Technical Report # 0910

Criterion-related Evidence Using easyCBM® Reading Measures and Student Demographics to Predict State Test Performance in Grades 3-8

Gerald Tindal

Joseph F. Nese

Julie Alonzo

University of Oregon

Published by

Behavioral Research and Teaching
University of Oregon • 175 Education
5262 University of Oregon • Eugene, OR 97403-5262
Phone: 541-346-3535 • Fax: 541-346-5689
http://brt.uoregon.edu

Note: Funds for this data set used to generate this report come from a federal grant awarded to the UO from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education: *Model Demonstration Centers on Progress Monitoring (*PR/Award # H326M050003 funded from January 2006 – December 2008).

Abstract

In this technical report, data are presented on the predictive and concurrent relation between various student demographic variables (gender, race/ethnicity, special education status, Title 1 status, English language learning status, and economic disadvantage) and three reading easyCBMs (passage reading fluency, vocabulary, and multiple-choice comprehension) with a criterion measure of the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS). The findings are replicated for two school districts and across three time periods. Consistently, a significant amount of the variance for the criterion measure is explained by the combination of variables, particularly from the three reading measures.

Criteron-related Evidence Using easyCBM Reading Measures and Student Demographics to Predict State Performance in Grades 3-8

In one of the early definitions of curriculum-based measurement (CBM), Deno (1987) stated that "the term curriculum-based assessment, generally refers to any approach that uses direct observation and recording of a student's performance in the local school curriculum as a basis for gathering information to make instructional decisions…The term curriculum-based measurement refers to a specific set of procedures created through a research and development program … and grew out of the *Data-Based Program Modification* system developed by Deno and Mirkin (1977)" (p. 41). He noted that CBM is distinct in two important respects: (a) the procedures reflect technically adequate measures ("they possess reliability and validity to a degree that equals or exceeds that of most achievement tests," p. 41) and (b) "growth is described by an increasing score on a standard, or constant, task. The most common application of CBM requires that a student's performance in each curriculum area be measured on a single global task repeatedly across time" (p. 41).

In these early days of curriculum-based measurement, the focus was on developing measures that were brief and capable of frequent administration so that teachers could use the student progress to evaluate instructional programs. At the same time, the results from these studies quickly indicated that the measurement system also could be used from a normative basis to screen students for identification of those failing to learn essential reading skills and therefore in need of special (education) services. In the first study of this kind, Tindal, Germann, & Deno (1983) published on the Pine County norms in which they reported on students' fall, winter, and spring oral reading performance. Since then, this practice has continued in the literature with various researchers publishing on either local or national levels of performance for various CBMs.

Method

Setting and Subjects

Because of the sheer volume of tables, we present the results with reference to page numbers. Note that the demographics for successive seasons (fall, winter, and spring) are the same. For each grade, we present the demographics for school district 1 (SD 1) first and school district 2 (SD 2) second.

Grade 3 (pages 25 – 31). The third grade SD 1 sample consisted of 1,280 students; 48% female, 25% historically low-achieving, 43% economically disadvantaged, and 16% receiving special education services. For SD 2, the sample consisted of 802 students; 45% female, 27% historically low-achieving, 64% economically disadvantaged, and 21% receiving special education services. The SD 2 sample was smaller in number, but had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students. The state test pass rates of the samples were comparable, as 89% of the SD 1 sample passed, while 86% of the SD 2 sample passed.

Grade 4 (pages 32 – 38). The fourth grade SD 1 sample consisted of 1,334 students; 51% female, 25% historically low-achieving, 43% economically disadvantaged, and 17% receiving special education services. For SD 2, the sample consisted of 881 students; 48% female, 27% historically low-achieving, 60% economically disadvantaged, and 20% receiving special education services. The SD 2 sample was smaller in number, but had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students. The state test pass rates of the samples were comparable, as 92% of the SD 1 sample passed, while 85% of the SD 2 sample passed.

Grade 5 (pages 39 – 45). The fifth grade SD 1 sample consisted of 1,211 students; 50% female, 23% historically low-achieving, 41% economically disadvantaged, and 18% receiving special education services. For SD 2, the sample consisted of 873 students; 50% female, 25% historically low-achieving, 60% economically disadvantaged, and 19% receiving special

education services. The SD 2 sample was smaller in number, but had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students. SD 1 had a higher state reading test pass rate at 87% than did SD 2 at 73%.

Grade 6 (pages 46 – 51). The sixth grade SD 1 sample consisted of 1,115 students; 52% female, 25% historically low-achieving, 38% economically disadvantaged, and 16% receiving special education services. For SD 2, the sample consisted of 766 students; 48% female, 26% historically low-achieving, 59% economically disadvantaged, and 17% receiving special education services. The SD 2 sample was smaller in number, but had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students. SD 1 had a higher state reading test pass rate at 85% than did SD 2 at 76%.

Grade 7 (pages 52 – 57). The seventh grade SD 1 sample consisted of 1,306 students; 49% female, 25% historically low-achieving, 38% economically disadvantaged, and 15% receiving special education services. For SD 2, the sample consisted of 872 students; 46% female, 25% historically low-achieving, 58% economically disadvantaged, and 17% receiving special education services. The SD 2 sample was smaller in number, but had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students. SD 1 had a higher state reading test pass rate at 85% than did SD 2 at 75%.

Grade 8 (pages 58 – 63). The eighth grade SD 1 sample consisted of 1,359 students; 49% female, 24% historically low-achieving, 35% economically disadvantaged, and 14% receiving special education services. For SD 2, the sample consisted of 834 students; 50% female, 23% historically low-achieving, 54% economically disadvantaged, and 15% receiving special education services. The SD 2 sample was smaller in number, but had a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students. SD 1 had a higher state reading test pass rate at 79% than did SD 2 at 70%.

Measurement/Instrument Development

A complete description of the development of the passage reading fluency and comprehension measures of reading is presented in three technical reports:

Alonzo, J., & Tindal, G. (2007). *Examining the Technical Adequacy of Word and Passage Reading Fluency Measures in a Progress Monitoring Assessment System* (Technical Report No. 40). Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching: University of Oregon.

Alonzo, J., Liu, K., & Tindal, G. (2007). *Examining The Technical Adequacy of Reading Comprehension Measures in a Progress Monitoring Assessment System* (Technical Report No. 41). Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching: University of Oregon.

Alonzo, J., & Tindal, G. (2008). *The Development of Fifth-Grade Passage Reading Fluency Measures for use in a Progress Monitoring Assessment System* (Technical Report No. 43). Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching: University of Oregon.

The vocabulary measure is described in Alonzo, J., & Tindal, G. (2004). *Technical report: District reading assessments, spring 2004 administration* (Technical Report No. 30). Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching: University of Oregon. The words for the vocabulary measure were pulled from the *World Book Encyclopedia* (2001). From the resulting word list, 60-90 items were used in a pilot study. After the pilot testing, the items were analyzed using IRT and the items that performed adequately were retained for use in the vocabulary assessments, resulting in three equivalent forms of a 25-item vocabulary assessment for each grade level.

The Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) Online test is taken for Reading and Mathematics. It is a computer-based adaptive test in which items are selected according to each student's demonstrated ability; this feature results in the number of items being

taken by a student to vary as the test is terminated when a reliable estimate of performance is attained. Typically, students take from 35 to 50 items. All of the test items have been developed by Oregon teachers and reviewed by Oregon experts. Students may take assessments via OAKS Online up to three times per year in an eight-month testing window. State test data referenced in this technical report were taken somewhere between October 2008 and May 2009.

On average, students will finish the OAKS Online Assessment in 60 – 75 minutes (in Reading or in Mathematics), depending on the subject and grade. However, some students may need up to two hours. A paper-pencil version is allowed for students whose Individualized Education Program (IEP) or 504 Plan indicates this need. The test is presented in English with a side-by-side version in Spanish, if needed. Braille and large print versions also may be requested and used.

During the administration of the OAKS Reading Assessment, the use of resources such as a dictionary, a thesaurus, literature texts, or literary glossaries is **NOT** permitted. A number of other resources are allowed (such as highlighters and markers). In Mathematics, allowable resources include calculators, rulers, multiplication tables, and other kinds of tables, number lines and charts. Sample tests are presented on the Oregon Department of Education web site.

The score from the multiple-choice test is a Rasch scaled score that is vertically articulated across grades 3-10 with the lowest score being approximately 195 and the highest score being 260. Cut scores for each grade level begin at grade 3 (201) and extend to grade 10 (239) in approximately 7-point increments per grade.

Design and Operational Procedures

For this study, students were assessed on the CBM measures at three time periods: (a) fall – September through October, (b) winter – January through February, and (c) spring – May through June. The passage reading fluency measures were administered by trained assessors in a

one-on-one testing environment, while the vocabulary and comprehension tests were group-administered in a computer lab. The test administrators were retired teachers who had been hired specifically to test students on all oral reading fluency measures; all test administrators had been previously trained in earlier district-wide initiatives (the past three years); furthermore, they received a refresher training prior to each normative period. The other two measures were computer-based and simply required students to respond to one of three options in either selecting the best word (synonym) in the vocabulary measure or the best answer to a literal, inferential, or evaluative question in the comprehension measure.

Data Preparation and Analysis

Data from the easyCBM database were merged with district test files and demographics using the following codes.

Variable	Description	Values
ORDER	Order of test administration	0=0th month (Sept.), 4=4th month (Jan.), 8=8th month (May)
DSID	District Student ID	9 digit code (from district files)
PRF	Passage reading fluency	Words read correctly per minute
VOC	Vocabulary synonyms	0-25 in grades 3-8
MCRC	Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	0-12 in grade 2 and 0-20 in grades 3-8
Gender–n	Gender numeric	0=Male, 1=Female
EthnicCd	Ethnic Code	1=Amer Ind/AK Nat, 2=Asian/Pac Isl, 3=Black, 4=Hispanic, 5=White, 6=Multi-ethnic, 7=Decline
Ethnicity	Ethnicity (historically high- and low-achieving)	SD1: 0=White, 1=Non-White; 7=System missing (For SD2analyses 0=White or Asian)
Econdis	Economic Disadvantage	0=No, 1=Yes
Title1	Title 1 Services	0=No, 1=Yes
Speced	Special Education Status	0=No, 1=Yes
SchlInstID	School Institutional ID	Numeric Value for 4J only
Plg_Tot	OAKS Placing Code for Total Reading Score	D=Does not Meet, M=Meets, E=Exceeds

Prof	OAKS Proficiency value	0=Below meets, 1=Meets or above
Rit_Tot	OAKS Reading Total Score	175-260 (on the RIT scale)

Results

We report descriptive statistics for students' demographic information by grade level and school district. In the full set of tables listed in the appendix, each district (SD 1 and SD 2) is paired within each grade and norm period (fall, winter and spring). For example, we present SD 1 grade 3 fall and then SD 2 grade 3 fall; then SD 1 grade 3 winter followed by SD 2 grade 3 winter, etc. Because of the sheer volume of tables, we display these results with reference to page numbers.

The sample includes third through fifth grade students from two Oregon school districts. The sample size varied considerably across school district (SD) as SD 1 was a larger district than SD 2, but the sample size was reasonably consistent across grade-levels within SD 1 (*N* ranges from 1,068-1,293) and SD 2 (*N* ranges from 766-881). The demographic and background data of the sample generally match that of the populations. In SD 1, 38% of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 3% are English language learners, 15% are identified as students with disabilities, and about 78% can be categorized as historically high-achieving. In SD 2, 53% of the student population is economically disadvantaged, 7% are English language learners, 19% are identified as students with disabilities, and about 78% can be categorized as historically high-achieving.

Grade Three

Fall (pages 64 –68). The correlations between the respective benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .60. The vocabulary measure had the highest correlation with the state test score in both SDs. The correlations between easyCBM predictors within SDs were above .62, indicating

multicollinearity in the regression model that may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The fall regression analyses for third grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .60 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .58, which suggested that the imposed model fits the data well. Unique to the SD 1 analysis, both ethnicity (coefficient = -1.70, *SE* = .50) and economically-disadvantaged students (coefficient = -1.19, *SE* = 0.48) scored significantly lower on the state test, while in SD 2, students receiving special education services scored lower on the state test than students receiving general education services exclusively (coefficient = -6.6, *SE* = 1.70). In both SDs, the easyCBM assessments of oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the three easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model, with coefficients ranging from 21% to 30% of a standard deviation.

