

LA 4 Prekindergarten Annual Report

Prepared for The Louisiana Department of Education

Final

Prepared by Cecil J. Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Acknowledgements

Louisiana Department of Education

John White Superintendent of Education

Kerry Laster, PhD Deputy Superintendent Office of Literacy

Jill Slack, PhD Director Office of Literacy

Mary Louise Jones, EdD Director Early Childhood Programs

Program Consultants: Anita Ashford Kaye Eichler Nicholy Johnson Cindy Ramagos Ivy Starns

Education Research Analysts: Fen Chou, PhD Marieanne Hollay, PhD

LA 4 and Special Education Regional Coordinators: Carla Amy Tara Baudean Penny Black Sherri Caskey Ellen Howell April Lauterbach Stacy Marino Joyce Sjolander Terri McClellan Sonja Jackson

Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

James D. Garvey Jr. Secretary-Treasurer 1st District

Kira Orange Jones 2nd District

Lottie Beebe 3rd District

Walter Lee 4th District

Jay Guillot 5th District

Chas Roemer Vice President 6th District

Holly Boffy 7th District

Carolyn Hill 8th District

John L. Bennett Member-at-Large

Connie E. Bradford Member-at-Large

Penny Dastugue President Member-at-Large

Cecil J. Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning Research Team at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Billy R. Stokes, EdD, MBA Executive Director; Cecil J. Picard Endowed Fellow in Child Development

Susan A. Aysenne, EdD Chief Operation Officer; Project Director LA 4 Research and Evaluation

Gary J. Asmus, PhD Loyd J. Rockhold/BORSF Endowed Professor; Director, Management Information Systems

Mike Mayne, BS Assistant Manager, Data Management

Steven Dick, PhD Statistician

Sebreana Domingue, BA Research Associate

Tamika Carmouche, MEd Project Director

Kara Farmer, MS Data Consultant

Kasey Patin, BA Research Assistant

Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine and Research Institute

Craig T. Ramey, PhD Professor and Distinguished VTC Research Scholar

Sharon L. Ramey, PhD Professor and Distinguished VTC Research Scholar

Contents

LA 4 Program Background	4
Study Design for the Annual Report	6
Study of Demographic Data for LA 4 Students in Cohort 9 (2010–11)	6
Introduction	6
Recommendations	7
Special Education	7
Growing Hispanic Population	8
Study of Performance Data of LA 4 Students in Cohort 9 (2010-11)1	LO
Introduction1	LO
Student Performance by Quartile for Cohort 9 (2010–11)1	LO
Student Performance for Cohorts 5 through 9 (2006–11)1	L2
LA 4 Growth and Outcomes by Race, Household Income, and Special Education Status1	L3
Student Performance by Race1	L3
Student Performance for Special Education Children1	L4
Student Devfermence by Femily Income	L5
Student Performance by Farmy income	
Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation1	L6
Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation	L6 L6
Student Performance by Parmy income	L6 L6 L8
Student Performance by Parmy Income	L6 L6 L8 L8
Student Performance by Parmy Income	L6 L6 L8 L8
Student Performance by Family income	L6 L6 L8 L8 L8
Student Performance by Family income	L6 L6 L8 L8 L8 L9 21
Student Performance by Panning Income	L6 L8 L8 L8 L9 21
Student Performance by Family Income	L6 L8 L8 L8 L9 21 21 22
Student Performance by Parmy Income 1 Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation 1 Recommendations 1 Appendix A: Statewide Demographics 1 Gender 1 Race and Ethnicity 1 Educational Classification with Part C Services 1 English Spoken in the Home 2 Annual Household Income with Free and Reduced Price Meal (FRM) Services 2 Family Units: Size and Education Level of Guardians 2 Child Care Prior to LA 4 2	L6 L8 L8 L8 L9 21 21 22
Student Performance by Parmity income 1 Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation 1 Recommendations 1 Appendix A: Statewide Demographics 1 Gender 1 Race and Ethnicity 1 Educational Classification with Part C Services 1 English Spoken in the Home 2 Annual Household Income with Free and Reduced Price Meal (FRM) Services 2 Family Units: Size and Education Level of Guardians 2 Child Care Prior to LA 4 2 Appendix B: Cohort 9 (2010–11) Demographic Data by Local Education Agency 2	L6 L8 L8 L8 L9 21 22 24 25
Student Performance by Parinity income 1 Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation 1 Recommendations 1 Appendix A: Statewide Demographics 1 Gender 1 Race and Ethnicity 1 Educational Classification with Part C Services 1 English Spoken in the Home 2 Annual Household Income with Free and Reduced Price Meal (FRM) Services 2 Family Units: Size and Education Level of Guardians 2 Child Care Prior to LA 4 2 Appendix B: Cohort 9 (2010–11) Demographic Data by Local Education Agency 2 Appendix C: Parish Developing Skills Checklist Results 3	L6 L8 L8 L9 21 22 24 25 37
Student Performance by Panny Income 1 Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation 1 Recommendations 1 Appendix A: Statewide Demographics 1 Gender 1 Race and Ethnicity 1 Educational Classification with Part C Services 1 English Spoken in the Home 2 Annual Household Income with Free and Reduced Price Meal (FRM) Services 2 Family Units: Size and Education Level of Guardians 2 Child Care Prior to LA 4 2 Appendix B: Cohort 9 (2010-11) Demographic Data by Local Education Agency 2 Appendix C: Parish Developing Skills Checklist Results 3 Cohort 9 (2010-11) Quartile Performance for Pretest and Posttest on the Developing Skills 3 Checklist–Revised Subtests for Language, Math, and Print by Local Education Agency 3	L6 L8 L8 L9 21 22 24 25 37

