

Acelero Learning 2011-12 Program Evaluation--Summary Report

Steve Barnett and Kwanghee Jung

Introduction and Sample Description

This report presents the results from the second year of NIEER's evaluation of Acelero Learning students' learning in two areas: language and general conceptual knowledge, as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), and early math skills, as measured by the Applied Problems subtest of the Woodcock Johnson Tests of Achievement (WJ-AP). In addition to measuring overall growth, we examined relationships between learning gains and children's personal and family characteristics, program structure, curriculum, assessment system used, classroom process as measured by CLASS observations, and teacher characteristics.

Data collection began in Fall of 2011 with a stratified, random sample of 1718 children in 145 classrooms across three delegate agencies. The characteristics of the children and classrooms sampled are described in Tables 1 and 2. Classrooms were sampled first, and then 12 children were sampled from each classroom, with equal numbers of three and four-year-olds selected where possible. The 4-year old sample was further stratified to ensure adequate numbers of returning and new students.

The primary analytical sample is composed of children who were tested at two time points, fall and spring. A secondary subsample consists of children who were age three in the initial sample and who were tested a third time at the beginning of their four year old year in the fall of 2012. Overall, 78% of the original sample has a spring test score on the PPVT and 81% has a spring score on the WJ-AP. For the three-year-old sample the percentage tested a third time in Fall of 2012 fell to 63%. Attrition rates were similar across delegate agencies for both the Spring 2011 and Fall 2012 retesting.

As can be seen in Table 1, the demographics of the children served vary by delegate agency. In the Monmouth/Middlesex (MM) and Clark County (CC) delegate agencies, most children are of Hispanic or Latino descent, and the majority of families report that Spanish is their home language in MM. The vast majority of children served by the Camden-Philadelphia delegate agency (CP) are African-American (92%). Most children qualify for services based on an income below the poverty line in each delegate agency, but in CP about 30 percent qualify based on participation in public assistance, much more than at the other delegate agencies.

As can be seen in Table 2, program features also vary across delegate agencies. All classrooms in CP and more than 85 percent of classrooms in MM operate for a full day, whereas only 24 percent of classrooms in CC are full-day classrooms. Curriculum models also differ across agencies. Tools of the Mind, Creative Curriculum, and Curiosity Corner are used only by MM. EPIC is used only by CP. CC uses only the Acelero curriculum, which is also the predominate curriculum for CP. Despite these differences in program features there are no statistically significant differences in CLASS scores by delegate agency.

We conduct both simple descriptive analyses and complex multivariate analyses that account for the structure of the data (children are nested within classrooms which are nested within centers and agencies). The descriptive statistics provide some insights of their own, but also inform the conduct and interpretation of the more complex statistical analyses that examine child and program features associated with change in children’s test scores over time. In examining the relationship of program features to child outcomes, we analyze the full sample with and without control for delegate agency and for each delegate agency individually.

As we discuss below, there are clear differences in outcomes across delegate agencies. Particularly with data on a single cohort of children, it is difficult to identify the contributions of specific program features and child characteristics to these differences among agencies because some of these features do not vary much, or at all, within each agency. As a result, we cannot be sure that the “effects” of some features are not confounded with other unique features of delegate agencies that are measured or unmeasured (including, for example, leadership and management practices, and neighborhood characteristics). With multiple years of data in the future, it may be possible to produce greater insights into these differences.

We do not present analyses at the individual center or teacher level because the resulting sample sizes are too small to provide reliable estimates. At the classroom level, differences may primarily result from sampling variation among the children selected in each classroom rather than differences in effectiveness between teachers.

Findings and Discussion

Gains in children's PPVT and WJ-AP scores were calculated to assess the overall improvement of the children served by Acelero on language and general conceptual knowledge (PPVT) and early math skills (WJ-AP). All of the gains in raw scores cannot be ascribed to the program as children would learn something in the absence of the program and have other experiences that contribute to their learning and development at home and in the community. Standard score gains are more readily interpreted as controlling for learning gains not influenced by program participation, and change in gain scores in principle may be thought to provide a better estimate of Acelero Learning’s contribution. However, in reality the standardization is imperfect and takes into account whatever is “normal” for children which can include participation in a preschool program. Standard score change likely underestimates the program’s contribution. Evidence suggesting this is that standard scores tend to decline with age for disadvantaged children who do not receive quality pre-K. This being the case, retaining the same standard score over time is actually a gain compared to the expected result without the program. In some ways it is more informative to consider the gains for Acelero Learning students relative to those of similar students in previous years at Acelero and in other programs.

