



Supplemental Education Services

Annual Evaluation Report

2005-2006

Prepared by:

Helen E. Jenkins, Ed. D.

John J. Usera, Ph. D.

Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation

1641 Deadwood Avenue

Rapid City, SD 57702



Table of Contents

- Overview 3
- Methodology 4
- Findings 4
 - Interviews 4
 - Documentation 7
 - CCSSO Pilot Monitoring Process 7
 - Results 8
- Conclusion 16
- Recommendations 17

Overview

No Child Left Behind (2002) requires local education agencies (LEA) to provide supplemental education services to low income students when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement. Title I, Section 1116(e) explains that supplemental education services (SES) are “additional instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement. These services may include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions...”

South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) issues a request for proposals for agencies to provide supplemental education services. The applications are reviewed based on several criteria. The proposals must include descriptions of the program, staff, research and program effectiveness, evaluation and monitoring of students, and financial and organizational capacity. There must be evidence that the program is aligned to the state standards in reading and math.

Once the SES provider has successfully completed the request for proposal and successfully completes the review process, then the provider is placed on the DOE approved provider list. The LEA is required then to notify parents when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement and offer supplemental education services. Parents may elect to have their child participate. Upon receipt of acceptance for supplemental education services, the LEA contacts the SES providers and services are contracted for the child. The services are paid by the LEA through allocated Title I funds. The services are provided before or after school. Depending on the provider, services may be implemented in the school or home.

The purpose of this report is to provide data and information regarding the implementation of supplemental education services in South Dakota during the 2005-06 school year. For the reporting period, there were 19 providers approved in South Dakota. The providers ranged from computer-based programs to tutoring and mentoring. The Institute for Educational Leadership and

Evaluation® (IELE), a project of the Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc., was commissioned to conduct the review of the SES proposals and to monitor and evaluate the SES providers for the 2005-06 school year.

Methodology

Data regarding the SES providers was collected using a phone interview, documentation from DOE, surveys from principals, parents, and students, and the spring 2006 Dakota STEP results. A total of 12 providers responded to the phone interview. For the 2005-06 school year, 28 schools from 12 school districts were at Level II school improvement and were required to offer supplemental services to their respective students.

Findings

Interviews

The phone interview was conducted in June 2006. A phone protocol and questionnaire were created to gather information about the SES providers' implementation during the 2005-06 school year. Of the 19 providers, 12 individuals responded to the survey. In some cases, the questionnaire was faxed to the provider to allow more time to respond to the items. Six of the 12 respondents did not provide services during the 2005-06 school year. One provider conducted programming in two school districts. Of the 12 school districts required to offer services, five had students who participated with at least one of the SES providers.

SES providers reported whether or not they were contacted by schools or districts to provide services. Six of the 12 SES providers reported that they were contacted by the school or district. In addition, six providers reported that they contacted the school or district during the 2005-06 school year. An advertisement of services was disseminated by the providers in the form of fliers

and brochures. One provider reported that they met face to face with administrators and another provider commented that they held a parent meeting to inform the parents about the SES provider.

The number of students who received services ranged from two in one school to 415 in another school. The total number of students in kindergarten through 5th grade was 611 as reported by the providers. There were 400 sixth to eighth graders served, and 279 high school students received services. Services were reported to have begun in December 2005 by one provider, while other providers did not start until February and March of 2006. Three providers reported that they started services in 2001, 2003, and 2004. The last date services provided were April 2005, August 2005, June 2006, and four reported that they were continuing services.

The frequency of contact by the SES providers with the school personnel and parents was collected in the questionnaire. Based on the responses to the questionnaire, four providers made contact with school personnel on a daily basis; one provider made contact weekly; one provider made monthly contact; and one provider reported that they never made contact with the school personnel regarding student progress. Two of the providers reported that they made contact on as needed basis especially with teachers. One provider had online services available for monitoring. The providers contacted the school personnel by phone (n = 6), email (n = 5), face to face (n = 5); and written letters (n = 3).

Parent communication was completed less frequently than with the school personnel. Most of the respondents (n = 5) reported that they communicated with the parents on a monthly basis. One provider communicated daily and three communicated weekly. Two providers reported that it varied by student. Written letters or reports (n = 7) were the most used method of communication by providers to parents. Another five providers reported that they met with parents face to face. Phone calls (n = 3) and email (n = 2) were other forms of communication used by the providers. One provider commented that they used phone calls and emails only for permission for field trips.

