Relative Performance (Z-Scores) of Students on 2009 FCAT Reading 2010 FCAT Reading,
by Free/Reduced Lunch Characteristics

| On Free/Reduced Lunch Both Years |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Mean Z-Score |  |  |
| Grade Level in 2009 <br> to Grade Level in <br> 2010 | 2009 | 2010 | Number of <br> Students in <br> Group |
| Grade 3 to Grade 4 | -0.30 | -0.29 | 96,924 |
| Grade 4 to Grade 5 | -0.30 | -0.30 | 95,494 |
| Grade 5 to Grade 6 | -0.31 | -0.32 | 90,364 |
| Grade 6 to Grade 7 | -0.32 | -0.31 | 88,803 |
| Grade 7 to Grade 8 | -0.32 | -0.31 | 82,594 |
| Grade 8 to Grade 9 | -0.34 | -0.33 | 75,604 |
| Grade 9 to Grade 10 | -0.35 | -0.37 | 61,185 |


| Not on Free/Reduced Lunch Both Years |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Mean Z-Score |  |  |
| Grade Level in 2009 <br> to Grade Level in <br> 2010 | 2009 | 2010 | Students in <br> Group |
| Grade 3 to Grade 4 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 67,324 |
| Grade 4 to Grade 5 | 0.43 | 0.42 | 69,080 |
| Grade 5 to Grade 6 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 68,294 |
| Grade 6 to Grade 7 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 72,416 |
| Grade 7 to Grade 8 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 74,522 |
| Grade 8 to Grade 9 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 76,252 |
| Grade 9 to Grade 10 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 83,068 |

Not on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in 2009; On
Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in 2010

| Free/Reduced Priced |  |  | Mean Z-Score |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade Level in 2009 <br> to Grade Level in <br> 2010 |  |  | Number of <br> Students in <br> Group |  |  |
| Grade 3 to Grade 4 | -0.03 | 0.00 | 12,384 |  |  |
| Grade 4 to Grade 5 | -0.05 | -0.01 | 11,977 |  |  |
| Grade 5 to Grade 6 | -0.04 | -0.03 | 12,442 |  |  |
| Grade 6 to Grade 7 | -0.09 | -0.06 | 12,408 |  |  |
| Grade 7 to Grade 8 | -0.12 | -0.11 | 12,724 |  |  |
| Grade 8 to Grade 9 | -0.10 | -0.10 | 12,484 |  |  |
| Grade 9 to Grade 10 | -0.21 | -0.21 | 13,301 |  |  |

Students who were on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in both years performed similarly in both 2009 and 2010 on FCAT Reading, relative to the distribution of scores, in each grade level.
Students who were not on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in both years performed similarly in both 2009 and 2010 on FCAT
Reading, relative to the distribution of scores, in each grade level.
Students who were not on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in 2009, but on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in 2010 performed similarly in both 2009 and 2010 on FCAT Reading, relative to the distribution of scores, in most grade levels
The exceptions are:

When the students were on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch in 2010, they actually performed better (relative to the distribution of scores) in Grades 4, 5, and 7, then they did in 2009 when they were not on Free/Reduced Priced Lunch and in Grades 3, 4, and 6 , respectively.

