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## LA 4/Starting Points:

## Early Childhood Education in Louisiana



## Louisiana's Prekindergarten Success Transfers to Third Grade iLEAP Scores

In 2006-07, prekindergarten intervention was provided in the LA 4/Starting Points (SP) programs for over 10,000 LA 4/SP-eligible children. Analyses of LA 4/SP test scores over past school years reveal significant improvement in the participating children's pretest to posttest performance. For each of the last six years, LA 4/SP children's performance on the posttest remains close to or higher than the national average on the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC). Specific analyses of the test scores also indicate a narrowing of the gap in performances of children from differing family income backgrounds. Additionally, these results coincide with the implementation of highquality Louisiana Standards for Programs Serving Four-Year-Old Children and the Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum, such as hiring certified teachers and highly qualified aides, providing full-day programs, and maintaining a low child-to-teacher ratio. Research-based and developmentally appropriate curricula such as Creative Curriculum and High Scope serve as a pedagogical foundation. This year, longanticipated iLEAP results confirmed that the gains made in prekindergarten for Cohort 1 children carried over to third grade iLEAP scores as well.

## Each year enrollment

 in LA 4 has increased. In 2006-07, 10,041 children received high-quality, early childhood education in Louisiana through the LA 4/Starting Points program. During the 2007-08 school year, LA 4 will serve 13,409 preschoolers.

## *Children who do

 not qualify based on their FRL status may be locally funded or pay tuition.
## Who Is Served by LA 4/SP?

The LA 4 /SP program is targeted to serve at-risk children who qualify for Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) services. In addition, it provides services to children with disabilities and access to other support services focusing not only on academics, but on health issues as well. This focus leads to the following questions:

- Is the LA 4/SP Program serving its intended audience of children at risk for school failure? YES. Onsite program monitoring conducted at midyear indicates that $94 \%$ of LA 4 participants were enrolled in FRL services for the 2006-07 school year. These data demonstrate that the program serves the targeted population of at-risk children.


## The History of LA 4/SP

The LA 4 prekindergarten program began in 2001 with the passage of Senate Bill 776 and was designed to serve 4-year-old children not currently enrolled in publicly funded prekindergarten classes. The LA 4 program was modeled after the Starting Points prekindergarten program, which began in the 1992-93 school year. Both programs follow Louisiana Standards for Programs Serving Four-Year-Old Children and the Comprehensive Curriculum to assure the provision of highquality services at no cost for those children eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch services (FRL). Children not qualifying based on income may pay tuition or be locally funded. Over the past 6 years the following characteristics have emerged as the quality anchors of the Louisiana preschool effort:

- Certified early childhood teachers

Small classroom sizes of 20 children

- Vision, hearing, and dental screening 10:1 child-to-adult ratio
- Full-day (6-hour) program
- Research-based and developmentally appropriate curricula
- At least 18 hours of targeted professional development each year
- Before- and-after school enrichment program
- Program evaluation using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R)
- Pretest and posttest measurement of child progress using the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC)
- Evaluation and longitudinal research necessary to measure and predict outcomes
- Collaboration with physical health, mental health, and social service agencies
- Support and adult education services for children and their families
- SWOT analysis to determine perceived strengths and needs

The LA 4 program also provides transportation for its participating children. Before-and-after school enrichment activities are available to all 4-year-old children, whether or not they participate in the full program. The Louisiana Department of Education contracts with the University of Louisiana at Lafayette Center for Child Development to conduct program evaluation and longitudinal research analysis. arget population of at-risk childre.

- Are children with disabilities included in the LA 4/SP program? YES. What was their level of participation? At the beginning of the school year, parents reported $1.7 \%$ of the participants qualified for special education. By the end of the school year, the participation rate reported by the school districts was $6.84 \%$. This rate is less than half of the state average in other grades.
- Do LA 4/SP children receive needed support services? YES. What is the LA 4/SP referral participation activity for vision, hearing, and dental screening services across the state? The following table shows that $93 \%$ of the enrolled children were screened for vision, $88 \%$ were screened for hearing, and $22 \%$ received dental screenings.

| Total LA 4 | Vision | Hearing | Dental |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment | Screenings | Screenings | Screenings |
| 10,041 | 9,355 | 8,861 | 2,232 |

## Children Perform Better on the DSC

Every year the LA 4/SP program has demonstrated significant improvement in child performance on the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC) from pretest to posttest statewide. The school year 2006-07 was no exception. At-risk children left the LA 4 program this year performing at or above the national average in all areas tested.

National Percentile Rank for LA 4/Starting Points Children Statewide in Language, Print, and Math Across Program Years


*National Percentile Rank is determined by the conversion of the mean number of correct responses.
†2001-02 was the pilot year for LA 4. Students enrolled in this year only attended a half year of the program, starting in January 2002.

## High-Quality Classrooms: Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R)

Does the LA 4/SP program demonstrate higher ECERS-R program quality ratings when compared to similar programs outside of Louisiana? YES. Programs in LA 4/SP continue to perform well above expected levels when compared to similar programs in other states. The ECERS-R program quality assessment is conducted utilizing a random sampling of classrooms participating in the LA 4/SP programs. This assessment encompasses seven areas associated with programs of high quality: space and furnishings, personal care routines, language reasoning, activities, interaction, program structure, and parents and staff. A compilation of the assessment scores for this sample of 75 classrooms rated the LA 4/SP classrooms as "good to excellent," with an overall score of 5.5 on a scale of 1 to 7 .


The SWOT findings reported here are based on feedback from a representative sample of schools. Responses from all schools were analyzed and will be included in a future report.


## Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT)

Does the SWOT analysis of stakeholder perceptions reveal areas of strengths and opportunities as well as weaknesses and threats so as to inform and develop strategies for continued improvement? YES.

SWOT is completed by administrators and teachers each year in order to ascertain stakeholders' perceptions of program implementation and performance. Generally, strengths and opportunities were noted in the areas of funding, curriculum, faculty and staff, training, and children's improved language and literacy skills. Issues noted as weaknesses and/ or threats in need of attention centered around classroom improvements, use of the ECERS-R program, behavior management, and staff. Some areas were identified as both strengths and weakness, or as opportunities and threats. This could be due in part to stakeholders' desire to enhance an already strong area as well as possibly demonstrating the need for further training in the use of the SWOT as an analytical tool.

## Longitudinal Benefits

Does LA 4 affect performance in later grades? YES.

LA 4/SP has consistently demonstrated high quality results each year that the program has been in existence. High quality standards for the program have resulted in children being ready for kindergarten. The expectation that these children would experience continued academic success based on the available research was realized this year as Cohort 1 demonstrated increased iLEAP performance when compared to their peers who received no public prekindergarten. The following sections present the longitudinal impact of LA 4/SP on reading, grade retention, special education participation, and performance on standardized tests. The first year (2001-02) services were provided for a half year and will be referred to as the "Pilot Group." Subsequent years are then referred to by "cohort" beginning with the 2002-03 students being identified as Cohort 1 . Subsequently, 2003-04 is Cohort 2, 2004-05 is Cohort 3, 2005-06 is Cohort 4, and 2006-07 is Cohort 5 .

## Longitudinal Benefits: Reading First

Is there a positive relationship between LA 4/SP and participation in the Reading First program? YES.

Children previously in LA 4/SP perform overall at higher levels in the Reading First program. Children who are exposed to both programs perform at higher levels than children who have only LA 4 or Reading First. Students who participate in either program perform at higher levels than students who have participated in neither.

## Percentage of Students on Benchmark as Measured by Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Oral Reading Fluency

Data limited to the following LEAs that participate in both programs:

Bogalusa, DeSoto, East Baton Rouge, Jefferson, Tangipahoa, Vermilion, and Washington

|  | Neither LA 4 nor <br> Reading First | Reading First <br> Only | LA 4 | Reading First + <br> LA 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| First Grade | $49 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| Second Grade | $38 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Third Grade | $31 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $46 \%$ |

## Longitudinal Benefits: Retention

## Does LA 4 affect retention rates? YES.

Children who participated in LA 4 in the 2004-05 (Cohort 3) school year and who received FRL services showed a statistically significant difference in retention rate (6.91\%) in kindergarten as compared to the retention rate of their peers who did not receive public prekindergarten services (11.29\%).


## Longitudinal Benefits: Student Achievement

Does LA 4 affect child performance on the Integrated Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (iLEAP)? YES.

Children who received the first full year of LA 4 (Cohort 1, 2002-03) performed better on statewide tests of achievement in the third grade than did their peers who received no public prekindergarten and better than students statewide as a whole.


Note: Statewide represents students who entered public school kindergarten the same year as Cohort 1 students and completed iLEAP testing in the third grade.

Children who participated in LA 4/SP demonstrated increased levels of student achievement and decreased
levels of retention and special education participation.

African American


Both African American and White/ non-Hispanic students who received the LA 4 program in 2002-03 (Cohort 1) and were eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch Services (FRL) had higher achievement levels on the iLEAP than students who were eligible for FRL services but did not receive any public prekindergarten.


Females


Males


Both males and females who received the LA 4 program in 2002-03 (Cohort 1) and were eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) services had higher achievement levels on the iLEAP than students who were eligible for FRL services but did not receive any public prekindergarten.

## Longitudinal Benefits: Special Education

Does LA 4 affect Special Education participation rates? YES.
Children who participated in LA 4 (FRL) during 2004-05 (Cohort 3) were significantly less likely to be placed in Special Education during their kindergarten and first grade years than children who were also eligible for FRL services but did not participate in a public prekindergarten program.

Percentage of Children Placed in Special Education in Kindergarten as a Function of Participation in the LA 4 Program and FRL Eligibility for Cohort 3 (2004-05)


Percentage of Children Placed in Special Education in First Grade as a Function of Participation in the LA 4 Program and FRL Eligibility for Cohort 3 (2004-05)


## Closing the Gap: Student Performance

Proportion of Correct Responses for African American LA 4 Students Statewide in Language, by Family Income Level for 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{3 , 8 8 1 \text { ) }}$


Pretest
Posttest

Proportion of Correct Responses for White LA 4 Students Statewide in Language, by Family Income Level for 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=3,452$ )


## What the Future Holds

In summary, for the past six years, results from the evaluation of LA 4/SP have consistently come to the same conclusion: high-quality preschool works! The Louisiana Department of Education early childhood staff and CCD staff at UL Lafayette have recently constructed research designs to answer the following longitudinal research questions. Implementation of these research questions will measure whether or not students benefiting from this program continue to sustain their gains consistent with previous longitudinal research findings.

