



**south dakota**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
Learning. Leadership. Service.

## **Supplemental Education Services Annual Evaluation Report 2010-11**



*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

Executive Summary ..... 3

Introduction ..... 6

Guiding Questions for Evaluating SES Providers ..... 9

Methodology ..... 10

    Effectiveness Measures ..... 10

    Customer Satisfaction Measures ..... 11

Findings ..... 11

    Demographic Profile ..... 11

    Monitoring ..... 30

    Principal Questionnaire Results ..... 31

    Classroom Teacher Questionnaire Results ..... 33

    Parent Questionnaire Results ..... 36

    District SES Administrator Results ..... 39

    SES Provider Feedback ..... 42

Conclusion ..... 46

Recommendations ..... 48

---

# South Dakota Department of Education Supplemental Educational Services Annual Evaluation Report ■ 2010-11

## Executive Summary

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services (SES) providers for the 2010-11 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?
- 4 As a result of the supplemental services received, do the student participants demonstrate achievement growth as measured by the Dakota STEP assessments in mathematics and reading?

Supplemental educational services are provided free of charge to eligible students (n ≈ 8,600) outside of the regular school day. According to non-regulatory guidance issued by the U.S. Department of Education, such services must be “designed t increase academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement. These services:

*. . . must include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation and other educational interventions, provided such approaches are consistent with the state’s academic content standards. Supplemental education services must be of high quality; research based, and specifically designed to increase student academic achievement.*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Education (2005). *Supplemental educational services: Non-regulatory guidance*. Report No. ED/OPBE-91-34 Washington, DC: Author.

---

In order to determine if SES is an effective intervention strategy for students who need additional instructional support, the evaluation undertaken explores how students improvement upon the state mandated criterion referenced tests in reading and mathematics (Dakota STEP) administered each spring. Additionally, the evaluation procedures explores the level of satisfaction with the services provided by the approved providers by parents, administrators and teachers. The combination of the quantitative analysis of the student's scores on the state assessments over a two year period and input from the users of the providers' intervention strategies, gives the South Dakota Department of Education insight and evidence regarding the effectiveness of the SES programs within the state. It serves to answer a set of critical evaluation questions regarding the impact of SES on South Dakota students requiring academic assistance.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed by providers, grade levels, and school districts for the participating students. Results from the spring 2010 and spring 2011 Dakota STEP were compiled and statistical tests showed that there was a statistically significant positive improvement in the standard scores from 2010 to 2011 in the area of mathematics for the participating students ( $p < 0.0001$ ). In the area of reading there the reading level showed no statistical improvement from 2010 to 2011 assessment scores for all participating students ( $p < 0.634$ ). Positive significant changes were noted from all grade levels in the mathematic scores from 2010 to 2011. In the area of reading, there were either no significant decreases or increases in the Dakota STEP reading scores over the two year period. Over half of the school districts (53.3%) showed that their students improved in both reading and mathematics, while one third showed no improvement in their students' reading scores.

The small representative sample of teachers, principals, and administrators responded to a questionnaire regarding the providers in their respective school district. They reported mixed satisfaction with their SES providers. Most administrators were in contact with their providers, but both teachers and administrators asked for more communication and reporting of student progress on a regular basis especially in the areas of attendance and academic achievement. Forty-seven percent of the teachers believed that the providers were addressing student's academic skill needs and the same percentage report not receiving any information from the provider.

---

Over 250 parents responded to a survey regarding the services given to their child. Almost ninety percent (88.9%) were very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of service their child was receiving from their provider. But less than half of the parents did not receive information for their child to address any specific concerns or issues. About one in five (22.7%) received information regarding student attendance; 47.0% received information on pre and post assessment results; and 37.7% received reports on their child's participation.

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

When asked about the challenges for the providers, parent communication was highlighted by 32.0% of the respondents. Linked to this was getting information to parents about SES (20.0%). The greatest challenge was student attendance (44.0%). This was noted by the administrators and teachers as an issue. One-fourth (28.0%) of the providers reported that communication between classroom teacher and SES provider was a challenge. The providers reported that the majority of the communication was performed through email, direct mail, and telephone calls.

Overall, SES appear to be effective in improving students' academic achievement in mathematics. The reading areas for all grade levels did not show any gains over a two year period. This has been consistent with findings from previous years. Almost 90% of the parents and half of the educators were pleased with supplemental education services being provided. There were a set of recommendations made by the evaluator to improve the reporting process and to assure an accurate assessment of the supplemental education services being provide to the eligible children in South Dakota.

---

# South Dakota Department of Education

## Supplemental Educational Services

### Annual Evaluation Report ■ 2010-11

#### Introduction

Among the primary accountability measures of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) is the requirement for schools to make “adequate yearly progress” (AYP) toward bringing all of their students, categorized by subgroup, to proficiency in mathematics and reading by the end of the 2013-14 school year. Schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years are identified as being *in need of improvement* or in School Improvement Level I status. Once identified as being in need of improvement, schools are required to offer low-income students the option of transferring to a school that has not been identified as being in the need of improvement. Schools that fail to meet AYP for three consecutive years are categorized as being in School Improvement Level II are required to offer supplemental education services (SES) , in addition to the transfer option, to their low-income students.<sup>2</sup>

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...”<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> Government Accounting Office (2006). *No Child Left Behind Act: Education actions needed to improve local implementation and state evaluation of supplemental education services*. Report No. GAO 06-758. Washington, DC: Author.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Department of Education (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act: Title I Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged*. Public Law 107-110. Washington, DC: Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students.

---

approving SES providers and providing local districts with a list of the approved providers serving the area.<sup>4</sup>

The supplemental education services must be designed to increase academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement. These services

*. . . may include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation and other educational interventions, provided such approaches are consistent with the content and instruction used by the local education agency (LEA) and are aligned with the state's academic content standards. Supplemental education services must be of high quality; research based, and specifically designed to increase student academic achievement.*<sup>5</sup>

Supplemental educational services can be provided by a variety of entities, including non-profit groups, for-profit companies, local community programs, private schools, charter schools, national organizations, faith-based groups, public schools, school districts, and colleges or universities. However, providers must be approved by the state before they can begin offering services.