Winter (pages 69 – 72). Data for the winter vocabulary measure were systematically missing across the SD samples and were consequently omitted from the regression analyses. The correlations between the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension benchmark measures and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were above .60 for both SDs. The oral reading fluency measure had the highest correlation with the state test score in both SDs. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors were above .51 for both SDs, indicating multicollinearity in the regression model that may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The winter regression analyses for third grade were fairly similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .63, higher than the SD 2 R^2 value of .53. The imposed models fit the data moderately well, but the predictor variables in the SD 1 model explained more of the

variance in the state reading test criterion than in the SD 2 model. Students receiving special education services scored lower on the state test than regular education students in both SD 1 (coefficient = -2.28, *SE* = 1.01) and SD 2 (coefficient = -5.50, *SE* = 1.11). And in both SDs, the easyCBM assessments oral reading fluency and reading comprehension significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that these easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model, with SD 1 reading fluency and comprehension coefficients equal to .51 and .30, respectively, and SD 2 reading fluency and comprehension coefficients equal to .40 and .29, respectively.

Spring (pages 73 – 77). Data for the spring vocabulary measure was missing for the SD 1 sample and was omitted from the regression analysis. The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .62. For SD 1, the reading fluency measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test criterion, .69, while for SD 2 the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation, .69. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SDs were .57 or higher, indicating multicollinearity in the regression model may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The spring regression analyses for third grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .59 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .57, which suggested that the imposed model fit the data well. Specific to the SD 1 analysis, both historically low-achieving (coefficient = -1.49, *SE* = .49) and economic disadvantaged students (coefficient = -1.48, *SE* = 0.46) scored significantly lower on the state test. In both SD 1 and in SD 2, special education students scored lower on the state test than regular education students (coefficient = -1.27, *SE* = 0.62; coefficient = -2.15, *SE* = 0.83, respectively). In both SDs, the easyCBM assessments

entered into the models also significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest the three easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model, with coefficients ranging from .20 to .44.

Grade Four

Fall (pages 78 – 81). The correlations between the respective benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .66. For SD 1, the reading fluency measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test criterion, .67, while for SD 2 the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation, .69. The correlation between the easyCBM predictors in SD 1 was .58, and the correlations between easyCBM predictors in SD 2 was above .66, indicating multicollinearity in the regression model may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The fall regression analyses for fourth grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .60 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .58, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data well. In both SDs the easyCBM assessments entered into the models were the only variables to significantly predict state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .29, .33, and .26 respectively; and in SD 2 these same coefficients were equal to .24, .27, and .30, respectively.

Winter (pages 82 – 85). The fourth grade, winter samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall data. The correlation between the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension benchmark measures and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) was above .61 for SD 1 and above .64 for SD 2. The oral

reading fluency measure had the highest correlation with the state test score in SD 1, .65, and the correlations between the easyCBM assessments and the criterion variable were almost the same in SD 2, about .64. The correlation between the easyCBM predictors was .53 for SD 1 and .61 for SD 2 indicating multicollinearity in the SD 2 regression model may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The winter regression analyses for fourth grade were fairly similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .54, which was about the same as SD 2 R^2 value of .53. The imposed models fit the data moderately well, but the predictor variables in the SD 1 model explained more of the variance in the state reading test criterion than in the SD 2 model. In the SD 1 model, each student demographic predictor was significant. In the SD 2 model, historically low-achieving students scored lower on the state test than historically high-achieving students (coefficient = -2.66, *SE* = 0.94), and economically disadvantaged students scored lower on the state reading test than did economically advantaged students (coefficient = -1.89, *SE* = 0.82). In both SDs, the easyCBM assessments oral reading fluency and reading comprehension significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that these easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model, with SD 1 reading fluency and comprehension coefficients equal to .41 and .36, respectively, and SD 2 reading fluency and comprehension coefficients equal to .36 and .40, respectively.

Spring (pages 86 – 89). The fourth grade, spring samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall and winter data. The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .59. For both SDs the vocabulary measure had the

strongest correlation with the state reading test criterion, .67 for SD 1 and .68 for SD 2. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 and SD 2 were.53 or higher, indicating multicollinearity in the regression model which may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The spring regression analyses for fourth grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .60 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .59, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data well. Unique to the SD 1 analysis, students in Title 1 schools (i.e., schools with a high percentage of students from low-income families) scored significantly lower than students not in Title 1 schools (coefficient = -1.65, *SE* = .42). For SD 2 the only significant demographic predictor of the state tests was economic disadvantage (coefficient = -.103, SE=.59). In both SDs, three easyCBM assessments entered into the models significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .30, .33, and .24 respectively; and in SD 2 these same coefficients were equal to .27, .39, and .22, respectively.

Grade Five

Fall (pages 90 – 93). The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .58. For both SDs, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test criterion, .70 for SD 1 and .66 for SD 2. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 were higher than .50 and within SD 2 were higher than .61, indicating

multicollinearity in the regression models, more so in the SD 2 model, which may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The fall regression analyses for fifth grade were different across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .63 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .56, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data well. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that only economic disadvantage significantly predicted state reading test scores (coefficient = -1.46. *SE* = .40), while no student demographic variable in the SD 2 model was a significant predictor. In both SDs, however, the three easyCBM assessments entered into the models did significantly predict state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .30 and .36, and .19, respectively; and in SD 2, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension these same coefficients were equal to .25, .29, and .30, respectively.

Winter (pages 94 – 97). The fifth grade, winter samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall data. Data for the winter vocabulary measure was systematically missing across the SD samples and were consequently omitted from the regression analyses. The correlation between the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension benchmark measures and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) was above .64 for SD 1 and above .54 for SD 2. The oral reading fluency measure had the highest correlation with the state test score both SD 1, .66, and the reading comprehension had the highest correlation with the state test in SD 2, .60. The correlation between the easyCBM predictors was .53 for SD 1 and .52 for SD 2 indicating multicollinearity in the regression model may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The winter regression analyses for fifth grade were fairly similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .59, higher than the SD 2 R^2 value of .50. The imposed models fit the data fairly well, but the predictor variables in the SD 1 model explained more of the variance in the state reading test criterion than in the SD 2 model. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that the student demographic variables ethnicity, economic disadvantage, special education status, and Title 1 status all significantly predicted state reading test scores, while the results of the SD 2 regression analysis revealed that the student demographic variables of ethnicity, economic disadvantage, and special education status were significant predictors. In both SDs the two easyCBM assessments, reading fluency and comprehension, significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency and comprehension coefficients were .42 and .36, respectively, and in SD 2, these same coefficients were equal to .35 and .35, respectively.

Spring (pages 98 – 101). The fifth grade, spring samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall and winter data. The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were higher for SD 1, above .55, than for SD 2, above .50. For both SDs the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test criterion, .72 for SD 1 and .67 for SD 2. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within samples were high, ranging from .46 to .72 in SD 1 and from .48 to .67 in SD 2. This finding indicates multicollinearity in the regression model may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The spring regression analyses for fifth grade were fairly similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .63, higher than the SD 2 R^2 value of .54. The imposed models fit the data fairly well, but the predictor variables in the SD 1 model explained more of the variance in the state reading test criterion than in the SD 2 model. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that the student demographic variables economic disadvantage, special education status, and Title 1 status all significantly predicted state reading test scores, while the results of the SD 2 regression analysis revealed that the student demographic variable economic disadvantage and special education status were significant predictors. In both SDs, the three easyCBM assessments significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .22, .45, and .16, respectively, and in SD 2, these same coefficients were equal to .25, .40, and .14, respectively.

Grade Six

Fall (pages 102 – 105). The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .51 in SD 1 and above .46 in SD 2. For SD 1, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .70, and for SD 2, the reading fluency had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .58. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 ranged from .44 to .59, and within SD 2 ranged from .45 to .57. This indicated multicollinearity in the regression models may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The fall regression analyses for sixth grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .59 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .48, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data somewhat well. In the SD 2 analysis, economic disadvantaged students (coefficient = -1.62, *SE* = 0.80) scored significantly lower on the state test than economic advantaged students, and special education students scored lower on the state test than regular education students (coefficient = -5.14, *SE* = 1.13). In both SDs, the easyCBM assessments entered into the model significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model. In SD 1, the oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension had coefficients of .30, .40 and .18, respectively, and in SD 2, the oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension had coefficients of .29, .27, and .17, respectively.

Winter (pages 106 – 107). The winter sample sizes for SD 1 (*N* = 90) and SD 2 (*N* = 10) were quite small. Further analyses for SD 2 were suspended, and the following summary of data from SD 1 should be interpreted with much caution. In addition, data for the winter vocabulary measure was systematically missing across the SD samples. The correlation between the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension benchmark measures and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) was .63 and .46, respectively; the oral reading fluency measure had the highest correlation with the state test score. The correlation between the easyCBM predictors was .49 for SD 1, indicating possible multicollinearity in the regression model that may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

No regression analysis was conducted for SD 2 due to the small sample size (*N* = 10). The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .47, suggesting that the imposed model fit the data somewhat well. Both reading fluency (coefficient = 0.11, *SE* = 0.02) and comprehension

(coefficient = 0.56, *SE* = 0.30) significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model. In SD 1, the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension had coefficients of .54 and .19, respectively.

Spring (pages 108 – 111). The sixth grade, spring samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall and winter data. The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, above .57 in both SDs. In SD 1 and SD 2, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .72 in both cases. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 ranged from .44 to .60, and within SD 2 ranged from .42 to .50. This indicated multicollinearity in the regression models may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The spring regression analyses for sixth grade were fairly similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .62, lower than the SD 2 R^2 value of .69. The imposed models fit both datasets well, but the predictor variables in the SD 2 model explained more of the variance in the state reading test criterion than in the SD 1 model. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that the student demographic variables economic disadvantage, special education status, and Title 1 status all significantly predicted state reading test scores, while the results of the SD 2 regression analysis revealed that the student demographic variable economic disadvantage and special education status were significant predictors. In both SDs, the three easyCBM assessments significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and

comprehension coefficients were .22, .44, and .21, respectively, and in SD 2 these same coefficients were equal to .31, .37, and .29, respectively.

Grade Seven

Fall (pages 112 – 115). The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, ranging from .60 to .68 in SD 1 and from .54 to .61 in SD 2. In SD 1, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .68, and in SD 2, the reading fluency score had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .61. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 ranged from .45 to .53, and within SD 2 ranged from .47 to .49. This indicated multicollinearity in the regression models may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The fall regression analyses for seventh grade were fairly similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .61, higher than the SD 2 R^2 value of .51. The imposed models fit both datasets well, but the predictor variables in the SD 1 model explained more of the variance in the state reading test criterion than in the SD 1 model. In the SD 1 analysis, females scored higher than males on the state reading test (coefficient = 1.53, *SE* = 0.37) historically high-achieving students scored higher than historically low-achieving students (coefficient = -1.04, *SE* = 0.43), and economic disadvantaged students scored lower than economic advantaged students on the state test (coefficient = -1.45, *SE* = 0.40). In the SD 2 analysis, the only significant student demographic variable was SPED; student receiving special education services scored significantly lower on the state test than regular education students (coefficient = -4.11, *SE* = 0.93). In both SDs the three easyCBM assessments significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects

on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .26, .39, and .24, respectively, and in SD 2 these same coefficients were equal to .31, .26, and .22, respectively.

Winter (pages 116 – 117). The winter sample sizes for SD 1 (N = 80) and SD 2 (N = 20) were quite small. Further analyses for SD 2 were suspended, and the following summary of data from SD 1 should be interpreted with much caution. In addition, data for the winter vocabulary measure was systematically missing across the SD samples. The correlation between the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension benchmark measures and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) was .65 and .65, respectively. The correlation between the easyCBM predictors was .63 for SD 1, indicating multicollinearity in the regression model may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analysis.

