

APPENDIX A2: SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS BY GOAL

Summary of Major FY 2009 Program Evaluations and Studies

For a complete list of program evaluations and studies from the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, please visit <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html>. For a complete list of evaluation studies of the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/index.asp>.

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
<i>The Evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform Program Implementation and Outcomes: Third Year Report (2008)</i>	1	Provides third-year study findings regarding schools receiving comprehensive school reform (CSR) assistance awards in 2002, focusing on (1) how the CSR award receipt was related to subsequent changes in achievement and (2) whether or not aspects of program implementation were associated with achievement gains. Findings are based on analyses of survey, case study and assessment data collected from grantees and comparison schools from fall 2002 through spring 2005.	Key findings: (1) Receipt of a CSR award was not associated with gains in mathematics or reading achievement through the first three years of award. (2) There was limited evidence that schools adopting models with scientific evidence of effectiveness experienced positive gains, especially in math.	http://www.ed.gov/r schstat/eval/other/c srd-outcomes/year3-report.pdf
<i>Technical Methods Reports Series (various dates)</i>	1	Large-scale evaluations of education programs and practices supported by federal funds; provides research-based technical assistance to educators and policymakers.	Reports address current methodological questions and offer guidance to resolving or advancing the application of high-quality evaluation methods in varying educational contexts.	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
<p><i>The Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs Final Report (2009)</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The primary purpose of this study is to determine whether providing structured academic instruction in reading or math to students in grades 2 to 5 during their after-school hours—instead of the less formal academic supports offered in regular after-school programs—improves their academic performance in the subject. This is the second and final report from the Evaluation of Enhanced Academic Instruction in After-School Programs—a two-year demonstration and random assignment evaluation of structured approaches to teaching math and reading in after-school settings.</p>	<p>One year of enhanced instruction in math produces positive and statistically significant impacts on student achievement. Two years of the enhanced program produce no additional achievement benefit beyond the one-year impact. Students in the enhanced programs received math and reading instruction that was more structured and intensive than regular after-school students. The enhanced reading program has no impact on total reading test scores after one year of participation. Two years of participation produces significantly fewer gains in reading achievement for students in the enhanced program group.</p>	<p>http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20094077/pdf/20094077.pdf</p>
<p><i>Effectiveness of Selected Supplemental Reading Comprehension Interventions: Impacts on a First Cohort of Fifth-Grade Students (2009)</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Reports on the impacts on student achievement for four supplemental reading curricula that use similar overlapping instructional strategies designed to improve reading comprehension in social studies and science text.</p>	<p>Fifth-grade reading comprehension for each of three commercially available curricula (Project CRISS, ReadAbout and Read for Real) was not significantly different from the control group. The fourth curriculum, Reading for Knowledge, was adapted from Success for All for this study and had a statistically significant negative impact on fifth-grade reading comprehension.</p>	<p>http://ies.ed.gov/nc/ee/pubs/20094032/pdf/20094032.pdf</p>

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
<p><i>State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VIII-Teacher Quality Under NCLB: Final Report (2009)</i></p>	1	<p>Provides updated information on the progress that states, districts and schools have made in implementing <i>NCLB's</i> teacher quality, professional development and paraprofessional provisions. The report is based on the second round of data collection from the National Longitudinal Study of <i>NCLB</i> and the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under <i>NCLB</i>. The report presents findings from interviews with state education officials in all states and surveys of nationally representative samples of districts, principals and teachers conducted in 2004–05 and 2006–07.</p>	<p>Key findings include: (1) By 2006–07, the vast majority of teachers met their states' requirements to be considered highly qualified under <i>NCLB</i>. (2) State requirements for the demonstration of content-knowledge expertise varied greatly. (3) Teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. (4) Even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught. (5) Nearly all teachers reported taking part in content-focused professional development related to reading or mathematics during the 2005–06 school year and summer; a relatively small proportion participated in extended sessions.</p>	<p>http://www.ed.gov/r schstat/eval/teachin g/nclb- final/report.pdf</p>
<p><i>Title I Implementation: Update on Recent Evaluation Findings (2009)</i></p>	1	<p>Provides a summary of findings from Title I evaluation studies that have become available after the publication of the National Assessment of Title I final report in 2007. The report presents data collected in 2006–07 through the National Longitudinal Study of <i>NCLB</i> and the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under <i>NCLB</i>. The report includes findings from interviews with state education officials in all states; surveys of nationally representative samples of districts, principals and teachers; data from consolidated state performance reports; and analyses of student achievement trends on state assessments and NAEP.</p>	<p>In states with consistent achievement trend data from 2004–05 to 2006–07, the percentage of students reaching the state's proficient level rose for most student groups, but most states would not meet <i>NCLB's</i> goal of 100-percent proficiency by 2013–14 unless student achievement increases at a faster rate. Nearly 11,000 Title I schools were identified for improvement in 2006–07, and almost half were in the more advanced stages of corrective action and restructuring. Student participation in Title I school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) continues to rise, and district expenditures on these choice options doubled from 2003–04 to 2005–06.</p>	<p>http://www.ed.gov/a bout/offices/list/ope pd/ppss/reports.htm l/#title</p>