Our previous year’s sample consists only of 4-year-olds, and when we compare it only against the 4-year-olds in our current sample, we find no difference in PPVT gains. However, 4 year-old children scored higher on the WJ-AP at the beginning of this academic year and demonstrated larger gains than in the previous year.

Focusing on standard scores, there are substantial gains for all delegate agencies, as reported in Tables 1 and 3. The average Acelero gain on the PPVT is 5.1 points. This compares to 3.4 points for Head Start nationally in 2009, the most recently reported figure from FACES (Aikens, et al. 2011). The average Acelero gain on the WJ-AP is 4.1 points which compares to a national Head Start figure of 2.4 points. Although one hypothesis for these differences could be that the Acelero advantage is due to differences in the populations served, the evidence does not bear this out. While Acelero Learning children are more likely to be Hispanic and to start low on the PPVT, they also start high on the WJ-AP relative to other children and still make larger gains on the WJ-AP. Also, non-Hispanic children are making only slightly smaller gains than Hispanic children in Acelero for the most part. Note that looking only at four-year-olds for comparison with last year (when only 4's were included in the evaluation) we found that gains on the PPVT were unchanged from last year, while WJ-AP gains were somewhat larger this year than last.

Not included in these tables are the pre-post gains over 12 months for children who started the program as 3 year olds and who continued to be enrolled in Acelero Learning in the fall of 2012 when they were tested again. For these children, gains on the PPVT over 12 months amounted to 9.5 standard score point. Twelve month gains for WJ-AP were 7.36. These children may differ in important ways from those who do not return the following fall, but they received a 12 month program and this plausibly explains their larger standard score gains compared to the progress of children over a school-year.

Looking at each delegate agency separately (Tables 4-6), what stands out is that MM children begin the academic year with skill levels below those of children in the other two delegate agencies and make much larger gains during the course of the program year on both PPVT and WJ-AP. This is true for Black and White students as well as for Hispanic students. The MM advantage cannot be attributed to simply starting lower, however. It is clear that even if children start at about the same level on the WJ-AP in MM and CC, the children in MM make much larger gains. Gains for children in the CP and CC agencies are more similar to the average gains for Head Start nationally, but even at these two agencies the Acelero PPVT gains are still 50% higher than the national average.

Full details of gains in scores by delegate agency are provided in Tables 3 to 6. At program entry, the mean PPVT standard score was 77 in MM, 80 in CC and 85 in CP, compared to 85 for Head Start nationally. The mean WJ-AP standard score at program entry was 92 in MM, 93 in CC, 96 in CP, and 92 for Head Start nationally. Children in MM gained more than 8 standard score points on the PPVT and about 7 standard score points on the WJ-AP. CC children gained nearly 3 standard score points on the PPVT and 2 standard score points on the WJ-AP. CP children gained 3.5 standard score points on the PPVT and 1.8 standard score points on the WJ-AP. Average PPVT post-test scores across the three delegate agencies ranged from about 83 to 88. Average WJ-AP post-test scores ranged from 95 to 99.

These large differences in gains across delegate agencies warrant further investigation. In our multivariate regression analyses (Table 7), these differences were not largely explained by any of the child, family, or program characteristics that we measured. Differences in curriculum, assessment systems, and teacher quality each explained a part of the variation in outcomes among children, but not necessarily among agencies. Larger gains in MM may be partly due to

the curricula employed by MM including Tools of the Mind. MM may also be benefitting from the larger number of school district-contracted classrooms, a lower percentage of children with IEPs and a higher percentage of children receiving a full day. Finally, children in MM also attend school for a greater number of days than in the other two delegates. Unfortunately, the sample does not permit us to untangle the potential contributions of each of these program features

Our multivariate approach did not find teacher background characteristics to significantly affect children's outcomes. Contrary to our expectations, teacher participation in the Teach for America program is not significantly correlated with better results. Teacher experience is not consistently related to outcomes either. Unmeasured characteristics such as teachers' attitudes and expectations regarding the children they serve might be influenced by Acelero Learning's continuous research and practical efforts, which, in turn, may positively impact children's growth. This is a potentially interesting subject for future evaluation.