No regression analysis was conducted for SD 2 due to the small sample size (N = 20). The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .59 suggesting that the imposed model fit the data fairly well. Special education status (coefficient = -5.00, SE = 2.19), economic disadvantage (coefficient= -3.02, SE= 1.62), reading fluency (coefficient = 0.08, SE = 0.02), and comprehension (coefficient = 0.83, SE = 0.31) significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model. In SD 1, the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension had coefficients of .38 and .30, respectively.

Spring (pages 118 – 121). The seventh grade, spring samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall and winter data. The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, ranging from .56 to .68 in SD 1, and from .51 to .62 in SD 2.

In SD 1, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .68, and in SD 2, the reading fluency measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .62. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 ranged from .42 to .49, and within SD 2 ranged from .41 to .45. This indicated multicollinearity in the regression models may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The spring regression analyses for seventh grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .63 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .59, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data somewhat well. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that females scored higher than males on the state reading test (coefficient = 0.90, *SE* = 0.34), and economically disadvantaged students scored lower than economically advantaged students on the state reading test (coefficient = -1.49, *SE* = 0.37). The results of the SD 2 regression analysis revealed that historically low-achieving students scored lower on the state reading than historically high-achieving students (coefficient = -2.30, *SE* = 0.72), and students receiving special education services scored lower on the state reading test than students receiving general education services exclusively (coefficient = -2.44, *SE* = 0.99). In both SDs, the three easyCBM assessments significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .30, .41, and .22, respectively, and in SD 2 these same coefficients were equal to .38, .29, and .23, respectively.

Grade Eight

Fall (pages 122 – 125). The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples,

ranging from .46 to .68 in SD 1 and ranging from .52 to .60 in SD 2. In SD 1, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .68, and in SD 2, the reading fluency score had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .60. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 ranged from .39 to .54, and within SD 2 ranged from .37 to .48. This indicated possible multicollinearity in the regression models may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The fall regression analyses for eighth grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .58 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .53, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data somewhat well. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that economic disadvantaged students scored lower than economic advantaged students on the state reading test (coefficient = -1.31, *SE* = 0.34). For both SD 1 and SD 2, students receiving special education services scored lower on the state reading test than regular education students (SD 1 coefficient = -2.22, *SE* = 0.51; SD 2 coefficient = -2.46, *SE* = 0.82). Also in both SDs, the three easyCBM assessments significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .24, .43, and .16, respectively, and in SD 2, these same coefficients were equal to .33, .27, and .24, respectively.

Winter (pages 126 – 127). The eighth grade, winter samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall data. The winter sample sizes for SD 1 (*N* = 72) and SD 2 (*N* = 22) were quite small. Further analyses for SD 2 were suspended, and the following summary of data from SD 1 should be interpreted with much caution. In addition, data for the winter vocabulary measure was systematically missing across the SD samples. The correlation between the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension benchmark measures and the state

standardized reading test score was .68 and .51, respectively. The correlation between the easyCBM predictors was .29 for SD 1, indicating that multicollinearity in the regression model was likely not a problem in the final analysis.

No regression analysis was conducted for SD 2 due to the small sample size (N = 22). The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .68, suggesting that the imposed model fit the data well. Reading fluency (coefficient = 0.12, SE = 0.02), and comprehension (coefficient = 0.70, SE = 0.21) significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the model. In SD 1, the oral reading fluency and reading comprehension had coefficients of .64, and .29, respectively.

Spring (pages 128 – 131). The eighth grade, spring samples and descriptive statistics for SD 1 and SD 2 were the same as the fall and winter data. The correlations between the benchmark measures (i.e., oral reading fluency, vocabulary when available, and reading comprehension) and the criterion variable (i.e., state standardized reading test score) were generally high across all samples, ranging from .56 to .68 in SD 1, and from .50 to .57 in SD 2. In SD 1, the vocabulary measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .68, and in SD 2, the reading fluency measure had the strongest correlation with the state reading test, .57. The correlations between the easyCBM predictors within SD 1 ranged from .43 to .55, and within SD 2 ranged from .40 to .52. This indicated multicollinearity in the regression models may have affected the coefficient estimates in the regression analyses.

The spring regression analyses for eighth grade were similar across the SDs. The SD 1 analysis yielded an R^2 value of .61 and SD 2 yielded an R^2 value of .65, which suggested that the imposed models fit the data somewhat well. The results of the SD 1 regression analysis revealed that historically low-achieving students scored lower on the state reading than historically high-

achieving students (coefficient = -0.86, *SE* = 0.35). In both the SD 1 and SD 2 analyses, economic disadvantaged students scored lower than economic advantaged students on the state reading test (SD 1 coefficient = -1.19, *SE* = 0.33; SD 2 coefficient = -1.72, *SE* = 0.60), and students receiving special education services scored lower on the state reading test than regular education students (SD 1 coefficient = -2.41, *SE* = 0.50; SD 2 coefficient = -2.97, *SE* = 0.84). Also in both SDs, the three easyCBM assessments significantly predicted state reading test scores. The standardized beta weights suggest that the easyCBM measures had the largest effects on the criterion variable compared to the other variables in the models. In SD 1, the reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension coefficients were .25, .38, and .22, respectively, and in SD 2 these same coefficients were equal to .30, .40, and .22, respectively.

Discussion

The results from these analyses were very consistent across grades and time periods. The easyCBMs correlated quite highly with each other and with the state test (OAKS). They generally were more predictive of state test performance than student demographics. This relation was always significant (whereas on some grade levels and time periods, various demographics were not significantly related). Even though multicollinearity was present with the easyCBMs, they nevertheless were significantly related to the state test AND accounted for unique variance. In fact, the unique variance (semi-partial correlation coefficients) accounted for by the easyCBMs was moderately high and usually well above any of the variance explained by the demographic variables. The findings from the two districts were generally consistent: The pattern for the grade and time period was close. Although more districts with more diverse student populations would be helpful to increase the robustness of the findings, it is unlikely that the relations would be substantially different.

References

Deno, S. (1987). Curriculum-based measurement. *Teaching Exceptional Children* (Fall), 41-47.

Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. M. (1977). *Data based program modification.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute/Special Education.

Tindal, G., Germann, G., & Deno, S. L. (1983). Descriptive research on the Pine County norms: A compilation of findings (Technical Report 132). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities.

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		37	2.9	2.9	2.9
	F	611	47.7	47.7	50.6
	M	632	49.4	49.4	100.0
	Total	1280	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 = Amer Ind/Alsk Nat	20	1.6	1.6	1.6
	2 = Asian/Pac Isl	52	4.1	4.2	5.8
	3 = Black	28	2.2	2.3	8.0
	4 = Hispanic	109	8.5	8.8	16.8
	5 = White	892	69.7	71.8	88.6
	6 = Multi-Ethnic	110	8.6	8.8	97.4
	7 = Decline	32	2.5	2.6	100.0
	Total	1243	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	37	2.9		
Total		1280	100.0		

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	892	69.7	73.7	73.7
	1	319	24.9	26.3	100.0
	Total	1211	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	69	5.4		
Total		1280	100.0		

Economic Disadvantage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	687	53.7	55.4	55.4
	1	554	43.3	44.6	100.0
	Total	1241	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	39	3.0		
Total		1280	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1043	81.5	83.9	83.9
	1	200	15.6	16.1	100.0
	Total	1243	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	37	2.9		
Total		1280	100.0		

Title1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	578	45.2	46.5	46.5
	1	665	52.0	53.5	100.0
	Total	1243	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	37	2.9		
Total		1280	100.0		

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	503	25	2.0	2.0	2.0
	504	85	6.6	6.8	8.8
	507	23	1.8	1.9	10.7
	508	33	2.6	2.7	13.4
	510	50	3.9	4.0	17.4
	511	51	4.0	4.1	21.5
	513	81	6.3	6.5	28.0
	514	42	3.3	3.4	31.4
	515	41	3.2	3.3	34.7
	522	81	6.3	6.5	41.2
	523	39	3.0	3.1	44.3
	525	53	4.1	4.3	48.6
	529	68	5.3	5.5	54.1
	530	33	2.6	2.7	56.7
	534	61	4.8	4.9	61.6
	1239	27	2.1	2.2	63.8
	1240	47	3.7	3.8	67.6
	1241	49	3.8	3.9	71.5
	1242	34	2.7	2.7	74.3
	1259	45	3.5	3.6	77.9
	1339	23	1.8	1.9	79.7
	1774	51	4.0	4.1	83.8
	3229	23	1.8	1.9	85.7
	3233	26	2.0	2.1	87.8
	4146	57	4.5	4.6	92.4
	4157	72	5.6	5.8	98.1
	4554	23	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	1243	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	37	2.9		
Total		1280	100.0		

OAKS Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		37	2.9	2.9	2.9
	D	103	8.0	8.0	10.9
	E	507	39.6	39.6	50.5
	M	633	49.5	49.5	100.0
	Total	1280	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	103	8.0	8.3	8.3
	1	1140	89.1	91.7	100.0
	Total	1243	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	37	2.9		
Total		1280	100.0		

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	440	54.9	54.9	54.9
	Female	362	45.1	45.1	100.0
	Total	802	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	20	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Asian/Pac Islndr	14	1.7	1.7	4.2
	Black	15	1.9	1.9	6.1
	Latino	125	15.6	15.6	21.7
	White	556	69.3	69.3	91.0
	Multi-Ethnic	58	7.2	7.2	98.3
	Decline	14	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	802	100.0	100.0	

Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Historically High-Achieving Students - White, Asian	570	71.1	72.3	72.3
	Historically Low-Achieving Students - AmerInd/AlskNtv, Black, Latino, Multi-Ethnic	218	27.2	27.7	100.0
	Total	788	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	14	1.7		
Total		802	100.0		

Economically disadvantaged students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No reduced lunch	289	36.0	36.2	36.2
	Free/Reduced lunch status	510	63.6	63.8	100.0
	Total	799	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.4		
Total		802	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular Ed students	637	79.4	79.4	79.4
	Special Ed students	165	20.6	20.6	100.0
	Total	802	100.0	100.0	

RDG_LEP_FLAG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		723	90.1	90.1	90.1
	B	3	.4	.4	90.5
	N	2	.2	.2	90.8
	T	16	2.0	2.0	92.8
	X	2	.2	.2	93.0
	Y	56	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	802	100.0	100.0	

Limited English Proficiency students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	LEP services	743	92.6	92.6	92.6
	No LEP services	59	7.4	7.4	100.0
	Total	802	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10106	31	3.9	3.9	3.9
	10108	14	1.7	1.7	5.6
	10115	65	8.1	8.1	13.7
	10116	67	8.4	8.4	22.1
	10117	58	7.2	7.2	29.3
	10118	10	1.2	1.2	30.5
	10119	50	6.2	6.2	36.8
	10120	52	6.5	6.5	43.3
	10121	50	6.2	6.2	49.5
	10122	76	9.5	9.5	59.0
	10123	8	1.0	1.0	60.0
	10124	76	9.5	9.5	69.5
	10125	63	7.9	7.9	77.3
	10126	81	10.1	10.1	87.4
	10127	24	3.0	3.0	90.4
	10128	66	8.2	8.2	98.6
	11789	5	.6	.6	99.3
	11792	4	.5	.5	99.8
	21252	2	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	802	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	F	675	50.6	50.6	50.6
	M	659	49.4	49.4	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 = Amer Ind/Alsk Nat	21	1.6	1.6	1.6
	2 = Asian/Pac Isl	69	5.2	5.2	6.7
	3 = Black	32	2.4	2.4	9.1
	4 = Hispanic	103	7.7	7.7	16.9
	5 = White	956	71.7	71.7	88.5
	6 = Multi-Ethnic	105	7.9	7.9	96.4
	7 = Decline	48	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	956	71.7	74.3	74.3
	1	330	24.7	25.7	100.0
	Total	1286	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	48	3.6		
Total		1334	100.0		

