

Supplemental Education Services

2007-2008 Effectiveness and Customer Service Evaluation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) includes academic assistance such as tutoring and remediation designed to increase the academic achievement of students in low-performing schools which are provided outside of the regular school day. Students from low-income families who are attending Title I schools that are in their second year of school improvement, in corrective action, or in restructuring status are eligible to receive these services. The Georgia Department of Education (Department) is required to identify organizations, both public and private, that qualify to provide these services. Parents/legal guardians of eligible students are then notified by the local educational agency (LEA) that SES will be made available, and parents/legal guardians can select any approved provider that they feel will best meet their child's needs in the area served by the LEA or within a reasonable distance of that area. The LEA will sign an agreement with providers selected by parents/legal guardians, and the provider will then deliver services to the child and report on the child's progress to the parents/legal guardians and to the LEA.

The evaluation of SES in Georgia during the 2007-2008 school year was conducted by external evaluators at the University of Georgia (UGA). The analysis consisted of stakeholder surveys and the analysis of student academic achievement in order to determine the stakeholder satisfaction with SES providers and the effectiveness of SES providers. Below is the data on schools, students, and providers who participated in the SES program during 2007-2008.

School Information

- 135 schools were required to offer SES
- 126 schools had students requesting and receiving SES

Student Information

- 77,576 students were eligible for SES
- 15,320 parents/legal guardians requested SES (19.7% of eligible students)
- 9,924 students received SES (12.8% of eligible students)

Provider Information

- 99 SES providers worked with 58 school systems to offer SES to students
- Each school system worked with 1 to 30 providers
- \$8,870,563 of Title I funds were expended in 2007-2008, an average of \$894 per pupil
- 28 school systems said they would be spending SES funds during the month of June 2008

Effectiveness Evaluation

The Department is required by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 to “develop, implement, and publicly report on standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services offered by approved providers under this subsection, and for withdrawing approval from providers that fail, for two (2) consecutive years, to contribute to increasing the academic proficiency of students served under this subsection as described in subparagraph (B)”.

Six evaluation questions were posed to determine the impact of SES, however the core evaluation question is “Did more than 50 percent of the provider’s SES students score higher than their matched non-SES student on the state assessments of academic achievement (Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT), End of Course Test (EOCT), or Graduation High School Test (GHSGT))?” The other five evaluation questions are used as supporting documentation as well as other approaches of evaluating a provider’s effectiveness.

In 2007-2008, a total of 7,967 students had complete information and received at least 10 hours of SES and were included in the analyses. Most of the students receiving SES in Georgia were middle school students; this group represented 70.5 percent of all students who received SES. The lowest percentages were in the high schools (12.4%). Most of the SES students received tutoring in both reading (74.3%) and math (92.5%). Less than one-half (48.2%) of SES students received tutoring in English/language arts.

SES students were matched with students who were:

- Eligible for SES but did not participate
- Had the same state test score in the previous year
- In the same grade
- In the same special education classification
- In the same school and/or district, if possible

In looking at SES students as a whole, none of the evaluation questions can be answered in the affirmative. While SES students passed state reading and ELA tests at a higher rate than in the previous year, overall, they lagged slightly behind comparison group students in each of the measures of academic achievement. While the differences are small in most cases, they are still a concern because students were matched based on previous year test scores. Because the students had identical scores on the previous year’s state test, they can be seen as starting at the same academic level. Matching students by school, or at least by district, should remove any differences created by the school environment, making differences between matched students on the current year’s test more clearly related to the influence of SES.

In reading, 43.6 percent of SES students scored higher on state tests than their matched comparison, meaning that the criterion was not met for the first (core evaluation) question. SES students scored an average of 2.2 points lower than their matched comparison group, which was statistically significant.

In English/language arts (ELA), 44.1 percent of SES students scored higher on state tests than their matched comparison, so the core question criterion was not met in this subject. This was, however, a higher percentage than in 2006-2007 (41.5%). SES students scored an average of 1.7 points lower than their matched comparison group, which was statistically significant.

In mathematics, 46.6 percent of SES students scored higher on state tests than their matched comparison, so the core question criterion was not met in this subject as well. This was, however, a slightly higher percentage than in 2006-2007 (46.0%). SES students scored an average of 1.1 points lower than their matched comparison group, which was statistically significant.