LA 4 Program Background

The LA 4 Prekindergarten (PreK) Program was instituted in 2001 with the passage of Senate Bill 776 and was designed to serve at-risk, 4-year-old children who are not enrolled in publicly funded prekindergarten classes. The program was initially piloted in the spring of 2002, and beginning with the 2002–03 school year, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) provided the LA 4 prekindergarten intervention for a full school year. For most years, the number of students enrolled in the Cecil J. Picard LA 4 Early Childhood Program and the number of participating local education agencies has grown. Table 1 illustrates, by cohort, the increase in student participation seen over the years. This report is specific to Cohort 9 (2010–11) and a study of student performance data using the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC).

# of Records	LA 4 PreK	К	1 st Grade	2 nd Grade	3 rd Grade	4 th Grade	5 th Grade	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade
*Pilot N=1,358 11 LEAs	Jan. 2002	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Cohort 1 N=3,711 19 LEAs	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	
Cohort 2 N=4,767 22 LEAs	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11		
Cohort 3 N=4,665 21 LEAs	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11			
Cohort 4 N=7,898 52 LEAs	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11				
Cohort 5 N=8,557 53 LEAs	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11		_			
Cohort 6 N=9,787 68 LEAs	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11		-				
Cohort 7 N=12,629 73 LEAs	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11		-					
Cohort 8 N=13,388 76 LEAs	2009-10									
Cohort 9 N=12,685 72 LEAs	2010-11									

 Table 1. Distribution by Cohort of LA 4 Participants in the Longitudinal Research Study, Pilot Group

 Through Cohort 9 (2010–11)

*Note: The pilot year does not reflect a complete year of student participation in the LA 4 Program.

From inception through 2007–08, the LA 4 initiative was financed through a split of federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds and state general funds. During 2008–09, the program was funded entirely with state dollars. From 2009 up to the present day, the LA 4 Program has again been funded by TANF and state funds, with the majority coming from TANF.

As part of the enrollment criteria, children must be eligible to enter public school kindergarten the following year. The program's purpose is to provide prekindergarten classes as well as before- and afterschool enrichment activities for four-year olds. Families eligible for Free and Reduced Price Meal (FRM) services are not charged, and children from higher income families are allowed to participate in the program if they pay tuition or the district absorbs the cost. All of these services are elective and are implemented at varying degrees by the local education agencies (LEAs).

The LA 4 Program follows specific requirements to ensure the provision of high-quality services, including certified teachers, an adult-to-child ratio of no more than one to 10, and use of a research-based, developmentally appropriate prekindergarten curriculum. Although the LDOE oversees the administration of LA 4, it is the responsibility of the participating LEAs to implement the program. Figure 1, below, shows the LEAs (72) in Louisiana that participated in the LA 4 program during the 2010-11 school year forming Cohort 9, a notable increase from the 11 original districts that started the pilot program in 2002. Note that the LEAs in Figure 1 include traditional school districts, special schools, and independent charter schools; Orleans Parish schools do not include LA 4 classrooms, but there are 12 independent charter schools operating within the parish.



Figure 1. Distribution of Louisiana LEAs included in the LA 4 study for Cohort 9 (2010–11).

Study Design for the Annual Report

The LDOE contracted with the Cecil J. Picard Center for Child Development and Lifelong Learning at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette to conduct program evaluations and research activities. This research has been ongoing since the inception of the program with the pilot cohort in the spring of 2002. Part of this process is to provide an annual report on the demographics of the children participating in the LA 4 Program, student performance based on the results of the fall and spring Developmental Skills Checklist (DSC) during LA 4, and a review of program performance based on classroom observations using the *ECERS*—*R* (Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale – Revised). It is important to note that the 2010-11 year evaluation does not include ECERS-R data. Due to resource constraints, no environmental measures of quality were used. This limits the results presented to only those measures of student achievement available from the DSC.

The primary research questions addressed by the annual evaluation are as follows:

- To what extent do the participating students' demographics document that LA 4 provides services to the students for which the program was initially designed?
- To what extent does the LA 4 Program impact student performance from fall pretest to spring posttest on the DSC?
- Does LA 4 produce similar benefits for children from different racial/ethnic groups, family income categories and parent education groups?

In creating the frozen analytical data set for Cohort 9, the Picard Center used the same process and procedures as with previous cohorts for inclusion into the LA 4 cohort, students must have three pieces of information on record: 1) an intake form completed by October 1 of the year they enrolled in LA 4, 2) a DSC pretest completed by October 1, and 3) a DSC posttest.

The LA 4 DSC records are then linked to the LDOE Student Information System (SIS) records, the electronic database used by the state. The frozen cohort for the 2010–11 school year yielded 12,685 student records (97.8% DSC to SIS match). This high degree of student record match is a result of continuous data cleanup activity conducted collaboratively by LDOE staff, Red-E-Set Grow, and the Picard Center research staff.

Because of the filtering process used for record matching, there will be a difference between the total number of students officially enrolled in LA 4 (enrollment records from LDOE) and the number included as part of the longitudinal research cohort. The final sample excluded 1,006 LA 4 Cohort 9 students who did not meet the three inclusion criteria, yielding a final cohort count of 12,685.