Economic Disadvantage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	760	57.0	57.0	57.0
	1	574	43.0	43.0	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1110	83.2	83.2	83.2
	1	224	16.8	16.8	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

Title1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	651	48.8	48.8	48.8
	1	683	51.2	51.2	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	503	37	2.8	2.8	2.8
	504	78	5.8	5.8	8.6
	507	32	2.4	2.4	11.0
	508	53	4.0	4.0	15.0
	510	53	4.0	4.0	19.0
	511	39	2.9	2.9	21.9
	513	91	6.8	6.8	28.7
	514	24	1.8	1.8	30.5
	515	50	3.7	3.7	34.3
	522	77	5.8	5.8	40.0
	523	42	3.1	3.1	43.2
	525	31	2.3	2.3	45.5
	529	65	4.9	4.9	50.4
	530	37	2.8	2.8	53.1
	534	60	4.5	4.5	57.6
	1239	25	1.9	1.9	59.5
	1240	52	3.9	3.9	63.4
	1241	50	3.7	3.7	67.2
	1242	55	4.1	4.1	71.3
	1259	48	3.6	3.6	74.9
	1339	29	2.2	2.2	77.1
	1774	56	4.2	4.2	81.3
	2082	5	.4	.4	81.6
	3229	23	1.7	1.7	83.4
	3233	32	2.4	2.4	85.8
	4146	66	4.9	4.9	90.7
	4157	93	7.0	7.0	97.7

School ID (Cont.)					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	4554	31	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

OAKS Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	111	8.3	8.3	8.3
	E	650	48.7	48.7	57.0
	M	573	43.0	43.0	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	111	8.3	8.3	8.3
	1	1223	91.7	91.7	100.0
	Total	1334	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	460	52.2	52.2	52.2
	Female	421	47.8	47.8	100.0
	Total	881	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	26	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Asian/Pac Islndr	16	1.8	1.8	4.8
	Black	15	1.7	1.7	6.5
	Latino	112	12.7	12.7	19.2
	White	624	70.8	70.8	90.0
	Multi-Ethnic	82	9.3	9.3	99.3
	Decline	6	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	881	100.0	100.0	

Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Historically High-Achieving Students - White, Asian	640	72.6	73.1	73.1
	Historically Low-Achieving Students - AmerInd/AlskNtv, Black, Latino, Multi-Ethnic	235	26.7	26.9	100.0
	Total	875	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.7		
Total		881	100.0		

Economically disadvantaged students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No reduced lunch	343	38.9	39.6	39.6
	Free/Reduced lunch status	524	59.5	60.4	100.0
	Total	867	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	14	1.6		
Total		881	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular Ed students	706	80.1	80.1	80.1
	Special Ed students	175	19.9	19.9	100.0
	Total	881	100.0	100.0	

RDG_LEP_FLAG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		814	92.4	92.4	92.4
	E	1	.1	.1	92.5
	N	3	.3	.3	92.8
	T	16	1.8	1.8	94.7
	X	7	.8	.8	95.5
	Y	39	4.4	4.4	99.9
	Z	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	881	100.0	100.0	

Limited English Proficiency students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No LEP services	841	95.5	95.5	95.5
	LEP services	40	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	881	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10106	28	3.2	3.2	3.2
	10108	9	1.0	1.0	4.2
	10115	67	7.6	7.6	11.8
	10116	86	9.8	9.8	21.6
	10117	62	7.0	7.0	28.6
	10118	16	1.8	1.8	30.4
	10119	60	6.8	6.8	37.2
	10120	49	5.6	5.6	42.8
	10121	44	5.0	5.0	47.8
	10122	109	12.4	12.4	60.2
	10123	8	.9	.9	61.1
	10124	74	8.4	8.4	69.5
	10125	61	6.9	6.9	76.4
	10126	78	8.9	8.9	85.2
	10127	32	3.6	3.6	88.9
	10128	75	8.5	8.5	97.4
	11789	3	.3	.3	97.7
	11792	11	1.2	1.2	99.0
	21252	9	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	881	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No-Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below	129	14.6	14.9	14.9
	Above	738	83.8	85.1	100.0
	Total	867	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	14	1.6		
Total		881	100.0		

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	F	604	49.9	49.9	49.9
	M	607	50.1	50.1	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	35	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Asian/Pac Islndr	53	4.4	4.4	7.3
	Black	34	2.8	2.8	10.1
	Latino	79	6.5	6.5	16.6
	White	867	71.6	71.6	88.2
	Multi-Ethnic	72	5.9	5.9	94.1
	Decline	71	5.9	5.9	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	867	71.6	76.1	76.1
	1	273	22.5	23.9	100.0
	Total	1140	94.1	100.0	
Missing	System	71	5.9		
Total		1211	100.0		

Economic Disadvantage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	716	59.1	59.1	59.1
	1	495	40.9	40.9	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	994	82.1	82.1	82.1
	1	217	17.9	17.9	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

Title1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	575	47.5	47.5	47.5
	1	636	52.5	52.5	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	503	37	3.1	3.1	3.1
	504	75	6.2	6.2	9.2
	507	18	1.5	1.5	10.7
	508	42	3.5	3.5	14.2
	510	49	4.0	4.0	18.2
	511	39	3.2	3.2	21.5
	513	90	7.4	7.4	28.9
	514	24	2.0	2.0	30.9
	515	49	4.0	4.0	34.9
	522	63	5.2	5.2	40.1
	523	32	2.6	2.6	42.8
	525	46	3.8	3.8	46.6
	529	60	5.0	5.0	51.5
	530	50	4.1	4.1	55.7
	534	48	4.0	4.0	59.6
	1239	31	2.6	2.6	62.2
	1240	45	3.7	3.7	65.9
	1241	50	4.1	4.1	70.0
	1242	47	3.9	3.9	73.9
	1259	44	3.6	3.6	77.5
	1339	29	2.4	2.4	79.9
	1774	50	4.1	4.1	84.1
	3229	23	1.9	1.9	86.0
	3233	22	1.8	1.8	87.8
	4146	44	3.6	3.6	91.4
	4157	83	6.9	6.9	98.3
	4554	21	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

OAKS Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	155	12.8	12.8	12.8
	E	426	35.2	35.2	48.0
	M	630	52.0	52.0	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	155	12.8	12.8	12.8
	1	1056	87.2	87.2	100.0
	Total	1211	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	440	50.4	50.4	50.4
	Female	433	49.6	49.6	100.0
	Total	873	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	22	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Asian/Pac Islndr	13	1.5	1.5	4.0
	Black	12	1.4	1.4	5.4
	Latino	116	13.3	13.3	18.7
	White	639	73.2	73.2	91.9
	Multi-Ethnic	65	7.4	7.4	99.3
	Decline	6	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	873	100.0	100.0	

Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Historically High-Achieving Students - White, Asian	652	74.7	75.2	75.2
	Historically Low-Achieving Students - AmerInd/AlskNtv, Black, Latino, Multi-Ethnic	215	24.6	24.8	100.0
	Total	867	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.7		
Total		873	100.0		

Economically disadvantaged students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No reduced lunch	346	39.6	39.8	39.8
	Free/Reduced lunch status	523	59.9	60.2	100.0
	Total	869	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		873	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular Ed students	711	81.4	81.4	81.4
	Special Ed students	162	18.6	18.6	100.0
	Total	873	100.0	100.0	

RDG_LEP_FLAG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		793	90.8	90.8	90.8
	B	2	.2	.2	91.1
	E	39	4.5	4.5	95.5
	N	2	.2	.2	95.8
	T	10	1.1	1.1	96.9
	X	10	1.1	1.1	98.1
	Y	16	1.8	1.8	99.9
	Z	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	873	100.0	100.0	

Limited English Proficiency students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No LEP services	816	93.5	93.5	93.5
	LEP services	57	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	873	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10106	31	3.6	3.6	3.6
	10108	9	1.0	1.0	4.6
	10115	64	7.3	7.3	11.9
	10116	85	9.7	9.7	21.6
	10117	78	8.9	8.9	30.6
	10118	7	.8	.8	31.4
	10119	50	5.7	5.7	37.1
	10120	52	6.0	6.0	43.1
	10121	48	5.5	5.5	48.6
	10122	101	11.6	11.6	60.1
	10123	17	1.9	1.9	62.1
	10124	80	9.2	9.2	71.2
	10125	70	8.0	8.0	79.3
	10126	72	8.2	8.2	87.5
	10127	24	2.7	2.7	90.3
	10128	73	8.4	8.4	98.6
	11789	5	.6	.6	99.2
	11792	4	.5	.5	99.7
	21252	3	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	873	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	F	583	52.3	52.3	52.3
	M	532	47.7	47.7	100.0
	Total	1115	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 = Amer Ind/Alsk Nat	14	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2 = Asian/Pac Isl	56	5.0	5.0	6.3
	3 = Black	32	2.9	2.9	9.1
	4 = Hispanic	88	7.9	7.9	17.0
	5 = White	793	71.1	71.1	88.2
	6 = Multi-Ethnic	85	7.6	7.6	95.8
	7 = Decline	47	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	1115	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	793	71.1	74.3	74.3
	1	275	24.7	25.7	100.0
	Total	1068	95.8	100.0	
Missing	System	47	4.2		
Total		1115	100.0		

Economic Disadvantage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	685	61.4	62.0	62.0
	1	420	37.7	38.0	100.0
	Total	1105	99.1	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.9		
Total		1115	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	700	62.8	80.0	80.0
	1	175	15.7	20.0	100.0
	Total	875	78.5	100.0	
Missing	System	240	21.5		
Total		1115	100.0		

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	518	166	14.9	14.9	14.9
	519	152	13.6	13.6	28.5
	520	149	13.4	13.4	41.9
	524	185	16.6	16.6	58.5
	526	200	17.9	17.9	76.4
	528	136	12.2	12.2	88.6
	2082	3	.3	.3	88.9
	3229	22	2.0	2.0	90.9
	3233	25	2.2	2.2	93.1
	4554	77	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	1115	100.0	100.0	

OAKS Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	166	14.9	14.9	14.9
	E	411	36.9	36.9	51.7
	M	538	48.3	48.3	100.0
	Total	1115	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	166	14.9	14.9	14.9
	1	949	85.1	85.1	100.0
	Total	1115	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	396	51.7	51.7	51.7
	Female	370	48.3	48.3	100.0
	Total	766	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	16	2.1	2.1	2.1
	Asian/Pac Islndr	15	2.0	2.0	4.0
	Black	9	1.2	1.2	5.2
	Latino	128	16.7	16.7	21.9
	White	546	71.3	71.3	93.2
	Multi-Ethnic	39	5.1	5.1	98.3
	Decline	13	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	766	100.0	100.0	

Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Historically High-Achieving Students - White, Asian	561	73.2	74.5	74.5
	Historically Low-Achieving Students - AmerInd/AlskNtv, Black, Latino, Multi-Ethnic	192	25.1	25.5	100.0
	Total	753	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	13	1.7		
Total		766	100.0		

Economically disadvantaged students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No reduced lunch	311	40.6	40.8	40.8
	Free/Reduced lunch status	451	58.9	59.2	100.0
	Total	762	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.5		
Total		766	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular Ed students	634	82.8	82.8	82.8
	Special Ed students	132	17.2	17.2	100.0
	Total	766	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10107	162	21.1	21.1	21.1
	10111	182	23.8	23.8	44.9
	10112	127	16.6	16.6	61.5
	10113	106	13.8	13.8	75.3
	10114	160	20.9	20.9	96.2
	10118	9	1.2	1.2	97.4
	10127	14	1.8	1.8	99.2
	11789	1	.1	.1	99.3
	11792	4	.5	.5	99.9
	21252	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	766	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below	180	23.5	23.7	23.7
	Above	580	75.7	76.3	100.0
	Total	760	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.8		
Total		766	100.0		

