Virginia Math Outcomes Analysis 2016/17

Grade Levels: 3, 4, 5
ST Math Program: Gen-4
Analysis Type: Z-score of scale score
Treatment-Years: 2016/17
Baseline-Year: 2015/16
Subgroup: All Students

Jessica Guise
MIND Research Institute

Abstract

This analysis evaluates grades using ST Math in Virginia in 2016/17. It identifies those grades with nominal or better implementation of the ST Math program, and matches them to randomly selected, similar math-performance comparison grades. The nominal ST Math users are an aggregation of 20 grades, consisting of grades 3, 4, and 5 at 9 schools, with an average baseline of 85% in Proficient or Advanced proficiency levels (refer to Figures 2 and 3 to see how your schools compare to those analyzed in this report).They were matched to 20 similar, randomly selected control grades at 20 schools that never used ST Math. Grade-wise growth in math proficiency was evaluated (i.e. growth in same grade, same school, from 2015/16 to 2016/17) on the percentage proficient, scale scores, and Z-scores of the scale scores (see Section 3.1). Grades 3, 4, and 5 aggregated showed an ST Math effect of 0.47 points at the Proficient or Advanced levels, 1.04 points at the Advanced Level, and Z-score of 0.14.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This is a quasi-experimental analysis at the grade-mean level. Entire grades represent the units of analysis, and outcome measures are the 1-year changes in grade-mean VSOL Proficient or Advanced percentages. The treatment grades used the ST Math program for 1 year, beginning in the 2016/17 school year. The study hypothesis is treatment grades using ST Math will outperform similar matched control grades, using their "business as usual" conditions of instructional content and professional development. The control grades were selected to have similar demographic, math, and economically disadvantaged attributes to the treatment grades during the baseline year (2015/16), and did not use ST Math in 2016/17. The treatment grades' selection pool was all schools using ST Math in grades 3, 4, and 5 in Virginia. The control grades' pool was all schools not using ST Math in grades 3, 4, and 5 in Virginia. This study method measures effectiveness of the ST Math program when nominally implemented.

1.2 Program Description

The ST Math program is a supplemental math program covering grade-level Virginia math standards. The ST Math content consists of visual representations of math standards, concepts, and procedures, presented to students as "Puzzles" of virtual manipulatives, with which they interact to pose solutions. Each time the student poses a solution, the computer visually animates the Puzzle, diagram, or symbols to show why the posed solution correctly solves, or why it does not solve, the math problem (puzzle). The Puzzles are arranged into sequential groups, called "Levels". To proceed to the next Level in sequence, the student needs to master his/her current Level. Mastering a Level requires solving 100% of the math problems, or Puzzles correctly. In this way, the program is self-paced. Students must correctly solve approximately 4-12 Puzzles, with only 1 failure and retry allowed, to proceed. Levels are sequenced together into Games and, again, the student must master each Game to get to the next Game in sequence. Games are sequenced into "Learning Objectives" (e.g. 'Fractions Concepts'). The ST Math curriculum of approximately 20-25 Learning Objectives can be rearranged in a year-long, grade-level syllabus to match district math pacing through the school year.

The Puzzles typically start with concrete representations of the math, without abstract symbols, math vocabulary, or even English words. Gradually, through subsequent Levels or Games, abstractions are introduced. For example, a Puzzle might start with "n" green blocks on the screen, and then at a subsequent Level may represent the quantity with the numeral for "n" (no green blocks anymore). In this way, three things are accomplished: i) language proficiency prerequisites to engage with the program are minimal, ii) non-mathematical distractions (e.g. back-stories for word problems) are minimized or eliminated – thereby reducing load on working memory, and iii) the actual math in the problem can be represented clearly, simply, and unambiguously.

Besides the self-paced progress made by students in their one-to-one environment, the program is designed to be referenced by teachers during their regular math instruction. It is supplemental to core or basal math instruction and instructional materials. As the great majority of grade-level math standards are covered in the ST Math digital curriculum, completion of 100% of the entire ST Math curriculum (i.e. completing every Game) is required to cover all grade-level math standards.

