|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Design** |
| **Type**: Formative**Approach**: Decision-and-Accountability-Oriented **Designs**: Longitudinal, Change, Comparison, Status |

|  |
| --- |
| **Principal Interviews** |
| **Design:** Status**Type**: Pre - and- Post Evaluation**Content**: Survey questions covered understanding and views of Math-Two-A-Days (MTD) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Statistical Findings** | **Follow-up Analyses** |
| **Design:** 3 (Grade; 3rd-5th) x 3 (School; Control 1, Control 2, Experimental) x 6 (year, 2008-2014)**Results**: F(20,3581) = 1.96; p = .007, η2 = .005 |  |
| **Design:** 2 (Year, Baseline, Treatment) x 3 (School; Control 1, Control 2, Experimental) Univariate ANOVA**Results**: F(17,3581) = 13.98; p < .001, | **Design:** Onway ANOVA (Year, Baseline, Treatment) for Control School 1, Control School 2, and Experimental School**CS1 Results:** F(1, 1355) = 28.42; p < .001**CS2** **Results**: F(1,1002) = 6.61; p =.060**ES Results:** F (1, 1225) = 87.92, p < .001 |
| **Design:**2 (Year, Baseline, Treatment) x 3 (Grade, 3rd-5th) for Control School 1 and Experimental School Univariate ANOVA**CS1 Results:** F(5, 1355) = 6.47; p < .001**ES Results:** F (5, 1225) = 27.73, p < .001 | Tukey Follow up analysis showed significant differences in all grades for Experimental School and in 3rd and 4th only in Control School 1.  |
| **Design:** 2 ( Year, Baseline, Treatment) x3 (Grade; 3rd-5th) x 3 (School; Control 1, Control 2, Experimental) For kids on IEPs - Univariate ANOVA**Results:** F(4,341) = 1.70; p = .151, *nonsignificant* |  |
| **Design:** 2 ( Year, Baseline, Treatment) x 3 (School; Control 1, Control 2, Experimental) -Univariate ANOVA**Results:** F(3,3581) = 29.79; p < .001 | Tukey Follow up analysis showed significant differences between the Experimental school and both controls for the treatment years. |

Principal Interviews were conducted both prior and following the evaluation. The pre-evaluation findings were that both control school principals had head of MTD and knew it was a math fact fluency intervention; though. they varied on their understanding on the implementation of the intervention. Control School 1 knew that MTD functioned under differentiated skills by a pre-determined sequence and was conducted school-wide via the morning announcements. Meanwhile, Control School 2 reporting knowing it was a fact fluency intervention that they conduct similarly with another intervention by allowing their teachers a window to conduct within their classrooms. Obviously, the Experimental school principal knew MTD, but when asked about their assessment, it was reported as antidotal success. Post-evaluation findings were that all schools agreed with the significant difference and thus effectiveness findings of MTD. Control School 1’s principal reported supporting the intervention and would implement if the school’s mathematics state test scores school-wide if his score dropped below proficient (700.00). Control School 2 focused on explaining their limited growth in terms of teacher and student turnover and desired to fix fidelity of the current intervention. Meanwhile, the experimental school was pleased with the statistical results to support the prior antidotal determination of success. The principal plans of improving student motivation with feedback and graphing class, grade, and school-wide with rewards for reaching pre-determined goals.