

Supplemental Education Services Annual Evaluation Report 2009-2010



Prepared by:

John J. Usera, Ph. D.
Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation®
Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc.
1641 Deadwood Avenue
Rapid City, SD 57702



Table of Contents

Introduction 3

Guiding Questions for Evaluating SES Providers 5

Methodology 6

 Effectiveness Measures 6

 Customer Satisfaction Measures 7

Findings 7

 Demographic Profile 7

 Monitoring 24

 Principal Questionnaire Results 25

 Classroom Teacher Questionnaire Results 27

 Parent Questionnaire Results 29

 District SES Administrator Results 32

 SES Provider Feedback 35

Conclusion 37

Recommendations 39

South Dakota Department of Education Supplemental Educational Services Annual Evaluation Report ■ 2009-10

Introduction

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) are additional, free, academic instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). NCLB 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...”

Supplemental educational services are provided outside of the regular school day to increase student achievement and may include assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other academic interventions. Parents of eligible students may obtain these services from their child free of charge from an approved SES provider of their choice. The South Dakota Department of Education are responsible for approving SES providers and providing local districts with a list of the approved providers serving the area.¹

South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) issued a request for proposals for agencies to provide supplemental education services (Appendix A) due on April 9, 2009.

¹ U.S. Department of Education (2007). *Giving parents options: Strategies for informing parents and implementing public school choice and supplemental education services under no child left behind*. Washington, D.C.: Author, Office of Innovation and Improvement.

The proposals were reviewed by a team of educators on April 23 and 24. The applications were reviewed based on several criteria. These included a description of the program, staffing, research and program effectiveness, assessment and monitoring of students, and financial and organizational capacity. The provider was asked to show evidence that the program is aligned to the state standards in the areas of reading and mathematics.

Once the SES provider had successfully completed the request for proposal and successfully completed the review process, then the provider was placed on the DOE approved provider list. The local educational agency (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 2009-10 school year. For the reporting period, there were 11 authorized providers in South Dakota that made their services available to 1,249 students residing in 11 school districts. The providers ranged from computer-based programs to face-to-face 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 2009-10 school year.

Guiding Questions For Evaluating SES Providers

To effectively monitor SES providers, the South Dakota Department of Education in collaboration with the Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation, develop a set of guiding questions and protocol to measure the impact of the SES provider's services. The guiding questions for evaluating supplemental educational service providers were aligned with Center on Innovation & Improvement suggested strategies.² There were three major questions asked:

1. Did the provider increase student achievement in reading, language arts, and mathematics? [Effectiveness]
2. Are parents of students who receive SES satisfied? [Satisfaction]
3. Did the provider comply with applicable South Dakota and district laws and contractual procedures associated with the delivery of SES? [Compliance]

The providers were informed of the expectation to demonstrate effectiveness of their respective programs in serving all types of students including English language learners (ELL) and students with special needs and disabilities. Depending upon the specific locations, delivery methodologies, and resources, the providers were expected to provide information and data about:

1. Tutors' experience and qualifications;
2. The amount of tutoring time students received;
3. The individualized instructional strategies used;
4. Instructor to student ratios and grouping formats;
5. Communication protocols with parents and teachers;
6. Promised transportation of students to and from tutoring; and
7. Promised materials and support systems for the students.

² Harmon, J., Ross, S. & Potter, A. (2006). *Evaluating supplemental educational service providers: Suggested strategies for states*. 2nd Edition. Lincoln, IL: Center for Innovation & Improvement.

Methodology

Effectiveness Measures

Measures of impact on student academic achievement are critical to a state's evaluation of SES providers. This is especially true because the No Child Left Behind Act requires that, a minimum, states remove providers from their approved list if the provider fails to increase students' achievement for two consecutive years.³ Data was collected using the Dakota Step to measure annual progress in the areas of reading and mathematics in addition to supplementary individualized assessments, and provider developed assessments to document improved academic achievement.

Many of the providers used pretest and posttest scores to measure changes in student's achievement. The pretest scores served as a guide for developing individualized instructional strategies by the many of the providers. In some case the pretest was used as a diagnostic or screening tool to determine what level and components of instruction were need by the individual student. The validity and reliability of supplementary individualized assessments were monitored and substantiated by the providers when requested. Some of the supplementary assessments were administered at the school site, but in the majority of the cases it was administered during the tutoring period of instruction both on-line and face-to-face.

Provider developed assessments to measure student progress were used in conjunction with specific curriculum materials. The objectivity and validity of the scores could be compromised when the providers themselves were asked to administer and score the tests that would be used to judge the effectiveness of their inventions. For many of the providers, these tests served a diagnostic and formative role rather than a true assessment of achievement.

³ U.S. Department of Education (2006). Supplemental educational services non-regulatory guidance. Washington, DC: Author.

Customer Satisfaction Measures

Parents, families, and students are SES providers' most important customers. Teachers and school administrators were viewed as passive customers of the SES providers. For the school it was important that program was satisfactory or excellent in helping students receive quality services. To collect information on customer satisfaction regarding the SES providers the **Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS)**, a web-based Survey Monkey system, was designed and implemented by South Dakota Department of Education. The CAS included a District Administrator Survey, a SES Provider Survey, a Teacher Survey, a Principal Survey, and a Parent Survey.

All the providers and the schools were contacted to complete the CAS surveys and provide documentation and logs regarding the students served. Field monitors reported the quality and status of the implementation of services by the providers.

Findings

Demographic Profile

Data was collected by the South Dakota Department of Education on 1,049 students during the 2008-09 school year. In 2009-10 school year, data was available for 1,249 students. This was an increase of 19.1% in the number students enrolled in any available SES program from the previous year. 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 2009-10 school year, data was collected from 37 schools located in 11 school districts.