We note that despite these multivariate findings there is some evidence of association between teacher education level and child progress. The delegate agency whose students demonstrated the largest gains also had the highest percentage of teachers who had attained a BA or higher (MM: 96%). More generally, whether the teacher has at least a BA was associated with greater test score gains in simple correlations. It is possible that because teachers influence each other and do not work in isolation while directors assign children based on knowledge of teacher characteristics, our multivariate analyses simply incorrectly model the ways in which teacher education influences outcomes.

How well teachers teach does clearly matter. We found that higher CLASS scores correlated with larger gains in PPVT score for the entire sample using our multivariate model, with and without controlling for the inherent differences between delegate agencies. CLASS does not explain differences among agencies because on average it does not differ among agencies. Of course, CLASS cannot be assumed to capture all relevant differences in teaching. In considering what else might explain differences in agency performance, it would be useful to consider what aspects of teaching might matter most that may not be well measured by the CLASS.

Finally, children's attendance was positively related to WJ-AP gains for the whole sample controlling for delegate agencies. In addition, we found strong evidence that increased length of day contributed to greater learning gains. Compared to half-day classrooms, mean gains in full-day classrooms were significantly higher, especially for the PPVT. These findings are consistent with those of NIEER's previous study of Head Start in Chicago, which in a randomized trial found that full-day programs led to substantial PPVT score improvements compared to half-day.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics: Total and by Delegate Agency

	Total			Delegates								
				Monmouth/Middlesex			Philadelphia/Camden			Las Vegas/Clark County		
	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD
Home Language												
English	964	56.7%		254	36.5%		289	96.7%		421	59.6%	
Spanish	716	42.1%		434	62.4%		10	3.3%		272	38.5%	
Other/Unknown	38	2.2%		25	3.5%		0	.0%		13	1.8%	
Age												
3-year-olds	765	44.5%		328	46.0%		151	50.5%		286	40.5%	
4-year-olds	953	55.5%		385	54.0%		148	49.5%		420	59.5%	
IEP												
No	1572	93.6%		657	97.0%		272	91.3%		643	91.2%	
Yes	108	6.4%		20	3.0%		26	8.7%		62	8.8%	
Participation Years												
1.00	787	45.9%		364	51.1%		125	42.1%		298	42.2%	
2.00	871	50.8%		343	48.1%		142	47.8%		386	54.7%	
3.00	58	3.4%		6	.8%		30	10.1%		22	3.1%	
Eligibility												
Under 100% FPL	1217	70.8%		542	76.0%		152	50.8%		523	74.1%	
101 - 130% FPL	65	3.8%		32	4.5%		21	7.0%		12	1.7%	
Over Income (> 130%)	65	3.8%		32	4.5%		15	5.0%		18	2.5%	
Foster Child	21	1.2%		4	.6%		8	2.7%		9	1.3%	
Homeless	115	6.7%		41	5.8%		14	4.7%		60	8.5%	
Public Assistance	235	13.7%		62	8.7%		89	29.8%		84	11.9%	
Ethnicity												
White/Asian/Other	206	12.0%		96	12.1%		3	1.0%		117	16.6%	
Black	580	33.8%		111	15.6%		275	92.0%		194	27.5%	
Hispanic	932	54.2%		516	72.4%		21	7.0%		395	55.9%	

Table 2. Program Features Including Curriculum, Assessment and Teacher Characteristics

	Total			Delegates								
				Monmouth/Middlesex			Philadelphia/Camden			Las Vegas/Clark County		
	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD
Session Type												
Half Day	53	36.6%		9	14.8%		0	0%		44	74.6%	
Full Day	92	63.4%		52	85.2%		25	100.0%		15	25.4%	
Assessment												
ELS	17	11.7%		17	27.9%		0	0%		0	0%	
GOLD	100	69.0%		41	67.2%		0	0%		59	100.0%	
WSS	28	19.3%		3	4.9%		25	100.0%		0	0%	
Curriculum												
Acelero curriculum	93	64.1%		16	26.2%		18	72.0%		59	100.0%	
Creative Curriculum	18	12.4%		18	29.5%		0	.0%		0	.0%	
Curiosity	6	4.1%		6	9.8%		0	.0%		0	0%	
EPIC	7	4.8%		0	0%		7	28.0%		0	0%	
Tools	21	14.5%		21	34.4%		0	0%		0	0%	
CLASS(Fall)												
Emotional Support	145	5.91	.73	61	6.05	.63	25	5.80	.83	59	5.82	.78
Classroom Organization	145	4.91	1.00	61	4.92	.87	25	4.80	.97	59	4.94	1.15
Instructional Support	145	3.34	1.14	61	3.32	.97	25	2.73	.60	59	3.63	1.37
CLASS Average	145	4.84	.85	61	4.89	.71	25	4.58	.71	59	4.90	1.01

