

# Texas Math Outcomes Analysis 2015/16

**Grade Levels: 3, 4, 5**  
**ST Math Program: Gen-4**  
**Analysis Type: Two-Year**  
**Treatment-Years: 2014/15, 2015/16**  
**Baseline-Year: 2013/14**  
**Subgroup: All**

**Jessica Guise**

**MIND** Research Institute

2017-09-13 RLL Version 1.0 (S.A.M.01.12.15) ©2016

## **Abstract**

This analysis covers all grades using ST Math in Texas in 2015/16. It identifies those grades with nominal or better implementation of the ST Math program, and matches them to randomly selected, similar math-performance, comparison grades. The nominal ST Math users are an aggregation of 48 grades, consisting of grades 3, 4, and 5 at 16 schools, with an average baseline of 35% in Satisfactory or Advanced proficiency levels (refer to Figures 2 and 3 to see how your schools compare to those analyzed in this report). They were matched to 48 similar, randomly selected control grades at 48 schools that never used ST Math. Grade-wise growth in math proficiency was evaluated (i.e. growth in same grade, same school, from 2013/14 to 2015/16) on the percentage proficient, scale scores, and Z-scores of the scale scores (see Section 3.1). Grades 3, 4, and 5 aggregated showed an ST Math effect of 8.9 points at the Satisfactory or Advanced levels, 3.71 points at the Satisfactory Level, 5.19 points at the Advanced Level, and Z-score of 0.45.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Background . . . . .	5
1.2	Program Description . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Data Collection</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Proficiency Levels Definition . . . . .	6
2.2	Treatment Grades Pool and Selection . . . . .	6
2.3	Control Grades Pool and Selection . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Data Analysis</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Z-scores . . . . .	8
3.2	Percentile Ranking . . . . .	8
3.3	Final Treatment and Control . . . . .	9
3.3.1	ST Math Grade-Aggregated Implementation ( $\geq 85\%$ Enrollment Grades Only) . . . . .	9
3.3.2	Filtering Treatment and Controls . . . . .	10
3.3.3	Match of Controls to Treatment . . . . .	11
3.4	Grade-Aggregated Analysis . . . . .	13
3.5	Grade-Level Analysis . . . . .	17
3.5.1	Grade Level Result Tables . . . . .	17
3.5.2	Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in Math Satisfactory or Advanced . . . . .	18
3.5.3	Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in STAAR Math scale scores . . . . .	19
3.5.4	Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in STAAR Z-scores of scale scores . . . . .	20
<b>4</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Findings Summary</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Confounders</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Reference Tables Grouped By School Year</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Lists of Schools</b>	<b>24</b>
8.1	Treatment Schools . . . . .	24
8.2	Control Schools . . . . .	25

## List of Figures

1	Histogram of ST Math Percent Progress for $\geq 85\%$ Enrollment Grades 2015/16	9
2	Baseline Year Density Plots Showing Math Scores Match between TRT and CTRL - 2013/14	11
3	Baseline Year Density Plot Showing Student Need Match between TRT and CTRL	12
4	Change at each Proficiency Level for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	13
5	Changes in STAAR Math scale scores and Z-scores (See Section 3.1) for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	14
6	Changes in Satisfactory or Advanced for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	15
7	Changes in Percentile Ranking for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	16
8	Changes in Percent of Students at Satisfactory or Advanced for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	18
9	Changes in Grade-Mean STAAR Math scale score for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	19
10	Changes in Grade-Mean STAAR Z-score (See Section 3.1) for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16	20

## List of Tables

1	Proficiency Level Naming . . . . .	6
2	Descriptive Statistics of ST Math Percent Progress for $\geq 85$ percent Enrollment Grades . . . . .	9
3	Number of ST Math Grades with $\geq 85$ percent Enrollment and with $\geq 50$ percent progress . . . . .	9
4	Treatment Pool Filtering and Controls: Counts of Grades, Schools, and Students	10
5	Matching TRT and CTRL . . . . .	12
6	Yearly Math Proficiency and Counts for TRT and CTRL Grade-Aggregated Datasets . . . . .	13
7	Statistics for the Differential Changes in Math Scores Growth (TRT - CTRL) .	15
8	Grade 3 - Yearly Math Performance and Counts for TRT and CTRL Datasets	17
9	Grade 4 - Yearly Math Performance and Counts for TRT and CTRL Datasets	17
10	Grade 5 - Yearly Math Performance and Counts for TRT and CTRL Datasets	17
11	Statistics for the Differential Changes in Satisfactory or Advanced, (TRT - CTRL)	18
12	Statistics for the Differential Changes in STAAR Math scale scores Growth, (TRT - CTRL) . . . . .	19
13	Statistics for the Differential Changes in STAAR Z-scores (See Section 3.1) Growth, (TRT - CTRL) . . . . .	20
14	Cohen's d Effect Size . . . . .	21
15	TRT Grades Detail Sorted by Year . . . . .	23
16	CTRL Grades Detail Sorted by Year . . . . .	23
17	Treatment Schools (TRT Dataset) . . . . .	24
18	Matched Control Schools (CTRL Dataset) . . . . .	25