- Do children maintain these gains as demonstrated by iLEAP scores in grades 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9?
- Is there less grade level retention among LA 4/SP children?
- Is there a reduction in special education placement?
- How do LA 4/SP children perform in schools with different school performance scores?
- Do LA 4/SP children have higher graduation rates?

Children enrolled in the LA 4/SP program demonstrate a similar proportion of correct responses on the DSC regardless of ethnicity when their responses are controlled for income. These results also suggest a larger positive response from lower income families.


STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
POST OFFICE BOX 94064, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804-9064 Toll Free \#: 1-877-453-2721
http://www.louisianaschools.net

Thank you for your continued support of the LA 4/Starting Points program. The State Department of Education has been able to help even more children in Louisiana because of the legislature's approval to increase funding by $\$ 23$ million. As a result, LA 4 has been expanded to include approximately 5,000 additional students this school year, bringing the total number of students in the program to approximately 15,000.

This program started as a vision of my dear friend Cecil J. Picard, who was a great champion of high-quality, early childhood education. He worked diligently to develop a quality PreKindergarten program for children under the age of 5 , especially at-risk children. Our goal is to continue Cecil's dream of making certain this program ultimately serves every at-risk child in this state.

LA 4 has a proven track record of success and it remains a top priority for this department. The research continues to show that students who participate in LA 4 outperform those students who do not. LA 4 students who started the 2006-2007 school year scoring in the lowest quartile for math, language, and print, scored above the national average for PreK students after one year in the program. Language test scores for both black and white students of various income levels indicate a narrowing of the achievement gap. Its impact is far reaching and the benefits can be seen in students for many years afterward. Extensive data shows that this program has helped improve students' test scores as well as their literacy and math skills.

It is clear that LA 4 is a smart investment, and I am confident that the return on our investment will be significant for years to come. Based on analysis conducted by the Center for Child Development at $U L L$, it is expected that students who participate in LA 4 will perform better in school, have higher test scores, and will have fewer retentions and referrals to special education.

Unfortunately, many of our school-age children live in poverty. One of the greatest gifts this state can give them is a solid education, one that will enable them to be successful in the classroom and in life. Education is the strongest path to breaking that cycle of poverty. My executive team and I are currently crafting an academic plan that will create a world-class education system for ALL students. That is the Department's vision for the children of Louisiana. Our mission is to improve the academic performance for ALL students, eliminate achievement gaps, and prepare students to be effective citizens in a global market. We are reaching out to education experts statewide, nationally, and internationally. LA 4 is an integral part of this plan. I will share more details with you once it has been finalized.

I am grateful for Governor Kathleen Blanco's support of LA 4 and its expansion. I look forward to working with each of you as we embark on the road to improving education for ALL of our children.

Paul G. Pastorek
State Superintendent of Education
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## LOUISIANALA 4 PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM: STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS

The LA 4 prekindergarten program began in 2001 after the passage of Senate Bill 776. The purpose of the program is to serve 4-year-old children not currently enrolled in publicly funded prekindergarten classes. The LA 4 program was modeled after the Starting Points prekindergarten program which began in the 1992-93 school year.

This report summarizes the results of an extensive qualitative analysis in which 373 administrators and 636 teachers were asked to provide valuable feedback regarding their experiences with the LA 4 program. Responses were received from 282 administrators and 471 teachers, which corresponds to a 75\% response rate. Respondents provided the sort of valuable insight into the LA 4 program that can only be obtained from those who are intimately involved in the daily functioning of the program.

A standardized analytical tool named the SWOT survey, is designed to capture the internal strengths and weaknesses of the LA 4 program, as well as the external opportunities and threats that may exist. The ultimate pur-

pose is to gather quality subjective information from teachers and administrators to aid in program development.

In this survey, strengths were defined as things done well or the advantages of LA 4. Weaknesses were defined as what could be improved or needs to be avoided. External strengths (economy, community support) were considered opportunities; outside obstacles were considered threats to the program.
"The LA 4 program is research-based and evaluated by state monitors. This is a strength!"

LA 4 Teacher

## Background

In 2006-07, prekindergarten intervention was provided by the LA 4/Starting Points programs for over 10,000 eligible children. The overwhelming growth and success of LA 4 has led to inquiries regarding the characteristics that make Louisiana's preschool program so remarkable.

SWOT analysis has been used effectively in the past to develop the agenda and strategies that have moved the LA 4 program forward by identifying stakeholder concerns. Issues such as ensuring reliable funding, aligning curriculum, and reducing paperwork have been targeted and improvements have been made.

In the 2005-06 school year, a similar analysis was completed. Key findings from that evaluation included the following concerns: quality of instruction; program guidelines; facilitation of school readiness; social and emotional growth experienced by the students; family communication; assessment, accountability, and record keeping; funding; and inclusion.

The results from the 200607 analysis revealed similar concerns as the previous year along with several newly emerging themes. Issues common to both analyses are noted in the recommendations at the end of this report.

The findings here reflect those responses that were commented upon most frequently. Then, because each theme is multilayered, some of the alternative views are presented along with opportunities and threats.

Consequently, recommendations will be comprehensive and multilayered. This qualitative approach to inquiry allows for investigation into the program so that adjustments and improvements can be made and positive outcomes will be sustainable.

The strengths of the LA 4 program were categorized based on the overall number of respondents who considered each of the particular components to be key to the success of LA 4. Then, within each of these categories, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities were investigated in detail.

The themes that emerged from this investigation include funding,
 curriculum, faculty, behavior management, kindergarten readiness, and training and seminars.

## Funding



Approximately 25\% of the respondents ranked funding as one of the major strengths of the LA 4 program. Especially appreciated were the quality and variety of materials that teachers have available to them, including storybooks and paper products. Additionally, funding of field trips was considered a priority for teachers who frequently reported that such opportunities were invaluable for their students who otherwise would miss out on these important experiences.

Funding was also a source of concern for many respondents, especially administrators. Approximately $27 \%$ of administrators considered the lack of funding a threat to the LA 4 program. Additional concerns about funding included reports that funds were not always available at the beginning of the school year as well as the practice of linking funding to student attendance. Administrators found this to be quite a challenge for budgeting. Additionally, faculty felt that requiring a physician's excused absence was unreasonable as many childhood illnesses do not require a visit to a doctor, and for many families, transportation and costs associated with medical care make this obligation a burden.

While the funds provided were obviously appreciated, teachers had many recommendations for future fund allocation. Topping their list ( $23 \%$ of teacher respondents) were improvements to classrooms, including additional space for children and for storage, and accessibility to bathroom facilities. Many teachers acknowledged that their classrooms did not meet ECERS-R requirements and regretted they were unable to meet standards due to lack of funding. Improvements to outdoor playground facilities were also on the wish list for $13 \%$ of respondents. Teachers reported that playgrounds were not always appropriate for preschool children, that there was limited space to meet the gross motor skill requirements set forth by ECERS-R, and that playgrounds were not easily accessible. Faculty would also like to see funds made available for salary increases.
"This program reaches children who are most in need-those at risk who live in poverty." LA 4 Teacher

## Curriculum

Both teachers and administrators value the LA 4 curriculum and 8\% listed it among the greatest strengths of the program. They reported that the curriculum promotes independence, establishes routines, and develops social skills. The diversity of subjects taught and the exposure children had to technology and other cultures were also listed as strengths. Approximately $6 \%$ of responding educators specifically noted that by participating in the LA 4 program, children demonstrated remarkable improvement in language and literacy skills. Other respondents noted that hands-on exploration across the curriculum was especially beneficial.

Approximately $7 \%$ of respondents listed the curriculum as a weakness of the LA 4 program. Some individuals reported that the curriculum is too rigid and that this inhibits creativity. Others noted that the structure of the program makes it difficult to individualize instruction for maximum classroom effectiveness. Some teachers expressed that, after completing daily requirements, they were left with no time for planning and very little time to complete the variety of mandatory assessment tools.
> "Education's purpose is to replace an empty mind with an open one."

Malcolm S. Forbes (1919-1990)

## ECERS-R

Some of the teachers who responded (10\%) listed ECERS-R as one of the weaknesses of the LA 4 program and some even identified it as a threat (13\%). Particularly troubling to them were the following concerns:
"Between ECERS and the comprehensive cur-riculum-we are being forced to do things that are not realistic and are not always developmentally appropriate-it puts overdue stress on teachers and their students."

LA 4 Teacher
-lack of ECERS-R training
-ECERS-R emphasis is inappropriate -inconsistency in ECERS-R observations and scores -requirements of ECERS-R are beyond the teachers control -lack of follow-up responsibility for identified ECERS-R deficiencies

Educators recommended that other evaluation tools be investigated or that ECERS-R evaluations be conducted every 2 years rather then annually.

It should be noted that some respondents listed ECERS-R as a strength of the program and others reported an appreciation for the high accountability that the LA 4 program provides.

## Faculty Attributes

Almost 16\% of responding teachers and administrators agreed that the highly qualified teachers in the LA 4 program are in large part responsible for the program's success. Additionally, the quality of program administration was noted as a strength by many teachers ( $5 \%$ of teacher respondents). Teachers were very appreciative of the assistance of paraprofessionals which results in a low child-to-instructor ratio. However, it was noted that some of the children, especially those with special needs, require additional attention, and the ratio was still considered to be too high to adequately provide for these children's requirements (3\% of teacher respondents). The need for additional staff to address children with special needs was reported by a number of teachers and administrators as both an opportunity and a threat to the program.