Table 2, continued

	Total			Delegates								
				Monmouth/Middlesex			Philadelphia/Camden			Las Vegas/Clark County		
	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD
Teacher Experience												
Less Than 1 yr	28	24.3%		8	17.4%		5	26.3%		15	30.0%	
1~3 yrs	58	50.4%		28	60.9%		14	73.7%		16	32.0%	
3~5 yrs	25	21.7%		6	13.0%		0	0%		19	38.0%	
More Than 5 yrs	4	3.5%		4	8.7%		0	0%		0	0%	
Months of Experience	115	25.31	16.23	46	26.67	18.79	19	18.37	5.93	50	26.70	15.93
Teacher Fluent in Spanish & Eng.	21	18.3%		10	21.7%		0	0%		11	22.0%	
Teachers' Highest Degree												
CDA	1	.9%		0	0%		1	5.3%		0	0%	
Associate's Degree in ECE	18	15.7%		1	2.2%		9	47.4%		8	16.0%	
Associate's Degree in related	7	6.1%		1	2.2%		2	10.5%		4	8.0%	
Bachelor's Degree in ECE	23	20.0%		15	32.6%		2	10.5%		6	12.0%	
Bachelor's Degree in other	22	19.1%		9	19.6%		1	5.3%		12	24.0%	
Bachelor's Degree in related	29	25.2%		10	21.7%		3	15.8%		16	32.0%	
Graduate Degree in ECE	5	4.3%		4	8.7%		0	.0%		1	2.0%	
Graduate Degree in other	3	2.6%		2	4.3%		1	5.3%		0	.0%	
Graduate Degree in related	6	5.2%		4	8.7%		0	.0%		2	4.0%	
Other	1	.9%		0	.0%		0	.0%		1	2.0%	
Credits within ECE	39	23.95	8.38	20	26.75	7.02	4	14.25	7.50	15	22.80	8.50

Table 3. Child Test Scores and Characteristics: Study Sample

	Total			Delegates								
				Monmouth/Middlesex			Philadelphia/Camden			Las Vegas/Clark County		
	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD	N	Mean/%	SD
PPVT standard score												
Fall with Spring score	1338	79.58	17.21	544	76.57	17.81	254	84.87	14.38	540	80.12	17.19
Spring	1341	84.67	16.32	544	84.89	15.16	254	88.41	14.37	543	82.71	17.93
Fall – Spring Gain	1338	5.12	12.64	544	8.32	13.84	254	3.54	11.48	540	2.64	11.13
Woodcock Johnson Math standard score												
Fall with Spring score	1377	92.98	13.29	573	91.71	14.01	244	96.31	11.20	560	92.83	13.14
Spring	1392	97.14	11.99	578	98.73	11.20	252	98.37	10.28	562	94.96	13.11
Fall – Spring Gain	1377	4.12	11.76	573	7.06	13.40	244	1.81	10.02	560	2.11	9.89