South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) issued a request for proposals for agencies to provide supplemental education services due on March 12, 2010. (Appendix A) The proposals were reviewed by a team of eight educators on May 20 and 21. The reviewers received training on the guidance for selecting providers and the use of the reviewer's checklist. Two team members reviewed each application. If the review resulted in a significant difference between the scores, then a third team member reviewed the applicant and an average score was assigned to the application. The applications were reviewed based on several criteria. These included a description of the program, staffing, research based and program effectiveness, assessment and monitoring of students, and financial and organizational

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Department of Education (2005). *Supplemental educational services: Non-regulatory guidance*. Report No. ED/OPBE-91-34 Washington, DC: Author.

---

capacity. The provider was asked to show evidence that the program is aligned to the state standards in the areas of reading and mathematics. The criteria checklist and scores were submitted to the DOE staff for a final review and to resolve any major discrepancies in the application.

Once the SES provider had successfully completed the request for proposal and successfully completed the review process and met the requirements for being an approved service provide, 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 for their child. Parents may elect or not 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 2010-11 school year. For the reporting period, there were 25 authorized providers in South Dakota that made their services available to 1,940 students residing in 15 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 2010-11 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.<sup>6</sup> There were four 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. Are school administrators and teachers satisfied with the SES providers in meeting student academic needs? [Satisfaction]
4. 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> Harmon, J., Ross, S. & Potter, A. (2006). *Evaluating supplemental educational service providers: Suggested strategies for states*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Lincoln, IL: Center for Innovation & Improvement.

---

## Methodology

To address the evaluation questions, the IELE collected data from SD DOE on four monitoring requirements imposed by the U.S. Department of Education. These requirements included measurement of program effectiveness, parent and client satisfaction with services, system for collecting information from the stakeholders (parents, teachers, administrators, and providers), and measurement of student progress.

### 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.<sup>7</sup> 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,

---

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Education (2006). Supplemental educational services non-regulatory guidance. Washington, DC: Author.

---

these tests served as a diagnostic and formative role rather than a true assessment of achievement.

## **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. Additionally, observation and interview protocols were developed to determine the level of provider satisfaction and 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 1,940 students during the 2010-11 school 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 2010-11 school year, data was collected from 46 schools located in 15 school districts.

Table 1.0 shows the distribution of reports and surveys returned to the South Dakota Department of Education. There were 8,438 eligible students from the reporting school districts for supplemental educational services. One thousand nine hundred forty (n = 1,940) students enrolled in SES during the 2010-11 school year or 23.0% of the eligible students used the services. In 2009-10 school year 1,249 students participated in SES out of 7,615 eligible students or 16.4% of the eligible students. This was a difference of 6.6% or a 40.2% change of in the percentage of students served in this two year period (2009 to 2011).

---

Huron School District reported a 100% participation rate while Cheyenne Eagle Butte School District had a rate of participation at 75.6% (n = 130) followed by Andes Central District at 56.7% (n = 51) and McLaughlin School District at 49.2% (n = 58). The largest number of students served were in Sioux Falls School District (n = 506), Rapid City School District (n = 479) and Todd County School District (n = 216). There were three school districts (Belle Fourche, Oelrichs, and Watertown) who reported serving less than ten students during the 2010-11 school year.

For 2010-11, a total of 99 classroom teachers completed a survey regarding SES, while 15 principals completed a survey. The percentage of teachers completing the survey from the previous year increased by 20.7% while the percentage of principals completing the survey decreased by 66.7%. In the 2009-10, 82 teachers and 25 principals completed the SES survey. Twelve district administrators completed a satisfaction survey in 2010-11 as compared to 24 administrators in the previous year.

For 2010-11, a total of 279 parents completed a survey regarding SES. In 2009-10, 18 parents completed the survey. The questionnaires asked questions about the delivery and quality of services from the providers and the participating schools.

Table 2.0 shows the number of students served by 22 of the providers used by eligible school districts. Tables 1.1 and 2.0 present data reported by the providers. *One to One Tutors* reported the highest SES use by 512 participating students or 23.5% of the total students served. *A Math Companion* (n = 275; 12.6%) and *Acadamia* (n = 267; 12.3%) had the next two highest participation rate. *Accel Online* (0.55%), *Babbage.Net* (1.0%), *Tutor Co* (0.28%), and *Student Nest* (0.69%) reported SES use of less than one percent.

**Table 1.0  
Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education  
School District Reports ■ 2010-11**

<b>District</b>	<b>SES District Adm</b>	<b>Principal Survey</b>	<b>Teacher Survey</b>	<b>Parent Survey</b>	<b>Average Number of Providers Used Per District</b>	<b>Number of Eligible Students<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Number of Students Receiving Services</b>	<b>Number of Students Not Using SES</b>	<b>Percent of Students Served</b>
Andes Central	3	0	12	2	3	90	51	39	56.7%
Belle Fourche	0	0	0	1	1	402	5	397	1.2%
Bennett County	0	1	7	0	7	212	60	152	28.3%
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	0	2	172	130	42	75.6%
Huron	2	0	2	26	5	58	58	0	100.0%
McLaughlin	1	1	5	8	3	189	93	96	49.2%
Oelrichs	1	0	0	5	1	19	6	13	31.6%
Sisseton	0	0	0	0	3	353	71	282	20.1%
Rapid City	2	4	15	139	16	1,327	479	848	36.1%
Sioux Falls	0	0	0	65	11	2,029	506	1,523	24.9%
Todd County	2	5	36	31	6	1,318	216	1,102	16.4%
White River	0	0	0	0	2	262	58	204	22.1%
Smee	1	1	3	1	2	141	16	125	11.3%
Shannon County	0	3	19	1	7	687	183	504	26.6%
Watertown	0	0	0	0	3	1,179	8	1,171	0.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>8,438</b>	<b>1,940</b>	<b>6,498</b>	<b>23.0%</b>

<sup>1</sup> Based on 3<sup>rd</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade enrollments for eligible Title I schools within the identified school district.