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	F	645	49.4	49.4	49.4
	M	661	50.6	50.6	100.0
	Total	1306	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 = Amer Ind/Alsk Nat	20	1.5	1.5	1.5
	2 = Asian/Pac Isl	60	4.6	4.6	6.1
	3 = Black	37	2.8	2.8	9.0
	4 = Hispanic	114	8.7	8.7	17.7
	5 = White	894	68.5	68.5	86.1
	6 = Multi-Ethnic	92	7.0	7.0	93.2
	7 = Decline	89	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	1306	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	894	68.5	73.5	73.5
	1	323	24.7	26.5	100.0
	Total	1217	93.2	100.0	
Missing	System	89	6.8		
Total		1306	100.0		

Economic Disadvantage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	798	61.1	61.7	61.7
	1	495	37.9	38.3	100.0
	Total	1293	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	13	1.0		
Total		1306	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1107	84.8	84.9	84.9
	1	197	15.1	15.1	100.0
	Total	1304	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.2		
Total		1306	100.0		

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	506	186	14.2	14.2	14.2
	518	166	12.7	12.7	27.0
	519	166	12.7	12.7	39.7
	520	147	11.3	11.3	50.9
	524	173	13.2	13.2	64.2
	526	214	16.4	16.4	80.6
	528	129	9.9	9.9	90.4
	2082	12	.9	.9	91.3
	3229	23	1.8	1.8	93.1
	3233	29	2.2	2.2	95.3
	4041	3	.2	.2	95.6
	4554	58	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	1306	100.0	100.0	

OAKS Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	200	15.3	15.3	15.3
	E	501	38.4	38.4	53.7
	M	605	46.3	46.3	100.0
	Total	1306	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	200	15.3	15.3	15.3
	1	1106	84.7	84.7	100.0
	Total	1306	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	469	53.8	53.8	53.8
	Female	403	46.2	46.2	100.0
	Total	872	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	11	1.3	1.3	1.3
	Asian/Pac Islndr	11	1.3	1.3	2.5
	Black	22	2.5	2.5	5.0
	Latino	128	14.7	14.7	19.7
	White	631	72.4	72.4	92.1
	Multi-Ethnic	51	5.8	5.8	97.9
	Decline	18	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	872	100.0	100.0	

Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Historically High-Achieving Students - White, Asian	642	73.6	75.2	75.2
	Historically Low-Achieving Students - AmerInd/AlskNtv, Black, Latino, Multi-Ethnic	212	24.3	24.8	100.0
	Total	854	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	18	2.1		
Total		872	100.0		

Economically disadvantaged students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No reduced lunch	364	41.7	42.4	42.4
	Free/Reduced lunch status	495	56.8	57.6	100.0
	Total	859	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	13	1.5		
Total		872	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular Ed students	725	83.1	83.1	83.1
	Special Ed students	147	16.9	16.9	100.0
	Total	872	100.0	100.0	

RDG_LEP_FLAG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		798	91.5	91.5	91.5
	E	29	3.3	3.3	94.8
	N	2	.2	.2	95.1
	T	9	1.0	1.0	96.1
	X	11	1.3	1.3	97.4
	Y	20	2.3	2.3	99.7
	Z	3	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	872	100.0	100.0	

Limited English Proficiency students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No LEP services	823	94.4	94.4	94.4
	LEP services	49	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	872	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10107	147	16.9	16.9	16.9
	10111	209	24.0	24.0	40.8
	10112	168	19.3	19.3	60.1
	10113	118	13.5	13.5	73.6
	10114	203	23.3	23.3	96.9
	10118	16	1.8	1.8	98.7
	10127	4	.5	.5	99.2
	11789	1	.1	.1	99.3
	11792	5	.6	.6	99.9
	21252	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	872	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	F	661	48.6	48.6	48.6
	M	698	51.4	51.4	100.0
	Total	1359	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 = Amer Ind/Alsk Nat	22	1.6	1.6	1.6
	2 = Asian/Pac Isl	72	5.3	5.3	6.9
	3 = Black	34	2.5	2.5	9.4
	4 = Hispanic	86	6.3	6.3	15.7
	5 = White	973	71.6	71.6	87.3
	6 = Multi-Ethnic	106	7.8	7.8	95.1
	7 = Decline	66	4.9	4.9	100.0
	Total	1359	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	973	71.6	75.3	75.3
	1	320	23.5	24.7	100.0
	Total	1293	95.1	100.0	
Missing	System	66	4.9		
Total		1359	100.0		

Economic Disadvantage

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	862	63.4	64.3	64.3
	1	479	35.2	35.7	100.0
	Total	1341	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	18	1.3		
Total		1359	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1173	86.3	86.3	86.3
	1	186	13.7	13.7	100.0
	Total	1359	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	506	204	15.0	15.0	15.0
	518	154	11.3	11.3	26.3
	519	177	13.0	13.0	39.4
	520	154	11.3	11.3	50.7
	524	176	13.0	13.0	63.6
	526	237	17.4	17.4	81.1
	528	141	10.4	10.4	91.5
	2082	12	.9	.9	92.3
	3229	23	1.7	1.7	94.0
	3233	15	1.1	1.1	95.1
	4041	10	.7	.7	95.9
	4554	56	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	1359	100.0	100.0	

OAKS Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	283	20.8	20.8	20.8
	E	393	28.9	28.9	49.7
	M	683	50.3	50.3	100.0
	Total	1359	100.0	100.0	

Pass-No Pass

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	283	20.8	20.8	20.8
	1	1076	79.2	79.2	100.0
	Total	1359	100.0	100.0	

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	419	50.2	50.2	50.2
	Female	415	49.8	49.8	100.0
	Total	834	100.0	100.0	

Ethnic Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Amer Ind/Alsk Native	22	2.6	2.6	2.6
	Asian/Pac Islndr	15	1.8	1.8	4.4
	Black	17	2.0	2.0	6.5
	Latino	102	12.2	12.2	18.7
	White	625	74.9	74.9	93.6
	Multi-Ethnic	50	6.0	6.0	99.6
	Decline	3	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	834	100.0	100.0	

Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Historically High-Achieving Students - White, Asian	640	76.7	77.0	77.0
	Historically Low-Achieving Students - AmerInd/AlskNtv, Black, Latino, Multi-Ethnic	191	22.9	23.0	100.0
	Total	831	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.4		
Total		834	100.0		

Economically disadvantaged students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No reduced lunch	384	46.0	46.5	46.5
	Free/Reduced lunch status	442	53.0	53.5	100.0
	Total	826	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	8	1.0		
Total		834	100.0		

Special Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular Ed students	707	84.8	84.8	84.8
	Special Ed students	127	15.2	15.2	100.0
	Total	834	100.0	100.0	

RDG_LEP_FLAG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		773	92.7	92.7	92.7
	B	4	.5	.5	93.2
	E	19	2.3	2.3	95.4
	T	21	2.5	2.5	98.0
	X	2	.2	.2	98.2
	Y	14	1.7	1.7	99.9
	Z	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	834	100.0	100.0	

Limited English Proficiency students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No LEP services	797	95.6	95.6	95.6
	LEP services	37	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	834	100.0	100.0	

School ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	10107	132	15.8	15.8	15.8
	10111	223	26.7	26.7	42.6
	10112	155	18.6	18.6	61.2
	10113	97	11.6	11.6	72.8
	10114	202	24.2	24.2	97.0
	10118	15	1.8	1.8	98.8
	10127	7	.8	.8	99.6
	11789	1	.1	.1	99.8
	11792	2	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	834	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	88.79	39.142	1179
VOC	17.89	4.968	1167
MCRC	11.41	3.983	1151
OAKS	215.56	11.320	1243

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.692**	.626**	.680**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1179	1163	1148	1161
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.692**	1	.651**	.695**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1163	1167	1150	1149
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.626**	.651**	1	.644**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1148	1150	1151	1134
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.680**	.695**	.644**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1161	1149	1134	1243

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.774[a]	.599	.596	7.177

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Title1, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	83933.499	8	10491.687	203.660	.000[a]
	Residual	56152.219	1090	51.516		
	Total	140085.718	1098			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Title1, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	188.689	1.150		164.020	.000			
	Gender	.102	.442	.005	.230	.818	.091	.007	.004
	Ethnicity	-1.702	.503	-.066	-3.383	.001	-.185	-.102	-.065
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.192	.475	-.052	-2.508	.012	-.282	-.076	-.048
	Special Education	-.658	.656	-.021	-1.003	.316	-.289	-.030	-.019
	Title1	-.571	.461	-.025	-1.239	.216	-.182	-.037	-.024
	PRF	.089	.008	.302	10.924	.000	.678	.314	.209
	VOC	.701	.069	.296	10.169	.000	.687	.294	.195
	MCRC	.676	.077	.237	8.759	.000	.648	.256	.168

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	213.8664	13.54507	307
Passage Reading Fluency	77.4104	34.23450	307
Vocabulary	16.2476	5.12306	307
Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	10.1629	4.06799	307

Correlations

		Passage Reading Fluency score, fall	Vocabulary score, fall	Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension score, fall	OAKS reading score, 2008-2009
Passage Reading Fluency	Pearson Correlation	1	.715**	.629**	.628**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	338	314	315	338
Vocabulary score	Pearson Correlation	.715**	1	.640**	.676**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	314	314	314	314
Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	Pearson Correlation	.629**	.640**	1	.624**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	315	314	315	315
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	Pearson Correlation	.628**	.676**	.624**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	338	314	315	797

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.758[a]	.575	.565	8.93488

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving, Gender, Economically disadvantaged students, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32271.739	7	4610.248	57.749	.000[a]
	Residual	23869.785	299	79.832		
	Total	56141.524	306			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	188.527	2.465		76.474	.000			
	Gender	1.573	1.045	.058	1.505	.133	.085	.087	.057
	Historically high-achieving- low achieving	-.302	1.275	-.009	-.237	.813	-.043	-.014	-.009
	Economically disadvantaged students	-.932	1.104	-.034	-.844	.399	-.241	-.049	-.032
	Special Education	-6.524	1.659	-.174	-3.932	.000	-.498	-.222	-.148
	Passage Reading Fluency	.101	.023	.254	4.455	.000	.657	.249	.168
	Vocabulary	.690	.161	.261	4.280	.000	.673	.240	.161
	Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	.705	.175	.212	4.036	.000	.622	.227	.152

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	116.37	42.060	1221
MCRC	10.80	2.975	1133
OAKS	215.56	11.320	1243

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.518**	.681**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	1221	1131	1197
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.518**	1	.605**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	1131	1133	1118
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.681**	.605**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	1197	1118	1243

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.794[a]	.630	.625	7.773

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Title1, PRF, Special Education

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	54138.837	7	7734.120	128.006	.000[a]
	Residual	31780.955	526	60.420		
	Total	85919.792	533			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Title1, PRF, Special Education

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	187.391	1.580		118.623	.000			
	Gender	-1.238	.691	-.049	-1.792	.074	.083	-.078	-.048
	Ethnicity	-1.117	.792	-.038	-1.410	.159	-.123	-.061	-.037
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.119	.773	-.043	-1.447	.149	-.313	-.063	-.038
	Special Education	-2.277	1.014	-.084	-2.246	.025	-.418	-.097	-.060
	Title1	-1.080	1.230	-.032	-.878	.380	-.366	-.038	-.023
	PRF	.149	.010	.511	15.177	.000	.736	.552	.402
	MCRC	1.240	.136	.302	9.136	.000	.640	.370	.242

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	213.7912	12.43750	522
Passage Reading Fluency	109.2261	37.76718	522
Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	10.3103	2.97905	522

Correlations

		Passage Reading Fluency score, winter	Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension score, winter	OAKS reading score, 2008-2009
Passage Reading Fluency	Pearson Correlation	1	.556**	.639**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	547	531	546
Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	Pearson Correlation	.556**	1	.607**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	531	532	531
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	Pearson Correlation	.639**	.607**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	546	531	797