Study of Demographic Data for LA 4 Students in Cohort 9 (2010–11)

Introduction

This section of the report presents demographic data about the children who participated in the LA 4 Program in 2010–11 (LA 4 Cohort 9). In this report, data are presented for the following categories: students' gender, race and ethnicity, educational classification, early intervention

services (Part C of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA]), primary language spoken at home, annual household income bracket, FRM status, number of siblings under age 18 in the home, highest level of education achieved by their male and female guardians, and nonparental care and type of care received since birth. Information provided in the body of the report addresses statewide demographics. Refer to the appendixes to obtain information specific to the participating LEAs. It should be noted that LEAs with research participation numbers smaller than 10 were excluded from the LEA breakdown in the appendices. However, the children in these LEAs were included in the statewide demographic data as part of the 12,685 participants.

The primary research question addressed by this section of the annual evaluation is:

• To what extent do the participating students' demographics document that LA 4 provides services to the children for whom the program was initially designed?

Table 2 provides a summary of the demographics of the nine LA 4 full-year research cohorts. Detailed charts and descriptive text regarding Cohort 9 can be found in Appendix A and Appendix B provides the detailed demographics by LEA.

Children from families with a household income of less that 200% of the federal poverty level are provided access, free of charge, to LA 4 programs in participating LEAs. LDOE has consistently demonstrated that these children are being served as indicated by the FRM percentages shown in the table; 92% of the 12,685 children included in Cohort 9 were qualified for free or reduced price meals. This is the average percent of students that qualified for FRM over the previous eight cohorts.

Most of the overall demographics of LA 4 participants and their families have remained consistent over the life of the program, but there are two recent trends that merit consideration. First, the percentages of children that are classified as special education have been substantially higher in the last two cohorts. The first seven cohorts had an average of less than 2% children in special education, but over the last two cohorts approximately 5% of the LA 4 children were coded as receiving special education services. Second, the percentages of Hispanic children have increased to more than 6% in Cohort 9. This increasing percentage of Hispanic children is mirrored in the growing Hispanic population in Louisiana. Census figures from 2000 and 2010 show an increase in Louisiana from 2.4% to 4.2%. This is reflected in the LA 4 data indicating an average of 3.6% in Cohorts 1-4 to an average of 5% in Cohorts 5-9.

Recommendations

Special Education

The LDOE should work with implementing LEAs to ensure that the resources are available and targeted for what appears to be a growing population of students with special needs within the LA 4 classrooms. While inclusion is generally beneficial for all children, ensuring that sufficient resources are available to provide needed services in critical.

Growing Hispanic Population

There is substantial variation in the percentages of Hispanic children across LEAs. LDOE should ensure that those LEAs with large populations of Hispanic and, in particular, English language learners are prepared to provide necessary support to ensure that this population is successfully prepared for kindergarten entry.

Table 2: Demographics of LA 4 Cohorts through Cohort 9 (2010-11)

	Demographic Factors	Cohort 1 N=3 711	Cohort 2 N=4 767	Cohort 3 N=4 665	Cohort 4 N=7 898	Cohort 5 N=8 557	Cohort 6 N=9 787	Cohort 7 N=12 629	Cohort 8 N=13 388	Cohort 9 N=12.685
Gender	% Male	49	49	48	51	51	49	51	51	50
	% Black	49	51	47	49	50	47	48	50	47
Race	% White	42	43	46	44	41	43	41	42	42
	% Hispanic	3	4	4	3	4	4	5	5	6
Special	% Special Education	1	1	1	2	2	0.4	2	5	5
Education	% Part C Services	14	6	6	10	7	4	6	6	7
Language	% English Spoken at Home	96	93	93	97	92	92	94	98	98
	% < \$10K	37	36	34	38	36	32	37	37	37
Household	%\$10,000 - \$19,999	30	29	27	27	27	24	22	24	24
Income and	% \$20,000 - \$29,999	17	17	16	17	18	22	21	18	18
FRM Status	% \$30,000+	15	18	20	18	16	18	20	21	21
	% FRM	93	88	84	93	94	95	98	95	92
	% 1 Child	22	19	19	11	18	17	17	19	19
Family Size	% 2 Children	35	37	38	27	36	36	37	36	37
	% 3 Children	25	25	26	32	25	26	27	27	27
	% 4+ Children	17	19	17	30	17	17	19	18	17
Mothora	% < High School	20	18	16	18	26	28	26	26	23
Education	% HS or GED	37	33	33	34	25	25	27	25	25
Education	% Postsecondary Education	38	39	41	45	43	41	44	46	50
Fotherel	% < High School	22	17	16	19	29	30	28	26	27
Education	% HS or GED	43	39	39	41	30	27	30	25	30
	% Postsecondary Education	24	25	28	26	26	25	26	46	28
	% Childcare Center	53	28	28	40	23	25	24	27	26
Child Care	% Head Start/Early Head Start	23	15	14	15	8	12	17	20	19
Prior to LA 4	% All Other	58	32	28	63	31	16	21	25	27
	% None	50	46	46	46	37	43	38	45	44

Study of Performance Data of LA 4 Students in Cohort 9 (2010–11)

Introduction

This section of the report presents the results for the LA 4 Program in 2010–11 (LA 4 Cohort 9) regarding participants' performance on the DSC Language, Math, and Print subtests.

The primary research questions addressed by this section of the annual evaluation are:

- To what extent does the LA 4 program impact student performance from fall pretest to spring posttest?
- Does LA 4 produce similar benefits for children from different racial/ethnic groups, family income categories and parent education groups?