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

This is a quasi-experimental analysis at the grade-mean level. Entire grades represent the units of analysis, and outcome measures are the 2-year changes in grade-mean STAAR Satisfactory or Advanced percentages. The treatment grades used the ST Math program for 2 years, beginning in the 2014/15 school year. The study hypothesis is treatment grades using ST Math will outperform similar matched control grades, using their “business as usual” conditions of instructional content and professional development. The control grades were selected to have similar demographic and math attributes to the treatment grades during the baseline year (2013/14), and did not use ST Math in 2014/15, and 2015/16. The treatment grades’ selection pool was all schools using ST Math in grades 3, 4, and 5 in Texas. The control grades’ pool was all schools not using ST Math in grades 3, 4, and 5 in Texas. This study method measures effectiveness of the ST Math program when nominally implemented.

## 1.2 Program Description

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2 Data Collection

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

### 2.1 Proficiency Levels Definition

The following (Table 1) is Texas’s proficiency level descriptions:

Proficiency Level	State Proficiency Level Name
L1	Unsatisfactory
L2	Satisfactory
L3	Advanced

Table 1: Proficiency Level Naming

### 2.2 Treatment Grades Pool and Selection

The Treatment grades pool originated with all schools and grades using ST Math in Texas. From these schools, every grade that had used the ST Math program was identified. They comprise the Treatment grades pool for this evaluation of 2-year usage.

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

this is the case for each individual treatment grade by comparing the number of ST Math student accounts at a grade level to the Texas’s reported enrollment at that grade level. We discard from the Treatment pool any grade with a ratio of ST Math student accounts to reported grade enrollment lower than 85%.

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

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

### 2.3 Control Grades Pool and Selection

The control grades are randomly selected from a control pool of schools in Texas. Though they are randomly selected, they are also matched to be similar to the Treatment grades’ math attributes and demographics during the baseline 2013/14 year. The matched attributes include:

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

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

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



### 3 Data Analysis

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

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

#### 3.1 Z-scores

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

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{School A, Grade 3, Mean scale score: } 300 \\ &\text{Average across all schools statewide, Grade 3: } 350 \\ &\text{Standard deviation across all schools statewide, Grade 3: } 30 \\ \text{Z-score} &= ((\text{School A, Grade 3, Mean scale score}) - (\text{Average across all schools, Grade 3})) / (\text{Standard} \\ &\quad \text{deviation across all schools, Grade 3}) \\ \text{Z-score} &= \frac{300 - 350}{30} = -1.67 \end{aligned}$$

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

#### 3.2 Percentile Ranking

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

### 3.3 Final Treatment and Control

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

**ST Math Percent Grade Mean Progress Distribution – 2015/16**




Figure 1: Histogram of ST Math Percent Progress for  $\geq 85\%$  Enrollment Grades 2015/16

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

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

	Min.	Max.	Average	S.D.
ST Math % Progress	7.1	87.9	65.4	22.9

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of ST Math Percent Progress for  $\geq 85\%$  Enrollment Grades

Grades with $\geq 85\%$ Enrollment:	58
Grades with in addition $\geq 50\%$ Progress:	48

Table 3: Number of ST Math Grades with  $\geq 85\%$  Enrollment and with  $\geq 50\%$  percent progress

### 3.3.2 Filtering Treatment and Controls

Table 4 shows the total number of grades in the Treatment pool, the number of grades that exceeded the 85% Enrollment figure, and also the 50% Progress filter. Other rows in the table indicate counts of numbers of students (2015/16 from state testing count) and counts of number of schools represented. The number of matched Control (CTRL) grades, students, and schools is also shown.