Table 1.0 shows the distribution of reports and surveys returned to the South Dakota Department of Education. There were 7,615 eligible students from the reporting school districts for supplemental educational services. One thousand forty-nine (n = 1,249) students enrolled in SES during the 2009-10 school year or 16.4% of the eligible students used the services. In 2008-09 school year 1,049 students participated in SES out of 7,403

eligible students or 14.2% of the eligible students. This was a difference of 2.2% or a 15.4 percent change of in the number of students served in this two year period (2008 to 2010).

White River School District had the highest rate of participation at 32.2% (n = 88) followed by Sioux Falls District at 28.8% (n =455) and Oelrichs School District at 25.0% (n =8). The largest number of students served were in Sioux Falls School District (n = 455) and Rapid City School District (n = 415). There were three school districts (Bennett County Smee, and Shannon County) who reported serving no students during the 2009–10 school year.

For 2009-10, a total of 75 classroom teachers completed a survey regarding SES, while 25 principals completed a survey. This was approximately the same number of respondents for both groups as in 2008-09. In the previous year 74 teachers and 22 principals completed the SES survey. In 2009-10,18 parents completed a survey as compared to 43 parents from the previous year. The questionnaires asked questions about the delivery and quality of services from the provider and the participating schools.

Table 2.0 shows the number of students served by nine of the providers used by school site. **Club Z** reported the highest use by the participating students at 28.0% (n = 199). This was a from the previous year in which Club Z was used by 160 of the students. **TutorCo** had the lowest use rate for 2007-08 at less than 1% (0.02%, n = 14). Tutorial Services had the second highest use rate by the students at 17.3% (n = 123). The third high use rate was Sylvan Learning Center at 13.1% (n = 93). Sioux Falls School District used the largest number of providers, 6 out of the 9 (66.7%) being reported. Six of the 12 (50.0%) reporting schools used only one provider for the year.

Table 1.0 Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education 2009-2010									
District	SES District Adm	Principal Survey	Teacher Survey	Parent Survey	Average Number of Providers Used Per District	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Number of Students Not Using SES	Percent Served
Andes Central	0	0	0	0	2	154	16	138	10.4%
Belle Fourche	1	0	0	0	2	164	4	160	2.4%
Bennett County	1	1	0	0	1	58	22	0	0.0%
McLaughlin	3	2	0	0	1	320	33	287	10.3%
Oelrichs	1	0	0	0	1	32	8	24	25.0%
Sisseton	0	0	0	0	1	312	47	265	15.1%
Rapid City	3	8	11	9	7	2,104	415	1,689	19.7%
Sioux Falls	1	9	49	7	7	1,578	455	1,123	28.8%
Todd County	4	2	5	1	3	1,918	153	1,765	8.0%
White River	2	1	15	0	1	273	88	185	32.2%
Smee	3	1	0	0	0	201	0	201	0.0%
Shannon County	2	1	0	0	0	231	0	231	0.0%
Watertown	3	0	2	1	3	270	8	262	3.0%
TOTAL	24	25	82	18	2.2	7,615	1,249	6,366	16.4%

Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2009-2010

District	Academia	Babbage	Club Z	Failure Free	Excel Achieve Center	Achieve High Points	Olaudah SES Program	Sylvan Learning Center	Academy of Learning	Tutorial Services	Total
Andes Central										5	5
Bennet County		28									28
Belle Fourche		1									1
McLaughlin	84										84
Oelrichs										8	8
Rapid City	71	4	36	59		27		150		118	465
Shannon County											0
Sisseton									47	5	52
Sioux Falls		4	131		17	1		216		98	467
Smee											0
Todd County	183	14								35	232
Watertown		1				1				3	5
White River	103										103
Lake Andes	11										11
Total	452	52	167	59	17	29	0	366	47	272	1461

In 2009-2010, 31.6% of the students were White and 43.3% were American Indian. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls and Rapid City, while the majority of sites report at least two different ethnic groups (Table 3.1). Andes Central, Bennett County, and White River reported high numbers of American Indian students due to their location on or near an Indian Reservation. In addition, 47.1% of the students (n = 588) were female and 52.9% (n = 660) were male. One in five students (21.5%, n = 268) had disabilities and 33.6% (n = 314) were identified as special education students.

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	1	0	13	2	0	16
Belle Fourche	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Bennett County	1	0	1	7	13	0	22
McLaughlin	0	0	0	32	1	0	33
Oelrichs	0	0	0	7	1	0	8
Rapid City	5	16	16	192	186	0	415
Sioux Falls	18	149	104	39	145	0	455
Sisseton	0	0	0	37	10	0	47
Todd County	0	0	0	143	10	0	153
Watertown	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
White River	1	0	0	69	17	1	88
TOTAL	25	166	121	541	395	1	1,249
Percent	2.0%	13.3%	9.7%	43.3%	31.6%	0.1%	100.0%

Table 3.2 Distribution of Students by Ethnicity & School District 2008-2009							
School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	1	0	15	1	11	28
Oelrichs	0	0	0	18	3	24	45
Sisseton	0	0	0	1	3	4	8
Sioux Falls	4	57	48	15	81	239	444
Todd County	0	0	0	53	0	8	61
Watertown	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
TOTAL	4	58	48	102	92	286	590
Percent	0.7%	9.8%	8.1%	17.3%	15.6%	48.5%	100.0%

In 2008-09 (Table 3.2), 15.6% of the identified students were White and 17.3% were American Indian. Almost half of the students (48.5%) did not report their ethnicity in this reporting year. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls, while the majority of sites report less than three different ethnic groups. Over half of the students reported their gender (51.4%, n = 290). Of these students, 46.6% (n = 135) were female and 53.5% (n = 155) were male.