Teachers identified various threats regarding staffing. They worried that some fellow instructors were frustrated and that they might request grade transfers. The lack of tenure concerned some, and others worried that there are too few qualified teachers available to hire.

Some teachers reported having excellent working relationships with kindergarten teachers and they viewed this as a strength of their program. However, a substantial number stated that establishing collaborative relationships with kindergarten teachers and with each other would benefit the program and viewed this as an opportunity.

```
"It is the supreme art of
the teacher to awaken joy
in creative expression and
knowledge."
```

Albert Einstein

"Lack of staff development for new teachers could lessen effectiveness of the program."

LA 4 Administrator

## Behavior Management



The ability to manage students' off-target behavior was considered a weakness and a threat by a number of respondents. Some indicated that there was no behavior policy in place, while others remarked that the policy "had no teeth." Especially problematic for teachers and administrators were those students identified as "habitual violators."

# "Perfect behavior is born of complete indifference." 

While negative behaviors were a noted concern, a large number of teachers and administrators (11\%) reported that by participating in the LA 4 program, children learned important social skills. This seems a valuable opportunity for the children and a strength of the program.

##  <br> Kindergarten Readiness

Teachers and administrators believed that one of the best opportunities of the LA 4 program was the chance to prepare students for kindergarten (19\% of respondents). By participating in LA 4, it was believed that children had a greater opportunity to succeed in school. This was reportedly accomplished by reaching children early ( $9 \%$ of respondents) and fostering an enjoyment of learning.

Some teachers believed that the LA 4 curriculum still needs refining to be better aligned with kindergarten activities. Others noted that abundance of free choice, play, and center time in LA 4 makes transition to kindergarten difficult for some children.
"The kindergarten children are confident in spirit, infinite in resources, and eager to learn. Everything is still possible."

Robert Fulghum



Faculty who participate in the LA 4 program have opportunities for professional development, and this characteristic was seen as a strength and opportunity by many respondents (12\% of teachers and $6 \%$ of administrators). Some administrators reported that they did not have an opportunity for as many professional development experiences as they would like and indicated that this is an area that could be improved upon. Some teachers requested that new topics be added to the workshops. Also, some paraprofessionals were reportedly unable to attend some seminars, and both teachers and paraprofessionals viewed this as a lost opportunity for paraprofessionals to develop skills and to increase understanding of goals that teachers were working on in the classroom. New teachers expressed concern for receiving training earlier in the school year.

Many respondents reported that information dissemination programs would provide an opportunity to improve parents' understanding of the LA 4 program. Teachers specified that these sessions need to be scheduled when working parents can attend. Teachers reported that the increased understanding could lead to greater parental interest in their child's progress, greater participation in homework activities, and increased attendance and punctuality.

In addition to sharing information about the LA 4 program, respondents provided other suggestions for parents of the children they serve. Educators stated that the LA 4 program had an excellent opportunity to promote parenting skills overall. Teachers suggested that facilitating a parent support group might be beneficial for the children they serve.


## Recommendations

Based on a summary of the SWOT factors identified in this report, the Center for Child Development recommends that the Louisiana Department of Education consider the following:

1) Reassess funding restrictions.
2) Continue professional development and consider new topics for teachers who have been working with LA 4 for an extended period of time. Contemplate seminars for administrators. Remind school districts that paraprofessionals are to be included in these workshops.
3) Consider training new teachers earlier in the school year.
4) Explore implementing some prekindergarten and kindergarten joint workshops, seminars, and collaborative opportunities.
5) Investigate establishing a teachers' listserv as a discussion board for idea sharing.
6) Revisit the system of tracking attendance.
7) Consider facilitating a parent support group.
8) Evaluate the establishment of a behavior-management program to target the reduction of less desirable behaviors.
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## LA 4 and/or Starting Points Prekindergarten Test Data 2006-07

In 2006-07, a pretest and posttest was given to each student enrolled in the LA 4 prekindergarten program for research and evaluation purposes. The test chosen was a portion of the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC), and this instrument was provided to all districts implementing the program. LA 4 students were assessed in the areas of Language, Print, and Math.

This section provides numerous ways of looking at the test results. All test information provided is for those students who had both pretest and posttest scores; in total, a sample of $\mathrm{n}=8,557$ students. When looking at the data by school district, care should be taken with interpretation of results when samples are less than 30 students.

First, graphs depict the percentage of children scoring in all four quartiles of the pretest and posttest. LA 4 students showed improvement after a full school year of instruction and there was both a decrease in the percentage of students scoring in the lowest (first) quartile and an increase in the percentage of students scoring in the highest (fourth) quartile.

Second, a line graph displays how student scores place in a national percentile rank (NPR) for pretest and posttest. The NPR is calculated by conversion of the mean score, using the national norms by grade. Again, these numbers display the improvement made by LA 4 students from pretest to posttest and show that, in most cases, Louisiana 4 -year-old students are scoring equal to or higher than the national average on the posttest in Language, Print, and Math. For 5 consecutive years, LA 4 children have scored in the $50^{\text {th }}$ NPR in Language and the $59^{\text {th }}$ NPR in Print on the DSC posttest. Similar results have shown improvement in the area of Math over a 3-year period; children score in the $52^{\text {nd }}$ NPR on the DSC posttest. Trend analyses indicate a dosage effect when students exposed to a full year of prekindergarten instruction (2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07) show greater gains from pretest to posttest than those students who were exposed to only a half year of instruction (pilot year 2002). It should be noted that the DSC has no norm tables for children tested in the fall of prekindergarten; therefore, spring prekindergarten norms were used. This may underestimate the children's actual performance relative to peers at that time. Earlier statistical analyses showed no difference in the significance of results based on use of the grade norms versus age norms.

Third, information is provided on the mean, median, range, and interquartile range for each district in Language, Print, and Math. This information is provided for the pretest and posttest and allows for observation of improvement.

Fourth, LA 4 and Starting Points programs are reported in aggregate. In the 2006-07 school year, 10 districts were classified as Starting Points and no new districts participated in the LA 4 program.

Fifth, a t-test procedure was run on the test results to identify significance in the scores. A t-test determines the difference between two means. Three types of analyses were run on the test results: (1) comparison of the pretest mean percentage of correct responses with the norming sample mean percentage of correct responses, (2) comparison of the posttest mean percentage of correct responses with the norming sample mean percentage of correct responses, and (3) comparison of the mean number of correct responses in the pretest to the mean number of correct responses in the posttest for each child. These results are presented by district for Language, Print, and Math as " $\square=$ significantly lower than norm," " $\boldsymbol{\Delta}=$ significantly higher than norm" or " $\approx=$ not significantly different from norm." Statistical significance is determined by a z-score of less than .05 .

## Test Results for LA 4 2006-07 Using National Norms

Test scores are reported for a total of 8,557 students, the number of students who had both pretest and posttest scores. Analyses of the test scores reveal statistically significant improvement statewide from pretest to posttest for students participating in the program.


Figure 1. Percentage of LA 4 students statewide scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=8,557$ )

## National Percentile Rank

Another way to look at the student test scores is to convert the mean score to an NPR. Results over the past 6 years are shown in the following figure and indicate the stability of student scores.


Figure 2. NPR for LA 4 students statewide in Language, Print, and Math

2006-07 (NPR) for LA 4 prekindergarten students, by race and ethnicity


Figure 3. Pretest and posttest scores converted to an NPR in Language, Print, and Math for LA 4/Starting Points prekindergarten students in 2006-07, by race and ethnicity

The conversion of all LA 4/SP student test scores (by race and ethnicity) to an NPR for the 2006-07 school year is shown in the figure above. Children enrolled in the LA 4 program, regardless of race, demonstrated improvement on the DSC from pretest to posttest. It should be noted that the lower performance of Hispanic children, in the area of Language, is potentially linked to the children's recent arrival to the United States. These students' exposure to the English language during the course of one full school year proves to be beneficial as evidenced by their advancements from pretest to posttest.

## The School District of Acadia Parish

The school district of Acadia Parish provided services to 85 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 4. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Acadia Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the $\mathrm{DSC}, 2006-07(\mathrm{n}=85)$

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Acadia Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of the Acadia school district student test scores for the past 4 years to an NPR is shown in the following figure.


Figure 5. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Acadia Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Assumption Parish

The school district of Assumption Parish provided services to 16 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program (previously Starting Points) in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 6. Percentage of LA 4 (previously Starting Points) students in the school district of Assumption Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=16$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Assumption Parish provided services to students in LA 4 (previously Starting Points) for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of Assumption school district student test scores for the past 4 years to an NPR is shown in the following figure.


Figure 7. NPR for LA 4 (previously Starting Points) students in the school district of Assumption Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Bienville Parish

The school district of Bienville Parish provided services to 53 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates 0\% of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.

Figure 8. Percentage of LA 4 students in the Bienville Parish school district scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=53$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The conversion of the Bienville Parish student test scores for 2005-06 and 2006-07 to an NPR is shown in the following figure.


Figure 9. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Bienville Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Calcasieu Parish

The school district of Calcasieu Parish provided services to 865 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 10. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Calcasieu Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the $\mathrm{DSC}, 2006-07(\mathrm{n}=865)$

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Calcasieu Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 11. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Calcasieu Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Caldwell Parish

The school district of Caldwell Parish provided services to 14 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 12. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of Caldwell Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=14$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Caldwell Parish provided services to students in Starting Points for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 4 years is shown in the figure below.


Figure 13. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of Caldwell Parish in Language, Print, and Math

The School District of Catahoula Parish
Data for this parish was not available.

## The School District of the City of Baker

The school district of the City of Baker provided services to 39 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 14. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of the City of Baker scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=39$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The conversion of the City of Baker student test scores to an NPR for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 200607 is shown in the following figure.


Figure 15. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of the City of Baker in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of the City of Bogalusa

The school district of the City of Bogalusa provided services to 56 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 16. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of the City of Bogalusa scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=56$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of the City of Bogalusa provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 17. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of the City of Bogalusa in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Claiborne Parish

The school district of Claiborne Parish provided services to 14 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.