**Table 1.1  
Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education  
Provider Reports ■ 2010-11**

<b>District</b>	<b>SES District Adm</b>	<b>Principal Survey</b>	<b>Teacher Survey</b>	<b>Parent Survey</b>	<b>Average Number of Providers Used Per District</b>	<b>Number of Eligible Students<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled</b>	<b>Number of Students Not Using SES</b>	<b>Percent of Students Served</b>
Andes Central	3	0	12	2	3	123	28	95	22.8%
Belle Fourche	0	0	0	1	1	182	8	174	4.4%
Bennett County	0	1	7	0	7	244	84	160	34.4%
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	0	2	346	102	244	29.5%
Huron	2	0	2	26	5	57	57	0	100.0%
McLaughlin	1	1	5	8	3	290	101	189	34.8%
Oelrichs	1	0	0	5	1	15	4	11	26.7%
Sisseton	0	0	0	0	3	390	67	323	17.2%
Rapid City	2	4	15	139	16	1,816	457	1,359	25.2%
Sioux Falls	0	0	0	65	11	1,780	469	1,311	26.3%
Todd County	2	5	36	31	6	1,898	388	1,510	20.4%
White River	0	0	0	0	2	350	102	248	29.1%
Smee	1	1	3	1	2	203	10	193	4.9%
Shannon County	0	3	19	1	7	608	296	312	48.7%
Watertown	0	0	0	0	3	270	6	264	2.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>8,572</b>	<b>2,179</b>	<b>6,393</b>	<b>25.4%</b>

**Table 2.0**  
**Distribution of Students by SES Providers & School District**

	Andes Center	Belle Fourche	Bennett County	Eagle Butte	Huron	McLaughlin	Oelrichs	Rapid City	Shannon County	Sioux Falls	Sisseston	Smee	Todd County	Watertown	White River	Total
One to One			14	13	9	20		70	52	51			282	1		512
A Math Companion			7	70	21	50		24	72	19			11	1		275
Academia	11		13		11	31		58	13				30		100	267
Academy of Learning											67					67
Accel Online								4		8						12
Achieve High Points				19				14	1	4		4	1			43
At Home Advantage								33		89						122
ATS Project Success					1			14		64			10		2	91
Babbage.Net			13					9								22
BH Special Services		4						42								46
Club Z								8		3				3		14
Educate Online									12							12
Excel Achievement										13						13
Failure Free Reading								24	29							73
Ivy League			11		3			6	5	5			3			33
Learning Solutions								47								47
Skills Center										117						117
Student Nest									6				9			15
Sylvan Learning Center	5	4			1			119	14	65			27			235
Tutor Co										6						6
Tutorial Services	12		6		1		4	66	4	15		6	15	1		130
Youth & Family Services								27								27
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>2179</b>

**Table 3.0  
Distribution of Students by Ethnicity & School District  
2009-10**

<b>School District</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>American Indian</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Available</b>	<b>Total</b>
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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,249</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	<b>31.6%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

In 2009-10, 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 3.0). 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.

**Table 3.1**  
**Distribution of Students by Ethnicity & School District**  
**2010-11**

<b>School District</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>American Indian</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Andes Central	0	0	3	42	4	2	51
Belle Fourche	0	0	1	0	4	0	5
Bennett County	0	0	4	44	7	5	60
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	128	2	0	130
Huron	28	0	9	1	19	0	57
McLaughlin	2	0	1	80	10	0	93
Oelrichs	0	0	0	4	2	0	6
Rapid City	10	14	34	226	177	11	472
Shannon County	0	0	1	177	2	1	181
Sioux Falls	29	166	91	23	188	9	506
Sisseton	0	1	1	52	16	0	70
Smee	0	0	0	16	0	0	16
Todd County	2	1	0	205	8	0	216
Watertown	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
White River	2	1	0	43	10	0	56
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>1,042</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1,927</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

In 2010-11, 23.7% (n = 456) of the students were White and 54.1% (n = 1,042) were American Indian. The most diverse student populations were 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, Eagle Butte, Todd County, and White River reported high numbers of American Indian students due to their location on or near an Indian Reservation. In addition, 52.0% of the students (n = 1,001) were female and 48.0% (n = 926) were male. One in five students (23.1%, n = 268) had disabilities and 22.7% (n = 445) were identified as special education students.

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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>Percent</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>39.8%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 3.2 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.

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Other	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	6	3	0	9
Belle Fourche	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Bennett County	0	0	3	13	2	2	20
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	36	0	0	36
Huron	0	0	1	1	8	0	10
Mclaughlin	0	0	0	13	0	0	13
Oelrichs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rapid City	2	5	6	40	38	1	92
Shannon County	0	0	0	38	0	0	38
Sioux Falls	2	34	23	8	83	6	156
Sisseton	0	1	0	12	4	0	17
Smee	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Todd County	0	1	0	30	0	0	31
Watertown	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
White River	0	0	0	10	4	0	14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>445</b>

Table 3.3 shows the reported number and percentage of students with disabilities served by SES in 2010-11. One in five students (22.9%, n = 445) were reported to have some type of disability. Sioux Falls served the largest percent of the disabled students

---

(35.1%, n = 156) while Rapid City had the next highest group at 20.7% (n = 92). White students (32.6%) and American Indian students (47.6%) 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 11 are tested in the spring of each year in the areas of reading and mathematics. 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* 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.

In Table 4.1 shows the Dakota STEP reading scores for SES participants by reporting school district. It shows that 75.6% (n = 988) of the students who received SES during the 2010-11 school year completed the Dakota STEP in 2009-10. The 2009-10 scores were used as the pre-test scores and were matched with post-test scores from 2010-11. Sixty percent (n = 9) of the school districts showed an improvement in Dakota STEP mean reading scores from pre to post for the participating SES students. The improvement in the mean reading scores by district ranged from 0.85 to 16.20 while the decrease in mean reading scores ranged from -0.50 to -13.50. Overall, the average reading score change was -1.80 (-0.30%).