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Total
ST Math Using Grades	20	21	17	58
ST Math Using Schools	20	21	17	21
ST Math Students	2019	2148	1621	5788
ST Math Grades (Enroll $\geq$ 85%)	20	21	17	58
TRT Grades (Enroll $\geq$ 85% & Prog $\geq$ 50%)	16	16	16	48
TRT Schools (Enroll $\geq$ 85% & Prog $\geq$ 50%)	16	16	16	16
TRT Students (Enroll $\geq$ 85% & Prog $\geq$ 50%)	1933	1954	1806	5693
CTRL Grades	17	15	16	48
CTRL Schools	17	15	16	48
CTRL Students	1751	1383	1647	4781

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

### 3.3.3 Match of Controls to Treatment

Figure 2 shows the density plot of the baseline STAAR Math scale scores (left plot) and baseline percent students at STAAR Satisfactory or Advanced (right plot) for treatment grades overlaid on control grades, showing the closeness of the match obtained between Treatment and Control sets of grades in the baseline year, 2013/14.




Figure 2: Baseline Year Density Plots Showing Math Scores Match between TRT and CTRL - 2013/14

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




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

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

	Mean(TRT)	SD(TRT)	Mean(CTRL)	SD(CTRL)	Estimate	P-Value
Satisfactory or Advanced - 2013/14	34.56	11.35	35.00	11.15	-0.44	0.85
Scale score - 2013/14	1534.02	70.08	1534.10	70.21	-0.08	1.00
Percent Free or Reduced Lunch	53.75	16.63	54.21	17.22	-0.46	0.89

Table 5: Matching TRT and CTRL

### 3.4 Grade-Aggregated Analysis

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

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Satisfactory or Advanced	ST Math Per Comp.
TRT.13.14	48	16	4764	1534.0	-0.01	50.44	65.44	19.35	15.21	34.56	-
TRT.14.15	48	16	4792	1549.0	0.44	64.71	55.19	25.42	19.40	44.81	79.03
TRT.15.16	48	16	4934	1566.8	0.47	65.25	49.96	26.96	23.08	50.04	75.32
TRT.Delta	-	-	-	32.7	0.47	14.81	-15.48	7.60	7.87	15.48	-
CTRL.13.14	48	48	4652	1534.1	0.02	51.40	65.02	18.81	16.19	35.00	-
CTRL.14.15	48	48	4605	1528.9	0.14	54.77	60.10	23.25	16.67	39.92	-
CTRL.15.16	48	48	4781	1539.0	0.05	51.96	58.42	22.71	18.88	41.58	-
CTRL.Delta	-	-	-	4.9	0.03	0.56	-6.60	3.90	2.69	6.58	-

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

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




Figure 4: Change at each Proficiency Level for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

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




Figure 5: Changes in STAAR Math scale scores and Z-scores (See Section 3.1) for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

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




Figure 6: Changes in Satisfactory or Advanced for Grade-Aggregated TRT and CTRL datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

Table 7 shows the statistics for the *differences* in changes between TRT and CTRL (Treatment - Control) for these same STAAR math proficiency and scale score changes as in the above figures.<sup>1</sup>

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Satisfactory or Advanced	8.90	0.00*	3.62	14.18
scale score	27.85	0.00*	11.89	43.82
Z-score	0.45	0.00*	0.19	0.71
L1	-8.88	0.00*	-14.16	-3.59
L2	3.71	0.03*	0.45	6.97
L3	5.19	0.01*	1.26	9.11

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

<sup>1</sup>\* statistically significant p<0.05



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




Figure 7: Changes in Percentile Ranking for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

## 3.5 Grade-Level Analysis

### 3.5.1 Grade Level Result Tables

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

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Satisfactory or Advanced	ST Math Per Prog.
TRT.13.14	16	16	1628	1457.6	-0.04	50.00	70.12	17.38	12.50	29.88	-
TRT.14.15	16	16	1644	1474.8	0.51	66.75	50.56	30.25	19.19	49.44	76.56
TRT.15.16	16	16	1668	1496.0	0.61	67.81	46.00	29.75	24.25	54.00	78
TRT.Delta	-	-	-	38.4	0.65	17.81	-24.12	12.38	11.75	24.12	-
CTRL.13.14	17	17	1665	1461.6	0.02	51.82	68.53	17.18	14.29	31.47	-
CTRL.14.15	17	17	1690	1447.1	0.06	52.94	58.41	27.12	14.47	41.59	-
CTRL.15.16	17	17	1751	1466.4	0.11	53.94	56.71	24.06	19.24	43.29	-
CTRL.Delta	-	-	-	4.8	0.09	2.12	-11.82	6.88	4.94	11.82	-