Figure 18. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of Claiborne Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=14$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Claiborne Parish provided services to students in Starting Points for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for the past 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 19. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of Claiborne Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Concordia Parish

The school district of Concordia Parish provided services to 35 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 20. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Concordia Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Concordia Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of the student test to an NPR for the past 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 21. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Concordia Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of DeSoto Parish

The school district of DeSoto Parish provided services to 197 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 22. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of DeSoto Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 $(\mathrm{n}=197)$

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of DeSoto Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 23. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of DeSoto Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of East Baton Rouge Parish

The school district of East Baton Rouge Parish provided services to 838 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 24. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of East Baton Rouge Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=838$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of East Baton Rouge Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 25. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of East Baton Rouge Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of East Feliciana Parish

The school district of East Feliciana Parish provided services to 50 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Figure 26. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of East Feliciana Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=50$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of East Feliciana Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of East Feliciana School District student test scores to an NPR for those 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 27. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of East Feliciana Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Evangeline Parish

The school district of Evangeline Parish provided services to 89 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Figure 28. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Evangeline Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 $(\mathrm{n}=89)$

## National Percentile Rank

The Evangeline school district provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.

$\rightarrow$ 2002-03 ( $\mathrm{n}=54$ ) $\simeq 2003-04(\mathrm{n}=48) \nsim 2004-05(\mathrm{n}=44) \rightarrow 2005-06(\mathrm{n}=108) \longrightarrow 2006-07(\mathrm{n}=89)$
Figure 29. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district in Evangeline Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Iberia Parish

The school district of Iberia Parish provided services to 294 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 30. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Iberia Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=294$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Iberia Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 200607. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.

$\simeq$ 2002-03 ( $\mathrm{n}=131$ ) $\longrightarrow$ 2003-04 $(\mathrm{n}=173) \longrightarrow 2004-05(\mathrm{n}=153) \longrightarrow$ 2005-06 $(\mathrm{n}=280) \longrightarrow$ 2006-07 $(\mathrm{n}=294)$
Figure 31. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Iberia Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Iberville Parish

The school district of Iberville Parish provided services to 95 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 32. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Iberville Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=95$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Iberville Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 33. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Iberville Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Jefferson Parish

The school district of Jefferson Parish provided services to 1,294 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 34. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Jefferson Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=1,294$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Jefferson Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for these 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 35. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Jefferson Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of La Salle Parish

The school district of La Salle Parish provided services to 81 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Figure 36. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of La Salle Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=81$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of La Salle Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 37. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of La Salle Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Lafayette Parish

The school district of Lafayette Parish provided services to 648 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates 0\% of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 38. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Lafayette Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=648$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Lafayette Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 39. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Lafayette Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Livingston Parish

The school district of Livingston Parish provided services to 65 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 40. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Livingston Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=65$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The conversion of Livingston Parish student test scores to an NPR for 2005-06 and 2006-07 is shown in the following figure.


Figure 41. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Livingston Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Madison Parish

Data for Madison Parish was not available.

## The School District of the City of Monroe

The school district of the City of Monroe provided services to 38 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.

Figure 42. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of the City of Monroe scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=38$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of the City of Monroe provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for those 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 43. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of the City of Monroe in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Morehouse Parish

The school district of Morehouse Parish provided services to 26 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 44. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of Morehouse Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=26$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Morehouse Parish provided services to students in Starting Points for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for those 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 45. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of Morehouse Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Natchitoches Parish

The school district of Natchitoches Parish provided services to 99 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 46. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Natchitoches Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=99$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Natchitoches Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.


- 2002-03 ( $\mathrm{n}=110$ ) - 2003-04 $(\mathrm{n}=110)$ 米2004-05 $(\mathrm{n}=69)$ 米2005-06 $(\mathrm{n}=155) \longrightarrow$ 2006-07 $(\mathrm{n}=99)$

Figure 47. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Natchitoches Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Orleans Parish

The school district of Orleans Parish provided services to 44 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 48. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Orleans Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the $\mathrm{DSC}, 2006-07(\mathrm{n}=44)$

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Orleans Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for those 5 years in the following figure.


Figure 49. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Orleans Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Ouachita Parish

The school district of Ouachita Parish provided services to 195 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 50. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Ouachita Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=195$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Ouachita Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for those 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 51. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Ouachita Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Plaquemines Parish

The school district of Plaquemines Parish provided services to 37 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 52. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Plaquemines Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=37$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The conversion of the Plaquemines Parish student test scores to an NPR is shown for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2006-07 in the following figure.


Figure 53. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Plaquemines Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Pointe Coupee Parish

The school district of Pointe Coupee Parish provided services to 19 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 54. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of Pointe Coupee Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Pointe Coupee Parish provided services to students in Starting Points for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for those 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 55. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of Pointe Coupee Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Rapides Parish

The school district of Rapides Parish provided services to 396 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 56. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Rapides Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the $\mathrm{DSC}, 2006-07(\mathrm{n}=396)$

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Rapides Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 57. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Rapides Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The Recovery School District

The Recovery School District provided services to 311 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates 0\% of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.
Figure 58. Percentage of LA 4 students in the Recovery School District scoring in the respective quartiles on the $\mathrm{DSC}, 2006-07(\mathrm{n}=311)$

## National Percentile Rank

The Recovery School District provided services to students in LA 4 for the first year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for that year is shown in the following figure.


Figure 59. NPR for LA 4 students in the Recovery School District in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Red River Parish

The school district of Red River Parish provided services to 56 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates 0\% of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.
Figure 60. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Red River Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=56$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Red River Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for the past 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 61. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Red River Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Richland Parish

The school district of Richland Parish provided services to 16 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.

Figure 62. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of Richland Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=16$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Richland Parish provided services to students in Starting Points for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for the past 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 63. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of Richland Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Sabine Parish

The school district of Sabine Parish provided services to 53 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 64. Percentage of LA students in the school district of Sabine Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=53$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Sabine Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for the past 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 65. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Sabine Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. Bernard Parish

The school district of St. Bernard Parish provided services to 129 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 66. Percentage of LA students in the school district of St. Bernard Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=129$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. Bernard Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for the past 5 years in the following figure.


Figure 67. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of St. Bernard Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. Helena Parish

The school district of St. Helena Parish provided services to 18 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Figure 68. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of St. Helena Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=18$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. Helena Parish provided services to students in Starting Points for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for the past 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 69. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of St. Helena Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. James Parish

The school district of St. James Parish provided services to 33 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 70. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of St. James Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=33$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. James Parish provided services to students for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR is shown for the past 4 years in the following figure.


Figure 71. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of St. James Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. John Parish

The school district of St. John Parish provided services to 31 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing $\operatorname{color}(s)$ on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 72. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of St. John Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=31$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. John Parish provided services to students for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for the past 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 73. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of St. John Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. Landry Parish

The school district of St. Landry Parish provided services to 170 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.

Figure 74. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of St. Landry Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=170$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. Landry Parish provided services to students for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 75. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of St. Landry Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. Martin Parish

The school district of St. Martin Parish provided services to 246 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 76. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of St. Martin Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=246$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. Martin Parish provided services to LA 4 students for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 77. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of St. Martin Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of St. Tammany Parish

The school district of St. Tammany Parish provided services to 543 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 78. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of St. Tammany Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $n=543$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of St. Tammany Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 79. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of St. Tammany Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Tangipahoa Parish

The school district of Tangipahoa Parish provided services to 218 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 80. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Tangipahoa Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=218$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Tangipahoa Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 81. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Tangipahoa Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Tensas Parish

The school district of Tensas Parish provided services to 12 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile. Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 82. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Tensas Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=12$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Tensas Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the second year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 2 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 83. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Tensas Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Terrebonne Parish

The school district of Terrebonne Parish provided services to 24 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program (previously Starting Points) in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 84. Percentage of LA 4 (previously Starting Points) students in the school district of Terrebonne Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=24$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The conversion of Terrebonne Parish student test scores to an NPR for 2003-04, 2004-05 and 200607 is shown in the following figure.


Figure 85. NPR for LA 4 (previously Starting Points) students in the school district of Terrebonne Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Union Parish

The school district of Union Parish provided services to 17 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 86. Percentage of Starting Points students in the school district of Union Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $n=17$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The conversion of Union Parish student test scores to an NPR for 2003-04 and 2006-07 is shown in the following figure.


Figure 87. NPR for Starting Points students in the school district of Union Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Vermilion Parish

The school district of Vermilion Parish provided services to 283 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.
Figure 88. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Vermilion Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=283$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Vermilion Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the sixth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 6 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 89. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Vermilion Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Vernon Parish

The school district of Vernon Parish provided services to 169 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 90. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Vernon Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 $(\mathrm{n}=169)$

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Vernon Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the second year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 2 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 91. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Vernon Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Washington Parish

The school district of Washington Parish provided services to 189 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 92. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Washington Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=189$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Washington Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fifth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 5 years is shown in the following figure.



Figure 93. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Washington Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Webster Parish

The school district of Webster Parish provided services to 87 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.

Figure 94. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Webster Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=87$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Webster Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 95. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Webster Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of West Baton Rouge Parish

The school district of West Baton Rouge Parish provided services to 99 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than 100\%.
Figure 96. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of West Baton Rouge Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=99$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of West Baton Rouge Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the third year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 3 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 97. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of West Baton Rouge Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of West Carroll Parish

The school district of West Carroll Parish provided services to 77 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 98. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of West Carroll Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=77$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of West Carroll Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the second year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 2 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 99. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of West Carroll Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The School District of Winn Parish

The school district of Winn Parish provided services to 44 at-risk, 4 -year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Any missing color(s) on the graph indicates $0 \%$ of students scoring in that quartile.
Due to rounding procedures, the above percentages may be less than, equal to, or greater than $100 \%$.
Figure 100. Percentage of LA 4 students in the school district of Winn Parish scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $\mathrm{n}=44$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The school district of Winn Parish provided services to students in LA 4 for the fourth year in 200607. The conversion of Winn school district student test scores to an NPR for those 4 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 101. NPR for LA 4 students in the school district of Winn Parish in Language, Print, and Math

## The Zachary Community School District

The Zachary Community school district provided services to 47 at-risk, 4-year-old students that were enrolled in its LA 4 program in 2006-07. Test information is reported only for those students who had both a pretest and a posttest.