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.730[a]	.534	.528	8.54397

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42999.520	6	7166.587	98.173	.000[a]
	Residual	37594.719	515	72.999		
	Total	80594.239	521			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	188.217	1.895		99.309	.000			
	Gender	.850	.756	.034	1.125	.261	.047	.050	.034
	Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving	-.539	.919	-.018	-.587	.558	-.033	-.026	-.018
	Economically disadvantaged	-1.477	.813	-.058	-1.816	.070	-.245	-.080	-.055
	Special Education	-5.504	1.107	-.170	-4.973	.000	-.452	-.214	-.150
	Passage Reading Fluency	.133	.012	.404	10.796	.000	.649	.430	.325
	Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	1.228	.159	.294	7.747	.000	.606	.323	.233

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	118.74	42.872	1240
MCRC	14.19	3.848	1232
OAKS	215.56	11.320	1243

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.581**	.685**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	1240	1226	1211
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.581**	1	.647**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	1226	1232	1211
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.685**	.647**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	1211	1211	1243

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.766[a]	.587	.585	7.239

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Title1, Gender, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	86954.539	7	12422.077	237.057	.000[a]
	Residual	61099.795	1166	52.401		
	Total	148054.334	1173			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Title1, Gender, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	188.689	1.065		177.110	.000			
	Gender	-.598	.430	-.027	-1.390	.165	.095	-.041	-.026
	Ethnicity	-1.492	.488	-.059	-3.055	.002	-.177	-.089	-.057
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.475	.461	-.065	-3.200	.001	-.286	-.093	-.060
	Special Education	-1.271	.624	-.041	-2.036	.042	-.304	-.060	-.038
	Title1	-1.559	.444	-.069	-3.509	.000	-.184	-.102	-.066
	PRF	.119	.006	.443	18.469	.000	.690	.476	.347
	MCRC	1.044	.069	.354	15.110	.000	.649	.405	.284

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	213.7376	11.78398	743
Passage Reading Fluency	109.1238	37.64218	743
Vocabulary score	21.2786	3.82243	743
Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	13.6245	3.74997	743

Correlations

		PRF	Vocab	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.653**	.577**	.604**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	787	761	771	783
Vocab	Pearson Correlation	.653**	1	.611**	.689**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	761	762	761	758
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.577**	.611**	1	.639**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	771	761	772	768
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.604**	.689**	.639**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	783	758	768	797

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.756[a]	.571	.567	7.75522

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension score, spring, student sex (M=0, F=1), Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving., Economically disadvantaged students., Special Education status, Passage Reading Fluency score, spring, Vocabulary score, spring

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	58830.400	7	8404.343	139.738	.000[a]
	Residual	44205.422	735	60.143		
	Total	103035.822	742			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension score, spring, student sex (M=0, F=1), Historically high-achieving, historically low achieving., Economically disadvantaged students., Special Education status, Passage Reading Fluency score, spring, Vocabulary score, spring

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	173.068	2.055		84.231	.000			
	Gender	.406	.578	.017	.703	.482	.064	.026	.017
	Achieve	.508	.674	.019	.754	.451	-.060	.028	.018
	Econ	-1.184	.640	-.048	-1.851	.065	-.239	-.068	-.045
	SPED	-2.152	.832	-.070	-2.587	.010	-.385	-.095	-.063
	PRF	.064	.011	.204	6.057	.000	.620	.218	.146
	Voc	1.112	.110	.361	10.105	.000	.687	.349	.244
	MCRC	.798	.101	.254	7.894	.000	.623	.280	.191

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	113.76	35.154	1214
VOC	17.04	4.228	1214
MCRC	13.34	4.039	1208
OAKS	222.89	10.762	1334

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.575**	.669**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	1214	1190	1214
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.575**	1	.660**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	1190	1208	1208
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.669**	.660**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	1214	1208	1334

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.777[a]	.604	.601	6.691

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Title1, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	77348.243	8	9668.530	215.994	.000[a]
	Residual	50761.160	1134	44.763		
	Total	128109.403	1142			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Title1, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	190.635	1.149		165.945	.000			
	Gender	.044	.401	.002	.109	.913	.035	.003	.002
	Ethnicity	-.361	.481	-.015	-.749	.454	-.171	-.022	-.014
	Economic Disadvantage	-.299	.447	-.014	-.670	.503	-.268	-.020	-.013
	Special Education	-.809	.581	-.028	-1.391	.164	-.293	-.041	-.026
	Title1	-.147	.424	-.007	-.346	.729	-.205	-.010	-.006
	PRF	.089	.008	.292	11.507	.000	.657	.323	.215
	VOC	.818	.069	.327	11.919	.000	.693	.334	.223
	MCRC	.675	.069	.258	9.812	.000	.656	.280	.183

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	221.1667	15.27532	312
PRF	105.8269	33.85142	312
VOC	15.9840	4.52607	312
MCRC	12.4038	4.26950	312

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.726**	.692**	.663**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	338	317	317	336
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.726**	1	.734**	.691**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	317	319	318	317
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.692**	.734**	1	.661**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	317	318	320	318
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.663**	.691**	.661**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	336	317	318	867

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.759[a]	.576	.567	10.05644

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	41823.238	7	5974.748	59.079	.000[a]
	Residual	30744.095	304	101.132		
	Total	72567.333	311			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	181.461	2.870		63.216	.000			
	Gender	.748	1.165	.025	.642	.521	.063	.037	.024
	Achieve	-1.652	1.480	-.045	-1.116	.265	-.163	-.064	-.042
	Econ	.356	1.288	.012	.276	.783	-.236	.016	.010
	SPED	-1.540	1.769	-.038	-.871	.385	-.358	-.050	-.033
	PRF	.108	.027	.240	4.046	.000	.665	.226	.151
	VOC	.926	.209	.274	4.438	.000	.690	.247	.166
	MCRC	1.089	.207	.304	5.250	.000	.682	.288	.196

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
RRF	142.56	41.578	1273
MCRC	14.25	3.644	1264
OAKS	222.89	10.762	1334

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.525**	.647**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	1273	1256	1273
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.525**	1	.611**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	1256	1264	1264
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.647**	.611**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	1273	1264	1334

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.737[a]	.543	.541	7.273

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Title1, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	75480.032	7	10782.862	203.827	.000[a]
	Residual	63482.405	1200	52.902		
	Total	138962.437	1207			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender_n, Title1, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	195.463	1.145		170.727	.000			
	Gender	-1.163	.426	-.054	-2.728	.006	.045	-.079	-.053
	Ethnicity	-1.282	.496	-.052	-2.585	.010	-.176	-.074	-.050
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.090	.473	-.050	-2.304	.021	-.277	-.066	-.045
	Special Education	-2.019	.609	-.069	-3.316	.001	-.303	-.095	-.065
	Title1	-1.483	.449	-.069	-3.306	.001	-.220	-.095	-.064
	PRF	.106	.006	.411	17.078	.000	.647	.442	.333
	MCRC	1.055	.069	.359	15.348	.000	.615	.405	.299

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	219.9388	13.18366	572
PRF	124.6766	36.32711	572
MCRC	13.7517	3.60306	572

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
Passage Reading Fluency	Pearson Correlation	1	.607**	.642**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	588	576	587
Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension	Pearson Correlation	.607**	1	.647**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	576	577	576
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	Pearson Correlation	.642**	.647**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	587	576	867

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.728[a]	.530	.526	9.08131

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender, Economically disadvantaged., Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	52649.169	6	8774.862	106.400	.000[a]
	Residual	46595.689	565	82.470		
	Total	99244.858	571			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	185.868	2.058		90.323	.000			
	Gender	-.498	.771	-.019	-.646	.518	.052	-.027	-.019
	Achieve	-2.685	.943	-.086	-2.847	.005	-.158	-.119	-.082
	Econ	-1.891	.820	-.071	-2.305	.022	-.240	-.097	-.066
	SPED	-1.431	1.138	-.042	-1.258	.209	-.372	-.053	-.036
	PRF	.132	.014	.362	9.521	.000	.635	.372	.274
	MCRC	1.445	.134	.395	10.772	.000	.646	.413	.311

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	142.56	41.578	1273
VOC	20.25	3.828	1250
MCRC	14.25	3.644	1264
OAKS	222.89	10.762	1334

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.572**	.525**	.647**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1273	1248	1256	1273
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.572**	1	.570**	.669**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1248	1250	1249	1250
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.525**	.570**	1	.611**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1256	1249	1264	1264
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.647**	.669**	.611**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1273	1250	1264	1334

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.774[a]	.599	.596	6.788

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Title1, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	81916.391	8	10239.549	222.223	.000[a]
	Residual	54832.535	1190	46.078		
	Total	136748.926	1198			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Title1, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	184.876	1.356		136.314	.000			
	Gender	-.485	.403	-.023	-1.205	.228	.046	-.035	-.022
	Ethnicity	-.256	.470	-.010	-.545	.586	-.175	-.016	-.010
	Economic Disadvantage	-.551	.445	-.026	-1.239	.215	-.274	-.036	-.023
	Special Education	-.837	.581	-.029	-1.441	.150	-.310	-.042	-.026
	Title1	-1.651	.420	-.077	-3.928	.000	-.215	-.113	-.072
	PRF	.077	.006	.302	12.549	.000	.647	.342	.230
	VOC	.914	.071	.329	12.963	.000	.669	.352	.238
	MCRC	.715	.069	.244	10.329	.000	.614	.287	.190

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	220.3716	11.86363	802
PRF	133.2581	39.56646	802
VOC	19.3229	3.96857	802
MCRC	13.7382	3.76544	802

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.604**	.533**	.620**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	853	816	821	849
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.604**	1	.578**	.686**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	816	818	814	814
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.533**	.578**	1	.593**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	821	814	822	818
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.620**	.686**	.593**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	849	814	818	867

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.771[a]	.594	.591	7.58804

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension score, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	67020.094	7	9574.299	166.283	.000[a]
	Residual	45717.178	794	57.578		
	Total	112737.272	801			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension score, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	178.640	1.724		103.599	.000			
	Gender	-.891	.545	-.038	-1.633	.103	.033	-.058	-.037
	Achieve	-.473	.636	-.018	-.744	.457	-.121	-.026	-.017
	Econ	-1.027	.586	-.042	-1.752	.080	-.226	-.062	-.040
	SPED	-.636	.817	-.020	-.778	.437	-.343	-.028	-.018
	PRF	.082	.009	.272	8.982	.000	.633	.304	.203
	VOC	1.172	.094	.392	12.464	.000	.698	.405	.282
	MCRC	.692	.091	.219	7.586	.000	.597	.260	.171

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	149.65	40.295	1139
VOC	19.34	4.143	1128
MCRC	14.67	2.846	1124
OAKS	226.19	9.405	1211

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.594**	.503**	.660**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1139	1124	1119	1139
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.594**	1	.569**	.697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1124	1128	1123	1128
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.503**	.569**	1	.591**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1119	1123	1124	1124
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.660**	.697**	.591**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1139	1128	1124	1211

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.794[a]	.631	.628	5.743

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender Title1, Ethnicity, Special, Economic Disadvantage, ORF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	59089.825	8	7386.228	223.951	.000[a]
	Residual	34564.504	1048	32.981		
	Total	93654.329	1056			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Title1, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	192.439	1.286		149.614	.000			
	Gender	.672	.366	.036	1.839	.066	.103	.057	.035
	Ethnicity	-.741	.433	-.033	-1.711	.087	-.202	-.053	-.032
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.460	.402	-.076	-3.632	.000	-.335	-.112	-.068
	Special Education	-.801	.528	-.033	-1.516	.130	-.401	-.047	-.028
	Title1	-1.481	.377	-.079	-3.933	.000	-.243	-.121	-.074
	PRF	.072	.006	.303	12.145	.000	.665	.351	.228
	VOC	.808	.059	.358	13.681	.000	.696	.389	.257
	MCRC	.609	.079	.187	7.704	.000	.598	.232	.145

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	222.7598	12.12023	333
PRF	137.3423	41.33360	333
VOC	17.2613	4.97169	333
MCRC	13.5405	3.37991	333

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.648**	.607**	.589**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	357	335	335	357
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.648**	1	.662**	.664**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	335	336	336	336
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.607**	.662**	1	.635**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	335	336	340	340
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.589**	.664**	.635**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	357	336	340	868