Table 4.2 shows the Dakota STEP mean reading scores by grade level. There was no statistically significant change in the reading scores from pre to post assessment at the alpha 0.05 level. There was no change noted in the fourth grade, but the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and high school students showed improvement in the reading scores. The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade SES participants showed a decreased in the mean reading scores from pre to post assessment.

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

School District	2009-10				2010-11				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (M)	Median (Md)	% Mean Change
Andes Central	20	601.6	27.4	606	28	601.1	32.6	589	(0.50)	(17.0)	-0.1%
Belle Fourche	5	598.4	15.1	606	5	606.2	8.7	606	7.80	0.0	1.3%
Bennett County	28	581.9	23.2	579	33	584.1	22.5	582	2.20	3.0	0.4%
Eagle Butte	102	592.3	28.6	592	127	593.7	31.9	590	1.40	(2.0)	0.2%
Huron	42	603.4	94.2	576	57	619.6	160.9	582	16.20	6.0	2.7%
McLaughlin	59	593.8	27.6	594	74	602.1	28.6	600	8.30	6.0	1.4%
Oelrichs	6	635.3	46.2	639	6	621.8	37.5	626	(13.50)	(13.0)	-2.1%
Rapid City	151	588.9	78.9	598	224	588.3	81.8	587	(0.60)	(11.0)	-0.1%
Shannon County	90	586.45	60.7	585	123	587.3	50.0	589	0.85	4.0	0.1%
Sioux Falls	252	609.2	149.1	591	380	596.4	111.3	592	(12.80)	1.0	-2.1%
Sisseton	53	595.0	69.4	600	55	586.3	94.7	603	(8.70)	3.0	-1.5%
Smee	11	600.1	20.1	600	12	601.1	19.7	599	1.00	(1.0)	0.2%
Todd County	140	580.5	65.5	585	149	582.3	60.8	583	1.80	(2.0)	0.3%
Watertown	4	602.0	30.1	594	2	606.0	26.9	606	4.00	12.0	0.7%
White River	25	581.2	109.1	595	32	579.8	91.1	587	(1.40)	(8.0)	-0.2%
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>594.6</b>	<b>93.5</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>1,307</b>	<b>592.8</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>(1.80)</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>

Current Grade	2009-10			2010-11			Independent Student t-test		
	n	Mean	SE Mean	n	Mean	SE Mean	df	t	p
4	273	583.5	5.3	274	583.4	5.1	544	-0.02	0.985
5	305	586.8	4.5	315	587.6	3.8	597	0.13	0.896
6	154	592.6	3.6	171	610.0	8.8	224	1.78	0.076
7	109	623.0	14.0	120	602.0	10.0	201	-1.16	0.249
8	113	624.0	11.0	124	603.5	8.8	221	-1.16	0.146
9-12	19	574.0	28.0	5	613.6	14.0	21	1.28	0.216
All Grades	988	594.6	3.0	1,307	592.8	2.4	2,020	-0.48	0.634

\* Statistically significant at the alpha 0.05 level

In Table 5.1 shows the Dakota STEP mathematics scores for SES participants by reporting school district. It shows that 75.6% (n = 988) of the students who received SES during the 2010-11 school year completed the Dakota STEP in 2009-10. All of the school districts showed a mean mathematics score improvement for their participating SES students except one school district. Overall the mean mathematics score improved by 13.0 points (2.3%) from pre to post assessment. The range of improvement of the mean mathematics score by district was from 3.0 to 45.0 points.

When the mean mathematic scores were compared by grade level, an statistically significant improvement was determined at 0.05 alpha level for all grades. The 4<sup>th</sup> graders in 2009-10 and 2010-11 had the lowest mean mathematics score (587.8 and 616.9, respectively). The high school had the highest mean mathematics scores in both years (659.0 and 736.2), respectively). (Table 5.2)

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

School District	2009-10				2010-11				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean ( $\Delta M$ )	Median ( $\Delta Md$ )	% Mean Change
Andes Central	20	621.2	30.4	619	28	636.1	37.6	633	15	14	1.9%
Belle Fourche	5	645.2	28.7	651	5	676.6	31.5	685	31	34	6.2%
Bennett County	28	621.9	39.4	628	33	644.6	37.0	648	23	20	4.2%
Eagle Butte	102	621.4	37.4	621	127	637.6	40.6	630	16	9	1.4%
Huron	42	643.6	34.2	641	57	655.8	62.7	657	12	16	2.1%
McLaughlin	59	638.2	50.3	639	74	655.8	46.2	648	18	9	1.5%
Oelrichs	6	698.7	56.1	713	6	694.8	37.2	713	-4	0	2.0%
Rapid City	151	616.2	62.4	616	224	626.3	70.1	630	10	14	2.2%
Shannon County	90	624.4	64.5	632	123	636.5	57.0	645	12	13	3.3%
Sioux Falls	252	592.1	62.4	600	380	613.4	61.0	618	21	18	4.4%
Sisseton	53	649.7	61.6	661	55	658.6	84.7	675	9	14	3.9%
Smee	11	656.1	34.6	663	12	659.0	46.7	678	3	15	3.3%
Todd County	140	620.1	61.6	626	149	629.9	60.0	632	10	6	1.9%
Watertown	4	682.0	23.3	679	2	726.5	40.3	727	45	48	6.6%
White River	25	617.9	102.5	623	32	626.2	82.1	630	8	7	2.0%
<b>Total/Average</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>617.8</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>1,307</b>	<b>631.0</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2.3%</b>

**Table 5.2**  
**Dakota STEP Mathematic Scores by Grade Level**  
**Comparison of Means By Grade Level**

Current Grade	2009-10			2010-11			Independent Student t-test		
	n	Mean	SE Mean	n	Mean	SE Mean	df	t	p
4	273	587.8	3.4	274	616.9	4.4	517	5.25	0.0001*
5	305	612.0	3.2	315	634.3	3.0	613	5.04	0.0001*
6	154	634.8	2.7	171	650.6	4.3	277	3.11	0.002*
7	109	639.7	7.6	120	659.0	5.4	197	2.07	0.039*
8	113	658.8	3.6	124	675.0	4.3	231	2.90	0.004*
9-12	19	659.0	26.0	5	736.2	16.0	20	2.49	0.022*
All Grades	988	617.8	1.9	1,307	631.0	1.7	2,144	5.05	0.0001*