Teachers receive initial training, either face to face or through self-guided online instruction. The training covers account startup, as well as math learning and growth mindset goals, the pedagogical

approach to learning in a visual experiential game, monitoring and intervention of the student 1:1 game play, and connecting of ST Math content to classroom content and pacing.

To achieve nominal progress through the program, there is a time-on-task requirement. While student progress rates through the program vary, MIND Research Institute has found that consistent application of 90 minutes per week throughout the school year is sufficient to get most students through at least half of the ST Math Learning Objectives. Students are recommended to use the program in school for at least two 45-minute sessions per week, or 90 minutes per week, over about 35 weeks. Analyses of ST Math usage have shown that consistently following this schedule throughout the school year is usually sufficient to achieve 50% or more Progress through ST Math content. Progress is a percentage of ST Math content coverage, and is defined as Levels completed by the student, divided by the total number of Levels in the curriculum. In addition, MIND's historical analyses have shown that it is necessary to complete at least 50% of the program in order to expect significantly higher performance compared to non-users.

2 Data Collection

Since this analysis uses grades as the unit of analysis, and states publish grade-mean state standardized test scores, the data for student math outcomes is collected from each state education agency's research files (retrieved from state websites). The treatment students use ST Math student accounts served by MIND. Student ST Math usage data is aggregated to grade-level means by MIND.

2.1 Proficiency Levels Definition

The following (Table 1) is Virginia's proficiency level descriptions:

Proficiency Level	State Proficiency Level Name
L1	Fail
L2	Proficient
L3	Advanced

Table 1: Proficiency Level Naming

2.2 Treatment Grades Pool and Selection

The Treatment grades pool originated with all schools and grades using ST Math in Virginia. From these schools, every grade that had used the ST Math program only for the year 2016/17 was identified. They comprise the Treatment grades pool for this evaluation of 1-year usage.

Because the analysis uses grade-mean data, such as grade-mean scale scores or grade-mean proficiency level percentages, it is necessary that the program also be a grade-wide treatment, with the great majority of students in each grade receiving treatment. Otherwise, the grade-means reported by the state of 100% of *tested* students would not be valid measures of a smaller fraction of *treatment* students. MIND's site implementation requirement is that an entire grade, including all teachers and all classes within that grade, use the ST Math program. We validate how closely this is the case for each individual treatment grade by comparing the number of ST Math student

accounts at a grade level to the Virginia's reported enrollment at that grade level. We discard from the Treatment pool any grade with a ratio of ST Math student accounts to reported grade enrollment lower than 85%.

Furthermore, the outcomes measure is a summative year-end test, i.e. Virginia's standardized math assessment (VSOL). The math assessment thus covers all the math standards for that entire grade level. Meanwhile, the ST Math program curriculum (arranged into Learning Objectives) is also aligned to Virginia math standards. To infer that the ST Math content is having a valid effect on student outcomes on the summative assessment, we discard any grade with grade-mean of ST Math Progress for its students lower than 50% by year-end.

Progress is a percentage, and is defined as Levels completed by the student, divided by the total number of Levels in the grade-level curriculum. Note that student achievement of at least 50% progress in ST Math is accomplished primarily by teacher assignment of computer session time to students. With sufficient time on task, students make progress. The program helps them self-pace through providing real-time informative feedback for each puzzle.

2.3 Control Grades Pool and Selection

The control grades are randomly selected from a control pool of schools in Virginia. Though they are randomly selected, they are also matched to be similar to the Treatment grades' math attributes and demographics during the baseline 2015/16 year. The matched attributes include:

- scale score
- student percentages at each math proficiency level
- percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch (using the demographic data from MDR).

To mitigate the risk of randomly picking a set of Control grades that generates an outlier for effect, a Monte Carlo approach is used to perform many random picks. The control pool's size is large enough that there are many possible "picks" of closely matched control grades.