Table 4. Pre-Post Test Scores by Different Groups: Monmouth/Middlesex

	pre PPVT standard			post PPVT standard			PPVT ss gain			pre WJ standard			post WJ standard			WJ ss gain		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Gender																		
Male	358	74.49	18.48	277	85.68	15.11	277	9.84	13.93	357	89.83	14.38	291	98.63	11.34	290	8.22	14.05
Female	355	75.31	18.95	267	84.07	15.20	267	6.74	13.59	351	91.89	14.49	287	98.84	11.08	283	5.86	12.62
Race																		
White/Asian	74	81.99	19.87	57	89.96	16.87	57	6.09	14.39	73	95.11	14.82	58	105.10	10.29	57	8.44	10.84
Black	111	83.95	14.91	88	90.94	12.50	88	7.11	13.95	110	95.89	12.90	89	100.85	12.01	88	4.73	15.38
Hispanic	516	71.81	18.40	390	82.74	14.75	390	8.91	13.73	513	89.23	14.42	422	97.45	10.77	419	7.34	13.34
Others	12	80.08	17.88	9	86.44	22.90	9	8.56	14.02	12	87.92	12.91	9	97.00	13.27	9	7.78	8.58
Home Language																		
English	254	84.43	16.91	206	91.30	14.32	206	6.49	13.33	252	96.33	12.51	211	102.77	11.48	209	5.67	11.24
Spanish	434	69.01	17.61	318	80.63	14.12	318	9.62	14.29	431	87.38	14.59	347	96.24	10.44	344	8.06	14.57
Others	8	74.25	7.78	8	79.25	13.27	8	5.00	6.21	8	93.38	11.55	8	97.88	11.26	8	4.50	11.19
Missing	17	83.06	13.35	12	91.33	17.70	12	7.50	10.69	17	96.53	12.99	12	100.25	6.72	12	4.08	12.83
Income Status																		
101 - 130%	32	75.00	16.22	25	82.52	10.61	25	8.28	13.12	32	92.25	13.64	23	94.09	10.93	23	1.09	7.34
Eligible (0 - 100%)	542	73.62	18.96	412	84.23	15.02	412	8.70	14.54	539	90.27	14.48	444	98.96	11.04	441	7.76	13.95
Foster Child	4	104.75	10.84	3	110.67	9.29	3	5.33	12.42	4	116.00	9.42	3	106.67	9.29	3	-5.33	3.21
Homeless	41	76.00	19.27	34	85.79	19.03	34	7.41	11.16	41	89.41	16.39	34	95.12	14.36	34	3.76	12.25
Over Inc (> 130%)	32	79.78	13.33	28	86.04	15.11	28	6.64	11.45	32	93.72	12.49	27	100.30	9.85	27	7.85	11.70
Public Assistance	62	80.85	17.33	42	89.40	13.83	42	6.71	10.74	60	93.07	12.94	47	100.09	10.43	45	6.09	11.20

Table 5. Pre-Post Test Scores by Different Groups: Camden/ Philadelphia

	pre PPVT standard			post PPVT standard			PPVT ss gain			pre WJ standard			post WJ standard			WJ ss gain		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Gender																		
Male	149	85.17	14.03	127	88.09	14.19	124	3.44	11.43	143	94.48	11.40	125	98.10	10.53	117	2.50	9.99
Female	146	85.26	14.53	130	88.32	15.05	130	3.63	11.58	142	97.41	11.29	130	98.35	10.38	127	1.17	10.05
Race																		
White/Asian	1	105.00		1	106.00		1	1.00		1	99.00		1	122.00		1	23.00	
Black	273	85.38	13.72	235	88.69	13.53	233	3.73	11.47	263	96.09	11.10	232	98.25	10.03	223	1.46	9.91
Hispanic	19	80.21	19.99	19	79.74	22.86	18	1.22	12.62	19	92.37	14.82	20	95.30	12.36	18	4.61	10.68
Others	2	99.50	6.36	2	103.00	12.73	2	3.50	6.36	2	108.50	14.85	2	113.50	17.68	2	5.00	2.83
Home Language																		
English	286	85.81	13.96	248	89.07	13.91	245	3.72	11.46	276	96.33	11.15	245	98.67	10.18	235	1.67	9.97
Spanish	9	66.11	9.79	9	64.56	14.09	9	-1.56	11.72	9	83.89	13.72	10	87.50	11.39	9	5.56	11.37
Income Status																		
101 - 130%	21	92.71	11.05	19	93.16	13.14	19	1.26	10.66	19	99.89	8.82	19	95.32	7.92	18	-5.33	9.86
Eligible (0 - 100%)	149	86.13	15.24	131	87.13	15.57	129	2.14	12.19	143	96.31	12.60	130	98.45	10.93	123	2.15	10.80
Foster Child	8	76.38	16.27	7	82.29	13.63	7	7.00	7.19	8	88.38	15.58	6	87.67	19.53	6	.00	8.65
Homeless	14	86.86	14.11	11	98.18	9.63	11	7.82	9.98	14	98.07	10.84	11	103.55	10.46	11	4.91	9.50
Over Inc (> 130%)	15	87.47	12.12	15	93.27	13.19	15	5.80	8.99	15	100.27	8.73	15	102.00	9.21	15	1.73	9.82
Public Assistance	88	82.02	12.45	74	86.91	13.36	73	5.15	11.16	86	94.03	9.32	74	97.89	8.73	71	2.72	8.26