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.749[a]	.561	.552	8.11584

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving., Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27364.064	7	3909.152	59.349	.000[a]
	Residual	21406.717	325	65.867		
	Total	48770.781	332			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving., Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	186.451	2.601		71.680	.000			
	Gender	-.118	.968	-.005	-.122	.903	.078	-.007	-.004
	Achieve	.468	1.181	.015	.396	.692	-.152	.022	.015
	Econ	-.217	.933	-.009	-.232	.817	-.182	-.013	-.009
	SPED	-1.471	1.463	-.044	-1.005	.316	-.395	-.056	-.037
	PRF	.072	.015	.246	4.668	.000	.633	.251	.172
	VOC	.709	.138	.291	5.122	.000	.664	.273	.188
	MCRC	1.069	.190	.298	5.641	.000	.658	.299	.207

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	155.35	40.639	1166
MCRC	16.32	2.941	1101
OAKS	226.19	9.405	1211

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.526**	.661**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	1166	1100	1166
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.526**	1	.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	1100	1101	1101
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.661**	.645**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	1166	1101	1211

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.769[a]	.592	.589	6.131

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Title1, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	56386.790	7	8055.256	214.303	.000[a]
	Residual	38866.205	1034	37.588		
	Total	95252.995	1041			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Title1, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	194.618	1.401		138.926	.000			
	Gender	-.279	.388	-.015	-.719	.472	.096	-.022	-.014
	Ethnicity	-1.339	.464	-.060	-2.889	.004	-.209	-.089	-.057
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.883	.434	-.097	-4.336	.000	-.354	-.134	-.086
	Special Education	-1.470	.554	-.060	-2.654	.008	-.395	-.082	-.053
	Title1	-1.246	.408	-.065	-3.054	.002	-.246	-.095	-.061
	PRF	.097	.006	.415	17.002	.000	.667	.467	.338
	MCRC	1.149	.080	.355	14.303	.000	.649	.406	.284

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	222.7337	10.83023	582
PRF	144.5653	39.23983	582
MCRC	15.2904	3.39026	582

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.515**	.546**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	596	585	596
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.515**	1	.598**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	585	587	587
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.546**	.598**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	596	587	868

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.703[a]	.495	.489	7.73901

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender), Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33709.660	6	5618.277	93.806	.000[a]
	Residual	34438.060	575	59.892		
	Total	68147.720	581			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	194.083	1.954		99.340	.000			
	Gender	-1.072	.664	-.049	-1.614	.107	.082	-.067	-.048
	Achieve	-1.898	.814	-.072	-2.332	.020	-.198	-.097	-.069
	Econ	-1.502	.675	-.069	-2.226	.026	-.226	-.092	-.066
	SPED	-3.848	.983	-.130	-3.915	.000	-.393	-.161	-.116
	PRF	.097	.010	.350	9.782	.000	.595	.378	.290
	MCRC	1.118	.115	.350	9.701	.000	.598	.375	.288

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	169.42	39.002	1194
VOC	21.00	3.416	1172
MCRC	14.82	2.592	1177
OAKS	226.19	9.405	1211

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.549**	.462**	.617**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1194	1169	1172	1194
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.549**	1	.550**	.719**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1169	1172	1170	1172
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.462**	.550**	1	.556**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1172	1170	1177	1177
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.617**	.719**	.556**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1194	1172	1177	1211

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.794[a]	.631	.628	5.740

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Title1, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	61442.172	8	7680.271	233.075	.000[a]
	Residual	35950.577	1091	32.952		
	Total	97392.749	1099			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Title1, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	183.809	1.504		122.242	.000			
	Gender	.766	.355	.041	2.157	.031	.092	.065	.040
	Ethnicity	-.683	.423	-.031	-1.614	.107	-.206	-.049	-.030
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.353	.395	-.071	-3.422	.001	-.356	-.103	-.063
	Special Education	-1.332	.504	-.055	-2.644	.008	-.383	-.080	-.049
	Title1	-1.586	.370	-.084	-4.290	.000	-.253	-.129	-.079
	PRF	.054	.006	.224	9.411	.000	.611	.274	.173
	VOC	1.235	.069	.450	17.976	.000	.725	.478	.331
	MCRC	.581	.083	.160	7.030	.000	.565	.208	.129

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	222.3016	11.60137	799
PRF	157.4668	39.76130	799
VOC	19.3016	3.71684	799
MCRC	13.7835	3.17247	799

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.589**	.478**	.573**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	850	817	811	847
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.589**	1	.519**	.667**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	817	820	809	817
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.478**	.519**	1	.500**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	811	809	813	810
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.573**	.667**	.500**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	847	817	810	868

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.732[a]	.535	.531	7.94359

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Economically disadvantaged, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57491.654	7	8213.093	130.159	.000[a]
	Residual	49912.653	791	63.101		
	Total	107404.308	798			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Economically disadvantaged, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	180.376	2.044		88.241	.000			
	Gender	Gender	Gender	Gender	Gender	Gender	Gender	Gender	Gender
	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve	Achieve
	Econ	Econ	Econ	Econ	Econ	Econ	Econ	Econ	Econ
	SPED	SPED	SPED	SPED	SPED	SPED	SPED	SPED	SPED
	PRF	PRF	PRF	PRF	PRF	PRF	PRF	PRF	PRF
	VOC	Voc	Voc	Voc	Voc	Voc	Voc	Voc	Voc
	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC	MCRC

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	151.60	37.103	1014
VOC	16.55	4.423	1005
MCRC	15.42	2.780	1006
OAKS	230.35	9.852	1115

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.588**	.436**	.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1014	1003	1003	1014
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.588**	1	.450**	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1003	1005	1005	1005
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.436**	.450**	1	.519**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1003	1005	1006	1006
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.657**	.704**	.519**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1014	1005	1006	1115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.768[a]	.589	.585	6.242

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	40887.283	7	5841.040	149.914	.000[a]
	Residual	28481.665	731	38.963		
	Total	69368.947	738			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	195.767	1.634		119.819	.000			
	Gender	.229	.472	.012	.485	.628	.068	.018	.011
	Ethnicity	-.492	.526	-.023	-.934	.351	-.145	-.035	-.022
	Economic Disadvantage	-.764	.509	-.039	-1.502	.134	-.305	-.055	-.036
	Special Education	-1.191	.666	-.049	-1.788	.074	-.394	-.066	-.042
	PRF	.077	.008	.297	9.554	.000	.644	.333	.226
	VOC	.865	.069	.395	12.609	.000	.683	.423	.299
	MCRC	.603	.094	.180	6.416	.000	.517	.231	.152

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS reading score, 2008-2009	227.7000	12.87954	660
PRF	146.1470	37.99730	660
VOC	14.9182	4.37568	660
MCRC	14.3242	3.30875	660

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.569**	.455**	.583**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	689	684	673	688
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.569**	1	.447**	.565**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	684	713	700	712
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.455**	.447**	1	.466**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	673	700	702	701
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.583**	.565**	.466**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	688	712	701	760

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.695[a]	.483	.478	9.30698

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving., Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	52840.460	7	7548.637	87.147	.000[a]
	Residual	56476.140	652	86.620		
	Total	109316.600	659			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving., Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	193.779	2.230		86.896	.000			
	Gender	.534	.739	.021	.723	.470	.046	.028	.020
	Achieve	-1.334	.884	-.045	-1.509	.132	-.122	-.059	-.042
	Econ	-1.620	.796	-.062	-2.035	.042	-.237	-.079	-.057
	SPED	-5.140	1.130	-.142	-4.550	.000	-.398	-.175	-.128
	PRF	.099	.012	.291	7.929	.000	.588	.297	.223
	VOC	.781	.108	.265	7.215	.000	.575	.272	.203
	MCRC	.673	.128	.173	5.260	.000	.475	.202	.148

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	151.19	40.863	93
MCRC	13.43	2.903	90
OAKS	230.35	9.852	1115

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.489**	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	93	90	93
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.489**	1	.460**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	90	90	90
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.625**	.460**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	93	90	1115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.689[a]	.474	.434	6.557

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Economic Disadvantage, Ethnicity, Gender, Special Education, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3062.596	6	510.433	11.871	.000[a]
	Residual	3396.997	79	43.000		
	Total	6459.593	85			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Economic Disadvantage, Ethnicity, Gender, Special Education, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	202.981	4.049		50.131	.000			
	Gender	1.873	1.561	.107	1.200	.234	.191	.134	.098
	Ethnicity	1.819	1.602	.099	1.136	.260	.018	.127	.093
	Economic Disadvantage	-2.908	1.557	-.164	-1.868	.066	-.106	-.206	-.152
	Special Education	-.712	2.315	-.029	-.307	.759	-.336	-.035	-.025
	PRF	.113	.021	.536	5.448	.000	.627	.523	.444
	MCRC	.559	.298	.190	1.878	.064	.465	.207	.153

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	172.14	45.037	1051
VOC	17.44	4.331	1013
MCRC	15.17	2.972	1013
OAKS	230.35	9.852	1115

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.600**	.443**	.622**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1051	1011	1009	1051
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.600**	1	.524**	.722**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1011	1013	1011	1013
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.443**	.524**	1	.572**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1009	1011	1013	1013
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.622**	.722**	.572**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1051	1013	1013	1115

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.789[a]	.623	.620	6.005

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	57133.674	7	8161.953	226.340	.000[a]
	Residual	34618.209	960	36.061		
	Total	91751.883	967			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	195.495	1.321		147.963	.000			
	Gender	.404	.397	.021	1.017	.309	.092	.033	.020
	Ethnicity	-.171	.454	-.008	-.377	.707	-.157	-.012	-.007
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.147	.429	-.057	-2.670	.008	-.320	-.086	-.053
	Special Education	-1.870	.616	-.068	-3.037	.002	-.408	-.098	-.060
	PRF	.047	.006	.218	8.189	.000	.624	.256	.162
	VOC	.981	.061	.437	16.069	.000	.723	.460	.319
	MCRC	.681	.078	.210	8.748	.000	.576	.272	.173

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	226.5691	8.93137	362
PRF	148.5359	42.43535	362
VOC	14.7265	4.34136	362
MCRC	14.1519	3.11668	362

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.499**	.419**	.572**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	388	371	369	385
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.499**	1	.464**	.716**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	371	599	593	594
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.419**	.464**	1	.623**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	369	593	596	591
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.572**	.716**	.623**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	385	594	591	760

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.829[a]	.686	.680	5.05026

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19767.949	7	2823.993	110.722	.000[a]
	Residual	9028.825	354	25.505		
	Total	28796.773	361			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, Passage Reading Fluency, Vocabulary

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	195.539	1.593		122.739	.000			
	Gender	.173	.542	.010	.320	.750	-.017	.017	.010
	Achieve	-.530	.631	-.027	-.841	.401	-.144	-.045	-.025
	Econ	-1.229	.598	-.065	-2.057	.040	-.177	-.109	-.061
	SPED	-2.561	.732	-.113	-3.500	.001	-.381	-.183	-.104
	PRF	.064	.008	.306	8.398	.000	.656	.408	.250
	VOC	.754	.076	.367	9.965	.000	.687	.468	.297
	MCRC	.827	.099	.289	8.397	.000	.607	.408	.250

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	160.68	34.827	1145
VOC	15.05	4.337	1165
MCRC	14.05	2.856	1164
OAKS	235.56	9.436	1306

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.501**	.453**	.602**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1145	1132	1131	1145
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.501**	1	.528**	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1132	1165	1164	1165
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.453**	.528**	1	.599**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1131	1164	1164	1164
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.602**	.682**	.599**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1145	1165	1164	1306

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.780[a]	.609	.606	5.826

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	55420.073	7	7917.153	233.271	.000[a]
	Residual	35568.850	1048	33.940		
	Total	90988.923	1055			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, PRF, VOC