Table 3.3 shows the reported number of students with limited English language proficiency (ELL) or special education (IEP). One in five students (19.8%) served in 2008-09 were identified in one of these categories. The largest ethnic group of students served were the White students (25.6%) and the American Indian students (21.4%). Sioux Falls School District served the largest percent of students in these two groups (81.2%)

Table 3.3
Distribution of Students with IEP or ELL By Ethnicity & School District
2008-09

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Oelrichs	0	0	0	6	1	0	7
Sioux Falls	0	39	23	5	28	0	95
Sisseton	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Todd County	0	0	0	11	0	0	11
Watertown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	39	23	25	30	0	117
Percent	0.0%	33.3%	19.7%	21.4%	25.6%	0.0%	100.0%

Table 3.4
Distribution of Students With Disabilities By Ethnicity & School District
2009- 2010

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Belle Fourche	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Bennett County	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Mclaughlin	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
Oelrichs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rapid City	1	4	3	35	47	0	90
Sioux Falls	3	29	17	16	47	0	112
Sisseton	0	0	0	9	4	0	13
Todd County	0	0	0	21	0	0	21
Watertown	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
White River	0	0	0	13	4	1	18
TOTAL	4	33	20	104	107	1	269
Percent	1.5%	12.3%	7.4%	38.7%	39.8%	0.4%	100.0%

Table 3.4 shows the reported number and percentage of students with disabilities served by SES in 2009-10. One in five students (21.5%, n = 269) were reported to have some type of disability. Sioux Falls served the largest percent of the disabled students (41.6%, n = 112) while Rapid City had the next highest group at 33.5% (n = 90). White students (39.8% and American Indian students (38.7%) were identified as the ethnic groups with the largest number of students with disabilities served through SES.

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 4.1 shows the two-year descriptive statistics of the students' reading scores by school districts. Table 5.1 shows two-year descriptive statistics of the students' mathematics scores by school districts. A measurable outcome of students participating in SES is to provide additional academic support so that students which will contribute to improved *Dakota STEP* scores from year to year.

The *Dakota STEP* is South Dakota's annual statewide assessment of student progress. It is administered to students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 for Reading and Mathematics, grades 5, 8, and 11 for Science, each spring. The *Dakota STEP* fulfills the requirements for statewide assessment contained in the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). The assessment instruments are composed of multiple-choice items for all content domains and grades. All operational (core) multiple-choice items are worth one raw score point and are the basis of student scores. All students are assessed with the same operational items for each content domain. Linking (anchor or equating) items are operational items used to link the current assessment to the previous year's score scale, and are included in the count of core items.

Table 4.1
Dakota STEP Scaled Reading Scores by School District
SES Participants' Reading Scores

School District	2008-09				2009-10				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (M)	Median (Md)	% Md Change
Andes Central	13	600.4	30.2	594	9	594.6	19.0	591	-6	-3	-0.5%
Belle Fourche	4	600.5	55.2	580	3	611.0	53.8	595	11	15	2.6%
Bennett County	22	604.0	24.1	608	20	619.0	30.1	616	15	8	1.3%
McLaughlin	30	599.1	34.7	590	21	590.8	30.2	583	-8	-7	-1.2%
Oelrichs	8	600.3	18.9	592	8	592.3	32.0	590	-8	-2	-0.3%
Rapid City	245	584.7	70.2	588	179	583.7	72.4	591	-1	3	0.5%
Sioux Falls	223	582.5	91.0	591	139	596.1	122.7	589	14	-2	-0.3%
Sisseton	33	590.1	26.7	579	21	586.8	23.8	580	-3	1	0.2%
Todd County	99	578.2	58.7	581	83	578.9	63.2	580	1	-1	-0.2%
Watertown					6	591.0	36.5	596			
White River	62	600.2	30.3	594	47	604.2	31.5	600	4	6	1.0%
Total/Average	739	586.4	69.5	589	536	590.2	80.9	589	4	0	0.0%

Table 4.2									
Dakota STEP Reading Scores by Elementary Grade Level									
Matched Student t-test of Means By Grade Level									
Grade	2008-09			2009-10			Paired t-test		
	n	Mean	SE Mean	n	Mean	SE Mean	df	t	p
4	191	584.9	5.06	191	589.0	5.47	190	0.97	0.332
5	158	577.9	6.88	158	586.6	8.55	157	1.71	0.089
6	49	585.2	11.2	49	582.4	11.0	48	-0.99	0.325
7	62	594.5	3.70	62	597.4	4.52	61	0.92	0.361
8	51	594.5	5.61	51	594.2	4.11	50	-0.07	0.945
All Grades	514	585.0	3.11	514	590.0	3.63	513	2.06	0.040*

* Statistically significant at the alpha 0.05 level

In Table 4.1 shows the Dakota STEP reading scores for SES participants by reporting school district. It shows that 59.2% (n = 739) of the students who received SES during the 2009-10 school year completed the Dakota STEP in 2008-09. Of these students 42.9% (n = 536) completed the Dakota STEP in the spring of 2010. The 2008-09 scores were used as the pre-test scores and were matched with post-test scores from 2009-10. There were four school districts that showed an improvement in Dakota STEP mean reading scores from pre to post for the participating students.

When the students were matched (n = 514) and analyzed for any statistically significant change by grade level, there was none noted for the 4th to 8th grade levels. Overall, there was a statistically significant change for all grade levels at the alpha 0.05 level (p < 0.040) (Table 4.2).

