, there were 2,899 third graders who had ECE experience and who also took the PSSA in 2011-12. For these district students, 47% performed at the proficient and advanced levels in reading in PSSA. Only 37% performed below basic proficiency.
- Based on this analysis of the two specific groups of students, third graders with ECE experience in SDP did not perform as well as their charter school peers on PSSA reading in 2011-12. As noted above, even though SDP did not maintain ECE record for charter students, ARC can reasonably assume that some charter students included in this analysis did participate in ECE.

ECE Student Subgroups in First Grade Reading

In considering first grade reading performance for different subgroups of students with ECE records in SDP, ARC makes several observations (see Tables 3-7):

- Racial and ethnic minority students who had an ECE record performed better than their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP. For example, 48% of the Latino students who received ECE service from SDP performed at target in reading in the first grade, comparing with only 34% of their non-ECE peers (Table 3)

- Low-income students who had ECE SDP record generally performed better than their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP. For example, 60% of the students who were eligible for free lunch based on federal income guidelines (FA) performed at target in reading in the first grade, comparing with 51% of their non-ECE peers. Further, 49% of the students with an ECE SDP record and who were eligible for Medicaid and other state support programs performed at target in reading in the first grade, comparing with 37% of their non-ECE peers (Table 4)
- Both female and male students who had an ECE record performed better than their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP. For example, 56% of the female students who received ECE service from SDP performed at target in reading in the first grade, comparing with 49% of their non-ECE peers (Table 5)
- Regarding students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), 43% of the LEPs who received SDP ECE were performing at target, comparing to only 29% of the LEP students who did not have an ECE record. Consequently, the gap for reading at target between LEP students and their non-LEP peers was smaller for those who had an ECE record in SDP. For example, the gap was 10 percentage points between these two groups of students when they received ECE services in SDP. In contrast, the gap was 17 percentage points between these two groups of students when they did not have an ECE record in SDP (Table 6).
- For students with disabilities, the percentage of students who were reading at target was comparable among those with or without an ECE record in SDP. Only about 16%-17% were reading at target in the first grade (Table 7)

ECE Student Subgroups in Third Grade Reading

In considering reading performance at third grade for different subgroups of students with ECE record in SDP, ARC makes several observations (see Tables 8-12):

- Racial and ethnic minority students who had an ECE record performed generally better than their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP in PSSA at the third grade in 2011-12. In particular, 45% of the Latino students who received ECE service from SDP performed at the proficient and advanced levels in third grade reading, comparing with only 37% of their non-ECE peers (Table 8)
- Both female and male students who had an ECE record performed at a generally comparable level as their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP. For

example, 42% of the male students who received ECE service from SDP performed at the proficient and advanced levels in third grade reading, comparing with 38% of their non-ECE peers (Table 9)

- Low-income students who had ECE SDP record generally performed better than their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP. For example, 66% of the students who were eligible for free lunch based on federal income guidelines (FA) performed at proficiency or better in reading in third grade, comparing with 57% of their non-ECE peers. Further, 41% of the students with an ECE SDP record and who were eligible for Medicaid and other state support programs performed at proficiency or better in reading in third grade, comparing with 37% of their non-ECE peers (Table 10)

- For students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) who did not have an ECE record in SDP, 22% performed at or above the proficiency level in third grade reading. This percentage was higher than the LEP students who received ECE services from either community partners or the SDP (19% and 18% at proficiency or above respectively). This performance difference merits further examination. Consequently, the gap for reading at or above proficiency between LEP students and their non-LEP peers was slightly wider for those who had an ECE record in SDP. For example, the gap was 25 percentage points between these two groups of students when they did not receive ECE services in SDP. In contrast, the gap was 30 percentage points between these two groups of students when they had an ECE record in SDP (Table 11).

- For students with disabilities who received ECE service from community partner organizations, 24% performed at or above the proficiency level in third grade reading. This percentage was much higher than those who either did not have ECE record or those who received ECE service from SDP. Consequently, the reading gap was narrower between students with disabilities and their non-IEP peers when community partners provided the ECE services. The gap was 23 percentage points as compared to 33 and 37 percentage points for those who did not have an ECE record or who received SDP ECE services respectively (Table 12)

Policy Implications on Early Literacy

The data presented above appear to demonstrate that SDP ECE services have narrowed the reading gap for their students when compared with their non-ECE peers in the year or two immediately following the Pre-K services. Early identification of reading needs form the basis for early intervention, which may result in better reading achievement and reducing remediation cost in later grades. By the time students took the PSSA in the

third grade, the benefits of ECE in reading proficiency tended to fade. ARC believes that SDP has not fully capitalized the benefits of ECE in implementing reading strategies during Kindergarten through third grade.