We address these questions assessing children's language, print concepts, and mathematical concepts using the Developing Skills Checklist (DSC) upon entry into the LA 4 program and again just prior to exit. This pretest-posttest design allows us to characterize their growth on the DSC as measured by using the defined national percentiles by grade. We will also present the results for LA 4 in the context of National Percentiles by Age for the group as whole.

Student Performance by Quartile for Cohort 9 (2010–11)

Results of the DSC assessment are presented in two distinct formats. First, we will present the overall distribution of children's' performance as indicated by their quartile distributions for both fall and spring. Each child assessed with the DSC is assigned a national percentile rank by grade for each subject area in the fall and the spring. These percentiles correspond to quartiles and the percentages of children with scores within each quartile are displayed in a stacked bar graph as in Figure 2. For example, 81% of the LA 4 children begin the PreK year scoring in the first (or bottom) quartile in Language, while only 1% of the children score in the fourth (or top) quartile. After a year in the LA 4 classroom, only 11% of the children remain in the bottom quartile and half (50%) of the children are performing in the top quartile.



Primary Data Source: Developing Skills Checklist 2010-11

Figure 2. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC pretest and posttest fall 2010 to spring 2011 (n = 12,685).

An alternative way of looking at the growth of students from the fall to the spring is to use a National Percentile based on Age (NPA) for the fall assessment. The National Percentile by Grade (NPG) is intended for use to compare children in the same grade regardless of age and is only formally defined beginning at the end of PreK. When LA 4 was initiated, accurate age and date of assessment data was not available, so the decision was made to use the end of PreK NPG rankings to report on children entering LA 4. Subsequently, the assessment protocol and record keeping for the DSC have improved where age at assessment is now available. As the DSC Norms Book and Technical Bulletin states, "The age percentile rank is typically used by a special education teacher. Its function is to assess the level of development of a child independent of his or her grade level and the time of year testing." Entry into LA 4 is only determined by age (and availability), so using the NPA at the beginning of the LA 4 year may provide a clearer picture of where children are developmentally at entry. The NPG is the best metric to use at the end of the LA 4 year as a benchmark of where children completing a year of PreK are expected to be developmentally regardless of age.

Table 3 displays the basic results from the DSC for the 12,685 children in Cohort 9. The National Percentiles for Age and Grade are presented in the table. Both the NPG and the NPA are based on using the average number of correct responses (NCR) within each subject area at each assessment period. The average age of the children is calculated in months for the fall and the spring. While NPG is best for the spring end-of-year measure, the table includes both NPA based on average age and the NPG based on the end-of-year PreK.

		NPA	NPG
Fall (Avg. Age = 53 Months)	Average NCR	4 years 3-5 months	
Language	14.4	13	9
Print	8.0	20	11
Math	12.1	14	5
Spring (Avg. Age = 61 Months)	Average NCR	5 years 0-2 Months	NPG
Language	25.8	54	59
Print	17.1	66	70
Math	29.1	56	58

 Table 3: Fall and Spring DSC results: Number of Correct Responses (NCR), National Percentile by Age (NPA), and National Percentile by Grade (NPG) [n=12,685]

Children entering the LA 4 program have an average age of 4 years and 5 months. Correspondingly, these children average 5 years and 1 month in age at end of the LA 4 program, approximately 8 months older. While there are differences between the NPA and NPG rankings in the fall, it is clear that children are performing below the national average when they enter. The LA 4 program is primarily intended for children who may be considered at risk due to their socioeconomic status, so the fact that children entering the program performing below either grade-level or age-level expectations is not surprising. Also, after participating in one year of LA 4 it has been shown that children are finishing at or above the national average regardless of whether age or grade level expectations are assessed.

Student Performance for Cohorts 5 through 9 (2006–11)

Figure 3 shows spring performance on the Language, Print, and Math subject areas of the DSC for the last 5 cohorts of LA 4 participants.



Primary Data Source: Developing Skills Checklist 2010-11

These results address the first research question related to student outcomes impacted by participation in LA 4. Students entering the program are performing substantially below expectations based on the DSC results regardless of whether we use the percentile rankings for

Figure 3. National Percentile Rank (NPG) of LA 4 Cohort 5-9 (2006-11) students on the DSC posttest

age or the end-of-year rankings by grade. The outcomes for the children participating in the program show that for Cohort 9, students performed at the 59th percentile in Language, the 70th percentile on concepts of Print, and at the 58th percentile for Mathematical concepts. The outcomes are consistent with the outcomes of the previous 8 cohorts of children that participated in LA 4.

LA 4 Growth and Outcomes by Race, Household Income, and Special Education Status

The second research question asks whether the results presented in the previous section for all children that participated in LA 4 also apply to important subgroups. All children appear to benefit from LA 4 and in this section we investigate whether various subgroups also benefit from the program. Figure 4 displays the pretest and posttest DSC NPG rankings for all three subject areas for all children in cohort 9.



Primary Data Source: Developing Skills Checklist 2010-11

Figure 4. National Percentile Rank (NPG) of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students on the DSC posttest (n=12,685)

Student Performance by Race

The Picard Center placed the LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) participants into four racial or ethnic groups: Black, Hispanic, White, and Other. The majority of the children belong in the Black group, with the White group of students almost as large. The "Other" group includes children of American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, and Pacific Islander ethnicity. Figure 5 shows the pre and posttest results for each subject of the DSC for whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Other. Each group enters LA 4 performing well-below the expectations and, other than Hispanics on Language, exit LA 4 performing at or above the national average. The growing Hispanic population in Louisiana may help to explain the substantially lower pre and posttest results for this group. Also, 53% of the students that were identified as Hispanic also indicated that the primary language spoken at home was Spanish.