\* Statistically significant different at the alpha 0.05 level

Table 6.1 shows a comparison between the reading levels between 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years by service provider. The overall means and medians include all the grade level scores of the participants the provider served during the year. Eleven (11) of the providers showed overall improvement in the mean reading scores. Twelve (12) of the providers showed an improvement or remained constant in their median scores of the participants from pre to post testing. The overall percent change in the mean scores was -0.3%, while the change in the median scores was + 1.0. The highest mean score was noted by Babbage.Net (M = 619.0) while Skills Center showed the greatest positive difference in mean scores from 2010 to 2011 ( $\Delta M = 20.4$ ).

Table 6.2 shows a comparison between the mathematics levels between 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years by service provider. The format for 2009-10 and 2010-11 for the Dakota STEP mathematics tests did not change during the two year period. There was an overall improvement in the change of mean scores by 2.1%. One program, Student Nest, was the only provider that did not show an increase in mean scores and median scores of the participants served. The high mean score was noted by Ivy League Tutor (M = 669.0) while TutorCo showed the greatest positive change in mean scores from 2010 to 2011 ( $\Delta M = 41.2$ ).

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

Provider	2009-10				2010-11				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (ΔM)	Median (ΔMd)	% Mean Change
A Math Companion	224	594.0	47.7	588	274	598.4	57.3	592	4.4	4	0.7%
Academia	92	596.6	74.3	595	123	594.6	87.3	592	(2.0)	(3)	-0.3%
Academy of Learning	52	595.0	70.1	601	54	585.9	95.5	603	(9.1)	2	-1.5%
Accel Online	5	753.0	226.0	619	6	582.7	12.1	580	(170.3)	(39)	-22.6%
Achieve High Points	31	604.9	31.3	607	42	607.9	33.9	609	3.0	2	0.5%
At Home Advantage	53	651.2	235.4	593	85	604.4	175.5	583	(46.8)	(10)	-7.2%
ATS Project Success	47	637.4	132.3	602	64	618.9	90.0	603	(18.5)	1	-2.9%
Babbage	4	610.3	29.4	613	5	619.0	31.6	613	8.7	0	1.4%
BH Special Services	19	591.2	28.3	587	29	581.6	89.7	595	(9.6)	8	-1.6%
Club Z	9	601.1	24.6	605	7	591.0	29.1	595	(10.1)	(10)	-1.7%
Educate Online	8	530.3	62.0	595.5	12	523.1	179.1	589	(7.2)	(7)	-1.4%
Excel Achievement Center	10	558.0	152.8	603	11	565.9	139.6	604	7.9	1	1.4%
Failure Free Reading	21	573.6	20.8	571	27	580.9	25.2	579	7.3	8	1.3%
Ivy League	12	591.9	33.3	590	18	602.6	38.1	595	10.7	5	1.8%
Learning Solutions	9	579.4	22.4	584	12	577.0	18.1	572	(2.4)	(12)	-0.4%
One to One Tutor (1 to 1)	164	577.5	79.7	587	200	580.8	70.4	586	3.3	(1)	0.6%
Skills Center	77	573.5	76.4	584	116	593.9	85.5	589	20.4	5	3.6%
Student Nest	1	558		558	2	566.5	10.6	567	8.5	9	1.5%

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

Sylvan Learning Center	83	601.2	54.6	593	120	594.9	31.7	592	(6.3)	(1)	-1.0%
TutorCO	4	610.0	38.0	602	4	596.3	39.1	594	(13.7)	(8)	-2.2%
Tutorial Services	57	580.2	111.9	598	89	582.1	113.5	593	1.9	(5)	0.3%
Youth & Family Services	6	583.3	34.4	578	7	602.9	24.8	608	19.6	30	3.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>594.6</b>	<b>93.5</b>	<b>591.0</b>	<b>1307</b>	<b>592.8</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>592.0</b>	<b>(1.8)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>

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

Provider	2009-10				2010-11				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (ΔM)	Median (ΔMd)	% Mean Change
A Math Companion	224	629.0	41.6	628	274	646.8	43.0	646	17.8	18	2.8%
Academia	92	621.1	63.8	620	123	634.4	64.7	638	13.3	18	2.1%
Academy of Learning	52	649.4	62.2	660	54	658.0	85.3	675	8.6	15	1.3%
Accel Online	5	604.0	19.7	599	6	613.3	10.5	614	9.3	15	1.5%
Achieve of High Points	31	631.9	40.8	632	42	645.7	40.4	646	13.8	14	2.2%
At Home Advantage	53	576.1	84.3	596	85	601.1	80.1	616	25.0	20	4.3%
ATS Project Success	47	614.1	47.5	612	64	638.4	40.6	640	24.3	28	4.0%
Babbage	4	648.0	15.6	649	5	672.6	19.4	671	24.6	22	3.8%