Table 5.1
Dakota STEP Scaled Mathematics Scores by School District
SES Participants' Mathematics Scores

School District	2008-09				2009-10				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (M)	Median (Md)	% Md Change
Andes Central	13	631.9	39.6	637	9	608.8	27.2	604	-23	-33	-5.2%
Belle Fourche	4	662.8	55.3	666	3	665.0	60.0	663	2	-3	-0.5%
Bennett County	22	699.0	38.4	698	20	699.6	43.0	692	1	-6	-0.9%
McLaughlin	30	654.7	63.1	658	21	647.0	55.3	629	-8	-29	-4.4%
Oelrichs	8	673.3	33.2	668	8	666.5	39.5	658	-7	-10	-1.5%
Rapid City	245	620.3	56.5	622	179	605.1	56.5	607	-15	-15	-2.4%
Sioux Falls	223	609.1	65.6	616	139	591.8	79.5	598	-17	-18	-2.9%
Sisseton	33	610.8	34.6	599	21	597.8	32.3	596	-13	-3	-0.5%
Todd County	99	621.0	59.5	630	83	620.4	59.1	621	-1	-9	-1.4%
Watertown					6	688.3	48.9	689			
White River	62	649.1	51.5	660	47	643.3	46.8	647	-6	-13	-2.0%
Total/Average	739	623.8	60.9	626	536	614.5	66.2	613	-9	-13	-2.1%

Table 5.2									
Dakota STEP Mathematic Scores by Grade Level									
Matched Student t-test of Means By Grade Level									
Grade	2008-09			2009-10			Paired t-test		
	n	Mean	SE Mean	n	Mean	SE Mean	df	t	p
4	191	613.9	3.71	191	588.2	3.31	190	-11.16	0.001*
5	158	623.2	5.34	158	598.9	6.12	157	-11.55	0.001*
6	49	654.3	10.7	49	625.9	9.40	48	-9.17	0.001*
7	62	671.4	4.98	62	660.1	5.46	61	-4.50	0.001*
8	51	688.7	5.60	51	673.6	5.51	50	-5.06	0.001*
All Grades	514	635.2	2.79	514	612.3	2.91	513	-18.61	0.001*

* Statistically significant different at the alpha 0.01 level

In Table 5.1 shows the Dakota STEP mathematics scores for SES participants by reporting school district. It shows that 59.2% (n = 739) of the students who received SES during the 2009-10 school year completed the Dakota STEP in 2008-09. Of these students 42.9% (n = 536) completed the Dakota STEP in the spring of 2010. The 2008-09 mathematics scores were used as the pre-test scores and were matched with post-test scores from 2009-10. There were two school districts that showed an improvement in Dakota STEP mean mathematic scores from pre to post for the SES participating students.

When the students were matched (n = 514) and analyzed for any statistically significant change by grade level, there was statistically significant decreases in mean scores noted for the 4th to 8th grade levels. Overall, there was a statistically significant decrease in mean scores for all grade levels at the alpha 0.01 level (p < 0.001) (Table 5.2).

Table 6.1
Dakota STEP Results by Provider
SES Participants' Reading Scores

Provider	2008-09				2009-10				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (ΔM)	Median (ΔMd)	% Md Change
Academia	231	589.1	55.1	587	181	587.3	58.8	586	(1.8)	-1	-0.2%
Academy of Learning	30	590.9	27.7	580	19	587.5	24.7	580	(3.4)	0	0.0%
Achieve of High Points	27	602.5	39.4	600	22	600.4	39.0	600	(2.1)	0	0.0%
Babbage	26	605.6	27.9	608	23	620.8	30.2	617	15.2	9	1.5%
Club Z	81	576.0	90.4	588	54	578.6	109.0	594	2.6	6	1.0%
Excel Achievement Center	11	598.4	30.6	604	8	602.8	23.5	600	4.4	-4	-0.7%
Failure Free Reading	23	594.7	30.3	590	15	597.8	24.2	603	3.1	13	2.2%
Sioux Falls School District	75	595.6	54.8	590	47	623.6	118.4	586	28.0	-4	-0.7%
Sylvan Learning Center	104	584.7	82.3	592	73	582.5	83.3	594	(2.2)	2	0.3%
Tutorial Services	120	572.8	96.8	582	86	580.5	104.3	583	7.7	1	0.2%
Youth & Family Services	11	579.0	23.2	570	8	576.3	25.8	570	(2.7)	0	0.0%
TOTAL	739	586.4	69.5	589.0	536	590.2	80.9	589.0	3.8	2	0.4%

Table 6.2
Dakota STEP Results by Provider
SES Participants' Mathematics Scores

Provider	2008-09				2009-10				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (ΔM)	Median (ΔMd)	% Md Change
Academia	231	633.7	59.7	636	181	623.3	56.8	621	(10.4)	-15	-2.4%
Academy of Learning	30	608.7	34.4	599	19	596.8	32.7	596	(11.9)	-3	-0.5%
Achieve of High Points	27	638.3	40.4	632	22	621.8	36.2	623	(16.5)	-9	-1.4%
Babbage	26	689.7	48.8	693	23	699.3	40.9	693	9.6	0	0.0%
Club Z	81	602.3	68.3	613	54	588.6	84.9	598	(13.7)	-15	-2.4%
Excel Achievement Center	11	633.5	32.6	632	8	617.6	38.5	604	(15.9)	-28	-4.4%
Failure Free Reading	23	612.5	41.4	611	15	603.1	28.3	600	(9.4)	-11	-1.8%
Sioux Falls School District	75	615.2	37.2	613	47	600.0	40.04	592	(15.2)	-21	-3.4%
Sylvan Learning Center	104	629.6	63.7	641	73	613.6	70.3	619	(16.0)	-22	-3.4%
Tutorial Services	120	608.2	71.1	616	86	604.6	83.6	611	(3.6)	-5	-0.8%
Youth & Family Services	11	609.5	29.0	615	8	586.5	19.0	587	(23.0)	-28	-4.6%
TOTAL	739	623.8	60.9	626.0	536	614.5	66.2	613.0	(9.3)	-14	-2.2%

Table 6.1 shows a comparison between the reading levels between 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years by service provider. The overall means and medians include all the grade level scores that the provider served during the year. Six of the providers showed overall improvement in the reading scores. Eight of the providers showed an improvement or remained constant in their median scores from pre to post testing. The overall percent change in the mean scores was +0.6%, while the percent change in the median scores was + 0.4%. The highest mean score difference was noted by Sioux Falls School District SES program ($\Delta M = +28.0$) while the minimum change was the Academy of Learning ($\Delta M = -3.4$).