Students were to be assessed on a regular basis by the SES providers to determine progress. The provider selected the assessment instrument and it was required to be in the initial proposal. In the questionnaire, eight of the providers indicated that they use some type of assessment to determine students' progress. The assessments included the Dakota STEP, DACS, Anywhere Learning System Adaptive Assessment, Lets Go Learn Reading Assessment, and the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement. One provider explained that they use the classroom assessments to determine student progress. Another provider did not use academic assessments, but rather used youth satisfaction surveys. The providers reported that they assess the students daily (n = 2), weekly (n = 1), monthly (n = 2), and quarterly (n = 1). Students in one program are assessed at three and nine months following entrance into the program. The annual Dakota STEP is the only measure for one of the providers.

Eight of the SES providers rated their level of satisfaction with working with South Dakota school districts. Three providers reported that they were very satisfied with working with the school districts. Three more providers were satisfied with the experience. Two providers reported that they were neutral. No provider indicated that they were dissatisfied with the school districts.

Seven of the providers rated their level of satisfaction with working with the South Dakota Department of Education. Six providers reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with DOE. One provider reported being neutral toward the work. No provider stated that they were dissatisfied with DOE.

At the conclusion of the questionnaire, providers were given the opportunity to add any additional comments. Three providers included additional comments. One provider believes that two years of programming is not long enough to evaluate the effectiveness. Another provider wants to provide services but is never contacted by eligible LEAs. The third provider wants to begin working with students before December.

Documentation

The South Dakota Department of Education monitored the schools and districts for meeting the requirements for supplemental education services. The schools were required to notify their students' parents of their school improvement status and offer supplemental services. According to the documentation that the DOE received from the schools, 20 of the 28 schools that were in Level II school improvement sent letters to the parents. In 18 of the letters, the dates ranged from August 19 to December 2005. Two of the letters were not dated. Eleven of the letters stated that a list of providers was included in the letter. The letters were required to have a date to respond for services. In 13 of the letters there was a date to respond for services. The schools provided the parents between two weeks and one month to respond to the letter. One school offered a parent information night in their letter.

CCSSO Pilot Monitoring Process

Dr. Al Kosters was hired by the South Dakota Department of Education to pilot a monitoring process for supplemental education services. The monitoring process was developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and was piloted in five states. The monitoring process includes forms to monitor SES providers through feedback from the SES providers, LEA, principal, teacher, parent, and student. In South Dakota, three school districts were selected to participate in the pilot monitoring. Two school districts had one school each and one school district had four schools that were monitored during the 2005-06 school year.

One school reported using an online web-based reading program, **Failure Free**, as the SES provider. A total of 29 students were enrolled in the program that occurred in the school's computer laboratory. The LEA representative, principal and parents were all satisfied with the program. The only recommendation was that the SES provider keep the teachers updated on the assessment of the students.

A second school reported using two different SES providers - **Excel Achievement Center** and **A-Z Tutoring**. Two students were driven by their parents to the **Excel Achievement Center** in a nearby city and seven were tutored at the school by **A-Z Tutoring**. The school personnel and parents determined that **A-Z Tutoring** was a success. The factor that contributed to its perceived success was the individual who was hired to administer the program.

The **Excel Achievement Center** was attended by the two students in the previously mentioned school as well as 27 students from the one district with four schools in Level II school improvement. Principals, parents, and students reported being satisfied with the SES provider. There was evidence that the staff was highly qualified. However, there were concerns regarding the lack of communication between the provider and the school. In addition, it was stated that **Excel** did not provide transportation which was a hindrance for the students.

Other providers that were used were **Plato**, **HOSTS Learning**, the **Skills Center** which is a program of Lutheran Social Services and the **Summer Reading Adventure Camp** which is a program of the Washington Pavilion. Feedback regarding the **Skills Center** was the issue of billing for students who were not attending. Another issue was attendance in the programs. There was a recommendation to monitor attendance more closely. One of the positives for the **Skills Center** was that they maintained good communication with the students' teachers and provided progress reports.

Results

Data was collected by the South Dakota Department of Education on 227 students during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years. Students who were enrolled in any SES provider's program were tracked using their Student Identification Membership number (SIMS). Data included assessment scores from the Dakota STEP state assessment and the providers' assessments. In the 2005-2006 school year, data was collected on 227 students from 11 schools. Table 1.0 shows the distribution of students by grade level and school.

Table 1.0									
Distribution of Students Receiving Supplemental Education Services									
2005-2006									
	Kdg	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	NA	Total
Andes Central	3	1	8	5	7	4	3	0	31
Anne Sullivan	13	6	5	4	7	6	0	3	44
Canton Elementary	0	0	1	1	2	5	0	0	9
General Beadle	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Hawthorne	5	1	5	3	1	4	0	36	55
LBA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Longfellow	4	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	12
Todd County Middle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Wagner Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	27
Wakpala Elementary	0	1	3	11	2	1	0	13	31
Shannon County	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	7
TOTAL	25	11	26	30	25	21	3	84	225

Table 2.0 shows the distribution of students by the service provider. Most students (25.0%;n =37) were involved with Summer Reads. Another 31 students were involved with Failure Free Reading.

Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2005-2006

	A to Z	Babbage	Black Hills	Club Z	Discovery Centers	Excel	Failure Free	Total					
			Black Hills Special	Club Z	Discovery Centers	Excel	Failure Free	Total					
			Black Hills Special	Club Z	Discovery Centers	Excel	Failure Free	Total					
Andes Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	31	
Anne Sullivan	1	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	6	26	0	44	
Canton Elementary	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	
General Beadle	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Hawthorne	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9	11	33	55	
LBA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Longfellow	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	0	12	
Todd County Middle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	
Wagner Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	27	
Wakpala Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	13	31	
Shannon County	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
TOTAL	8	1	6	2	2	22	18	31	21	37	78	226	

Table 3.0 shows that 40.9% of the students were White/Caucasian and 36.9% were American Indian. In addition, 48.3% of the students (n = 72) were female and 51.0% (n = 76) were male. Students with disabilities and on an Individualized Education Plan for special education accounted for 32.9% (n = 49) of the students.

Table 3.0							
Distribution of Students by Ethnicity							
2005-2006							
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	25	6	0	31
Anne Sullivan	1	4	9	3	27	0	44
Canton Elementary	0	1	0	0	8	0	9
General Beadle	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
Hawthorne	0	7	2	3	10	33	55
LBA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Longfellow	0	3	4	1	4	0	12
Todd County Middle	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Wagner Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
Wakpala Elementary	0	0	0	16	2	13	31
Shannon County	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
TOTAL	1	15	16	55	61	79	227

The Dakota STEP results were used as an annual comparison of student progress. Students in grades three through eight, and grade 11 are tested in the spring of each year. Students who are in kindergarten through second grade were not tested. Table 4.0 shows the distribution of students by their proficiency

level in both reading and math for the spring 2005 Dakota STEP. The purpose of the SES is to provide additional academic support so that students will score at the proficient or advanced levels on the Dakota STEP. As seen in the table, 61.9% of the students who received SES during the 2005-2006 school year and completed the Dakota STEP (n = 84) scored at the proficient and advanced levels in reading. For the math portion of the Dakota STEP, 39 of the 84 students assessed were in the proficient and advanced levels. No students scored at the below basic level in reading or math.

Table 4.0
Distribution of Students' Dakota STEP Results by School
2005-2006

	Reading				Math		
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic		Advanced	Proficient	Basic
Andes Central	0	11	8		0	11	8
Anne Sullivan	2	9	7		1	6	11
Canton Elementary	0	5	3		0	3	5
General Beadle	0	0	2		0	0	2
Hawthorne	4	4	2		3	3	4
LBA	1	0	0		0	1	0
Longfellow	0	3	1		0	2	2
Todd County Middle	0	0	0		0	0	0
Wagner Junior High	0	0	0		0	0	0
Wakpala Elementary	0	9	5		0	7	7
Shannon County	0	4	3		0	2	5
TOTAL	7	45	31		4	35	44

When the data was compared by service provider, the results showed that the Summer Reads program had 80.0% of their students who were tested in the proficient and advanced levels in reading. The Failure Free Reading program had 57.9% of their students at the proficient and advanced levels in math. Table 5.0 shows the results for each program.

Table 5.0									
Distribution of Students' Dakota STEP Results by SES Provider									
2005-2006									
	Reading					Math			
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	% P & A		Advanced	Proficient	Basic	% P & A
A to Z	0	4	3	57.1%		0	2	5	28.6%
Babbage	0	0	1	0.0%		0	0	1	0.0%
Black Hills Special Services	0	4	2	66.7%		0	2	4	33.3%
Club Z	0	0	1	0.0%		0	0	1	0.0%
Discovery Centers	0	0	1	0.0%		0	0	1	0.0%
Excel	2	5	2	77.8%		1	4	4	55.6%
Failure Free	0	9	5	64.3%		0	7	7	50.0%
Failure Free Reading	0	11	8	57.9%		0	11	8	57.9%
Lutheran Social Services	1	4	5	50.0%		1	3	6	40.0%
Summer Reads	4	8	3	80.0%		2	6	7	53.3%
TOTAL	7	45	31	62.7%		4	35	44	47.0%

Student data from the spring 2004 Dakota STEP was also collected and analyzed. Table 6.0 shows the results by school for those students who received services in 2005. One student did score below basic in reading. Overall, 61.3% of the students scored proficient and advanced in reading and 53.6% scored the same in math.

A t-test was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the spring 2004 and spring 2005 Dakota STEP results. The t-test could not be used for the math as the math portion of the test had changed between the two years. The reading results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the spring 2004 and spring 2005 results ($t = 0.69$; $p < 0.493$).