Figure 102. Percentage of LA 4 students in the Zachary Community school district scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC, 2006-07 ( $n=47$ )

## National Percentile Rank

The Zachary Community school district provided services to students in LA 4 for the third year in 2006-07. The conversion of student test scores to an NPR for those 3 years is shown in the following figure.


Figure 103. NPR for LA 4 students in the Zachary Community school district in Language, Print, and Math

## Parishes Missing Data

Data is not included for Catahoula and Madison Parishes because of the small number of complete intake, pretest, and posttest records (less than 10). In order to uphold consistent research methodologies, complete records are imperative to the analysis.
LA 4 and Starting Points 2006-07 Number of Correct Responses Results
The following table displays the number of correct responses (NCR) pretest results for 2006-07 LA 4 and Starting Points students statewide and by school district. These tables display the mean number of correct responses, the median number of correct responses, the range of correct responses, and the interquartile range (number of correct responses at the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile).
Table 1. LA 4 and Starting Points 2006-07 Pretest Number of Correct Responses (NCR) Results

|  |  | LANGUAGE |  |  |  | PRINT |  |  |  | MATH |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Mean | Median | Range | Quartile Range ( $\mathbf{5 5}^{\text {th }}-75^{\text {th }}$ ) | Mean | Median | Range | Quartile Range ( $25^{\text {th }}-75^{\text {th }}$ ) | Mean | Median | Range | Quartile Range ( $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}-75^{\text {th }}$ ) |
| Acadia | 85 | 16.39 | 17 | 4-26 | 13-20 | 9.36 | 9 | 1-17 | 7-12 | 13.15 | 13 | 0-29 | 7-18 |
| Assumption | 16 | 18.65 | 18 | 12-26 | 14.5-23 | 8.81 | 9 | 3-17 | 6.5-10.5 | 15.38 | 13.5 | 6-30 | 9.5-20 |
| Bienville | 53 | 14.19 | 15 | 0-29 | 10-19 | 7.23 | 7 | 0-18 | 4-10 | 9.85 | 7 | 0-30 | 4-16 |
| Calcasieu | 865 | 18.3 | 19 | 0-29 | 15-23 | 10.4 | 10 | 0-19 | 8-13 | 15.65 | 15 | 0-36 | 9-22 |
| Caldwell | 14 | 9 | 9.5 | 4-14 | 6-12 | 1.79 | 1.5 | 1-3 | 1-3 | 7.93 | 7.5 | 1-18 | 4-10 |
| Catahoula | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Baker | 39 | 13.36 | 14 | 3-24 | 11-17 | 8.54 | 9 | 2-15 | 6-11 | 10.95 | 10 | 0-25 | 5-15 |
| Bogalusa City | 56 | 13.3 | 13.5 | 4-21 | 10.5-16 | 7.98 | 8 | 1-16 | 6-10 | 9.73 | 9 | 0-24 | 5-14 |
| Claiborne | 14 | 17.21 | 16.5 | 10-27 | 12-23 | 9.79 | 10 | 4-15 | 7-12 | 13 | 10.5 | 3-27 | 7-21 |
| Concordia | 35 | 12.97 | 13 | 0-27 | 7-21 | 5.37 | 6 | 0-15 | 2-8 | 10.47 | 12 | 0-27 | 3-16 |
| DeSoto | 197 | 11.63 | 11 | 0-28 | 8-16 | 5.9 | 6 | 0-21 | 3-8 | 9.29 | 8 | 0-25 | 4-14 |
| East Baton Rouge | 838 | 13.85 | 14 | 0-29 | 9-18 | 7.65 | 7 | 0-21 | 4-11 | 11.67 | 10 | 0-36 | 5-17 |
| East Feliciana | 50 | 14.26 | 14.5 | 3-23 | 11-18 | 8.34 | 9 | 1-15 | 6-11 | 14.84 | 15 | 0-30 | 10-20 |
| Evangeline | 89 | 18.07 | 18 | 1-29 | 15-22 | 9.47 | 9 | 1-18 | 7-11 | 14.85 | 15 | 0-33 | 9-20 |
| Iberia | 294 | 13.98 | 14 | 0-29 | 10-18 | 7.56 | 8 | 0-19 | 5-10 | 11.36 | 11 | 0-35 | 6-17 |
| Iberville | 95 | 13.45 | 13 | 1-25 | 10-17 | 7.58 | 7 | 0-18 | 5-10 | 12.52 | 11 | 0-36 | 7-17 |
| Jefferson | 1294 | 12.3 | 12 | 0-29 | 8-17 | 7.22 | 7 | 0-21 | 4-10 | 11.17 | 10 | 0-34 | 4-17 |
| LaSalle | 81 | 16.09 | 17 | 0-28 | 12-20 | 7.94 | 8 | 0-17 | 5-11 | 10.41 | 8 | 1-31 | 6-14 |
| Lafayette | 648 | 13.59 | 14 | 0-29 | 9-18 | 7.7 | 8 | 0-20 | 5-10 | 11.99 | 11 | 0-32 | 5-18 |
| Livingston | 65 | 18.02 | 18 | 6-29 | 15-22 | 9.86 | 9 | 1-18 | 7-13 | 14.77 | 13 | 3-30 | 10-20 |
| Madison | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statewide | 8,557 | 14.6 | 15.0 | 0-29 | 10-19 | 7.98 | 8 | 0-21 | 5-11 | 12.23 | 11 | 0-36 | 6-18 |

Table 1 continued．LA 4 and Starting Points 2006－07 Pretest Number of Correct Responses（NCR）Results