Figure 5. DSC Pretest and posttest results for whites, blacks, Hispanics, and other races for Cohort 9 (2010-11)

Student Performance for Special Education Children

The LA 4 intake data indicates that 5.6% of the participants in Cohort 9 were special education students. Figure 6 displays the pre and posttest results for these students. The group enters performing at lower levels that total LA 4 population (9th, 11th, and 5th percentiles for Language, Print, and Math: see Figure 6) and are still performing below the 50th percentile upon exit. While these children clearly appear to benefit from their participation in LA 4, it appears likely that this group will need continued additional support as the enter kindergarten.



Figure 6. DSC results for students identified as receiving special education services in LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010-11)

Student Performance by Family Income

The LA 4 program is provided free of charge to families of poverty and is specifically intended to serve this population. Children that are not in poverty may participate in LA 4 programs based on available space and district policies; some districts allow families to pay tuition if they do not qualify to have their children participate free of charge. While the vast majority of children in LA 4 come from impoverished families (92% of LA 4 Cohort 9 qualified for free or reduced price meals), the services provided by the program should also be beneficial for non-FRM students. Intake information gathered on children as they enter LA 4 programs includes information on the families' household incomes. Table 4 displays the pre and posttest results for LA 4 Cohort 9 participants based on their annual household incomes. The NPGs of students from families of greater means appear to enter and exit the program exhibiting higher performance than their lower income classmates. All income levels enter LA 4 performing well below the 50th percentile in each subject area and all groups also enter performing at the 50th percentile or higher. Regardless of income level, participants appear to benefit from LA 4.

()									
	Language (NPG) Print (NPG)		Math (NPG)						
Annual Household Income	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest			
Less than \$10,000 (n=4,711)	7	50	9	70	4	52			
\$10,000 - \$19,999 (n=3,099)	9	59	11	70	5	58			
\$20,000 - \$29,999 (n=2,244)	10	59	11	70	5	64			
\$30,000 - \$39,999 (n=1,229)	12	59	14	81	6	64			
\$40,000 - \$49,999 (n=635)	12	69	14	81	8	70			
\$50,000 or greater (n=767)	14	69	17	81	9	70			

Table 4. I	DSC pretest and	posttest results f	or LA 4 participa	nts by family	income levels	for LA 4	Cohort 9
(2010-11)						

Summary of LA 4 Cohort 9 Evaluation

Overall, the 9th full year cohort of LA 4 appears to be as successful as the previous eight. The makeup of the population served by LA 4 appears to remain on target with the program goals. More than 92% of LA 4 participants are FRM qualified; the average percent qualified for FRM in the previous 8 cohorts is also 92%. Clearly, the LA 4 program continues to serve the intended population.

The DSC outcomes for children participating in LA 4 are also consistent with previous cohorts. Children begin their PreK year performing well below the 50th percentile and, at the end of their LA 4 experience, are performing at or above the 50th percentile. The benefits accrue to the population as a whole and all subgroups exhibit growth across all three subject areas.

While the overall evaluation is positive, the LA 4 program should not be viewed as a panacea that erases all risk factors for children from impoverished backgrounds. While the majority of children leave LA 4 performing above the 50th national percentile, there are still 10% of the children that are scoring in the lowest quartile. LA 4 alone is not enough to ensure that all children are successful, so attention to ensuring the children are provided quality services from birth to five prior to LA 4 and ensuring that schools are ready to continue on a positive trajectory through kindergarten entry after leaving LA 4 are critical.

Recommendations

In light of the findings presented here, the Picard Center offers the following recommendations.

- Special Education There appears to be an increasing proportion of LA 4 children that are
 receiving special education services. Inclusion of children with disabilities has always been
 encouraged in the LA 4 program, but with a potentially growing population it is important to
 ensure that additional services that are required for these children are available within the
 LA PreK program.
- A growing Hispanic population The percentage of children identified as Hispanic that participate in LA 4 has approximately doubled since program inception. Over half of the Hispanic children come from homes where Spanish is the primary language. Hispanic children are unevenly distributed across the state. In fact, 32% of these children are found in Jefferson parish LA 4 classrooms and almost a third of the districts have none. The LDOE should work to ensure that these districts have the resources necessary to serve this growing population.
- Measure of Classroom Quality The 9th cohort of LA 4 was the first in which there was no measure of classroom quality; in previous years the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale Revised (ECERS-R) was used. It was used for research purposes to have a measure of the overall classroom quality and for administrative purposes to assess first-time LA 4 educators' classrooms and to measure those that appeared to be less successful than others. While resource constraints led to the discontinuing ECERS-R, we recommend that LDOE explore ways in which ECERS-R or a similar metric could be used to assess the quality of the classrooms that are used for LA 4.
- Consolidation of Early Education There is a movement to consolidate and standardize how early childhood education is delivered and measured. We recommend that careful

evaluation and measurement continue to be included as changes are made. It is critical that rigorous evaluations of the program implementation and outcomes be measured and tracked as the programs are implemented and longitudinally to ensure that the expected benefits to society are realized.