One hundred randomly matched picks are made and sets of matched control grades are generated. For each set, the quality of the match as well as the math growth of the potential control set is evaluated. Some picked sets have high average math growth, some have low average math growth. From the set of all picks, a median pick is chosen. This avoids either an unlikely overestimate, or underestimate, of the Control grades' growth. When multiple median picks exist, the control set with the minimal math score differences in the baseline year is chosen.

3 Data Analysis

The set of all schools and grades using ST Math in Virginia is evaluated for Enrollment percentage and Progress percentage parameters. A filtered Treatment set (TRT) of all ST Math grades with $\geq$ 85% Enrollment and $\geq$ 50% Progress is identified. State math assessment data is tabulated. A matching set of Control grades based on baseline year state math assessment is selected.

Changes in math performance, i.e. the difference in math performance of a grade from a baseline year to the final year, are evaluated and tabulated. Statistical tests of the significance of the difference in math performance changes between Treatment grades and Control grades are performed. Finally, a grade-by-grade disaggregation is performed.

3.1 Z-scores

When states change their state assessment throughout the years, they also change the range of possible scale scores achieved on the exam. This makes it difficult to compare changes in grade mean scale scores across years with a different exam. To deal with this issue, a new Z-score is calculated. For each year being analyzed, by grade, a Z-score takes the difference of the grade mean scale score and the mean of all scale scores statewide for that year, and then divides it by the standard deviation of all scale scores statewide for that year. Here is a fictional example to illustrate the calculation of a Z-score for the 2015/16 exam:

School A, Grade 3, Mean scale score: 300
Average across all schools statewide, Grade 3: 350
Standard deviation across all schools statewide, Grade 3: 30
Z-score=((School A, Grade 3, Mean scale score)-(Average across all schools, Grade 3))/(Standard deviation across all schools, Grade 3)

$$\text{Z-score}=\frac{300-350}{30}=-1.67$$

The Z-score is calculated for every grade across all years being analyzed, using the full state data set of Virginia schools for the averages and standard deviations. The use of Z-scores is a valid statistical method to normalize any dataset and to enable analysis across otherwise uncomparable exams. In this report, we will include both mean scale scores and their accompanying Z-scores.

3.2 Percentile Ranking

These newly calculated z-scores can then be converted into a percentile ranking. Each percentile ranking shows the grade's performance relative to the others in that year and grade. For example, for a specific grade 3, a percentile ranking of 50 shows that this grade 3 performed at the average of all third grades in the state for that testing year.

3.3 Final Treatment and Control

3.3.1 ST Math Grade-Aggregated Implementation ($\geq$ 85% Enrollment Grades Only)



Figure 1: Histogram of ST Math Percent Progress for $\geq$ 85% Enrollment Grades 2016/17

For all ST Math grades with Enrollment $\geq$ 85%, Figure 1 shows the frequency distribution of grade-average Progress percentage through the program. Note that we will only be using grades with $\geq$ 50% Progress as the Treatment Group.

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics of the Progress distribution. Table 3 shows the number of remaining treatment grades after applying enrollment and progress filters.

	Min.	Max.	Average	S.D.
ST Math % Progress	1.5	74.2	44.3	23.6

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of ST Math Percent Progress for >= 85 percent Enrollment Grades

Grades with >= 85% Enrollment:	32
Grades with in addition >= 50% Progress:	20

Table 3: Number of ST Math Grades with >= 85 percent Enrollment and with >= 50 percent progress

3.3.2 Filtering Treatment and Controls

Table 4 shows the total number of grades in the Treatment pool, the number of grades that exceeded the 85% Enrollment figure, and also the 50% Progress filter. Other rows in the table indicate counts of numbers of students (2016/17 from state testing count) and counts of number of schools represented. The number of matched Control (CTRL) grades, students, and schools is also shown.