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

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Satisfactory or Advanced	ST Math Per Prog.
TRT.13.14	16	16	1579	1542.6	-0.06	47.88	66.75	19.00	14.25	33.25	-
TRT.14.15	16	16	1629	1561.7	0.53	67.44	59.00	20.19	20.81	41.00	78.65
TRT.15.16	16	16	1692	1573.1	0.37	62.50	55.19	21.88	22.94	44.81	73.61
TRT.Delta	-	-	-	30.6	0.43	14.62	-11.56	2.88	8.69	11.56	-
CTRL.13.14	15	15	1355	1543.0	-0.06	48.33	66.20	18.07	15.73	33.80	-
CTRL.14.15	15	15	1242	1546.9	0.29	58.80	62.27	19.87	17.87	37.73	-
CTRL.15.16	15	15	1383	1546.8	-0.05	49.07	62.00	18.67	19.33	38.00	-
CTRL.Delta	-	-	-	3.8	0.00	0.73	-4.20	0.60	3.60	4.20	-

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

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Satisfactory or Advanced	ST Math Per Prog.
TRT.13.14	16	16	1557	1601.9	0.09	53.44	59.44	21.69	18.88	40.56	-
TRT.14.15	16	16	1519	1610.5	0.27	59.94	56.00	25.81	18.19	44.00	81.89
TRT.15.16	16	16	1574	1631.1	0.44	65.44	48.69	29.25	22.06	51.31	74.36
TRT.Delta	-	-	-	29.2	0.35	12.00	-10.75	7.56	3.19	10.75	-
CTRL.13.14	16	16	1632	1602.8	0.10	53.81	60.19	21.25	18.62	39.88	-
CTRL.14.15	16	16	1673	1599.0	0.08	52.94	59.88	22.31	17.88	40.19	-
CTRL.15.16	16	16	1647	1608.8	0.08	52.56	56.88	25.06	18.06	43.12	-
CTRL.Delta	-	-	-	5.9	-0.02	-1.25	-3.31	3.81	-0.56	3.25	-

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

### 3.5.2 Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in Math Satisfactory or Advanced

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




Figure 8: Changes in Percent of Students at Satisfactory or Advanced for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

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

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Grade 3	12.30	0.01*	2.88	21.73
Grade 4	7.36	0.17	-3.35	18.08
Grade 5	7.50	0.02*	1.30	13.70

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

### 3.5.3 Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in STAAR Math scale scores

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




Figure 9: Changes in Grade-Mean STAAR Math scale score for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

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

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Grade 3	33.61	0.06	-0.89	68.11
Grade 4	26.76	0.08	-3.79	57.31
Grade 5	23.25	0.03*	1.99	44.51

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

### 3.5.4 Grade-Level Analysis of Changes in STAAR Z-scores of scale scores

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




Figure 10: Changes in Grade-Mean STAAR Z-score (See Section 3.1) for TRT and CTRL Datasets between 2013/14 and 2015/16

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

	Estimate	P-Value	Int.Low	Int.High
Grade 3	0.56	0.05*	0.00	1.11
Grade 4	0.43	0.08	-0.06	0.91
Grade 5	0.37	0.03*	0.03	0.71

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

## 4 Effect Size

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

	Scale score Effect Size	Z-score Effect Size	Satisfactory or Advanced Effect Size
Grade 3	0.71	0.76	1.01
Grade 4	0.70	0.72	0.63
Grade 5	0.92	0.91	0.94
All Grades	0.40	0.77	0.80

Table 14: Cohen's d Effect Size

## 5 Findings Summary

Texas grades 3, 4, and 5 using ST Math for the year 2015/16 averaged 65.4% ST Math Progress. 48/58 grades (83%) averaged covering more than 50% of ST Math content. Statistically significant differences were found in this analysis for both grade-aggregated and individual grade levels. Looking at Table 7, statistically significant differences were found for grade-aggregated Z-score, with an estimate of 0.45 points favorable for the ST Math treatment set, as well as for grade-aggregated Satisfactory or Advanced proficiency levels, with a 8.9 point favorable differential for the ST Math treatment set. Further, in Table 7, grade-aggregated ST Math treatment set outperformed their matched controls at both the Satisfactory level and the Advanced level, with statistically significant differences of 3.71 and 5.19, respectively. Referring to Table 11, statistically significant differences were found for grades 3 and 5 Satisfactory or Advanced proficiency levels, with estimates of 12.3 and 7.5 respectively, in favor of the ST Math treatment set. Looking at Table 13, grades 3 and 5 ST math treatment sets outperformed their matched controls for STAAR Z-scores with statistically significant differences of 0.56 and 0.37, respectively.