| 8I－9 | 9\＆－0 | II | とでてI | LI－S | IZ－0 | 8 | 86\％ | 6I－0I | 6て－0 | $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{SI}$ | 9＊＊I | LS9＇8 | әр！мәұ¢！ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| てて－ย1 | てを－乙 | 9I | L8．91 | 七I－8 | 8I－I | ZI | $\varepsilon \varsigma^{\prime}$ I I | \＆Z－¢I | $6 \mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{L}$ | 8I | II＇8I | $L t$ |  |
| Iて－8 | 6て－0 | SI | 89＊ャI | てI－S．L | 0Z－I | 0I | S0I | ¢「¢て－8I | 6 －s | 02 | ¢0．0Z | 七t | पu！M |
| 8I－S | 8で0 | I I | L8＊I I | ZI－L | 6I－0 | 6 | $90 \%$ | 0て－てI | 6て－0 | 9I | てで¢ I | LL |  |
| LI－L | 8て－0 | ZI | II「てI | 6－S | $\varepsilon[-0$ | 8 | $81^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | LI－II | Lて－0 | t | $68^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ I | 66 |  |
| 9I－L | IE－0 | てI | LS＇ZI | 0I－S | 9I－0 | 8 | $16^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | 8I－II | Lて－0 | ¢ I | ¢L゙カI | L8 | Jəұsqə $M$ |
| $\dagger \mathrm{I}^{-\varepsilon}$ | て£－0 | L | I $1 \times 6$ | 6－t | Iて－0 | L | L8．9 | 6I－6 | 6て－0 | $\varepsilon$ I | ¢カ゚ ！I | 68I |  |
| てて－01 | $9 \varepsilon-0$ | 9I | 8t゙91 | \＆I－8 | 8I－I | I I | St．0 I | ¢ I－t | $6 て-\varepsilon$ | 02 | L6．8I | 69I | แоแว $\Lambda$ |
| 6I－9 | 9£－0 | ZI | \＆L｀てI | 0I－カ | IZ－0 | 8 | $\varepsilon S^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | 0て－01 | 6て－0 | ¢ I | \＆8．カI | E87 |  |
| 9I－S | Iて－I | 8 | 81＊6 | 0I－S | 8I－0 | 8 | $88^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | てI－S | てて－0 | 6 | $65^{\circ} 6$ | LI | บо！Uด |
| 02－s | $\downarrow$ ¢－て | L | 26．I I | I－ナ | $\dagger \mathrm{I}^{-\varepsilon}$ | S．8 | ¢0．8 | s．02－I I | 6て－9 | 8I | LI＇LI | 七て | ขนиоุว．．．${ }_{\text {L }}$ |
| S．8I－S．L | して－† | $\varepsilon$ I | $\varepsilon I$ | I I－9 | $\dagger$ I－t | 0I | 268 |  | てて－6 | LI | S9I | てI | SセSUəL |
| てI－て | 9て－0 | 9 | て¢＇8 | 8－¢ | 9I－0 | 9 | $\varepsilon 8^{\circ} \mathrm{S}$ | 9I－6 | 8て－0 | $\varepsilon I$ | L＇ZI | 8IZ | courdtiour ${ }_{\text {L }}$ |
| 6I－9 | $\downarrow \mathcal{E}-0$ | $\varepsilon$ I | ย1＇${ }^{\circ}$ I | I I－9 | 6I－0 | 8 | $9 \varepsilon^{\circ} 8$ | 0て－I I | 6て－0 | 9I | てE＇¢ I | $\varepsilon \dagger$ ¢ |  |
| $\dagger \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{S}$ | 6て－0 | 6 | ¢で0I | 6－† | 9I－0 | 9 | 8で9 | 6I－6 | 8て－0 | －I | $\varepsilon \downarrow \mathrm{I}$ | $9 \downarrow$ ¢ | U！̣IL W＇7S |
| 6I－L | I $\varepsilon$－0 | －I | 81＊${ }^{\text {c }}$ | ZI－S | 0て－0 | 6 | $98^{\circ} 8$ | Iて－II | 6て－0 | LI | I0．91 | 0LI | K．ıpue7 7S |
| IZ－0］ | LZ－S | † | $\varepsilon \chi^{\prime} \varsigma 1$ | $\varepsilon$ ¢－6 | $6 \mathrm{I}-7$ | I I | II | Iて－てI | 9て－8 | 8 I | Z $5^{\circ} \mathrm{LI}$ | IE | UYO 17S |
| L－0 | くて－0 | て | L6＇S | L－0 | 9I－0 | 0 | ［9＊$\varepsilon$ | カI－て | 9て－0 | 乙 | $87^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | $\varepsilon \varepsilon$ | səure ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ， |
| $\varepsilon I^{\prime}-L$ | †I－I | I I | ＋6．6 | II－L | $\varepsilon[-¢$ | 6 | $68^{\circ} 8$ | てて－ 1 | 8て－I I | S．LI | 8L＇LI | 8I | еиวขН 7S |
| 0て－6 | 0ع－0 | SI | 96＊ | I I－9 | 8I－0 | 8 | S．8 | $0 て-て$ I | 8て－0 | 9I | I0．91 | 6ZI | p．ruirg 7 IS |
| $\dagger \mathrm{I}-5$ | ¢ $\mathcal{E}-0$ | 6 | 9ど0 I | 0I－L | てI－て | 8 | $18^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | 6I－6 | $87-7$ | ¢ I | $6 \pm \rightarrow$ I | \＆S | әu！qes |
| S．8－I | LI－0 | S＇S | $\checkmark 6^{\circ} \mathrm{S}$ | S．6－S＇Z | ャI－0 | $\mathrm{S}^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | 9¢＊9 | $\varepsilon ⿺ 𠃊 ⿳ ⿰ ㇒ 一 一 七 亍$ ¢ | 8I－0 | S．8 | 69＊8 | 9I | риеโЧЈ！ |
| 8I－C．9 | 6て－0 | S＇II | 6¢ $㇒^{\circ}$ I | II－S | LI－I | $S^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | で8 |  | 6て－0 | LI | LS＇9I | 9S | Iəл！у рәу |
| $\varepsilon \mathcal{E}-0$ | †－† | 6 | L8\％ | 0z－0 | 0 I－t | L | $80^{\circ} \mathrm{L}$ | 8て－0 | LI－8 | $\varepsilon]$ | 86．${ }^{\text {I I }}$ | IIE |  |
| 6I－8 | $\varepsilon \varepsilon-0$ | 七 | 89＊¢ I | ［［－9 | 8I－0 | 8 | ¢E．8 | 6I－01 | 6て－0 | 七I | $89^{\circ} \dagger$ I | 96\＆ | səp！̣dey |
| 02－8 | I $\varepsilon$－$冖$ | ZI | $\varepsilon \varsigma^{\circ} \varepsilon I$ | 0I－9 | 七I－I | 6 | Iで8 | 91－0］ | 6I－t | ¢ | $78^{\circ}$ Z I | 6 I | ә2dnoว $\ddagger$ U！${ }^{\text {d }}$ d |
| 8I－8 | £て－0 | $\varepsilon I$ | ย0＊${ }^{\circ}$ I | II－L | $\dagger \mathrm{I}-乙$ | 0 I | 89＊8 | $6 \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{I}$ | ¢て－t | 9I | 8L゚¢ I | LE | səu！uənbeld |
| $6 \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{L}$ | ¢£－0 | $\varepsilon I$ | 9 ${ }^{\circ}$ ¢ | ZI－S | 6I－0 | 6 | 78.8 | Iて－I I | 6て－I | 9I | カI＇9I | ¢6I | ет！¢จепО |
| S．Eて－6 | ¢E－I | S．8I | 89＊${ }^{\circ}$ I | LI－9 | $0 \chi^{-\varepsilon}$ | S．8 | 68．01 | Lて－てI | 6て－9 | S．0Z | 89＊6I | 切 | surəjo |
| $\rightarrow$ I－ | I $\varepsilon$－0 | 6 | $69^{\circ} 6$ | 9－て | LI－0 | t | L＇t | 6I－6 | して－て | SI | LE＇カI | 66 |  |
| $\dagger$ I－t | 0て－0 | S．6 | ¢E． 6 | L－E | ZI－0 | $\bigcirc$ | 9t＊ | 9I－0I | \＆て－S | S＇II | 9がてI | 97 | 2snoчə⿺𠃊⿴囗⿱一一 |
| SI－S | ¢て－0 | 6 | 9で01 | II－S | LI－I | 6 | Sガ8 | 0でけI | くて－9 | 8I | ¢6．91 | 8E | Kı！つ әоıиоW |
|  | Ostury | uห！pəW | UBコW |  | วstury | ив！рәы | UとうN |  | วธีury | ив！рәы | UВコN | U |  |
| H上VW |  |  |  | INITd |  |  |  | ヨソマก⿹Nマ7 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. LA 4 and Starting Points 2006-07 Posttest Number of Correct Responses (NCR) Results
The following table displays the number of correct responses (NCR) posttest results for 2005-06 LA 4 and Starting Points students statewide and by school district. These tables display the mean number of correct responses, the median number of correct responses, the range of correct responses, and the interquartile range (number of correct responses at the $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile).

|  |  | LANGUAGE |  |  |  | PRINT |  |  |  | MATH |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Mean | Median | Range | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quartile } \\ \text { Range } \\ \left(25^{\mathrm{th}}-75^{\mathrm{th}}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Mean | Median | Range | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quartile } \\ & \text { Range } \\ & \left(\mathbf{2 5}^{\mathrm{th}}-\mathbf{- 7} 5^{\mathrm{th}}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Mean | Median | Range | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quartile } \\ & \text { Range } \\ & \left(255^{5}-75^{\text {th }}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| Acadia | 85 | 26.39 | 27 | 13-29 | 25-29 | 16.75 | 17 | 9-21 | 15-19 | 27.47 | 28 | 3-37 | 24-33 |
| Assumption | 16 | 26.25 | 27.5 | 21-29 | 24-28.5 | 17.81 | 18 | 11-21 | 16-21 | 32.88 | 33.5 | 17-37 | 30.5-37 |
| Bienville | 53 | 23.19 | 26 | 7-29 | 19-27 | 14.19 | 14 | 5-21 | 11-18 | 22.53 | 24 | 5-37 | 14-31 |
| Calcasieu | 865 | 25.73 | 27 | 0-29 | 24-29 | 16.66 | 18 | 0-21 | 15-20 | 28.42 | 30 | 0-37 | 25-33 |
| Caldwell | 14 | 27.36 | 28 | 21-29 | 27-28 | 18.14 | 19 | 10-20 | 19-20 | 31.07 | 33 | 22-35 | 30-35 |
| Catahoula | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Baker | 39 | 25 | 27 | 10-29 | 24-28 | 17.67 | 19 | 8-21 | 16-20 | 29.13 | 30 | 11-37 | 25-33 |
| City of Bogalusa | 56 | 26.38 | 27 | 18-29 | 25-28 | 16.64 | 17 | 9-20 | 16-19 | 27.45 | 28 | 8-37 | 23-33 |
| Claiborne | 14 | 24.64 | 26 | 14-29 | 25-27 | 14.86 | 16 | 9-18 | 11-17 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 17-33 | 22-30 |
| Concordia | 35 | 26.91 | 29 | 14-29 | 25-29 | 17.89 | 19 | 8-21 | 16-21 | 30.49 | 32 | 11-37 | 26-35 |
| DeSoto | 197 | 26.64 | 28 | 0-29 | 26-29 | 17.58 | 18 | 0-21 | 16-20 | 29.34 | 31 | 0-37 | 26-34 |
| East Baton Rouge | 838 | 25.06 | 27 | 1-29 | 23-28 | 16.66 | 17.5 | 1-21 | 14-20 | 28.28 | 30 | 1-37 | 24-34 |
| East Feliciana | 50 | 24.62 | 25 | 13-29 | 22-28 | 16.7 | 18 | 7-21 | 15-19 | 26.06 | 27 | 11-36 | 22-30 |
| Evangeline | 89 | 25.71 | 28 | 7-29 | 26-29 | 16.99 | 18 | 5-21 | 15-20 | 29.25 | 31 | 8-37 | 26-34 |
| Iberia | 294 | 25.13 | 27 | 0-29 | 24-28 | 16.19 | 17 | 0-21 | 14-19 | 26.78 | 28 | 0-37 | 23-32 |
| Iberville | 95 | 23.83 | 25 | 10-29 | 21-28 | 15.38 | 16 | 3-21 | 13-18 | 25.81 | 26 | 1-37 | 22-31 |
| Jefferson | 1294 | 23.21 | 25 | 0-29 | 20-28 | 15.51 | 16 | 0-21 | 13-19 | 26.16 | 27 | 0-37 | 22-32 |
| LaSalle | 81 | 26.36 | 28 | 12-29 | 26-29 | 16.2 | 17 | 3-21 | 14-20 | 27.38 | 29 | 5-37 | 24-33 |
| Lafayette | 648 | 26.29 | 28 | 2-29 | 25-29 | 17.13 | 18 | 0-21 | 15-20 | 28.69 | 30 | 4-37 | 25-34 |
| Livingston | 65 | 26.12 | 27 | 14-29 | 25-29 | 17 | 18 | 3-21 | 15-20 | 29.29 | 30 | 12-37 | 25-35 |
| Madison | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statewide | 8,557 | 25.10 | 27.0 | 0-29 | 23-28 | 16.78 | 17.0 | 0-21 | 14-19 | 27.6 | 29.0 | 0-37 | 23-33 |