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Total
ST Math Using Grades	15	14	12	41
ST Math Using Schools	15	14	12	16
ST Math Students	1088	1122	961	3171
ST Math Grades (Enroll >= 85%)	12	10	10	32
TRT Grades (Enroll >= 85% & Prog >= 50%)	8	5	7	20
TRT Schools (Enroll >= 85% & Prog >= 50%)	8	5	6	9
TRT Students (Enroll >= 85% & Prog >= 50%)	679	536	434	1649
CTRL Grades	8	5	7	20
CTRL Schools	8	5	7	20
CTRL Students	758	374	398	1530

Table 4: Treatment Pool Filtering and Controls: Counts of Grades, Schools, and Students

3.3.3 Match of Controls to Treatment

Figure 2 shows the density plot of the baseline VSOL Math scale scores (left plot) and baseline percent students at VSOL Proficient or Advanced (right plot) for treatment grades overlayed on control grades, showing the closeness of the match obtained between Treatment and Control sets of grades in the baseline year, 2015/16. It is important to keep in mind that we only have a small number of treatment and control grades (20) and that the Control set was arrived at through a Monte Carlo process (see Section 2.3) rather than a closest math performance match.



Figure 2: Baseline Year Density Plots Showing Math Scores Match between TRT and CTRL - 2015/16

Similarly, figure 3 shows the density plot of the percentage of students needing free or reduced lunch for treatment grades overlayed on control grades, showing the closeness of the match obtained between Treatment and Control sets of grades.



Figure 3: Baseline Year Density Plot Showing Student Need Match between TRT and CTRL

Table 5 shows the difference of the means of Treatment versus Control in the baseline year, with accompanying p-values, for percent Proficient or Advanced, for mean scale score, and for percent of students receiving free or reduced lunch. The large p-values show the differences between the Treatment and Control grades are not statistically significant.

	Mean(TRT)	SD(TRT)	Mean(CTRL)	SD(CTRL)	Estimate	P-Value
Proficient or Advanced - 2015/16	84.61	11.44	84.67	7.18	-0.06	0.98
Scale score - 2015/16	457.55	21.81	456.55	21.56	1.00	0.88
Percent Free or Reduced Lunch	39.10	15.09	42.20	18.96	-3.10	0.57

Table 5: Matching TRT and CTRL

3.4 Grade-Aggregated Analysis

Table 6 shows for both Treatment (TRT) and Control (CTRL) aggregation across grades of scale scores, Z-scores, and proficiency level distributions. The far right column also shows the average ST Math Progress for the TRT set.

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Proficient or Advanced	ST Math Per Comp.
TRT.15.16	20	9	1496	457.6	0.34	61.50	15.39	58.10	26.51	84.61	–
TRT.16.17	20	9	1496	451.4	0.29	60.75	18.52	57.19	24.29	81.48	63.79
TRT.Delta	–	–	–	-6.2	-0.05	-0.75	3.13	-0.92	-2.22	-3.13	–
CTRL.15.16	20	20	1530	456.6	0.31	60.60	15.33	58.68	26.00	84.67	–
CTRL.16.17	20	20	1530	446.1	0.12	53.30	18.93	58.34	22.74	81.07	–
CTRL.Delta	–	–	–	-10.5	-0.19	-7.30	3.60	-0.34	-3.26	-3.60	–

Table 6: Yearly Math Proficiency and Counts for TRT and CTRL Grade-Aggregated Datasets

The following chart (Figure 4) shows the changes in percentage of students at each math proficiency level for the grade-aggregated Treatment and Control sets (TRT.delta and CTRL.delta).



Figure 4: Change at each Proficiency Level for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

Similarly, Figure 5 shows the changes in VSOL Math scale scores and changes in Z-scores for the grade-aggregated Treatment and Control sets.



Figure 5: Changes in VSOL Math scale scores and Z-scores (See Section 3.1) for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

Further, Figure 6 shows the changes in percent of students at VSOL Proficient or Advanced for the grade-aggregated Treatment and Control sets.



Figure 6: Changes in Proficient or Advanced for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

Table 7 shows the statistics for the *differences* in changes between TRT and CTRL (Treatment - Control) for these same VSOL math proficiency and z-score changes as in the above figures. [1]

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Proficient or Advanced	0.47	0.86	-4.98	5.92
scale score	4.30	0.43	-6.74	15.34
Z-score	0.14	0.46	-0.24	0.51
L1	-0.47	0.86	-5.91	4.98
L2	-0.57	0.85	-6.85	5.70
L3	1.04	0.73	-5.00	7.08

Table 7: Statistics for the Differential Changes in Math Scores Growth (TRT - CTRL)

[1] * statistically significant $p<0.05$

Finally, Figure 7 shows the changes in mean percentile ranking between TRT and CTRL.