## 6 Confounders

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

so the Treatment growth is not due to teacher differences. Finally, a possible confounder lies in the “business as usual” conditions at the matched control grades chosen for each analysis. It’s unknown whether these control grades used other programs that could affect the comparison of the two sets of grades. The Monte Carlo Method is used to mitigate the possibility of control picks being favorable or unfavorable (see Section 2.3).

## 7 Reference Tables Grouped By School Year

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

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Satisfactory or Advanced	ST Math Per Comp.
Grade 3 (13.14)	16	16	1628	1457.6	-0.04	50.00	70.12	17.38	12.50	29.88	-
Grade 4 (13.14)	16	16	1579	1542.6	-0.06	47.88	66.75	19.00	14.25	33.25	-
Grade 5 (13.14)	16	16	1557	1601.9	0.09	53.44	59.44	21.69	18.88	40.56	-
All Grades (13.14)	48	16	4764	1534.0	-0.01	50.44	65.44	19.35	15.21	34.56	-
Grade 3 (14.15)	16	16	1644	1474.8	0.51	66.75	50.56	30.25	19.19	49.44	76.56
Grade 4 (14.15)	16	16	1629	1561.7	0.53	67.44	59.00	20.19	20.81	41.00	78.65
Grade 5 (14.15)	16	16	1519	1610.5	0.27	59.94	56.00	25.81	18.19	44.00	81.89
All Grades (14.15)	48	16	4792	1549.0	0.44	64.71	55.19	25.42	19.40	44.81	79.03
Grade 3 (15.16)	16	16	1668	1496.0	0.61	67.81	46.00	29.75	24.25	54.00	78
Grade 4 (15.16)	16	16	1692	1573.1	0.37	62.50	55.19	21.88	22.94	44.81	73.61
Grade 5 (15.16)	16	16	1574	1631.1	0.44	65.44	48.69	29.25	22.06	51.31	74.36
All Grades (15.16)	48	16	4934	1566.8	0.47	65.25	49.96	26.96	23.08	50.04	75.32

Table 15: TRT Grades Detail Sorted by Year

	# Grades	# Schools	# Students	Scale score	Z-score	Percentile	L1	L2	L3	Satisfactory or Advanced	ST Math Per Comp.
Grade 3 (13.14)	17	17	1665	1461.6	0.02	51.82	68.53	17.18	14.29	31.47	-
Grade 4 (13.14)	15	15	1355	1543.0	-0.06	48.33	66.20	18.07	15.73	33.80	-
Grade 5 (13.14)	16	16	1632	1602.8	0.10	53.81	60.19	21.25	18.62	39.88	-
All Grades (13.14)	48	48	4652	1534.1	0.02	51.40	65.02	18.81	16.19	35.00	-
Grade 3 (14.15)	17	17	1690	1447.1	0.06	52.94	58.41	27.12	14.47	41.59	-
Grade 4 (14.15)	15	15	1242	1546.9	0.29	58.80	62.27	19.87	17.87	37.73	-
Grade 5 (14.15)	16	16	1673	1599.0	0.08	52.94	59.88	22.31	17.88	40.19	-
All Grades (14.15)	48	48	4605	1528.9	0.14	54.77	60.10	23.25	16.67	39.92	-
Grade 3 (15.16)	17	17	1751	1466.4	0.11	53.94	56.71	24.06	19.24	43.29	-
Grade 4 (15.16)	15	15	1383	1546.8	-0.05	49.07	62.00	18.67	19.33	38.00	-
Grade 5 (15.16)	16	16	1647	1608.8	0.08	52.56	56.88	25.06	18.06	43.12	-
All Grades (15.16)	48	48	4781	1539.0	0.05	51.96	58.42	22.71	18.88	41.58	-