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	201.467	1.218		165.420	.000			
	Gender	1.526	.366	.082	4.166	.000	.107	.128	.080
	Ethnicity	-1.035	.425	-.049	-2.439	.015	-.179	-.075	-.047
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.453	.398	-.076	-3.654	.000	-.307	-.112	-.071
	Special Education	-.414	.574	-.015	-.721	.471	-.296	-.022	-.014
	PRF	.068	.006	.255	10.612	.000	.595	.312	.205
	VOC	.840	.053	.393	15.802	.000	.676	.439	.305
	MCRC	.785	.078	.242	10.055	.000	.603	.297	.194

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	232.3833	10.73418	707
PRF	151.8953	35.67679	707
VOC	13.2829	4.25455	707
MCRC	12.9250	3.36602	707

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.473**	.486**	.606**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	743	733	735	736
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.473**	1	.479**	.555**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	733	771	768	763
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.486**	.479**	1	.542**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	735	768	773	765
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.606**	.555**	.542**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	736	763	765	849

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.712[a]	.507	.502	7.57215

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged., Vocabulary, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	41268.239	7	5895.463	102.820	.000[a]
	Residual	40078.884	699	57.337		
	Total	81347.123	706			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged., Vocabulary, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	200.739	1.785		112.473	.000			
	Gender	.112	.580	.005	.194	.847	.056	.007	.005
	Achieve	-.549	.700	-.022	-.783	.434	-.126	-.030	-.021
	Econ	.313	.612	.015	.512	.609	-.168	.019	.014
	SPED	-4.106	.934	-.134	-4.396	.000	-.429	-.164	-.117
	PRF	.095	.010	.314	9.213	.000	.601	.329	.245
	VOC	.644	.082	.255	7.870	.000	.549	.285	.209
	MCRC	.714	.103	.224	6.916	.000	.537	.253	.184

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	165.81	40.626	80
MCRC	14.96	3.089	78
OAKS	235.56	9.436	1306

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.632**	.654**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	80	78	80
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.632**	1	.646**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	78	78	78
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.654**	.646**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	80	78	1306

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression

Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.765[a]	.585	.546	6.037

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, Ethnicity, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3289.862	6	548.310	15.044	.000[a]
	Residual	2332.617	64	36.447		
	Total	5622.479	70			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, Ethnicity, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	209.254	4.747		44.081	.000			
	Gender	1.957	1.563	.109	1.252	.215	.068	.155	.101
	Ethnicity	.103	1.792	.005	.058	.954	-.147	.007	.005
	Economic Disadvantage	-3.015	1.618	-.162	-1.864	.067	-.325	-.227	-.150
	Special Education	-4.995	2.187	-.203	-2.284	.026	-.446	-.274	-.184
	PRF	.081	.023	.379	3.596	.001	.643	.410	.290
	MCRC	.828	.309	.296	2.684	.009	.647	.318	.216

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	166.86	38.234	1209
VOC	16.45	4.305	1208
MCRC	13.25	2.601	1208
OAKS	235.56	9.436	1306

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.493**	.417**	.639**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1209	1204	1203	1209
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.493**	1	.445**	.684**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1204	1208	1206	1208
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.417**	.445**	1	.558**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1203	1206	1208	1208
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.639**	.684**	.558**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1209	1208	1208	1306

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.796[a]	.634	.632	5.621

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, VOC, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	60948.266	7	8706.895	275.560	.000[a]
	Residual	35135.961	1112	31.597		
	Total	96084.228	1119			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Gender, Ethnicity, Special Education, Economic Disadvantage, VOC, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	199.322	1.159		171.906	.000			
	Gender	.896	.341	.048	2.625	.009	.089	.078	.048
	Ethnicity	-.549	.398	-.026	-1.378	.168	-.170	-.041	-.025
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.491	.370	-.079	-4.024	.000	-.320	-.120	-.073
	Special Education	-1.013	.543	-.037	-1.866	.062	-.305	-.056	-.034
	PRF	.072	.006	.295	12.967	.000	.626	.362	.235
	VOC	.883	.048	.410	18.308	.000	.684	.481	.332
	MCRC	.784	.075	.222	10.475	.000	.560	.300	.190

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	231.2762	9.39800	362
PRF	147.1519	37.18303	362
VOC	14.1713	3.94118	362
MCRC	11.7072	3.03852	362

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.453**	.411**	.617**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	396	384	384	384
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.453**	1	.438**	.552**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	384	685	683	669
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.411**	.438**	1	.510**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	384	683	692	677
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.617**	.552**	.510**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	384	669	677	849

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.770[a]	.592	.584	6.06063

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Vocabulary, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18881.505	7	2697.358	73.435	.000[a]
	Residual	13002.871	354	36.731		
	Total	31884.376	361			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Gender, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Economically disadvantaged, Special Education, Vocabulary, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	199.268	2.016		98.848	.000			
	Gender	-.086	.651	-.005	-.133	.895	.027	-.007	-.004
	Achieve	-2.303	.716	-.114	-3.216	.001	-.131	-.168	-.109
	Econ	.699	.726	.034	.964	.336	-.077	.051	.033
	SPED	-2.435	.993	-.094	-2.453	.015	-.414	-.129	-.083
	PRF	.097	.010	.384	9.271	.000	.637	.442	.315
	VOC	.701	.095	.294	7.364	.000	.579	.364	.250
	MCRC	.723	.122	.234	5.947	.000	.539	.301	.202

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	178.91	38.023	1234
VOC	15.70	3.974	1217
MCRC	15.22	2.669	1216
OAKS	236.23	8.245	1359

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.536**	.390**	.593**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1234	1210	1208	1234
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.536**	1	.391**	.678**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1210	1217	1214	1217
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.390**	.391**	1	.463**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1208	1214	1216	1216
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.593**	.678**	.463**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1234	1217	1216	1359

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.760[a]	.577	.575	5.112

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, VOC, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	40834.130	7	5833.447	223.244	.000[a]
	Residual	29893.200	1144	26.130		
	Total	70727.330	1151			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, VOC, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficientsv

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	208.046	1.137		182.905	.000			
	Gender	.084	.309	.005	.272	.785	.084	.008	.005
	Ethnicity	-.599	.361	-.033	-1.659	.097	-.169	-.049	-.032
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.312	.337	-.080	-3.888	.000	-.300	-.114	-.075
	Special Education	-2.222	.514	-.093	-4.326	.000	-.392	-.127	-.083
	PRF	.049	.005	.237	9.768	.000	.592	.277	.188
	VOC	.856	.048	.433	17.927	.000	.681	.468	.345
	MCRC	.473	.064	.161	7.344	.000	.470	.212	.141

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	234.1125	9.21433	720
PRF	169.1514	38.01362	720
VOC	14.1986	3.88367	720
MCRC	14.5292	2.92545	720

Correlations

		PRF	Vocabulary	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.476**	.422**	.602**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	737	734	731	730
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.476**	1	.370**	.560**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	734	757	753	750
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.422**	.370**	1	.521**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	731	753	753	746
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.602**	.560**	.521**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	730	750	746	818

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.725[a]	.525	.520	6.38059

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, VOC, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32058.987	7	4579.855	112.494	.000[a]
	Residual	28986.901	712	40.712		
	Total	61045.887	719			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Historically high-achieving-historically low achieving, Gender, Special Education, Economically disadvantaged, VOC, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	201.263	1.704		118.086	.000			
	Gender	.147	.494	.008	.297	.766	.130	.011	.008
	Achieve	-.592	.591	-.027	-1.002	.317	-.125	-.038	-.026
	Econ	-.813	.506	-.044	-1.605	.109	-.205	-.060	-.041
	SPED	-2.455	.819	-.089	-2.998	.003	-.417	-.112	-.077
	PRF	.079	.008	.326	10.081	.000	.605	.353	.260
	VOC	.644	.073	.272	8.836	.000	.558	.314	.228
	MCRC	.767	.094	.244	8.158	.000	.517	.292	.211

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	164.71	39.028	126
MCRC	13.68	3.057	72
OAKS	236.23	8.245	1359

Correlations

		PRF	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.292*	.678**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.013	.000
	N	126	72	126
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.292*	1	.506**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013		.000
	N	72	72	72
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.678**	.506**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	126	72	1359

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.826[a]	.683	.651	4.460

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Economic Disadvantage, Gender, PRF, Ethnicity, Special Education

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2567.154	6	427.859	21.512	.000[a]
	Residual	1193.353	60	19.889		
	Total	3760.507	66			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Economic Disadvantage, Gender, PRF, Ethnicity, Special Education

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	207.522	4.044		51.318	.000			
	Gender	-.562	1.109	-.037	-.507	.614	.003	-.065	-.037
	Ethnicity	-1.240	1.196	-.082	-1.037	.304	-.242	-.133	-.075
	Economic Disadvantage	-.140	1.326	-.008	-.106	.916	-.169	-.014	-.008
	Special Education	-1.212	1.762	-.062	-.688	.494	-.510	-.088	-.050
	PRF	.117	.016	.636	7.400	.000	.760	.691	.538
	MCRC	.696	.205	.285	3.396	.001	.514	.402	.247

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PRF	172.47	38.792	1211
VOC	17.35	4.184	1258
MCRC	14.21	2.958	1258
OAKS	236.23	8.245	1359

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.549**	.427**	.619**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	1211	1203	1203	1211
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.549**	1	.449**	.675**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	1203	1258	1256	1258
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.427**	.449**	1	.555**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	1203	1256	1258	1258
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.619**	.675**	.555**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	1211	1258	1258	1359

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.779[a]	.607	.605	5.006

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, VOC, PRF

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	44102.237	7	6300.320	251.459	.000[a]
	Residual	28512.668	1138	25.055		
	Total	72614.905	1145			

a. Predictors: (Constant), MCRC, Ethnicity, Gender, Economic Disadvantage, Special Education, VOC, PRF

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	207.444	1.030		201.349	.000			
	Gender	.424	.304	.027	1.395	.163	.098	.041	.026
	Ethnicity	-.859	.351	-.047	-2.447	.015	-.170	-.072	-.045
	Economic Disadvantage	-1.189	.332	-.071	-3.584	.000	-.311	-.106	-.067
	Special Education	-2.405	.500	-.101	-4.805	.000	-.409	-.141	-.089
	PRF	.051	.005	.245	10.335	.000	.616	.293	.192
	VOC	.724	.045	.381	16.083	.000	.672	.430	.299
	MCRC	.604	.060	.224	10.029	.000	.564	.285	.186

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OAKS	233.7629	8.52999	329
PRF	156.1915	40.45597	329
VOC	15.0851	4.51745	329
MCRC	13.3191	3.29518	329

Correlations

		PRF	VOC	MCRC	OAKS
PRF	Pearson Correlation	1	.465**	.515**	.565**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	353	338	339	346
VOC	Pearson Correlation	.465**	1	.399**	.556**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	338	678	675	666
MCRC	Pearson Correlation	.515**	.399**	1	.503**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	339	675	677	665
OAKS	Pearson Correlation	.565**	.556**	.503**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	346	666	665	818

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression Model Summary[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.809[a]	.654	.647	5.07017

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Economically disadvantaged, Gender, Historically high achieving-historically low achieving. Special Education, VOC, Passage Reading Fluency

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15613.673	7	2230.525	86.768	.000[a]
	Residual	8251.834	321	25.707		
	Total	23865.508	328			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension, Economically disadvantaged, Gender, Historically high achieving-historically low achieving. Special Education, VOC, Passage Reading Fluency

b. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009

Regression Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	206.906	1.701		121.671	.000			
	Gender	.126	.591	.007	.213	.832	.069	.012	.007
	Achieve	-.213	.679	-.011	-.314	.754	-.181	-.018	-.010
	Econ	-1.723	.596	-.099	-2.888	.004	-.208	-.159	-.095
	SPED	-2.968	.835	-.133	-3.556	.000	-.458	-.195	-.117
	PRF	.062	.009	.295	7.036	.000	.646	.366	.231
	VOC	.747	.073	.396	10.183	.000	.654	.494	.334
	MCRC	.558	.103	.216	5.434	.000	.560	.290	.178

a. Dependent Variable: OAKS reading score, 2008-2009