Table 2 continued. LA 4 and Starting Points 2006-07 Posttest Number of Correct Responses (NCR) Results

|  |  | LANGUAGE |  |  |  | PRINT |  |  |  | MATH |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Mean | Median | Range | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quartile } \\ \text { Range } \\ \left(\mathbf{2 5}^{\mathrm{th}}-75^{\mathrm{th}}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Mean | Median | Range | Quartile Range ( $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}-\mathbf{7 5}^{\text {th }}$ ) | Mean | Median | Range | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quartile } \\ \text { Range } \\ \left(\mathbf{2 5}^{\mathrm{th}}-75^{\mathrm{th}}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Monroe City | 38 | 24.71 | 26 | 11-29 | 23-28 | 17.21 | 18 | 10-21 | 15-20 | 26.84 | 29.5 | 14-36 | 20-32 |
| Morehouse | 26 | 26.54 | 28 | 16-29 | 26-28 | 16.62 | 17 | 9-21 | 15-19 | 29.88 | 32 | 14-36 | 28-35 |
| Natchitoches | 99 | 26.38 | 28 | 17-29 | 24-29 | 16.65 | 18 | 6-21 | 15-19 | 28.64 | 30 | 5-37 | 23-36 |
| Orleans | 44 | 28.09 | 29 | 16-29 | 28-29 | 19.27 | 20 | 2-21 | 18-21 | 30.07 | 35 | 25-37 | 33-36 |
| Ouachita | 195 | 25.67 | 27 | 6-29 | 24-29 | 17.37 | 18 | 0-21 | 16-20 | 28.74 | 31 | 5-37 | 25-34 |
| Plaquemines | 37 | 27.11 | 28 | 18-29 | 26-29 | 18.14 | 18 | 8-21 | 17-20 | 29.57 | 31 | 10-37 | 27-34 |
| Point Coupee | 19 | 25.79 | 28 | 14-29 | 25-29 | 14.16 | 15 | 3-19 | 12-16 | 22.84 | 24 | 7-33 | 15-30 |
| Rapides | 396 | 25.6 | 27 | 9-29 | 24-29 | 16.19 | 17 | 0-21 | 14-19 | 28.7 | 30 | 4-37 | 25-34 |
| Recovery School District | 311 | 23.96 | 25 | 22-28 | 1-29 | 15.51 | 16 | 13-19 | 1-21 | 25.40 | 26 | 20-32 | 1-37 |
| Red River | 56 | 25.05 | 27 | 8-29 | 23.5-28 | 13.98 | 15 | 2-21 | 12-16 | 27.25 | 29 | 7-37 | 24.5-32 |
| Richland | 16 | 17.44 | 18 | 2-28 | 14.5-23.5 | 11.75 | 13 | 5-16 | 9-14.5 | 17 | 17.5 | 4-29 | 11-23 |
| Sabine | 53 | 24.58 | 25 | 10-29 | 23-28 | 15.3 | 16 | 5-21 | 13-18 | 25.6 | 26 | 7-37 | 21-31 |
| St. Bernard | 129 | 24.11 | 25 | 1-29 | 21-28 | 15.98 | 16 | 1-21 | 14-19 | 27.4 | 28 | 2-37 | 24-33 |
| St. Helena | 18 | 26.68 | 27 | 21-29 | 25-28 | 15.78 | 16 | 12-19 | 15-16 | 33.17 | 34 | 24-37 | 32-36 |
| St. James | 33 | 28.21 | 29 | 22-29 | 29-29 | 19.18 | 21 | 12-21 | 18-21 | 34.06 | 37 | 9-37 | 31-37 |
| St. John | 31 | 24.84 | 26 | 18-29 | 23-28 | 17.52 | 18 | 9-21 | 16-20 | 28.19 | 30 | 14-36 | 24-33 |
| St. Landry | 170 | 25.32 | 27 | 7-29 | 24-28 | 17.39 | 18 | 3-21 | 16-19 | 27.6 | 28 | 7-37 | 25-32 |
| St. Martin | 246 | 26.43 | 28 | 1-29 | 26-29 | 17.1 | 18 | 0-21 | 15-20 | 28.47 | 30 | 0-37 | 25-34 |
| St. Tammany | 543 | 25.61 | 27 | 8-29 | 24-29 | 15.94 | 17 | 3-21 | 14-19 | 27.73 | 29 | 3-37 | 23-33 |
| Tangipahoa | 218 | 24.3 | 26 | 7-29 | 22-27 | 14.33 | 14 | 5-20 | 12-17 | 25.68 | 27 | 5-36 | 22-30 |
| Tensas | 12 | 27.17 | 29 | 17-29 | 27-29 | 16 | 19 | 0-21 | 12-21 | 27 | 30 | 14-35 | 19-33.5 |
| Terrebonne | 24 | 27.71 | 28 | 25-29 | 27-29 | 18.17 | 19 | 14-21 | 16.5-20 | 30.54 | 33 | 19-37 | 24-37 |
| Union | 17 | 19.94 | 21 | 0-29 | 18-26 | 14.29 | 16 | 1-21 | 13-17 | 19.59 | 21 | 1-33 | 15-26 |
| Vermilion | 283 | 24.37 | 26 | 0-29 | 22-29 | 15.54 | 17 | 0-21 | 13-19 | 27.24 | 28 | 0-37 | 23-33 |
| Vernon | 169 | 26.39 | 28 | 7-29 | 25-29 | 16.82 | 18 | 5-21 | 15-19 | 29.24 | 31 | 10-37 | 25-35 |
| Washington | 189 | 25.41 | 27 | 8-29 | 24-29 | 15.55 | 16 | 1-21 | 13-19 | 25.5 | 27 | 2-37 | 19-32 |
| Webster | 87 | 23.05 | 25 | 8-29 | 20-27 | 15.4 | 16 | 7-21 | 13-19 | 25.84 | 26 | 4-37 | 21-30 |
| West Baton Rouge | 99 | 24.29 | 26 | 12-29 | 21-28 | 16.08 | 16 | 4-21 | 14-19 | 25.39 | 25 | 5-37 | 21-32 |
| West Carroll | 77 | 25.94 | 27 | 11-29 | 25-29 | 15.88 | 17 | 8-21 | 13-19 | 29.51 | 31 | 13-37 | 25-35 |
| Winn | 44 | 27.07 | 29 | 12-29 | 28-29 | 16.89 | 18 | 6-21 | 15-19 | 33.23 | 36 | 14-37 | 32-37 |
| Zachary Comm. | 47 | 24.66 | 26 | 8-29 | 24-27 | 16.72 | 17 | 8-21 | 15-19 | 26.43 | 27 | 10-36 | 21-31 |
| Statewide | 8,557 | 25.10 | 27.0 | 0-29 | 23-28 | 16.78 | 17.0 | 0-21 | 14-19 | 27.6 | 29.0 | 0-37 | 23-33 |

## 2006-07 Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores on the Developing Skills Checklist to the National Norm

The results of all test scores are reported using the students who had both pretest and posttest scores ( $n=8,557$ ).

Overall results for the pretest and posttest provide information on a child's acquisition of the following skills: 1) Language, 2) Print, and 3) Math, as measured by the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC). Each of these DSC scales is further divided into subscales. Tables 3 through 5 provide a symbol-coded summary of performance on these scales and subscales, statewide and by school district. The symbol $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ indicates that LA 4 and Starting Points students scored significantly higher than the norming sample. The symbol $\approx$ indicates that LA 4 and Starting Points children performed equivalently to the norming sample. The symbol ■ indicates areas requiring additional emphasis or instruction, as LA 4 and Starting Points students scored significantly lower than the norming sample. Assignment of a table cell to one of these three categories is the result of conducting a t-test comparing the mean proportion of correct responses for the students in that district to the mean proportion of correct responses for the norming sample.

Statistical tests were run for each of the subscales in the three areas of Language, Print, and Math. There were seven subscales in Language, five subscales in Print, and eight subscales in Math.

## Pretest

For the pretest, LA 4/Starting Points students statewide scored significantly lower than the national grade norms in all three areas of Language, Print, and Math. As such, these results are displayed as red squares ( $\square$ ) in Tables 3-5. This indicates that student pretest scores were lower than the national grade norms and statistically significant at the $\mathrm{p}<.05$ level; however, these results should be interpreted conservatively, as explained in the Technical Appendix. As a hypothetical example, the z -score for "Naming Body Parts" could be 5.66 at $\mathrm{p}<.0001$. This indicates the norming sample's mean percentage of correct responses of 0.75 for "Naming Body Parts" (as found in Table 20 of the DSC Norms and Technical Bulletin) exceeded that of our students. As such, the skill requires additional emphasis.

In the Language portion on the pretest, students in 30 of the 52 listed school districts scored "not significantly different from the national norm" on at least one subscale. "Naming Body Parts" and "Stating Personal Information" were the subscales most commonly equivalent to the national norm. These results are represented by the symbol $\approx$ in Table 3 .

In the Print portion on the pretest, students in 28 of the 52 school districts scored "not significantly different from the national norm" on at least one subscale. "Holding a Book/Turning Pages" was the subscale most commonly equivalent to the national norm. These results are represented by the symbol $\approx$ in Table 4.

In the Math subscale on the pretest, students in 12 of the 53 school districts scored "not significantly different from the national norm" on at least one subscale. These results were seen most commonly on the subscales of "Counting" and "Naming Shapes." These results are represented by the symbol $\approx$ in Table 5 .

## Posttest

Student scores improved significantly from the pretest to the posttest as shown in the following tables. The posttest results demonstrated that almost all of the LA 4/Starting Points student scores met the national norm, and several exceeded it.

In the Language portion of the posttest, students in 40 of the 52 school districts scored significantly better than the national grade norms on at least one subscale. These were seen most frequently on the "Naming Body Parts" and "Demonstrating Knowledge of Opposites" subscales. These results are represented by the symbol $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ in Table 3.

In the Print portion of the posttest, students in 37 of the 52 school districts scored significantly better than the national grade norms on at least one subscale. This was seen most frequently on the "Identifying Components of Written Communication" subscale. These results are represented by the symbol $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ in Table 4.