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

BH Special Services	19	618.5	34.4	613	29	625.3	67.0	631	6.8	18	1.1%
Club Z	9	641.6	37.5	632	7	642.6	27.8	642	1.0	10	0.2%
Educate Online	8	603.0	119.3	625	12	597.3	121.6	628	(5.7)	3	-0.9%
Excel Achievement Center	10	582.3	114.9	608	11	612.9	90.3	634	30.6	26	5.3%
Failure Free Reading	21	607.6	34.5	612	27	620.2	39.7	627	12.6	15	2.1%
Ivy League	12	648.6	35.9	643	18	669.0	55.54	666	20.4	23	3.1%
Learning Solutions	9	596.6	35.9	585	12	606.3	35.7	616	9.7	31	1.6%
1 to 1 Tutor	164	614.7	68.2	622	200	624.3	63.5	630	9.6	8	1.6%
Skills Center	77	591.7	53.5	597	116	610.0	56.9	613	18.3	16	3.1%
Student Nest	1	581		581	2	579.0	2.83	579	(2.0)	-2	-0.3%
Sylvan Learning Center	83	619.5	38.5	612	120	630.8	52.1	622	11.3	10	1.8%
TutorCo	4	600.3	47.4	591	4	641.5	34.9	647	41.2	56	6.9%
Tutorial Services	57	622.7	95.6	639	89	624.3	84.2	628	1.6	-11	0.3%
Youth & Family Services	6	611.3	60.1	588	7	651.1	38.1	640	39.8	52	6.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>617.8</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>620.0</b>	<b>1307</b>	<b>631.0</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>632.0</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2.1%</b>

<b>Table 6.3</b>					
<b>Number of Sessions Served by Providers to Students</b>					
	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Median</b>
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
2010-2011	2,179	20.3	0	313	22.0

Table 6.3 shows the a summary of data service reported from 2005 to 2011 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. Data for 2008-09 was not available. 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 33.4 hours with a median of 26 hours. In 2010-11 the mean number of sessions was at 20.3 with a maximum number of 313 sessions. The average number of hours spent per child was 22.3 hours with a median of 27 hours.

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. In 2010-11, 1,732 parents (79.5%) were contacted and given an average of 9.2 reports in the form of email, postage mail, telephone, and face-to-face. Half of the parents received 6 or more reports on the child during the year.

<b>Table 7.0</b> <b>Number of Parent Contacts &amp; Reports</b> <b>2005-2011</b>					
	<b>Number of Parents</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Median</b>
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
2010-2011	1,732	9.2	0	73	6

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. In 2010-11, the average per pupil cost was \$2,332 with a median of \$2,409. One of the low cost per pupil providers was Club Z! while Acadamia had the highest per pupil cost at \$3,866.

<b>Table 8.0</b>				
<b>Provider Costs</b>				
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>2006-2007</b>				
<b>Per Pupil Cost</b>	\$938.20	\$7.00	\$2,569.00	\$927.50
<b>Cost Per Hour</b>	\$75.06	\$7.00	\$205.52	\$60.00
<b>2007-2008</b>				
<b>Per Pupil Cost</b>	\$875.20	\$10.00	\$3,052.50	\$1,100.00
<b>Cost Per Hour</b>	\$71.47	\$10.00	\$373.00	\$60.00
<b>2009-2010</b>				
<b>Per Pupil Cost</b>	\$1,294.00	\$0.00	\$3,030.00	\$1,560.00
<b>Cost Per Hour</b>	\$53.48	\$35.50	\$70.00	\$55.00
<b>2010-2011</b>				
<b>Per Pupil Cost</b>	\$2,332.00	\$1,441.00	\$3,866.00	\$2,409.00
<b>Cost Per Hour</b>	\$58.30	\$36.03	\$96.65	\$60.23

## **Monitoring**

The South Dakota Department of Education monitored 47 SES eligible schools and 15 school 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. Some of the districts and their respective schools monitored during the 2010-11 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, Rockyford Upper and Lower Elementary, Wolf Creek Upper and Lower Elementary and the Shannon County Alternative), Sioux Falls (LB Anderson Elementary, Cleveland Elementary, Garfield Elementary,

Hawthorne Elementary, Hayward Elementary, Longfellow Elementary, and Lowell Elementary), Sisseton (Westside Elementary and Middle School), Smea (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 15 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 15 principals that responded to this item 40.0% (n = 6) said that they used the pre and post assessment scores obtained from the instruments used by the provider and 13.3% (duplicated count) used the DakotaStep assessment scores. About half of the principals (46.7%) talked to the participant’s teacher or 33.3% of the parents about a student’s progress based on services received.

<b>Table 9.0</b> <b>How Quality of SES Is Assessed In Your School</b> <b>Principals’ Responses (n = 15)</b>		
	n	Percent
Pre & Post assessment scores administered by the SES provider	6	40.0%
Student state assessment scores (DakotaStep)	2	13.3%
Talk with the teacher regarding student’s progress	7	46.7%
Talk with the parent regarding their child’s progress	5	33.3%
I do not evaluate the quality of the SES provider	6	40.0%
Other	1	6.7%

<b>Table 10.0</b>		
<b>Where Successes Have Been Experienced</b>		
<b>Principals Responses (n = 15)</b>		
	n	Percent
Improvement in DakotaStep reading assessment scores	1	6.7%
Improvement in DakotaStep mathematics assessment scores	3	20.0%
Improvement in student's attendance in school	1	6.7%
Improvement in student's behavior	1	6.7%
Students who need the support are receiving SES	6	40.0%
SES has small group sessions	4	26.7%
I have not experience any success in providing SES	6	40.0%
Other	3	20.0%

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 (40.0%) Improvement in the student's Dakota STEP reading assessment scores was not chosen a means of measuring SES success (6.7%), while 20.0% of the principals reported success in mathematics by improvement in the mathematics scores. Six principals (40.0%) reported they had not experienced a successful program at their school. (Table 10.0)

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%) and being able to monitor the students involvement in SES were challenges. The top challenge identified by the principals was having communication with SES providers (66.7%). Three out of five principals (60.0%) faced challenges in their capacity to monitor the SES provider to determine their level satisfaction with the work being done and measure the provider's effectiveness. Providing transportation to students to and from the SES location (26.7%), and getting information from the provider( 46.7%) were additional challenges. (Table 11.0)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Table 11.0</b>  <b>Challenges Principals Faced in Providing SES in Their Building</b>  <b>Principals Responses (n = 15)</b></p>		
	n	Percent
Communication with SES provider	10	66.7%
Students needing academic assistance are not receiving SES	3	20.0%
Capacity to monitor SES provider	9	60.0%
Capacity to monitor students involvement in SES	5	33.3%
Students not attending sessions	5	33.3%
Provider curriculum not aligned with state standards	1	6.7%
Transportation to get students to and from SES location	4	26.7%
SES provider does not provide information regarding student progress	7	46.7%
I have not faced any challenges in providing SES	0	0.0%
Other	4	26.7%