Table 6.2 shows a comparison between the mathematics levels between 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years by service provider. The format for 2008-09 and 2009-10 for the Dakota STEP mathematics tests did not change during the two year period. There was an overall decline in the mean scores of 1.5%. One program, Babbage, showed an increase in overall mean scores and median scores from 2009 to 2010 at 1.4% or ΔM of 9.6.

Table 6.3					
Number of Sessions Served by Providers to Students					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	211	25.1	1	109	21.0
2007-2008	349	20.6	1	62	24.0
2008-2009	616	NA	NA	NA	NA
2009-2010	1,152	33.4	0	216	26.0

Table 6.3 shows the a summary of data service reported from 2005 to 2010 regarding the mean number of sessions for the reported student. The number of hours and sessions that a student participated depended on the attendance of the student, the requirements of the provider, and the location of the services. In 2007-08, students participated in an average of 20.6 sessions with minimum number of sessions being 1.0 and the maximum of 62. Half of the students participated in more than 24 sessions. In 2009-10 the mean number of sessions was

at 33.4 with a maximum number of 216 sessions. The average number of hours spent per child was 27.7 hours with a median of 26 hours. Data for 2008-09 was not available.

Parent contact is mandatory for the SES providers. In 2005-06, parents were contacted an average of 22.2 times (Table 7.0). In 2006-07, the parents were contacted an average of 12.5 times. But in 2007-08 the average number of contacts per student was 4 times. Half of the 59 students' parents were contacted between 5 and 12 times during the year. In 2008-2009, forty parents reported that they were contacted an average of 4.7 times with half of the respondents report at less four contacts by the provider. Some providers reported contacting parents after each session through the use of the email or on-line services, while other providers sent reports through the mail on a monthly basis. About 27% of the parents who completed the Parent Questionnaire reported never being contacted by the provider in 2008-09. In 2009-10, 596 parents (47.7%) were contacted and given an average of 9.4 reports. Half of the parents received 5 or more reports on the child during the year.

Table 7.0 Number of Parent Contacts & Reports 2005-2010					
	Number of Parents	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	137	12.5	1	109	10.0
2007-2008	59	4.1	3	12	5.0
2008-2009	40	4.7	0	12	4.0
2009-2010	596	9.4	0	30	5.0

Table 8.0 shows the cost comparison for serving students. The average per pupil cost was \$875.20 with a median at \$1,100 in 2007-08. The cost per hour of service was an average \$71.47 in 2007-08. In 2009-10 the average per pupil cost was \$1,237 with a median of \$1,560. The cost per hour of service was an average of \$53.48 with a median of \$55.00 per hour. There was no data available for 2008-09.

Table 8.0 Provider Costs				
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2006-2007				
Per Pupil Cost	\$938.20	\$7.00	\$2,569.00	\$927.50
Cost Per Hour	\$75.06	\$7.00	\$205.52	\$60.00
2007-2008				
Per Pupil Cost	\$875.20	\$10.00	\$3,052.50	\$1,100.00
Cost Per Hour	\$71.47	\$10.00	\$373.00	\$60.00
2009-2010				
Per Pupil Cost	\$1,294.00	\$0.00	\$3,030.00	\$1,560.00
Cost Per Hour	\$53.48	\$35.50	\$70.00	\$55.00

Monitoring

The South Dakota Department of Education monitored 37 SES eligible schools and 11 districts to determine if supplemental education services were being made available to students and parents. In addition to the reports and surveys completed by each provider and teachers, parents, and administrators from each school site, site visits were performed by Dr. Al Koster throughout the year to determine the level and type of services being provided. It served as opportunity to answer questions about SES and be in compliance with the state's reporting requirements. The following are some the highlights of the field notes from the monitoring process during the year. The districts monitored during the 2009-10 school year included Andes Central (Andes Elementary), Belle Fourche (Belle Fourche Middle School), McLaughlin (McLaughlin Elementary), Oelrichs (Oelrichs Junior High), Rapid City (General Beadle Elementary, Horace Mann Elementary, Knollwood Elementary, Robbinsdale Elementary, North Middle, and Valley View Elementary), Shannon County (Batesland K-8 and Redshirt Table K-8), Sioux Falls (LB Anderson Elementary, Cleveland Elementary, Garfield Elementary, Hawthorne Elementary, Hayward Elementary, Longfellow Elementary, and Lowell Elementary), Sisseton (Westside Elementary and Middle School), Smee (Wakpala Elementary, Wakpala Middle, and Wakpala High), Todd County (Todd County High, Todd County Middle, Rosebud Elementary, He Dog Elementary, Spring Creek Elementary, OKreek

Elementary, South Elementary, and North Elementary Schools), Watertown (Watertown High School), White River (White River Elementary, Norris Elementary, and White River Middle Schools).

Principal’s Questionnaire Results

There were 25 principals that responded to a survey asking questions about the supplemental educational services in their respective schools. The principals were asked how they assessed the quality of the SES provider in their respective schools (Table 9.0). Of the 21 principals that responded to this item 42.9% (n = 9) said that they used the pre and post assessment scores obtained from the instruments used by the provider and 47.9% (duplicated count) used the DakotaStep assessment scores. Less than a one-fourth of the principals talked to the either the teacher (28.6%) or parents (19.0%) about a student’s progress based on services received.