Appendix A: Statewide Demographics

Gender

For Cohort 9, 49.6% are girls and 50.4% are boys (Figure A1). Based on the U.S. Census Report, 2010 Population Estimates, this is close to the division that follows the general population for this age group in Louisiana (49% female and 51% male). The breakdown for gender by LEA can be found in Appendix B.



Primary Source: Louisiana Department of Education Student Information Systems

Figure A1. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by gender (n = 12,685).

Race and Ethnicity

Figure A2 shows the racial/ethnic backgrounds of the LA 4 students in Cohort 9. Based on the February 2010 *Public Student Counts and Percentages* published by the LDOE, these percentages are a close approximation of the racial/ethnic makeup of Louisiana public school populations, with the exception of the percentage of Hispanic students, which is 3.75% for the general school population. The breakdown by race and ethnicity by LEA can be found in Appendix B.



Primary Source: Louisiana Department of Education Student Information Systems Figure A2. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by race and ethnicity (n = 12,685).

The two largest racial groups represented in the LA 4 student population are Black and White. Though smaller in numbers overall, Hispanic students comprise 10% or more of the population in several LEAs: Ascension Parish, Bossier Parish, Jefferson Parish, Lincoln Parish, St. Bernard Parish, St. John the Baptist Parish, and Union Parish. Plaquemines Parish had the highest percentage of Asian or Pacific Islander students, with 11.4% of their LA 4 population identifying with this category. Sabine Parish had the highest percentage of American Indian or Alaska Native students, with 16.1% of the LA 4 population identifying with this category, followed by Terrebonne Parish with 8.4%, and Lafourche Parish with 3.4%. In the majority of participating LEAs, less than 1% of their student population was identified with this ethnic group. These percentages tend to reflect the composition of the general school population based on data in the February 2011 *Public Student Counts and Percentages* published by the LDOE.

Educational Classification with Part C Services

Figure A3 shows the percentage of Cohort 9 participants in regular education (inclusive of gifted and talented), and special education: 94.6% of the children are in the regular education category and 5.4% of the children have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) documenting services within special education. Based on the LDOE's Special Education Reporting System (SER) October 1, 2010, count, the statewide school population receiving regular education was approximately 84.8%, the population of students with disabilities was 11.7%, and the population receiving gifted and talented education was 3.5%. This breakdown by LEA can be found in Appendix B.

Though the percentage of students with disabilities among LA 4 participants was smaller than that in the general school population, these percentages closely approximate the demographic data relevant to Part C (early intervention services of IDEA) for children entering the LA 4 Program. In general, rates of special education placement increase over the elementary school grades.

During the prekindergarten intake process, 7.3% of the parents indicated their child received Part C services. These services, provided through the Office of Citizens with Developmental Disabilities within the Department of Health and Hospitals (DHH), target young children deemed to have an

established, diagnosed physical or mental condition (with a high probability of resulting in a developmental delay) or an existing delay, as well as children who are at risk of developing a delay affecting their development or impeding their learning.



Primary Source: Red-E-Set Grow Intake Form with information provided by the parent/guardian

Figure A3. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by Part C participation (n = 12,685).



Primary Source: Louisiana Department of Education Student Information System

Figure A4. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by Part C participation (n = 12,685).

English Spoken in the Home

According to an analysis conducted on the October 1, 2009, SIS data, English is the primary language spoken by 97.7% of Louisiana public school students. The statewide LA 4 results are illustrated in Figure A5 and a breakdown by LEA can be found in Appendix B.



Primary Source: Louisiana Department of Education Student Information System

Figure A5. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by language spoken at home (n = 12,685).

Annual Household Income with Free and Reduced Price Meal (FRM) Services

The majority of LA 4 students (91.9%) were eligible for FRM services. This is the criteria used by the education system to identify poverty. Of these children, 37.1% come from households with an annual income of less than \$10,000. Figures A6 and A7 document the annual household income reported during intake and FRM eligibility status statewide. A breakdown by LEA can be found in Appendix B. The largest percentage (37.1%) of LA 4 families reported earning less than \$10,000 annually.



Primary Source: Red-E-Set Grow Intake Form with information provided by the parent/guardian

Figure A6. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by annual household income (n = 12,685).



Primary Source: Louisiana Department of Education Student Information System

Figure A7. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010-11) students by FRM services eligibility (n = 12,685).

Family Units: Size and Education Level of Guardians

The majority of children participating in LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010-11) lived in a family unit with one or two children in the home under age 18. Figure A8 illustrates the breakdown of the number of children under the age of 18 living in the homes of LA 4 Cohort 9 students (2010-11) as reported by their parents/guardians. A breakdown by LEA can be found in Appendix B.



Primary Source: Red-E-Set Grow Intake Form with information provided by the parent/guardian

Figure A8. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by number of children under the age of 18 living in the home (n = 12,685).

The majority of these family units appear to have had both a female guardian and a male guardian. However, though less than 1% (.3%) of the families reported having no female guardian, a total of 6.3% of LA 4 students' families reported having no male guardian. Females in the family tended to be slightly more educated than their male counterparts, which follows postsecondary enrollment trends. Over the past several years, the average enrollment rate for Black females in postsecondary institutions has been almost three times higher than the rate for their male counterparts.

Figures A9 and A10 represent the information reported during the intake process relative to the level of education for the female and male guardian within the LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) family unit.



Primary Source: Red-E-Set Grow Intake Form with information provided by the parent/guardian

Figure A9. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by highest level of education achieved by the mother or female guardian (n = 12,685).



Primary Source: Red-E-Set Grow Intake Form with information provided by the parent/guardian

Figure A10. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by highest level of education achieved by the father or male guardian (n = 12,685).