The attainment of reading proficiency by the end of the third grade is one of the most important indicators of future academic success for all children. Consequently, there is an urgent need to reverse the trend described above of children losing ground in reading in the early grades. The analysis completed by ARC provides evidence that if students who are made reading ready as a result of these early childhood education experiences are identified and supported in the early grades (K-3) the benefits of ECE will be both retained and broadened. There is no doubt that every reform initiative from Kindergarten onward can be profoundly and positively affected by ECE.

ARC recommends the SRC and the Superintendent make it a priority to scale up the practices implemented by ECE providers that are associated with strong reading performance for particular subgroups of students, as suggested in this report. Among the findings on reading performance are:

- ECE services provided by community partners and the SDP were associated with a substantial percentage of Latino 3rd graders who scored at the level of proficiency or above in reading in the third grade PSSA.
- SDP Pre-K programs demonstrated that a higher percentage of their male students were meeting the PSSA reading proficiency level and better.
- Low-income students who had ECE SDP record generally performed better than their peers who did not have an ECE record in SDP.
- Community partners were more effective in preparing students with disabilities for reading proficiency by the time they took the PSSA in the third grade.
- At the same time, ARC observes a fading out of reading readiness as ECE students moved from Kindergarten to elementary grades.

In light of these findings, we further urge the SRC and the Superintendent to implement assessment-based intervention strategies in the early grades so that students who enter Kindergarten and first grade with strong reading skills do not lose ground. A more focused support system is necessary to ensure the learning transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten and the early elementary grades. K-2 teachers need to be fully engaged in student assessment of reading readiness. Diagnostic findings must be used to inform reading instruction across all early elementary grades on an ongoing manner in SDP. Full implementation of these practices will contribute to the District's aspiration of ensuring that all children become a proficient reader by the end of their third grade.

Finally, the district needs to move toward an accountability system that includes data on reading readiness for charter students in Pre-K through 2nd grade. Currently, Pre-K status for charter students is not part of the district data system. Data inclusion constitutes the necessary first step toward a more coherent support and monitoring system in the district. Our analysis shows that of the 933 third graders who took the PSSA reading assessment, 45% of them scored basic or below basic. There is clearly room for charter school improvement in reading.

To conclude, the district has an opportunity to build on the accomplishments of its Pre-K program with greater coordination on reading assessment and instruction in K-2. How can the district reverse the trend of losing ground as ECE students move toward third grade? What kind of support system should the SDP institute to ensure these effects are sustained? These are the critical issues that ARC urges the SRC and the Superintendent to give priority to even in the current climate of fiscal stress.

Key Issues in Accountability Review

This report has identified several key areas of focus for ARC through next year. Among the top issues are:

- ARC will focus on identifying the specific measures by which the District will be assessed in meeting its Action Plan objectives. ARC will examine how resources are deployed and the results of implementation of the initiatives described in the Action Plan to determine if the SRC and the District have done what they have committed to do in its public statements.
- ARC sees the need for SDP to implement a system of data accountability that uniformly applies to both charter schools and SDP schools. The lack of data transparency among charter schools is especially troubling from an accountability standpoint. ARC is hopeful that all charter schools will become part of the data accountability system in the near future.
- There is an urgent need to review and redesign the state funding formula so that resources are equitably distributed to meet the needs of the students in Philadelphia. As SRC Commissioner Joseph Dworetzky pointed out, state and local financing of charter schools may unfairly deprive District-run schools and students enrolled in them critical education resources.