Between one-quarter and one-third of providers in each subject area had positive results on most of the evaluation questions. A higher percentage of math providers met most of the criteria. Based on this data, 46 SES providers are on probation for the 2008-2009 school year. Of the 123 approved providers, 37.4 percent are on probation with 20 providers on probation for English/language arts, 34 for reading, and 36 for mathematics.

Customer Service Evaluation

Surveys were administered to key stakeholders through two data collection activities: 1) an end of year on-line survey of school systems offering SES to gather data on systems, schools, SES students, and providers; 2) stakeholder surveys of SES Title I Directors, providers of SES, principals, parents/legal guardians of children who had received SES, and middle and high school students who had received SES.

The purpose of the system survey was to collect data from all stakeholders and provide a statewide perspective of SES from those who had direct experience with SES in 2007-2008. These surveys were designed to gather feedback from parents/legal guardians, students, principals, and Title I Directors about SES provider compliance with NCLB legislative requirements for SES, satisfaction with quality of services provided by each provider, and perceptions of the impact of SES on student learning and achievement. Providers were asked to give feedback on SES administration by the school system.

Survey returns included responses from all Title I Directors whose systems had students served by SES providers, parent surveys representing about one-fifth of all SES students, and student surveys representing about one-third of the middle and high school SES students. Forty-four percent of the SES providers returned surveys. The majority of all stakeholders agreed with each survey statement. The Title I Directors were the most positive in their ratings. Parents/legal guardians and students also reported high levels of satisfaction with SES services. In general, providers rated school systems highly on the survey items.

Compliance

Title I Directors, parents/legal guardians, and students were all highly likely to agree that providers in general were fulfilling their obligations. Title I Directors gave the highest ratings overall; they had an agreement rate of over 90 percent on these items, compared to approximately 75 percent for parents/legal guardians and 67 percent for students. However, the surveys revealed that students and parents/legal guardians were not receiving learning plans and progress reports at a regular rate.

Satisfaction

Directors were generally satisfied with the quality of services offered to students by most of the SES providers and recommended unanimously that 83 of the 99 providers remain on the State-Approved Providers List for the 2008-2009 school year. More than three-quarters of parents/legal guardians and more than 70 percent of students agreed with each of the seven satisfaction questions.

Impact on Student Learning and Achievement

Over two-thirds of parents/legal guardians responded that their children are doing better academically after working with a provider. Over 80 percent of students reported that their grades are better since starting tutoring.

Key Issues from Provider Surveys

Over 60 percent of the providers who answered the survey said they had never had an on-site monitoring visit by an LEA. Two-thirds of the provider responses did indicate that school system personnel had reviewed SES instructional materials and provided feedback. Providers' written comments complimented the quality of the relationship between the provider and the system. Negative comments by providers focused on the burden of paperwork and procedures as well as problems with efforts by systems to promote SES to parents/legal guardians.

Next Steps

The Department has outlined several action steps that it has implemented or plans to implement in order to address concerns with the SES program. To assist parents/legal guardians in becoming informed consumers of supplemental education services, the Department will provide pertinent information in a parent-friendly format for the purpose of choosing an appropriate SES provider for their child(ren). Additionally, a report card on each provider will also be available to parents/legal guardians and districts that will provide information on the percent of the provider's students passing state tests, the percent of surveys with positive customer service feedback on the provider, and the provider's compliance rate with state standards. Furthermore, providers are held accountable for providing parents/legal guardians with progress reports on their child through the Department's Standards for Monitoring Supplemental Educational Services Providers.

To ensure that providers have all the necessary information to provide effective instruction, the Department will continue to encourage school systems to provide SES providers with student achievement data. The Department will also continue to encourage school systems to monitor the instructional practices of providers to ensure alignment with the Georgia Performance Standards.

The Department is also considering administering a survey to parents/legal guardians of eligible students who did not participate in the program to ascertain reasons for non-participation. This information will allow us to understand what barriers prohibit parents/legal guardians from enrolling their child(ren) in the supplemental education services program.

In order to more accurately assess provider effectiveness on student achievement, the Department is considering the use of a Web based, adaptive assessment that is aligned to the Georgia Performance Standards instead of the cumulative assessments currently used (CRCT, EOCT, GHS GT). The pre-test would provide detailed information on the skills that a student is not proficient in at the beginning of the services. The post-test would be used to determine if a provider was effective in increasing student achievement on the skills the student was not proficient in on the pre-test.