Table 6.0							
Distribution of Students' Dakota STEP Results by School							
2004-2005							
	Reading				Math		
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic		Advanced	Proficient	Basic
Andes Central	0	7	7		0	10	4
Anne Sullivan	4	2	8		4	4	6
Canton Elementary	0	4	4		0	4	4
General Beadle	0	1	0		0	0	1
Hawthorne	2	24	8		2	21	11
LBA	0	1	0		0	1	0
Longfellow	0	2	0		0	1	1
Todd County Middle	0	2	3		0	0	5
Wagner Junior High	2	9	6		1	4	12
Wakpala Elementary	0	8	4		1	6	6
Shannon County	0	0	3		0	1	2
TOTAL	8	60	43		8	52	52

Data regarding the specifics of the service provided was collected in 2005-2006. The number of hours and sessions that a student participates depends on the attendance of the student, the requirements of the provider, and the location of the services. Students participated in an average of 22.2 sessions with minimum number of sessions being 1.0 and the maximum being 54.0 sessions. Table 7.0 shows the descriptive statistics for the sessions.

Table 7.0 Number of Sessions Served by Providers to Students					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1.0	54.0	23.0

Parent contact is mandatory for the SES providers. In 2005-2006, parent contacts were made an average 6.7 times. The most parent contacts made was 25. Table 8.0 shows the statistics for parent contacts.

Table 8.0 Number of Parent Contacts					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1.0	54.0	23.0

Table 9.0 shows the cost comparison for serving students. The average per pupil cost was \$28.75 and the average total cost to the school was \$638.10 for all students.

Table 9.0 Costs to Serve Students 2005-2006				
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
Per Pupil	\$28.75	\$25.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Total Cost to School	\$638.10	\$30.00	\$1,445.00	\$660.00

Conclusion

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services providers for the 2005-2006 school year. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine:

1. Do the schools and school district in Level II school improvement provide parents the opportunity to enroll their children in supplemental education services?
2. Are supplemental education service providers implementing their programs in the South Dakota schools and districts?
3. How effective are the supplemental education services in South Dakota schools and districts?

Using data collected through interviews, surveys, documentation, and assessment results, the aforementioned questions can be answered. According to the documentation provided to the DOE, 20 of the 28 schools in Level II school improvement sent letters to the parents with information regarding supplemental education services. Eleven of the 28 schools included information about SES providers with the letter. One school sent the letter in December 2005, while most of the schools sent out their letters in August and September 2005.

Twelve of the 19 SES providers answered a questionnaire by phone or fax regarding the amount of implementation in South Dakota schools. Six of the SES providers reported that they had contracts with schools. SES providers reported serving 2,270 students in South Dakota. Six of eight providers reported that they make contact with school personnel daily, weekly, or monthly. Parent contact was made daily, weekly, or monthly as reported by nine providers. Six of eight providers reported being satisfied with working with South Dakota school districts.

Another data source was the CCSSO pilot monitoring process. Interviews and site visits with students, parents, school personnel, and SES providers were conducted in four sites. The results showed that most of the individuals were

satisfied with the programming that had been occurring. Some individuals reported that they had evidence that the SES provider was helping the student. However, communication between the school and provider was a needed improvement for the 2006-2007 school year.

Data was collected through the Department of Education regarding the demographics of students served, assessment data, and service data. The names of students who received services were submitted by the school districts directly to the state. The number of students did not match with the number of students that the service providers reported.

According to the school district data, a total of 225 students were served in 11 schools in South Dakota in 2005-2006. The students ranged in grade level from kindergarten to sixth grade. More than 100 students ($n = 139$) received an average of 22.2 sessions with the service provider. The cost per pupil averaged \$28.75 and the total cost to the school for all students ranged from \$30.00 to \$1,445.00.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed for the participating students. Results from the spring 2004 and spring 2005 Dakota STEP were compiled and a t-test showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the standard scores from 2004 to 2005 in the area of reading ($t = 0.69$; $p < 0.493$). Each provider used their own assessment to conduct pre and post testing. However, the data was unable to be used as there was no standard for scoring established across all service providers. Still, the service providers reported that 57 of the 69 students (82.6%) they reported on had successfully completed the program as they had defined the criteria.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this report, the external evaluator is proposing the following recommendations to be considered for the 2006-2007 school year:

- Expand the monitoring process to all schools, parents, students, and SES providers to ensure a broader evaluation.

- Increase compliance monitoring in the schools' dissemination of SES notification letters and SES providers list.
- Require service providers to utilize the same assessment for pre and post testing as the current method does not allow for comparison of results. Only the Dakota STEP can be used a valid determination of progress.
- In order to maintain an accurate data base of students receiving services, supplemental education service providers should submit their rosters and enrollment directly to the Department of Education.