Table 9.0 How Quality of SES Is Assessed In Your School Principals’ Responses (n = 21)		
	n	Percent
Pre & Post assessment scores administered by the SES provider	9	42.9%
Student state assessment scores (DakotaStep)	10	55.6%
Talk with the teacher regarding student’s progress	6	33.3%
Talk with the parent regarding their child’s progress	4	22.2%
I do not evaluate the quality of the SES provider	6	33.3%
Other	5	27.8%

Table 10.0		
Where Successes Have Been Experienced		
Principals Responses (n = 21)		
	n	Percent
Improvement in DakotaStep reading assessment scores	1	4.8%
Improvement in DakotaStep mathematics assessment scores	1	4.8%
Improvement in student's attendance in school	0	0.0%
Improvement in student's behavior	0	0.0%
Students who need the support are receiving SES	12	57.1%
SES has small group sessions	6	28.6%
I have not experience any success in providing SES	3	14.3%
Other	6	28.6%

The two top ways in which principals judged success of the SES program were by the number of students who needed the help received supplemental educational services (57.1%) Improvement in the student's Dakota STEP reading and mathematics assessment scores was not chosen a means of measuring SES success (4.8%). Three principals (14.3%) reported they had not experienced a successful program at their school. This included the difficulty in measuring a long-term impact improvement based on short term intervention although some teachers noted some skills improvement in their classroom. One principal reported having a large number of students participating in SES, but has not been able to determine if it has been successful for them. Two principals reported no interested in SES by their parents (Table 10.0).

Table 11.0		
Challenges Principals Faced in Providing SES in Their Building		
Principals Responses (n = 21)		
	n	Percent
Communication with SES provider	6	28.6%
Students needing academic assistance are not receiving SES	6	28.6%
Capacity to monitor SES provider	6	28.6%
Capacity to monitor students involvement in SES	9	42.9%
Students not attending sessions	7	33.3%
Provider curriculum not aligned with state standards	1	4.8%
Transportation to get students to and from SES location	3	14.3%
SES provider does not provide information regarding student progress	5	23.8%
I have not faced any challenges in providing SES	2	9.5%
Other	9	42.9%

The principals were asked what were some of the challenges in providing SES in their school. About one-third of the principals indicated getting to students to attend SES sessions (33.3%) , communication with SES providers (28.6%), and getting academic assistance to students who needed SES (28.6%). One in four of the principals (28.6%) faced challenges in their capacity to monitor the SES provider, providing transportation to students to and from the SES location (14.3%), and getting information from the provider(23.8%). About 10% of the principals report having not challenges with providing SES.

Teacher’s Questionnaire Results

There were 82 teachers who completed the teacher questionnaire regarding SES. The majority of the respondents taught in elementary school (74.4%, n = 62) with 14.6% (n = 12) teaching in the middle school level, grades 6 to 8, and 9.8% (n = 8) teaching in high school. Four out five teachers (84.0%, n = 63) indicated that the SES provided developed and shared an individual supplemental education plan for their student. One half of the teachers (53.3%)

indicated that they were involved in the development of this plan or at least in identifying specific educational goals of their students with the provider.

Table 12.0 Information Received From SES Provider Regarding Student's Progress Teacher Responses (n = 75)		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	12	16.0%
Student participation	32	42.7%
Course work information	39	52.0%
Provider assessment scores	41	54.7%
I did not receive any information from the provider	13	17.3%
Other	7	9.3%

Table 12.0 shows what type of information teacher's received from the SES provider regarding their participating students. Over half of the teachers (54.7%) reported receiving assessment scores from the provider and 42.7% of the teachers reported receiving information about student's participation in the program. One in five teachers received information about student's attendance (16.0%) and 52.0% reported receiving course work information. About one in five of the teachers (17.3%, n = 13) did not receive any information from their student's SES provider.

Table 12.1 Describe the SES Received By Your Students Teacher Responses (n = 75)		
	n	Percent
Provider is addressing the student's academic skills needs	53	70.7%
The provider has kept me informed of the student's progress	38	50.7%
The provider has not kept me informed of the student's progress	15	20.0%
Other	3	4.0%

Table 12.1 shows that 70.7% of the responding teachers stated the provider is addressing their student's academic skills needs. Additionally, 50.7% of the teachers stated that the provider kept them informed of their student's progress. One in five teachers (20.0%) reported that the provider was not keeping them apprised of their student's progress through the tutoring services. Twenty-four percent of the teachers (24.0%) indicated that the student's academic performance was stayed about the same as when the SES started, while 76.0% (n =57) had noticed some academic progress in the classroom.

Teachers had a wide range of experiences with the provider. In some case it was professional and very collaborative while in other cases the provider never made a contact with the teacher. Comments included:

- The program is very beneficial to the students.
- The provider and I met to created an individualized plan for the student. The provider was extremely appreciative and said that I was the only teacher that wanted to work with her. But that was the last time I heard from her.
- I wish my student could continue with this program. Her attendance and participation in school has improved significantly.
- My student made great gains. I hope the he will be able to maintain them over the summer.
- I believe the Club Z is the best SES program. I have seen great benefits to my students.
- Our school received information about SES but it was not given to all the teachers.
- Appreciated the progress reports and individualized learning plans.
- I would like to have some input and collaboration with the provider.

Parent Questionnaire Results

Eighteen parents responded to a survey regarding SES received by their child. When the parents were asked how they made their decision regarding the selection of a SES provider two parents (11.1%) said that their child's teacher help them in selected a SES provider, while 88.9% (n = 16) made the decision on their own.

When asked how their received information about their child's progress in SES, 50.0% (n = 9) said they received it in person, while 33.3% (n = 6) received a progress report in the mail and 38.9% (n = 7) by telephone. About twenty-eight percent (27.8%) received a progress report monthly, 16.7% received a progress report weekly, and 11.1% received before and after each completed session. Four parents (22.2%) never received any progress report or received any information about their child.