Table 16: CTRL Grades Detail Sorted by Year



## 8 Lists of Schools

### 8.1 Treatment Schools

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

PID	IID	District	School Name	GRADE
4027634	CED5WM	KILLEEN ISD	CEDAR VALLEY EL	3, 4, 5
996459	CLI5WM	KILLEEN ISD	CLIFTON PARK EL	3, 4, 5
2128581	DUN5WM	KILLEEN ISD	DUNCAN EL	3, 4, 5
996497	HAR5WM	KILLEEN ISD	HARKER HEIGHTS	3, 4, 5
2897213	HAY5WM	KILLEEN ISD	HAY BRANCH EL	3, 4, 5
11718474	HAY5WN	KILLEEN ISD	HAYNES EL	3, 4, 5
996540	MEA5WM	KILLEEN ISD	MEADOWS EL	3, 4, 5
3051503	MOU5WM	KILLEEN ISD	MOUNTAIN VIEW E	3, 4, 5
996564	NOL5WN	KILLEEN ISD	NOLANVILLE EL	3, 4, 5
996576	PEE5WM	KILLEEN ISD	PEEBLES EL	3, 4, 5
3244700	REE5WM	KILLEEN ISD	REECES CREEK EL	3, 4, 5
11449336	RIC5WN	KILLEEN ISD	RICHARD E CAVAZ	3, 4, 5
10030736	SKI5WM	KILLEEN ISD	SKIPCHA EL	4, 5, 3
10002052	TIM5WM	KILLEEN ISD	TIMBER RIDGE EL	4, 5, 3
4806571	TRI5WM	KILLEEN ISD	TRIMMIER EL	3, 4, 5
4368799	VEN5WM	KILLEEN ISD	VENABLE VILLAGE	3, 4, 5

Table 17: Treatment Schools (TRT Dataset)

## 8.2 Control Schools

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

PID	District	School Name	GRADE
1030711	ABBOTT ISD	ABBOTT SCHOOL	5
1051844	ARLINGTON ISD	LITTLE EL	4
4869846	AUSTIN ISD	CASEY EL	4
1052044	BIRDVILLE ISD	BIRDVILLE EL	4
4033669	BREMOND ISD	BREMOND EL	3
4028169	BRIDGEPORT ISD	BRIDGEPORT INT	4
2199918	BROWNWOOD ISD	BROWNWOOD INT	5
1018866	CLEAR CREEK ISD	ED H WHITE EL	3
1523691	CLEAR CREEK ISD	P H GREENE EL	5
11559840	COMAL ISD	CLEAR SPRING EL	5
3046895	COMMUNITY ISD	MCCLENDON EL	5
1010278	DESOTO ISD	NORTHSIDE EL	4
1052422	EAGLE MT-SAGINA	L A GILLILLAND E	3
11555557	EAGLE MT-SAGINA	WILLOW CREEK EL	5
4035667	EL PASO ISD	GREEN EL	5
11449178	EL PASO ISD	TOM LEA JR EL	3
1044827	FLOUR BLUFF ISD	FLOUR BLUFF EL	3
11130652	FORNEY ISD	NELL HILL RHEA	3
1826247	FORT BEND ISD	TOWNWEST EL	3
4356617	FRENSHIP ISD	WESTWIND EL	3
1041954	GOLDTHWAITE ISD	GOLDTHWAITE EL	5
2046517	GREGORY-PORTLAN	ANDREWS EL	4
1022489	HARDIN-JEFFERSO	SOUR LAKE EL	5
1029097	HAYS CISD	KYLE EL	4
1826297	HOUSTON ISD	CODWELL EL	3
1026069	HOUSTON ISD	ROOSEVELT EL	5
4948739	KATY ISD	ROBERT KING EL	5
11452113	KLEIN ISD	MUELLER EL	4
4804377	MANSFIELD ISD	D P MORRIS EL	4
10012552	MEDINA VALLEY I	POTRANCO EL	4
10913205	NORTHSIDE ISD	DRIGGERS EL	5
1006394	PLANO ISD	DAVIS EL	4
2130182	REDWATER ISD	REDWATER MIDDLE	4
1048483	REFUGIO ISD	REFUGIO EL	3
4850900	RICHARDSON ISD	FOREST LANE ACA	3
10911001	ROCKWALL ISD	SHARON SHANNON	3
996655	ROGERS ISD	ROGERS EL	3
2856740	ROUND ROCK ISD	WELLS BRANCH EL	5
998902	SAN ANTONIO ISD	SCHENCK EL	3
2896087	SAN MARCOS CISD	DEZAVALA EL	5
1016222	SOCORRO ISD	ESCONTRIAS EL	5
1027403	SPRING BRANCH I	VALLEY OAKS EL	3
1526045	SPRING ISD	MILDRED JENKINS	4
1050503	STRATFORD ISD	STRATFORD J H	5
2846264	TYLER ISD	OWENS EL	4
1054224	WHITE SETTLEMEN	NORTH EL	3
1016545	YSLETA ISD	RAMONA EL	4
1016600	YSLETA ISD	SCOTSDALE EL	3

Table 18: Matched Control Schools (CTRL Dataset)