Child Care Prior to LA 4

Of the children participating in LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010-11), 44.2% did not have nonparental child care prior to participating in LA 4. The second largest group (26.4%) attended a child care center, while 17% enrolled in Head Start. Figure A11 illustrates the statewide breakdown for the types of nonparental care received by the children in LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010-11). The overall percentage may exceed 100% due to the possibility of multiple answers from a single respondent. For a breakdown by LEA, refer to Appendix C.



Primary Source: Red-E-Set Grow Intake Form with information provided by the parent/guardian

Figure A11. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students statewide by type of nonparental care (n = 12,685).

Appendix B: Cohort 9 (2010–11) Demographic Data by Local Education Agency

There are two primary data sources for the Local Education Agency (LEA) breakdown. Researchers obtained the data from the Louisiana Department of Education's Student Information System (SIS) October 1, 2010, student enrollment numbers, as well as from parental reporting during the LA 4 intake processes.

The data from SIS include gender, ethnicity and race, educational classification, primary spoken language, and meal services eligibility.

The data from parental reporting through the intake process include annual household income, early intervention services (Part C of IDEA) participation, number of children under the age of 18 living in the home, educational level of the mother or female guardian, educational level of the father or male guardian, and nonparental care participation. Figures B1 through B11 provide the specific demographic breakdown by LEA.

	0% 2	25% 50	0% 7	5% 10	0%
Acadia (n = 144)					-
Allen (n = 92)					
Ascension (n = 65)				1	Female
Assumption (n = 117)	-				
Avoyenes (n = 51) Bienville (n = 37)	-				Male
Bossier (n = 104)					
Caddo (n = 295))				•
Calcasieu (n = 1,086)					
Cameron (n = 23) Cataboula (n = 27)	-				
Central Community (n = 75)	-				
City of Baker (n = 22)					•
City of Bogalusa (n = 76)					•
City of Monroe (n = 65) Concordia (n = 28)					
DeSoto (n = 155)					
East Baton Rouge (n = 839)					•
East Feliciana (n = 12)					•
Evangeline (n = 81)	-				
Iberia Parish (n = 293) Iberville (n = 50)					
Jackson (n = 26)					•
Jefferson Davis (n = 184))]			1	•
Jefferson (n = $1,201$)	-				
Larayette (n = 610) Lafourche (n = 528)	-				
Laburche (n = 323)	-				
Lincoln (n = 14)					•
Livingston (n = 387)					
Madison (n = 16) $Morehouse (n = 31)$	-				
Natchitoches (n = 123)					
New Orleans (n = 99)					•
Ouachita (n = 291)					•
Plaquemines (n = 35) Bointo Coupoo (n = 72)					
Rapides (n = 521)	-				
Recovery School District (n = 288)					•
Red River (n = 46)					•
Richland (n = 28)	-				
Algiers Charter (n = 178)	-				
Lafayette Academy Charter (n = 24)					
Dryades YMCA James M. Singleton Charter (n.				1	•
Dr. King Charter (n = 39)	-				
אואר אוכDonogn # 15 (n = 31) Medard H. Nelson-UNO Charter (n = 16)					
Sabine (n = 56)					•
St. Bernard (n = 260))]				•
St. Charles (n = 34)					1
St. Helena (n = 39) St. James (n = 35)	-				
St. John the Baptist (n = 37)	-				
St. Landry (n = 204)					•
St. Martin (n = 223)					
St. Mary (n = 106) St. Tammany (n = 697)	-				
Tangipahoa (n = 346)	-				
Terrebonne (n = 829)	·]			I	4
Union (n = 17)	2			1	•
Vermilion (n = 277)				· 	
vernon (n = 262) Washington (n = 197)					
Webster (n = 81)					
West Baton Rouge (n = 111))]				4
West Carroll (n = 56)					•
Winn (n = 35) Zachary Community (n = 88)	-				
Zachary Community (N = 88)				I	

Figure B1. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by gender.



Figure B2. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by race and ethnicity.



Figure B3. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by educational classification.



Figure B4. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by primary spoken language.



Figure B5. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by meal services eligibility.



Figure B6. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by annual household income.



Figure B7. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by early intervention services (Part C of IDEA) participation.

Figure B8. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by number of children living in the home under the age of 18.

Figure B9. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by educational level of the mother or female guardian.

Figure B10. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by educational level of the father or male guardian.

Figure B11. Percentage of LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) students in each LEA by type of nonparental care.

Note: Due to the possibility of multiple answers from a single respondent, the overall percentage may exceed 100%.
Appendix C: Parish Developing Skills Checklist Results

Cohort 9 (2010–11) Quartile Performance for Pretest and Posttest on the Developing Skills Checklist—Revised Subtests for Language, Math, and Print by Local Education Agency

Researchers developed bar graphs and line graphs, found on the following pages, for each individual Local Education Agency (LEA) having an "n" of 10 or larger, criteria for inclusion into the research cohort. The bar graph documents student performance on the Developing Skills Checklist by quartile for the pretest and posttest in Language, Math, and Print. The line graph documents student performance by individual LEA on the posttest based on the national percentile rank across four years for each of the subtests of Language, Math, and Print.