Table 13.0		
Providers Reported By Parents		
(n = 18)		
	n	Percent
Tutorial Services	3	16.7%
Club Z	3	16.7%
Failure Free Reading	1	5.6%
Excel Achievement	0	0.0%
Babbage Net	0	0.0%
Sylvan Learning Center	9	50.0%
Academia Net	1	5.6%
Skills Center	1	5.6%

Table 14.0		
What type of information do you receive from your child's SES provider?		
(n = 18)		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	2	11.1%
Student participation	6	33.3%
Student behavior	1	5.6%
Quiz and course work information	7	38.9%
Pre & post assessment scores	10	55.6%
Did not receive any information	0	0.0%

Half of the parents (55.6%) received information about their child's pre and post assessment scores during the year. About one in ten parents receive information regarding their child's attendance (11.1%), 33.3% about their child's participation and 38.9% about information on their child's course work. All of the respondents reported receiving some information about their child.

Table 15.0								
How satisfied are you with the quality of service your child has been receiving from the service provider listed above?								
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Very satisfied	41	45.6%	4	23.5%	22	59.5%	12	66.7%
Satisfied	40	44.4%	6	35.3%	13	35.1%	5	27.8%
Dissatisfied or No Information	7	7.8%	7	41.2%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%
Very dissatisfied	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%
Total	90	100.0%	17	100.0%	37	100.0%	18	100.0%

In 2009-10 over two-thirds of the parents (66.7%) were very satisfied and 27.8% were satisfied with the quality of instruction being provided by the SES programs. When asked about the size of the SES class, 72.2% were very satisfied and 27.8% were satisfied. Nine out of ten parents (88.9%) were very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of services being made available to their child. When asked how this has impacted their child's performance, 44.4% has noted a lot of improvement for their child, while 55.6% has noted little or no progress for their child.

Parents had a range of experiences with their child's provider. In some cases the provider was informative and very collaborative while in other cases the provider never made a contact with the parent. Parent comments included:

- Sylvan made a big difference in my child's fluency and ability to read.
- We had trouble getting a tutor at first. Then my child received another tutor who did not last long. The last tutor that worked with my child was amazing.

-
- It would make more sense to have my child start at the beginning of the year rather than in January.
 - It appears that my child is working on a curriculum that is not aligned with the school district's curriculum. I encourage my child's academic development and growth, but I believe the academic goals should be aligned with the classroom work.
 - My son loved going to the tutor and was excited about what he was learning.
 - Both of my children enjoyed the program and made good academic progress.
 - I was not please with the communication at all. I found out that my child was not attending and then she got kicked out before I could even do anything about her attendance.
 - I believe the service was a great help. Thank you!

District SES Administrator

There were 24 district administrators from 11 districts that responded to the on-line questionnaire. The school district used a variety of ways to inform parents of the supplemental education services that was available to their child. The majority of the district administrators (83.3%) sent out a letter to the parents while 66.7% held parent meetings (duplicated count). Two-thirds of the respondents (63.5%) reported making person contacts with the parents. Other methods included telephone calls (45.8%), newspaper articles (16.7%), public forums (12.5%), school newsletter (29.2%), and brochures (20.8%).

Success in taking advantage of supplemental education services was reported when parent chose the provider (86.4%). Other elements that made SES successful was receiving student progress reports from the provider (50.0%), improved student academic performance (36.4%), monitoring visits conducted by the state (22.7%) and evaluating the service providers (13.6%).

Table 16.0 provides a list of challenges encountered by the administrator in working with the providers. The most challenging aspect of the program was student attendance (77.3%). Parents signed up their child for SES, but the child did not come or missed a lot of sessions. Students who would benefit the most from SES did not attend (63.6%). Another challenge was the communication link between the classroom teacher and the provider

(40.9%). In many cases attendance could be improved if the teacher was informed of the absences.

Table 16.0		
Challenges Administrator Has Encountered In Providing Supplemental Education Services		
(n = 24)		
	n	Percent
Provider attendance at provider fair	1	4.2%
Parent attendance at provider fair	3	12.5%
Parents can choose provider	3	12.5%
Monitoring visits conducted by the SD DOE	5	20.8%
Receiving student progress reports from provider	10	41.7%
Getting SES information to parents	4	16.7%
Not all applying students attend sessions	17	70.8%
Students who would benefit the most do not attend	14	58.3%
Collecting student information from providers	4	16.7%
Communication between classroom teacher and provider	9	37.5%
SES too expensive	2	8.3%
Setting up transportation for students	1	4.2%

One of the administrators indicated he has “problems getting some parents to understand the importance of the program.” There is an acceptance that it is up to the school to work with child and make the SES program available. Other challenges included hiring local people to be tutors for the services that was being provided. Staffing seem to be a big issue for some of the providers. Additionally, the parents have a hard time reading the information sheets and the progress reports. Someone is needed to explain the reports and how their child is doing with the tutoring service.

The administrators reported that it is difficult to attribute student gains or progress to SES. The students may be receiving additional help from their classroom teacher or in-school supplemental services. One administrator believes that the services should be done in the

school by the child's teacher or assistant who knows not only the child's skills and achievement levels, but also their learning styles and behavioral issues, if any. Some complained about the information sheets provided by the provider. They are difficult to read and understand what progress the child is making through the program. It would be helpful to have the tutor, classroom teacher, parent, and administrator meeting to discuss the child's progress rather than an information or progress sheet that might be misunderstood. The providers need to work with the district and the classroom teacher in a more systematic and professional manner.