Tables 1-12

Table 1. Yearly Reading Levels by ECE Program Type for Students who Attended Pre-K in SDP, 2007-08										
		<i>End of year Kindergarten Reading Level</i>			<i>End of year 1st Grade Reading Level</i>			<i>End of year 2nd Grade Reading Level</i>		
		At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention
Pre-K Program in SDP 2007-08	<i>No Pre-K in SDP</i>	3215	2419	1090	3552	2063	1966	4314	1135	2329
		48%	36%	16%	47%	27%	26%	55%	15%	30%
	Bright Futures	235	90	4	234	65	39	235	42	46
		71%	27%	1%	69%	19%	12%	73%	13%	14%
	CELC	63	28	2	55	27	11	55	17	14
		68%	30%	2%	59%	29%	12%	64%	20%	16%
	Head Start	1240	799	35	1110	615	415	1217	336	510
		60%	39%	2%	52%	29%	19%	59%	16%	25%
Pre-K Counts	86	60	3	96	43	26	88	25	43	
	58%	40%	2%	58%	26%	16%	56%	16%	28%	

Percentages are for students who had an end of the year reading score
The percentages represent the students within a program at each intervention level. For example 71% of Bright Futures students were At Target in Kindergarten

Table 2. PSSA Proficiency Level by Third Grade School Type, 2011-12

	Total Number of Students who took PSSA	<i>Advanced</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Basic</i>	<i>Below Basic</i>	Number of Students who did not take PSSA
CHARTER	933	94 10%	417 45%	163 17%	259 28%	48
DISTRICT (Only Students with ECE Record in SDP)	2899	252 9%	1093 38%	474 16%	1080 37%	195
TOTAL (for the two groups)	3843	346 9%	1512 39%	637 17%	1348 35%	245

Table 3. First Grade End of 2011-12 Reading Levels by ECE Designation and Race/Ethnicity

	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	44%	28%	28%	100%
ASIAN	56%	22%	22%	100%
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN	40%	31%	28%	100%
HISPANIC/LATINO	34%	27%	39%	100%
MULTI RACIAL/OTHER	40%	26%	34%	100%
WHITE	60%	23%	17%	100%
PARTNER	49%	28%	23%	100%
ASIAN	70%	24%	6%	100%
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN	46%	28%	25%	100%
HISPANIC/LATINO	41%	30%	29%	100%
MULTI RACIAL/OTHER	56%	29%	16%	100%
WHITE	62%	26%	12%	100%
SDP	52%	29%	19%	100%
ASIAN	67%	21%	13%	100%
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN	50%	30%	20%	100%
HISPANIC/LATINO	48%	28%	23%	100%
MULTI RACIAL/OTHER	56%	30%	14%	100%
WHITE	58%	29%	13%	100%
Grand Total	46%	28%	26%	100%

Table 4. First Grade End of 2011-12 Reading Levels by ECE Designation and Free and Reduced Price Lunch

	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	44%	28%	28%	100%
FA	51%	28%	21%	100%
FT	37%	29%	33%	100%
NA	56%	24%	20%	100%
RA	60%	27%	13%	100%
PARTNER	49%	28%	23%	100%
FA	47%	44%	9%	100%
FT	45%	28%	27%	100%
NA	59%	25%	16%	100%
RA	67%	24%	10%	100%
SDP	52%	29%	19%	100%
FA	60%	30%	11%	100%
FT	49%	29%	22%	100%
NA	61%	27%	13%	100%
RA	58%	31%	11%	100%
Grand Total	46%	28%	26%	100%

FA: Free Lunch based on federal income guidelines

FT: Free Lunch based on state program eligibility

NA: No Free/Reduced Price Lunch

RA: Reduced Price lunch

Table 5. First Grade End of 2011-12 Reading Levels by ECE Designation and Gender

	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	44%	28%	28%	100%
FEMALE	49%	27%	24%	100%
MALE	39%	29%	32%	100%
PARTNER	49%	28%	23%	100%
FEMALE	53%	28%	19%	100%
MALE	44%	29%	27%	100%
SDP	52%	29%	19%	100%
FEMALE	56%	28%	16%	100%
MALE	48%	29%	23%	100%
Grand Total	46%	28%	26%	100%

Table 6. First Grade End of 2011-12 Reading Levels by ECE Designation and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	44%	28%	28%	100%
N	46%	28%	26%	100%
Y	29%	27%	44%	100%
PARTNER	49%	28%	23%	100%
N	50%	28%	21%	100%
Y	40%	28%	32%	100%
SDP	52%	29%	19%	100%
N	53%	29%	19%	100%
Y	43%	31%	25%	100%
Grand Total	46%	28%	26%	100%

Table 7. First Grade End of 2011-12 Reading Levels by ECE Designation and Learning Disability