Figure 7: Changes in Percentile Ranking for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

3.5 Grade-Level Analysis

3.5.1 Grade Level Result Tables

The following tables (Table 8, 9, and 10) present a disaggregation of results by grade level. The far right column in each table also shows the average ST Math Progress for the TRT set.

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Proficient or Advanced	ST Math Per Prog.
TRT.15.16	8	8	571	442.2	0.15	55.12	20.26	61.78	17.96	79.74	–
TRT.16.17	8	8	571	437.1	0.13	55.50	24.48	56.32	19.20	75.52	67.52
TRT.Delta	–	–	–	-5.1	-0.02	0.38	4.22	-5.46	1.23	-4.23	–
CTRL.15.16	8	8	758	440.5	0.08	53.38	19.98	62.81	17.21	80.02	–
CTRL.16.17	8	8	758	434.6	0.04	51.25	23.00	61.02	15.98	77.00	–
CTRL.Delta	–	–	–	-5.9	-0.04	-2.12	3.02	-1.79	-1.24	-3.02	–

Table 8: Grade 3 - Yearly Math Performance and Counts for TRT and CTRL Datasets

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Proficient or Advanced	ST Math Per Prog.
TRT.15.16	5	5	515	476.0	0.64	72.40	8.93	54.30	36.77	91.07	–
TRT.16.17	5	5	515	463.6	0.39	64.40	14.34	56.07	29.59	85.66	57.38
TRT.Delta	–	–	–	-12.4	-0.26	-8.00	5.42	1.76	-7.18	-5.42	–
CTRL.15.16	5	5	374	476.0	0.64	72.60	9.88	53.34	36.79	90.13	–
CTRL.16.17	5	5	374	464.8	0.43	63.80	13.43	55.41	31.16	86.57	–
CTRL.Delta	–	–	–	-11.2	-0.22	-8.80	3.55	2.07	-5.63	-3.56	–

Table 9: Grade 4 - Yearly Math Performance and Counts for TRT and CTRL Datasets

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Proficient or Advanced	ST Math Per Prog.
TRT.15.16	7	6	410	461.9	0.35	61.00	14.44	56.62	28.94	85.56	–
TRT.16.17	7	6	410	458.9	0.41	64.14	14.69	58.98	26.32	85.31	64.11
TRT.Delta	–	–	–	-3.0	0.06	3.14	0.25	2.36	-2.62	-0.25	–
CTRL.15.16	7	7	398	461.0	0.32	60.29	13.90	57.78	28.32	86.10	–
CTRL.16.17	7	7	398	445.7	-0.01	48.14	18.19	57.36	24.45	81.81	–
CTRL.Delta	–	–	–	-15.3	-0.33	-12.14	4.29	-0.41	-3.88	-4.29	–

Table 10: Grade 5 - Yearly Math Performance and Counts for TRT and CTRL Datasets

3.5.2 Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in Math Proficient or Advanced

Figure 8 shows the difference in the growth of percentages of students at math Proficient or Advanced, for the TRT and CTRL datasets, disaggregated by grade:



Figure 8: Changes in Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

Table 11 shows the statistics for the *differences* in changes between TRT and CTRL (Treatment - Control) for these same Proficient or Advanced math proficiency changes as shown in Figure 8.

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Grade 3	-1.20	0.82	-12.37	9.96
Grade 4	-1.86	0.66	-11.88	8.16
Grade 5	4.04	0.40	-6.28	14.36

Table 11: Statistics for the Differential Changes in Proficient or Advanced, (TRT - CTRL)

3.5.3 Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in VSOL Math scale scores

Figure 9 shows the changes in the grade-mean math scale scores of students for the TRT and CTRL datasets, disaggregated by grade:



Figure 9: Changes in Grade-Mean VSOL Math scale score for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

Table 12 shows the statistics for the differences between TRT and CTRL (Treatment - Control) for these same VSOL math scale score changes as shown in Figure 9.