In the Math portion of the posttest, students in 25 of the 52 school districts scored significantly better than the national grade norms on at least one subscale. This was seen most frequently on the "Copying/Extending Patterns" subscale. These results are represented by the symbol $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ in Table 5.
Table 3. Language-t-test Results Comparing LA 4/Starting Points Pretest and Posttest Scores to National Norms

|  |  | Naming Body Parts |  | Stating Function of Body Parts |  | Stating Personal Information |  | Labeling Objects |  | Demonstrating Knowledge of Opposites |  | Demonstrating Knowledge of Position Words |  | Telling a 5-Part Story in a Sequence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Pretest vs. <br> Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. <br> Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Pretest } \\ & \text { vs. } \\ & \text { Norm } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretes vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. <br> Norm | Posttest vs. Norm |
| Acadia | 85 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Assumption | 16 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ |
| Bienville | 53 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Calcasieu | 865 | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Caldwell | 14 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Catahoula | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Baker | 39 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| City of Bogalusa | 56 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | - | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Claiborne | 14 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Concordia | 35 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| De Soto | 197 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| East Baton Rouge | 838 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| East Feliciana | 50 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Evangeline | 89 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Iberia | 294 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A |
| Iberville | 95 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Jefferson | 1,294 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Lafayette | 81 | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\Delta$ |
| La Salle | 648 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Livingston | 65 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Madison | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monroe City | 26 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Morehouse | 99 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Natchitoches | 44 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Orleans | 53 | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ |
| Ouachita | 195 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |

$\square$ Significantly lower than Norm $\quad \Delta$ Significantly higher than norm $\approx$ Not significantly different from norm

Table 4. Print-t-test Results Comparing LA 4/Starting Points Pretest and Posttest Scores to National Norms

|  |  | Holding a Book/Turning Pages |  | Identifying Components of Written Communication |  | Identifying People Engaged in Reading Activities |  | Differentiating Print from Pictures Differentiating Letter from Numerals |  | Identifying Function of Words and Numerals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm |
| Acadia | 85 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Assumption | 16 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Bienville | 53 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Calcasieu | 865 | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Caldwell | 14 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Catahoula | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Baker | 39 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| City of Bogalusa | 56 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Claiborne | 14 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Concordia | 35 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | A |
| De Soto | 197 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| East Baton Rouge | 838 | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| East Feliciana | 50 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Evangeline | 89 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Iberia | 294 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Iberville | 95 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Jefferson | 1,294 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Lafayette | 81 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | A |
| La Salle | 648 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Livingston | 65 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Madison | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monroe City | 26 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Morehouse | 99 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Natchitoches | 44 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Orleans | 53 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Ouachita | 195 | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |

[^0]Table 4 continued. Print-t-test Results Comparing LA 4/Starting Points Pretest and Posttest Scores to National Norms

|  |  | Holding a Book/Turning Pages |  | Identifying Components of Written Communication |  | Identifying People Engaged in Reading Activities |  | Differentiating Print from Pictures/Diff. Letter from Numerals |  | Identifying Function of Words and Numerals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm |
| Plaquemines | 37 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Pointe Coupee | 19 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ |
| Rapides. | 396 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Recovery School District | 311 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Red River | 56 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Richland | 16 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Sabine | 53 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. Bernard | 129 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ |
| St. Helena | 18 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. James | 33 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | A | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. John | 31 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. Landry | 170 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| St. Martin | 246 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| St. Tammany | 543 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Tangipahoa | 218 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Tensas | 12 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Terrebonne | 24 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ |
| Union | 17 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Vermilion | 283 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Vernon | 169 | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Washington | 189 | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Webster | 87 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| West Baton Rouge | 99 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| West Carroll | 77 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Winn | 44 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Zachary | 47 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\Delta$ |
| Statewide | 8,557 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |

[^1]Table 5. Math-t-test Results Comparing LA 4/Starting Points Pretest and Posttest Scores to National Norms

| School District | n | Copying/ Extending Patterns |  | Counting |  | Identifying <br> Numerals |  | Joining \& Separating Sets of Objects |  | Demonstrating Knowledge of Ordinal Positions |  | Logical Operations |  | Matching Sets \& Numerals |  | Naming Shapes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pretest vs. Norm | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Posttest } \\ \text { vs. } \\ \text { Norm } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Posttest } \\ & \text { vs. } \\ & \text { Norm } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pretest vs. Norm | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Posttest } \\ \text { vs. } \\ \text { Norm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pretest } \\ \text { vs. } \\ \text { Norm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Posttest vs. Norm | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Pretest } \\ \text { vs. } \\ \text { Norm } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Posttest } \\ \text { vs. } \\ \text { Norm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Pretest vs. Norm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Posttest } \\ & \text { vs. } \\ & \text { Norm } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pretest vs. Norm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Posttest } \\ & \text { vs. } \\ & \text { Norm } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm |
| Acadia | 85 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Assumption | 16 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ |
| Bienville | 53 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Calcasieu | 865 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Caldwell | 14 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ |
| Catahoula | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City of Baker | 39 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| City of Bogalusa | 56 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Claiborne | 14 | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Concordia | 35 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| De Soto | 197 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| East Baton Rouge | 838 | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | A |
| East Feliciana | 50 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Evangeline | 89 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Iberia | 294 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Iberville | 95 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ |
| Jefferson | 1,294 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Lafayette | 81 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| La Salle | 648 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Livingston | 65 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Madison | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monroe City | 26 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ |
| Morehouse | 99 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Natchitoches | 44 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Orleans | 53 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ |
| - Significantly lower than Norm $\quad \Delta$ Significantly higher than Norm $\quad \approx$ Not significantly different from Norm Significance determined by z-score $\mathrm{p}<.05$ level or below, using the Bonferoni correction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5 continued. Math-t-test Results Comparing LA 4/Starting Points Pretest and Posttest Scores to National Norms

|  |  | Copying/ Extending Patterns |  | Counting |  | Identifying Numerals |  |  <br> Separating Sets of Objects |  | Demonstrating Knowledge of Ordinal Positions |  | Logical Operations |  | Matching Sets \& Numerals |  | Naming <br> Shapes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Pretest vs. Norm | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Posttest } \\ & \text { vs. } \\ & \text { Norm } \end{aligned}$ | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pretest } \\ & \text { vs. } \\ & \text { Norm } \end{aligned}$ | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm |
| Ouachita | 195 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Plaquemines | 37 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Pointe Coupee | 19 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ |
| Rapides. | 396 | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Recovery School District | 311 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | ■ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Red River | 56 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Richland | 16 | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Sabine | 53 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. Bernard | 129 | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. Helena | 18 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. James | 33 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| St. John | 31 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| St. Landry | 170 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| St. Martin | 246 | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| St. <br> Tammany | 543 | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | - |
| Tangipahoa | 218 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Tensas | 12 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Terrebonne | 24 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Union | 17 | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |

[^2]Table 5 continued. Math-t-test Results Comparing LA 4/Starting Points Pretest and Posttest Scores to National Norms

|  |  | Copying/ <br> Extending <br> Patterns |  | Counting |  | Identifying <br> Numerals |  |  <br> Separating <br> Sets of Objects |  | Demonstrating Knowledge of Ordinal Positions |  | Logical Operations |  | Matching Sets \& Numerals |  | Naming Shapes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School District | n | Pretest vS. Norm | Posttest <br> vs. <br> Norm | Pretest vS. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vS. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vS. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest <br> vs. <br> Norm | Pretest vs. Norm | Posttest vs. Norm | Pretest vS. Norm | Posttest vS. Norm | Pretest vS. Norm | Posttest <br> vs. <br> Norm |
| Vermillion | 283 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |
| Vernon | 169 | ■ | $\Delta$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | A |
| Washington | 189 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Webster | 87 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| West Baton Rouge | 99 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| West Carroll | 77 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | ■ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ |
| Winn | 44 | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | A |
| Zachary | 47 | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ | $\approx$ |
| Statewide | 8,557 | $\square$ | $\Delta$ | $\square$ | A | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\approx$ | $\square$ | $\Delta$ |

$\square$ Significantly lower than norm $\quad \triangle$ Significantly higher than norm $\approx$ Not significantly different from norm
Significance determined by z-score $\mathrm{p}<.05$ level or below, using the Bonferoni correction

## 2006-07 LA 4 and Starting Points Intake Form and Profile Data

General demographic information for each LA 4 participating student in 2006-07 was gathered electronically through implementation of an intake form on the Palm Pilot. A copy of this form is included in the Appendix of this report. The following figures describe the characteristics of those responding among the statewide longitudinal sample of 8,557 children.


Figure 104. 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students, by gender $(\mathrm{n}=8,557)$


These percentages may add up to more than $100 \%$ because more than one race can be chosen.

Figure 105. 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students, by race and ethnicity $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{8 , 5 5 7})$


This graph displays data collected at the beginning of the year and indicates that approximately $1 \%$ of LA 4 students were in special education. When examining the number of LA 4 students with an IEP (Individualized Education Plan), the numbers reflect more accurately that approximately $5 \%$ of LA 4 students are receiving Special Education services. This 5\% includes students receiving services for speech-related problems.

Figure 106. 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students, by educational classification $(\mathbf{n}=8,557)$


Figure 107. 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students who have or have not received Part C* early intervention services $(\mathrm{n}=8,557)$


Figure 108. Primary spoken language of 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students ( $\mathrm{n}=8,557$ )


Figure 109. 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students, by annual household income $(\mathrm{n}=8,557)$


Figure 110. Free or reduced price lunch services eligibility among 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students $(\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{8 , 5 5 7})$
*Part C is a Federal program for infants and toddlers with disabilities (Part C of IDEA) that assists states in operating a comprehensive statewide program of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities, ages birth through 2 years, as well as their families.


Figure 111. 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students in families with multiple children under age 18 living in the household $(\mathrm{n}=8,557)$


Figure 112. Highest education level of the mother or female guardian of 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students $(\mathbf{n}=8,557)$


Figure 113. Highest education level of the father or male guardian of 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{8 , 5 5 7})$


Figure 114. Nonparental care of 2006-07 LA 4 prekindergarten students, by type $(\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{9}, \mathbf{5 1 1})$

Table 6. Percentage of Students in 2006-07 LA 4 Program, by Gender

| District | n | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$|$ Male


[^0]:    ■ Significantly lower than norm $\quad \Delta$ Significantly higher than norm $\quad \approx$ Not significantly different from norm
    Significance determined by z-score $p<.05$ level or below, using the Bonferoni correction

[^1]:    $\square$ Significantly lower than Norm $\triangle$ Significantly higher than norm $\quad \approx$ Not significantly different from norm Significance determined by z-score $\mathrm{p}<.05$ level or below, using the Bonferoni correction

[^2]:    ■ Significantly lower than Norm $\triangle$ Significantly higher than Norm
    Significance determined by z-score $\mathrm{p}<.05$ level or below, using the Bonferoni correction