## Teacher's Questionnaire Results

There were 90 teachers who completed the teacher questionnaire regarding SES. The majority of the respondents taught in elementary school (81.1%, n = 73 with 24.4% (n = 22) teaching in the middle school level, grades 6 to 8, and 5.6% (n = 5) teaching in high school. Four out five teachers (57.8%, n = 52) indicated that the SES provided developed and shared an individual supplemental education plan for their student. Two-fifths of the teachers (44.4% n =40) 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 shows what type of information teacher's received from the SES provider regarding their participating students. About one third of the teachers (31.1%, n = 28) reported receiving assessment scores from the provider and 34.4% of the teachers reported receiving information about student's participation in the program. One in five teachers received information about student's attendance (24.4%) and the same percentage reported receiving course work information. Almost half of the teachers (45.6%, n = 41) did not receive any information from their student's SES provider.

<b>Table 12.0</b> <b>Information Received From SES Provider Regarding Student's Progress</b> <b>Teacher Responses (n = 90)</b>		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	22	24.4%
Student participation	31	34.4%
Course work information	22	24.4%
Provider assessment scores	28	31.1%
I did not receive any information from the provider	41	45.6%
Other	10	11.1%

<b>Table 12.1</b> <b>Describe the SES Received By Your Students</b> <b>Teacher Responses (n = 89)</b>		
	n	Percent
Provider is addressing the student's academic skills needs	42	47.2%
The provider has kept me informed of the student's progress	23	25.8%
The provider has not kept me informed of the student's progress	31	34.8%
The provider is not addressing the student's academic skill needs.	10	11.2%
Other	11	12.4%

Table 12.1 shows that 47.2% of the responding teachers stated the provider is addressing their student's academic skills needs. Additionally, 25.8% of the teachers stated that the provider kept them informed of their student's progress. One-third of the teachers (34.8%) reported that the provider was not keeping them apprised of their student's progress through the tutoring services. Forty percent of the teachers (40.0%, n = 36) indicated that the student's academic performance was stayed about the same as when the SES started, while 60.0% (n =54) 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 students would come in log on to the computer and do the work there was no score or anything for teachers or students in the way of letting them know where they are at.
- I believe the reading strategies Failure Free Reading provided were geared toward the emergent reader. Students who were not ready for the reading exercises became frustrated and bored. The schedule at the end of the day was too late for the young students (K-2nd) and many did not return after the first session. I would like to know how those who did continue for 5-8 weeks did.
- This tutoring provider was not great. The students were very bored with the program. Acadamia.net had some glitches, and made it hard for students to receive their hours.
- I would like there to be more interaction between the provider and the teacher. I did not get any information back about the student's progress.
- I feel this program did not benefit my students. There was never any contact with the provider as to how my students were doing. this is a complete waste of taxpayer money.
- As the core teacher, I was not asked nor made aware of what my student(s) were learning.
- I like this program and find that most of the students involved in this program enjoy it and are having success in it.
- They [*the providers*] kept us informed by phone calls, emails, and progress reports.
- I am a science teacher, I believe a lot of this information is about reading and math skills however knowing where my students are at would be beneficial in differentiating my instruction.
- Program is effective...provider is not well organized in terms of pay scale and authorized personnel.

## Parent Questionnaire Results

Over 240 parents (n = 242) 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 40 parents (17.1%) said that their child's teacher help them in selected a SES provider, while 79.9% (n = 187) made the decision on their own. Seven parents reported that the principal helped them select a SES provider.

When asked how their received information about their child's progress in SES, 25.6% (n = 60) said they received it in person, while 44.4% (n = 104) received a progress report in the mail and 23.5% (n = 55) by telephone. Twenty-nine percent (29.1%) received a progress report monthly, 12.0% received a progress report weekly, and 10.7% received before and after each completed session. Forty-one parents (17.5%) never received any progress report or received any information about their child.

	n	Percent
Tutorial Services	31	12.8%
1 to 1 Tutor	19	7.9%
A Math Companion	15	6.2%
Achieve High Point	7	2.9%
ATS Project Success	13	5.4%
Sylvan Learning Center	28	11.6%
Academia Net	29	12.0%
Black Hills Special Services	14	5.8%
Sioux Falls Skills Center	27	11.2%
Achieve High Point	7	2.9%
At Home Advantage Tutoring	20	8.3%
Other Providers (0 to 6 respondents)	32	13.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Table 14.0</b>		
<b>What type of information do you receive from your child's SES provider?</b>		
<b>(n = 234)</b>		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	53	22.7%
Student participation	87	37.2%
Quiz and course work information	90	38.5%
Pre & post assessment scores	110	47.0%
Did not receive any information	41	17.5%
Other	18	7.7%

About half of the parents (47.0%) received information about their child's pre and post assessment scores during the year. About two in ten parents (22.7%) receive information regarding their child's attendance, 37.2% about their child's participation and 38.5% about information on their child's course work. One-fifth of the respondents (17.5%) reported not receiving any information about their child's progress in a program.