Acadia Parish

Figure C1: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC (n=144)



Figure C2: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=144)

Algiers Charter



Figure C3: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC (n = 178)



Figure C4: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math (n = 178)

Allen Parish



Figure C5: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC (n=92)



Figure C6: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=92)

Ascension Parish



Figure C6: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC (n=65)



Figure C7: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=65)



Assumption Parish

Figure C8: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=117)



Figure C9: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=117)

Avoyelles Parish



Figure C10: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=51)



Figure C11: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=51)



Bienville Parish

Figure C12: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=37)



Figure C13: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=37)

City of Bogalusa



Figure C14: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=76)



Figure C15: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=76)

Bossier Parish



Figure C16: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=104)



Figure C17: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=104)

Caddo Parish



Figure C18: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=295)



Figure C19: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=295)

Calcasieu Parish



Figure C20: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=1,086)



Figure C21: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=1,086)

Cameron Parish



Figure C22: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=23)



Figure C23: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=23)

Catahoula Parish



Figure C24: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=27)



Figure C25: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=27)





Figure C26: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=75)



Figure C27: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=75)

City of Baker



Figure C28: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=22)



Figure C29: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=22)

Concordia Parish



Figure C30: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=28)



Figure C31: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=28)



Crocker Arts and Technology School

Figure C32: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=29)



Figure C33: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11





Figure C34: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC (n=155)



Figure C35: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11





Figure C36: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=39)



Figure C37: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11



Dryades YMCA James M. Singleton Charter

Figure C38: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=35)



Figure C39: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

East Baton Rouge Parish



Figure C40: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=839)



Figure C41: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

East Feliciana Parish



Figure C42: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=12)



Figure C43: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Evangeline Parish



Figure C44: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=81)



Figure C45: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Iberia Parish



Figure C46: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=293)



Figure C47: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Iberville Parish



Figure C48: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=50)



Figure C49: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Jackson Parish



Figure C50: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=26)



Figure C51: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Jefferson Davis Parish



Figure C52: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=184)



Figure C53: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Jefferson Parish



Figure C54: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=1201)



Figure C55: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Lafayette Academy Charter



Figure C56: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=24)



Figure C57: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Lafayette Parish



Figure C58: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=610)



Figure C59: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Lafourche Parish



Figure C60: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=528)



Figure C61: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

LaSalle Parish



Figure C62: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=93)



Figure C63: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Lincoln Parish



Figure C64: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=14)



Figure C65: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11

Livingston Parish



Figure C66: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=387)



Figure C67: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=387)

Madison Parish



Figure C68: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=16)



Figure C69: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=16)
Medard H. Nelson-UNO Charter



Figure C70: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=16)



Figure C71: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=16)

City of Monroe



Figure C72: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=65)



Figure C73: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=65)

Morehouse Parish



Figure C74: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=31)



Figure C75: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=31)

Natchitoches Parish



Figure C76: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=123)



Figure C77: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=123)





Figure C78: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=99)



Figure C79: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=99)

Ouachita Parish



Figure C80: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=291)



Figure C81: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=291)



Plaquemines Parish

Figure C82: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=35)



Figure C83: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=35)

Pointe Coupee Parish



Figure C84: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=73)



Figure C85: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=73)

Rapides Parish



Figure C86: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=521)



Figure C87: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=521)

Recovery School District-LDE



Figure C88: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=281)



Figure C89: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=281)

Red River Parish



Figure C90: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=46)



Figure C91: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=46)

Richland Parish



Figure C92: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=28)



Figure C93: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=28)



RSD-Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP) N.O.

Figure C94: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC Math 2010-11 (n=31)



Figure C95: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=31)

Sabine Parish



Figure C96: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=56)



Figure C97: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=56)

St. Bernard Parish



Figure C98: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=260)



Figure C99: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=260)

St. Charles Parish



Figure C100: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=34)



Figure C101: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=34)

St. Helena Parish



Figure C102: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=39)



Figure C103: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=39)

St. James Parish



Figure C104: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=35)



Figure C105: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=35)

St. John the Baptist Parish



Figure C106: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=37)



Figure C107: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=37)

St. Landry Parish



Figure C108: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=204)



Figure C109: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=204)

St. Martin Parish



Figure C110: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=223)





St. Mary Parish



Figure C112: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=106)



Figure C113: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=106)

St. Tammany Parish



Figure C114: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=697)



Figure C115: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=697)

Tangipahoa Parish



Figure C116: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=346)



Figure C117: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=346)

Terrebonne Parish



Figure C118: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=829)



Figure C119: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=829)



Figure C120: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=17)



Figure C121: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=17)

Union Parish

Vermillion Parish



Figure C123: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=277)



Figure C124: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=277)

Vernon Parish



Figure C125: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=262)



Figure C126: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=262)

Washington Parish



Figure C127: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=197)



Figure C128: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=197)

Webster Parish



Figure C129: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=81)



Figure C130: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=81)

West Baton Rouge Parish



Figure C131: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=111)



Figure C132: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=111)



West Carroll Parish

Figure C133: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=56)



Figure C134: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=56)

Winn Parish



Figure C135: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=35)



Figure C136: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=35)

Zachary Community



Figure C137: Percentage of LA 4 students scoring in the respective quartiles on the DSC 2010-11 (n=88)



Figure C138: NPR for LA 4 students in Language, Print, and Math 2010-11 (n=88)

Appendix D: Cohort 9 (2010-11) Outlier Report



Figure D1. LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) outlier performance report from pretest to posttest for Language by LEA



Figure D2. LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) outlier performance report from pretest to posttest for Print by LEA


Figure D3. LA 4 Cohort 9 (2010–11) outlier performance report from pretest to posttest for Math by LEA