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Grade 3	0.75	0.92	-14.52	16.02
Grade 4	-1.20	0.89	-21.65	19.25
Grade 5	12.29	0.34	-16.41	40.98

Table 12: Statistics for the Differential Changes in VSOL Math scale scores Growth, (TRT - CTRL)

3.5.4 Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in VSOL Z-scores of scale scores

Figure 10 shows the changes in the grade-mean Z-scores of students for the TRT and CTRL datasets, disaggregated by grade:



Figure 10: Changes in Grade-Mean VSOL Z-score (See Section 3.1) for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2015/16 and 2016/17

Table 13 shows the statistics for the differences between TRT and CTRL (Treatment - Control) for these same VSOL Z-score changes as shown in Figure 10.

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Grade 3	0.03	0.92	-0.54	0.59
Grade 4	-0.04	0.90	-0.76	0.67
Grade 5	0.39	0.35	-0.53	1.31

Table 13: Statistics for the Differential Changes in VSOL Z-scores (See Section 3.1) Growth, (TRT - CTRL)

4 Effect Size

The following table shows the effect sizes for Proficient or Advanced, VSOL scale score, and accompanying Z-score.

	Scale score Effect Size	Z-score Effect Size	Proficient or Advanced Effect Size
Grade 3	0.06	0.06	-0.24
Grade 4	-0.11	-0.10	-0.52
Grade 5	0.53	0.52	0.48
All Grades	0.20	0.24	0.07

Table 14: Cohen's d Effect Size

5 Findings Summary

Virginia grades 3, 4, and 5 using ST Math for the year 2016/17 averaged 44.3% ST Math Progress. 21/41 grades (51%) averaged covering more than 50% of ST Math content. No statistically significant findings were discovered during this analysis due to the small number of treatment grades for this state.

6 Confounders

Despite best efforts in minimizing confounders to the results of this analysis, there still remain a few input variables that could be significant in affecting differences of state test score outcomes between the Treatment and Control sets. One issue is the lack of randomization of grades chosen to receive the ST Math treatment. Instead of randomized selection, Treatment grades are self-selected. Self-selection can be an indication of districts or schools with a focus on math, an appetite for change, and with a spotlight on math training. Furthermore, not all grades using the ST Math program are chosen for analysis. Each grade must pass two specific filters to be considered for the Treatment set: the first being an enrollment filter of at least 85% of students in each grade using the program, and the second being a progress filter of at least 50% of the program completed on average by students in that grade. These filters might indicate relatively high-functioning schools with a team of relatively effective teachers in that grade, thus resulting in better instruction overall. A mitigation of this possible confounder is our selection of treatment groups on the grade level, rather than the teacher level, so there is no cherry picking of teachers: the full range of teachers in each grade is included. Moreover, the specific teachers may often be the same in the baseline year as in the current year, so the Treatment growth is not due to teacher differences. Finally, a possible confounder lies in the "business as usual" conditions at the matched control grades chosen for each analysis. It's unknown whether these control grades used other programs that could affect the comparison of the two sets of grades. The Monte Carlo Method is used to mitigate the possibility of control picks being favorable or unfavorable (see Section 2.3).

7 Reference Tables Grouped By School Year

The following tables show grade-level details, grouped by school year and for treatment (Table 15) and controls (Table 16) separately.