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
<i>State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VI—Targeting and Uses of Federal Education Funds (2009)</i>	1	Examines how well federal funds are targeted to districts and schools serving economically disadvantaged students, how Title I targeting has changed over the past seven years, how districts have spent federal funds and the base of state and local resources to which federal funds are added. The report covers six federal programs: Title I, Part A; Reading First; Comprehensive School Reform (CSR); Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; and Perkins Vocational Education State Grants.	Key findings include: (1) Federal education funds were more strongly targeted to high-poverty districts than were state and local funds; however, the higher level of federal funding in high-poverty districts was not sufficient to close the funding gap between high- and low-poverty districts. (2) The overall share of Title I funds going to the highest-poverty districts and schools changed little between 1997–98 and 2004–05, and the highest-poverty schools continued to receive smaller Title I allocations per low-income student than did the lowest-poverty schools.	http://www.ed.gov/r schstat/eval/disadv/ nclb-targeting/nclb-targeting.pdf
<i>Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction Results From the Second Year of a Randomized Controlled Study (2009)</i>	1	Compares outcomes of teachers offered intensive induction activities with full-time mentors to those of teachers with less intensive, less structured induction activities using an experimental study design.	There was no impact on teacher retention rates or overall student achievement.	http://ies.ed.gov/nc ee/pubs/20094072/ pdf/20094072.pdf
<i>The Impacts of Regular Upward Bound on Postsecondary Outcomes 7–9 Years After Scheduled High School Graduation: Final Report (2009)</i>	2	The study findings are based on a random assignment design implemented in a nationally representative sample of 67 Upward Bound projects hosted by two- and four-year colleges and universities. About 1,500 eligible applicants were randomly assigned to the evaluation's treatment group and were allowed to participate in Upward Bound, and about 1,300 students were randomly assigned to the control group.	The study concluded that Upward Bound (1) had no detectable effect on the rate of overall postsecondary enrollment or the type or selectivity of postsecondary institution attended; (2) increased the likelihood of earning a postsecondary certificate or license from a vocational school but had no detectable effect on the likelihood of earning a bachelor's or associate's degree; and (3) increased postsecondary enrollment and completion for students with lower educational expectations at baseline.	http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope pd/ppss/reports.html#higher

Name of Report	Goal	Issue	Findings and Recommendations	Link to the Report
Academic Competitiveness and SMART Grant Programs: First-Year Lessons Learned (2009)	3	<p>Academic Competitiveness Grants (ACG) and National SMART Grants (NSG) were created in the <i>Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005 (HERA)</i>. ACGs are intended to encourage students to take more challenging courses in high school, making success in college more likely. NSGs are intended to encourage post-secondary students to take college majors in high demand in the global economy, such as science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) and critical foreign languages. Students eligible for Pell Grants who completed a "rigorous program of study" in high school received an ACG of up to \$750 in their first year and, if they earned a 3.0 or better grade point average (GPA), up to \$1,300 in their second year. Pell-eligible students who majored in a STEM field or critical foreign language and maintained a 3.0 GPA received an NSG for up to \$4,000 for their third and fourth years.</p>	<p>Key findings: (1) Given the rapid implementation of the programs, many stakeholders reported difficulties in identifying eligible students. (2) Of the \$790 million appropriated for these programs for the initial year FY 2006, approximately \$448 million (57 percent) was disbursed. (3) Fewer students received awards than estimated: About 300,000 ACGs and 60,000 NSGs were awarded, as compared to initial budget estimates of 425,000 ACGs and 80,000 NSGs. (4) About three-quarters of ACG recipients were first-year students, suggesting that second-year students had difficulty meeting the 3.0 GPA requirements. (5) Of 3,600 postsecondary institutions eligible to award Pell Grants and ACGs, about 2,800 (78 percent) participated.</p>	<p>http://www.ed.gov/r schstat/eval/higher ed/acsmartyear1/ac smart.pdf</p>