

Supplemental Educational Services
2008-2009 Evaluation of Provider Effectiveness and Customer Service Satisfaction

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 state directed are eligible to receive these services.

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) 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 2008-2009 school year was conducted by external evaluators at the College of Education at the University of Georgia (UGA). The evaluation consisted of an analysis of student academic achievement to determine the effectiveness of SES providers as well as stakeholder surveys to determine customer satisfaction with SES providers. Below is the data on schools, students, and providers who participated in the SES program during 2008-2009:

Number of systems with SES students	67
Number of schools required to offer SES	176
Number of schools with SES students	173
Number of students eligible for SES	34,421
Number of parents requesting SES	17,818 (51.8% of eligible)
Number of students receiving SES	12,379 (36% of eligible)
Number of students receiving at least 10 hours of SES	8,875
Number of providers with SES students	88
Amount of Title I funds expended for SES	\$12,584,287
Average per-pupil expenditures	\$1,017

Georgia Department of Education

Effectiveness Evaluation

GaDOE is required by the Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act of 1965 (ESEA) 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 questions¹ are used as supporting documentation as well as other approaches of evaluating a provider’s effectiveness.

In 2008-2009, a total of 8,875 students had complete information, 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 65.1 percent of all students who received SES. The lowest percentages were in the elementary grades (15.5%). Most of the SES students received tutoring in both reading (66.8%) and math (92.7%). Less than one-half (42.3%) 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, only question 2 can be answered in the affirmative. SES students passed state tests at a higher rate than comparison group students in all three subject areas. This is a new and promising result, considering that the goal of the program is to improve academic achievement as measured by state tests.

¹ The six evaluation questions are:

1. 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 (CRCT, EOCT, and/or GHSGT)? (Core evaluation question)
2. Did the provider have a larger percentage of SES students who met or exceeded the standard for state assessments than the non-SES comparison group?
3. Did the provider have a larger percentage of SES students moving to a higher performance level on the CRCT than the non-SES comparison group?
4. Was the average scaled score for the provider’s SES students on state assessments higher than the non-SES comparison group?
5. If the answer to Question 4 was “yes,” was the difference meaningful based on an effect size of at least .2?
6. Did the provider’s SES students achieve proficiency on state assessments at a higher rate than all Title I students in Georgia who were eligible for SES but did not participate?

Georgia Department of Education

In reading, 42.2 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 2.4 points lower on state tests, which was not statistically significant. Although SES students passed reading tests at a significantly higher rate than comparison group students, a significantly larger percentage of comparison group students moved to a higher level on the CRCT, and there is still a gap in pass rates when comparing SES students to all nonparticipating SES-eligible students.

In English/language arts, 41.3 percent of SES students scored higher on state tests than their matched comparison, so the core question criterion was not met in this subject either. However, as with reading, a higher percentage of SES students passed state tests. SES students still scored an average of 2.4 points lower, but this difference was not statistically significant. A larger percentage of comparison group students moved to a higher level on the CRCT, and this difference was statistically significant. There is a large gap in pass rates when comparing SES students to all SES-eligible students, but this gap has narrowed from the previous year.

In math, the results are more positive, even though the core question criterion was not met; 44.9 percent of SES students scored higher on state tests than their matched comparison. This was a slightly lower percentage than in 2007-2008. However, a much higher percentage of SES students passed the state tests in math (59.7%) than of comparison group students (46.2%). The difference between groups on average scale score on state tests was less than half of one point, and the percentage of students moving to a higher level on the CRCT was virtually identical for the two groups. There is a small gap in pass rates when comparing SES students to all SES eligible students, but it shrank compared to the previous year.

Between one-fifth and one-third of providers in each subject area had positive responses to most of the evaluation questions. A majority of providers met the criterion for question 2, which was a considerable increase from the previous year. A higher percentage of math providers met most of the standards, with question 6 being the exception. The smallest percentage of providers met the criterion for question 1 in each subject. This presents a problem for providers, considering that question 1 is the key indicator of provider impact and failure to meet this criterion may result in probation or removal from the State-Approved Providers List.

A large majority of providers met at least one of the criteria in all subjects, a clear improvement over the previous year. About two-thirds of math providers and about half of reading and ELA providers met more than one criterion. Math was the only subject area in which some providers (6) met the criteria on all six questions. Based on the data from the 2008-2009 school year, 30 providers have been placed on probation and 18 have been placed on intensive review for the 2009-2010 school year. Of the 65 active providers, 46.2 percent are on probation in at least one subject and 27.7 percent are on intensive review for at least one subject.

Georgia Department of Education

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; and 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 2008-2009. These surveys were designed to gather feedback from parents/legal guardians, students, principals, and Title I Directors about SES provider compliance with ESEA 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 Title I Directors responses from 61 of the 67 (91%) whose systems had students served by SES providers. Parent surveys represented about 21 percent of all SES students and student surveys represented 34.3 percent of the middle and high school SES students. Seventy-one percent of the SES providers returned surveys.

Title I Directors, parents, and students were all highly likely to agree that providers in general were fulfilling their obligations. Title I Directors gave the highest ratings overall. In fact, on the two categories in which all three groups contributed, Title I Directors gave higher ratings than parents and students. The difference was largest on the items of provider compliance with regulations and provider service delivery of their program; Title I Directors had an agreement rate of over ninety percent on these items, compared to about three-quarters for parents and two-thirds for students. Parents and students were in general agreement about providers, with a majority agreeing with most of the statements. Both groups had their highest ratings for satisfaction of a provider's program. However, students gave providers much higher ratings for perceptions of the impact of SES on student learning and achievement than did the parents.

The overwhelming majority of provider responses were positive in terms of satisfaction with the level of communication with school system personnel (92.6%) and the working relationship between provider and school system (95.9%).

SES Provider Report Cards

SES provider report cards are available on the GaDOE Web site. These provider report cards present 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 as determined through annual state monitoring. Report cards are currently available for the following school years: 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009. School districts are encouraged to share these report cards with their parents in order to provide parents with additional information on selecting a provider for their child's academic needs.