Table 17.0				
Administrator's Report on the Number of Students Served				
(n = 15)				
	Administrators Reporting	Number of Students	Percent of Total	Average Per Administrator
Academia.Net	11	533	28.1%	48.5
Academy of Learning	2	0	0.0%	0.0
Achieve High Points	9	74	3.9%	8.2
Babbage Net School	12	43	2.3%	3.6
Brilliance Academy	8	1	0.1%	0.1
Educate Online	8	15	0.8%	1.9
Club Z!	9	209	11.0%	23.2
Excel Achievement Center	8	16	0.8%	2.0
Failure Free Reading	8	109	5.7%	13.6
Skills Center	5	164	8.6%	32.8
Sylvan Learning Center	11	372	19.6%	33.8
Tutorial Services	10	349	18.4%	34.9
Youth & Family Services	6	14	0.7%	2.3
Total	15	1,899	100.0%	126.6

Table 17.0 shows that Academia.Net provided services to the largest number of reporting school administrators at 28.1% (n = 533). It served an average of 48.5 students per district. The second highest service was the Sylvan Learning Center (Rapid City and Sioux Falls) at 19.6% (n = 372). The third highest was Tutorial Services at 18.4% (n = 349). The

percent distribution is consistent with the findings reported on Table 2.0 (page 10). The table shows a percent distribution of services provided by Acadamia.Net at 30.9%, by Sylvan Learning Center at 25.1% and by Tutorial Services at 18.6% for 212 school districts.

SES Provider Feedback

Ten providers completed a questionnaire regarding the services they provided to ten school districts in the past year. Nine of the providers reported having no concerns working with school districts in developing agreements. Two providers reported not being able to develop a workable agreement. Belle Fourche was unaware of the process needed to implement the supplemental education services within their district. “Sioux Falls prohibited providers from using their classrooms and computers.” The district SES could use the facilities, but no outside agency was allowed to use the facilities for tutoring or supplemental services. The provider reported the prohibition as an unfair advantage and did not give parents more choices for SES providers.

	n	Percent
Attendance at provider fair	4	40.0%
District communication	8	80.0%
Parents choice of provider	7	70.0%
Monitoring visits conducted by the SD DOE	4	40.0%
Student Attendance	6	60.0%
Improved student academic performance	7	70.0%
Parent communication	7	70.0%
Technical assistance provided by the SD DOE	3	30.0%
Other	0	0.0%

Providers stated that good district communication contributed to their success within the district. Additionally giving parents a choice of provider, demonstrating improved student academic performance and parent communication were equally good contributes to the success of the services within the district.

When asked about the challenges for the providers, parent communication was highlighted by 50% of the respondents. Linked to this was getting information to parents about SES. The next challenge noted by the providers was communication with the classroom teacher (30%). There was no explanation what the issue was by the provider.

Table 19.0				
Providers Report on the Number of Students Served				
(n = 10)				
	Providers Reporting	Number of Students	Percent of Total	Average Per Provider
Andes Central	2	16	1.2%	8.0
Belle Fourche	2	1	0.1%	0.5
Bennett County	2	22	1.6%	11.0
McLaughlin	2	3	0.2%	1.5
Oelrichs	1	7	0.5%	7.0
Rapid City	7	469	34.4%	67.0
Sioux Falls	7	524	38.4%	74.9
Sisseton	1	5	0.4%	5.0
Todd County	3	215	15.8%	71.7
Watertown	3	5	0.4%	1.7
White River	2	97	7.1%	48.5
Total	10	1,364	100.0%	136.4

Conclusion

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services providers for the 2009-2010 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?

Information about the quality and satisfaction with SES providers was obtain through reports and questions sent to the South Dakota Department of Education by district administrators, teachers, providers, and parents. The response rate from all four questionnaires was low and therefore the effect size was low for this evaluation report. Although, the effect size was low, the information was still valuable in determining the impact of the SES providers in 29 elementary school, 9 middle schools and 1 high school located in 11 school districts. The satisfaction level for the SES programs available within the school districts was high for the administrators, teachers and parents.

The largest area of concern or an issue for everyone was communication. Teachers and parents wanted to be more involved with individual student plans and getting timely progress reports that are easy to read and understand. Administrators and providers were interested in getting parents to encourage their children committed to attending all the tutoring sessions. Additionally, after parents sign up their child for supplemental education services, then an effort must be made to complete the program if the child is to make any academic progress. Maximizing student attendance was highlighted by everyone.

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. The state had documentation and completed records for 514 of the 1,250 students served by SES providers for 2009-10 school year.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed by provider and school district for the participating students. Results from the spring 2009 and spring 2010 Dakota STEP were compiled and statistical tests showed that there was a statistically significant negative difference in the standard scores from 2009 to 2010 in the area of mathematics for the participating students. In the area of reading there was a statistically significant positive change or improvement for the SES participants. Each provider used their own assessment to conduct diagnostic or screening assessments in addition to pre and post achievement tests. However, the data was unable to be used as there was no standard for scoring established across all service providers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this report, the external evaluator is proposing the following recommendations to be considered for the 2009-10 school year. Some of these recommendations were made in the previous year's evaluation report, but were not implemented due to changes in staffing and attention to other priorities.

- In the provider survey, a question should be added to identify who is completing the questionnaire (tutor, coordinator, CEO, etc. and their location.
- Identify a set of reading and mathematics standardized assessment tools that all providers can use to measure academic progress for their respective delivery modality. This will provide a consistent pre and post testing data comparative analysis of academic progress. Currently, only the Dakota STEP can be used to validate any progress.
- Team meetings for individual students should be initiated at the beginning of any student tutoring sessions to discuss the development of an individualized learning plan, reporting of student progress, and monitoring of attendance and other behaviors. The team meeting should include the tutor, parent(s), and teacher.
- There is still a need to recruit more parents, administrators, and teachers to complete the CAS questionnaires. Additionally, all providers and LEAs offering SES should be required to complete the CAS.
- Increase the number of student records for SES students in the areas of DakotaStep scores and demographics. Currently less than half of the SES participants have matched pre/post data to measure progress and change in the areas of reading and mathematics achievement.