Row Labels	At Target	Strategic Intervention	Intensive Intervention	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	44%	28%	28%	100%
N	47%	29%	25%	100%
Y	16%	22%	63%	100%
PARTNER	49%	28%	23%	100%
N	51%	29%	20%	100%
Y	17%	20%	63%	100%
SDP	52%	29%	19%	100%
N	54%	29%	17%	100%
Y	17%	24%	60%	100%
Grand Total	46%	28%	26%	100%

Table 8. Third-Grade Reading PSSA Proficiency Levels by ECE Designation and Race/Ethnicity

	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	9%	35%	15%	41%	100%
ASIAN	17%	44%	12%	27%	100%
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN	5%	33%	15%	47%	100%
HISPANIC/LATINO	5%	32%	16%	47%	100%
MULTI RACIAL/OTHER	12%	35%	16%	38%	100%
WHITE	21%	44%	12%	23%	100%
Partner	8%	37%	16%	39%	100%
ASIAN	23%	47%	17%	13%	100%
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN	5%	32%	17%	45%	100%
HISPANIC/LATINO	5%	38%	17%	41%	100%
MULTI RACIAL/OTHER	8%	38%	13%	42%	100%
WHITE	16%	55%	13%	16%	100%
SDP	9%	38%	16%	37%	100%
ASIAN	29%	50%	7%	13%	100%
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN	7%	35%	18%	40%	100%
HISPANIC/LATINO	9%	36%	16%	38%	100%
MULTI RACIAL/OTHER	6%	49%	13%	32%	100%
WHITE	20%	51%	11%	17%	100%
Grand Total	9%	36%	15%	40%	100%

Table 9. Third Grade Reading PSSA Proficiency Levels by ECE Designation and Gender

	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	9%	35%	14%	41%	100%
FEMALE	10%	39%	15%	35%	100%
MALE	7%	31%	14%	46%	100%
Partner	7%	37%	16%	39%	100%
FEMALE	9%	41%	19%	31%	100%
MALE	6%	33%	14%	45%	100%
SDP	9%	38%	16%	37%	100%
FEMALE	10%	40%	16%	33%	100%
MALE	7%	35%	16%	40%	100%
Grand Total	9%	35%	15%	40%	100%

Table 10. Third-Grade Reading PSSA Proficiency Levels by ECE Designation and Free and Reduced Price Lunch

	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	9%	35%	15%	41%	100%
FA	12%	45%	13%	30%	100%
FT	5%	32%	16%	47%	100%
NA	16%	39%	13%	32%	100%
RA	15%	46%	12%	27%	100%
Partner	8%	37%	16%	39%	100%
FA	18%	48%	13%	20%	100%
FT	5%	32%	18%	45%	100%
NA	10%	47%	14%	29%	100%
RA	11%	33%	11%	44%	100%
SDP	9%	38%	16%	37%	100%
FA	16%	50%	9%	26%	100%
FT	7%	34%	19%	41%	100%
NA	14%	45%	12%	29%	100%
RA	11%	56%	7%	27%	100%
Grand Total	9%	36%	15%	40%	100%

FA: Free Lunch based on federal income guidelines

FT: Free Lunch based on state program eligibility

NA: No Free/Reduced Price Lunch

RA: Reduced Price lunch

Table 11. Third Grade Reading PSSA Proficiency Levels by ECE Designation and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	9%	35%	15%	41%	100%
N	10%	37%	15%	39%	100%
Y	2%	20%	17%	62%	100%
Partner	8%	37%	16%	39%	100%
N	8%	40%	15%	37%	100%
Y	4%	15%	25%	55%	100%
SDP	9%	38%	16%	37%	100%
N	9%	39%	16%	36%	100%
Y	0%	18%	20%	63%	100%
Grand Total	9%	36%	15%	40%	100%

Table 12. Third Grade Reading PSSA Proficiency Levels by ECE Designation and Learning Disability

	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Grand Total
No ECE Record in SDP	9%	35%	15%	41%	100%
N	10%	39%	15%	35%	100%
Y	2%	14%	12%	72%	100%
Partner	8%	37%	16%	39%	100%
N	8%	39%	18%	35%	100%
Y	3%	21%	6%	70%	100%
SDP	9%	38%	16%	37%	100%
N	10%	41%	17%	33%	100%
Y	2%	12%	11%	75%	100%
Grand Total	9%	36%	15%	40%	100%