Table 6. Pre-Post Test Scores by Different Groups: Clark County

	pre PPVT standard			post PPVT standard			PPVT ss gain			pre WJ standard			post WJ standard			WJ ss gain		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Gender																		
Male	356	78.34	16.66	282	81.67	17.85	280	2.17	11.13	357	92.07	12.79	289	93.57	12.80	288	.90	9.59
Female	346	79.96	17.29	261	83.82	17.97	260	3.14	11.13	347	93.21	13.67	273	96.43	13.29	272	3.40	10.05
Race																		
White/Asian	94	89.43	17.34	75	92.76	17.69	74	1.92	10.99	96	99.67	13.92	73	101.95	15.82	73	1.47	9.17
Black	193	84.78	13.09	143	89.38	14.77	142	3.37	10.02	194	95.22	10.70	148	96.80	10.66	148	1.56	9.81
Hispanic	394	73.69	16.68	310	76.95	17.43	309	2.43	11.73	393	89.49	13.35	327	92.48	12.89	325	2.58	10.21
Others	21	83.48	13.61	15	87.80	10.45	15	3.60	9.46	21	95.29	11.52	14	97.00	10.33	14	.57	6.51
Home Language																		
English	419	85.91	14.16	312	90.46	15.02	311	2.85	10.93	421	96.76	12.09	317	98.87	12.22	317	1.46	8.98
Spanish	270	68.45	15.60	221	71.71	16.00	219	2.65	11.40	270	86.12	12.46	234	89.74	12.63	232	3.28	10.86
Others	13	82.92	14.47	10	83.90	15.65	10	-4.10	9.96	13	94.31	10.51	11	93.45	8.59	11	-3.64	10.73
Income Status																		
101 - 130%	12	80.42	16.22	11	84.82	13.65	11	4.64	11.66	12	94.92	9.01	11	95.36	12.12	11	.18	10.35
Eligible (0 - 100%)	521	78.42	17.32	409	82.25	17.88	407	2.77	11.17	521	92.49	13.51	422	95.00	13.22	420	2.51	10.15
Foster Child	9	87.56	12.04	7	92.14	11.10	7	5.29	8.36	9	100.44	9.41	7	103.43	13.50	7	1.86	7.34
Homeless	59	83.44	14.75	41	87.73	16.47	41	2.56	10.59	60	95.92	10.64	44	98.89	10.16	44	2.36	8.01
Over Inc (> 130%)	17	81.35	15.52	17	80.35	17.48	16	-.13	9.31	18	93.61	12.63	18	93.50	12.17	18	-.11	7.70
Public Assistance	84	79.02	16.80	58	81.50	20.26	58	1.83	12.05	84	89.81	13.54	60	91.20	13.76	60	.20	10.00

Table 7. Multivariate Analyses

	PPVT Standard Score	PPVT Standard Score	PPVT Standard Score	WJ-AP Standard Score	WJ-AP Standard Score	WJ-AP Standard Score
Age	-3.734*** (0.63)	-3.787*** (0.63)	-3.641*** (0.62)	-6.111*** (0.56)	-6.110*** (0.56)	-5.799*** (0.55)
White/Asian	0.415 (1.35)	0.629 (1.35)	0.313 (1.34)	1.903 (1.21)	1.894 (1.21)	1.635 (1.20)
Black	0.310 (1.07)	0.302 (1.07)	1.355 (1.13)	-0.414 (0.95)	-0.415 (0.95)	0.152 (1.00)
Other Race	2.424 (2.53)	2.629 (2.53)	2.375 (2.51)	1.298 (2.33)	1.289 (2.33)	1.047 (2.31)
Home Language (Spanish = 1)	2.861** (1.02)	2.906** (1.02)	2.248* (1.02)	3.131*** (0.90)	3.130*** (0.90)	2.413** (0.89)
Home Language Missing	0.502 (3.69)	0.306 (3.68)	-1.332 (3.64)	-1.141 (3.33)	-1.130 (3.33)	-3.138 (3.27)
Full Day	2.816** (0.88)	2.751** (0.86)	0.718 (1.06)	0.371 (0.76)	0.374 (0.76)	-2.379** (0.89)
Attendance	-0.006 (0.04)	-0.008 (0.04)	-0.020 (0.04)	0.046 (0.03)	0.047 (0.03)	0.041 (0.03)
CLASS		1.363* (0.58)	1.158* (0.55)		-0.050 (0.52)	-0.178 (0.47)
Philadelphia / Camden			-4.583*** (1.28)			-3.120** (1.11)
Las Vegas / Clark County			-4.585*** (1.07)			-5.247*** (0.90)
<i>N</i>	1338	1338	1338	1377	1377	1377