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Proficient or Advanced	ST Math Per Comp.
Grade 3 (15.16)	8	8	571	442.2	0.15	55.12	20.26	61.78	17.96	79.74	–
Grade 4 (15.16)	5	5	515	476.0	0.64	72.4	8.93	54.30	36.77	91.07	–
Grade 5 (15.16)	7	6	410	461.9	0.35	61.00	14.44	56.62	28.94	85.56	–
All Grades (15.16)	20	9	1496	457.6	0.34	61.50	15.39	58.10	26.51	84.61	–
Grade 3 (16.17)	8	8	571	437.1	0.13	55.50	24.48	56.32	19.20	75.52	67.52
Grade 4 (16.17)	5	5	515	463.6	0.39	64.4	14.34	56.07	29.59	85.66	57.38
Grade 5 (16.17)	7	6	410	458.9	0.41	64.14	14.69	58.98	26.32	85.31	64.11
All Grades (16.17)	20	9	1496	451.4	0.29	60.75	18.52	57.19	24.29	81.48	63.79

Table 15: TRT Grades Detail Sorted by Year

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Proficient or Advanced	ST Math Per Comp.
Grade 3 (15.16)	8	8	758	440.5	0.08	53.38	19.98	62.81	17.21	80.02	–
Grade 4 (15.16)	5	5	374	476.0	0.64	72.6	9.88	53.34	36.79	90.13	–
Grade 5 (15.16)	7	7	398	461.0	0.32	60.29	13.90	57.78	28.32	86.10	–
All Grades (15.16)	20	20	1530	456.6	0.31	60.60	15.33	58.68	26.00	84.67	–
Grade 3 (16.17)	8	8	758	434.6	0.04	51.25	23.00	61.02	15.98	77.00	–
Grade 4 (16.17)	5	5	374	464.8	0.43	63.8	13.43	55.41	31.16	86.57	–
Grade 5 (16.17)	7	7	398	445.7	-0.01	48.14	18.19	57.36	24.45	81.81	–
All Grades (16.17)	20	20	1530	446.1	0.12	53.30	18.93	58.34	22.74	81.07	–

Table 16: CTRL Grades Detail Sorted by Year

8 Lists of Schools

8.1 Treatment Schools

The following table lists the treatment schools and grades (after 85% enrollment and 50% progress filtering) used in the analysis.

PID	IID	District	School Name	GRADE
1068926	CRO1RP	Albemarle County	Crozet Elementary	3, 4, 5
1069671, 1075383	RAN1PO, RAN1RZ	Arlington County , Goochland County	Randolph Elementary	5, 3, 4, 5
1075321	BYR1S2	Goochland County	Byrd Elementary	3, 5
1075345	GOO1S3	Goochland County	Goochland Elementary	3, 4, 5
4029694	CAR1SS	Isle of Wight County	Carrollton Elementary	3
1077252	CAR1SR	Isle of Wight County	Carrsville Elementary	3, 5
1077264	HAR1T3	Isle of Wight County	Hardy Elementary	3
10003680	WES1T3	Isle of Wight County	Westside Elementary	4
1077290	WIN1T8	Isle of Wight County	Windsor Elementary	3, 4, 5

Table 17: Treatment Schools (TRT Dataset)

8.2 Control Schools

The following table lists the control schools and grades (matched control grades to treatment grades) used in the analysis.

PID	District	School Name	GRADE
1069152	Alleghany County	Sharon Elementary	5
1070723	Botetourt County	Breckinridge Elementary	5
11129768	Caroline County	Lewis & Clark Elementary	3
1071985	Chesterfield County	Grange Hall Elementary	3
1071997	Chesterfield County	Harrowgate Elementary	3
4362903	Chesterfield County	Marguerite F. Christian Elementary	4
1073476	Fairfax County	Springfield Estates Elementary	5
3251399	Fairfax County	Virginia Run Elementary	5
1074872	Franklin County	Dudley Elementary	5
1085156	Hampton City	Barron Elementary	3
1075876	Hanover County	Elmont Elementary	3
5272129	Loudoun County	Frances Hazel Reid Elementary	4
1086277	Newport News City	Achievable Dream Academy	3
1079365	Page County	Springfield Elementary	5
1080778	Roanoke County	Glen Cove Elementary	4
3246849	Rockingham County	John W. Wayland Elementary	3
10016223	Russell County	Lebanon Elementary	3
1082192	Spotsylvania County	Chancellor Elementary	4
3253414	Virginia Beach City	Ocean Lakes Elementary	4
1089358	Virginia Beach City	Pembroke Elementary	5

Table 18: Matched Control Schools (CTRL Dataset)