<b>Table 15.0</b>										
<b>How satisfied are you with the quality of service your child has been receiving from the service provider listed above?</b>										
	<b>2006-07</b>		<b>2007-08</b>		<b>2008-09</b>		<b>2009-10</b>		<b>2010-11</b>	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Very satisfied	41	45.6%	4	23.5%	22	59.5%	12	66.7%	114	48.7%
Satisfied	40	44.4%	6	35.3%	13	35.1%	5	27.8%	94	40.2%
Dissatisfied	7	7.8%	7	41.2%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%	14	6.0%
Very dissatisfied	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	12	5.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

---

In 2010-11 about half of the respondents (47.4%) were very satisfied and 42.3% were satisfied with the quality of instruction being provided by the SES programs. When asked about the size of the SES class, 45.3% were very satisfied and 35.9% 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 and progress made from the tutoring or special services received, 45.3% noted improvement for their child, while 53.8% 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. Some of the parent comments about regarding their child's experience with a provider included:

- You all are doing a great job with all of my children.
- I think this is a wonderful program. We had an exceptional, great tutor in home! She made it fun, they worked hard and she had many great ways of working with my son. I had no idea these programs were available until my son transferred to Knollwood and the booths set-up at registration time gave me the information to look through. Then I could make a decision that would fit into our life! It would have been nice to hear from parents who had used these services. To hear what they liked or disliked about the programs. It may help in the decision of what program to use.
- I am very happy with the services provided for the elementary classes, but wish they extended to the middle school classes.
- It would have been nice if it was longer.
- I would just like to know what her progress is in the program. She enjoys the class and I know she is learning but only to the extent that she tells me.
- I didn't understand how to read the printouts and never really knew if my son was making progress or not. I didn't get the first report for several months but then seemed to receive them more often towards the end.
- The tutor for my child was extremely hard to understand, even for an adult.
- More information about what my child is doing. Also give more time for work.
- Even after attending Sylvan for a month or more, my child still had to be put in a tutoring class in school.
- I tried several times to understand what he was trying to say but the language barrier was very difficult. Also the Skype connection continually cut out, losing the connection. With all of these problems, my child was getting discouraged, so we decided to end the

---

program. We tried several times to let 1 to 1 know we were ending the program and they can pick up their computer, but we've never heard from them.

- I have never spoken with any one from this tutoring service. It was set up through the school and that has been it.
- The program was boring for my child. I would not recommend this program to anyone.
- My daughter could not keep attending the sessions. The hours it was held (4-5 pm) were not convenient for us. I could not pick her up and then drop her off for an hour and then come back again.
- We still have not received a computer for my child to work on. Our computer is too slow and the company keeps saying the computer is on its way. He has completed a few assignments on his own but never worked with a tutor. She checked in a few times to see if he can get the home computer to work but it won't. School is over in 2 months so needless to say, I'm very disappointed.
- The service provider that I used needs to be more reachable. Cannot contact them after initial setup. Schedules and structure need to be implemented at setup. Motivation became a factor for my child after 2 months. Not sure what to do about that part.
- My child has completed the hours but we have received nothing on how she did or how to get the computer transferred to her. My child has completed the hours but we have received nothing on how she did or how to get the computer transferred to her.

## **District SES Administrator**

There were 12 district administrators from 7 districts that responded to the on-line questionnaire. Two-fifths of the respondents were Federal Program Directors and 25% were SES District Coordinators. 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 50.0% held parent meetings (duplicated count). Half of the respondents (50.0%) reported making person contacts with the parents. Other methods included telephone calls (75.0%), newspaper articles (8.3%), public forums (8.3%), school newsletter (33.3%), and brochures (25.0%).

Success in taking advantage of supplemental education services was reported when parent chose the provider (90.9%). Other elements that made SES successful was receiving student progress reports from the provider (54.5%), improved student academic performance

(72.7%), monitoring visits conducted by the state (45.5%) and evaluating the service providers (36.4%).

Table 16.0 provides a list of challenges encountered by the administrator in working with the providers and parents. The most challenging area noted by the respondents was getting the students to attend all sessions (90.9%). 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 (54.5%). Another challenge was the communication link between the classroom teacher and the provider (63.6%). In many cases attendance could be improved if the teacher was informed of the absences. Another area of concern was not receiving student progress reports from the providers (36.4%).

<b>Table 16.0</b>		
<b>Challenges Administrator Has Encountered In Providing</b>		
<b>Supplemental Education Services</b>		
<b>(n = 11)</b>		
	n	Percent
Provider attendance at provider fair	3	27.3%
Parent attendance at provider fair	1	9.1%
Parents can choose provider	2	18.2%
Monitoring visits conducted by the SD DOE	0	0.0%
Receiving student progress reports from provider	4	36.4%
Getting SES information to parents	1	9.1%
Not all students attend sessions (student attendance)	10	90.9%
Students who would benefit the most do not attend	6	54.5%
Collecting student information from providers	4	36.4%
Communication between classroom teacher and provider	7	63.6%
SES too expensive	3	27.3%
Setting up transportation for students	1	9.1%
Evaluating supplemental educational service providers	1	9.1%
Other	2	18.2%

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Table 16.1</b>  <b>Successes Encountered By Administrators In Providing</b>  <b>Supplemental Education Services in Their District</b>  <b>(n = 11)</b></p>		
	n	Percent
Attendance at provider fair	2	18.2%
District communication	3	27.3%
Parents choice of provider	10	90.9%
Monitoring visits conducted by the SD DOE	5	45.5%
Receiving student progress reports from provider	6	54.5%
Improved student academic performance	8	72.7%
Evaluating supplemental educational service providers	4	36.4%
Other	1	9.1%

The administrators reported that it is difficult to attribute student gains or progress to SES. Learning plans were developed for each student which included pre and post assessments, but the progress of achievement was not reported by some of the providers. Some of the gain could have been attained through the additional help from their classroom teacher or in-school supplemental services. As noted by one administrator, “We look at the growth shown from the pretest to the posttest. However, we always wonder what growth we can credit teachers versus the provider in overall growth.”

When the school district was unable to develop an agreement following a parent’s initial request then a second choice was identified. The challenge was meeting the provider’s requirement for a minimum class or service size. It was hard to meet the financial costs of a tutor with a small number of participants.

Table 17.0 shows that Sylvian Learning Center and Acadamia. Net served the largest number of students as reported by the district administrators at 17.1% (n =170) and 17.2% (n =171) respectively. The second highest was Tutorial Services at 16.5% (n = 164). The third highest was 1 to 1 Tutor at 10.7% (n = 106). The Table 2.0 (page 10) shows that 1 to 1 Tutor served the largest number of students (n = 512), followed by A Math Companion (n = 275), Acadamia.Net (n = 267), and Sylvan Learning Center (n = 235).

<p align="center"><b>Table 17.0</b>  <b>Administrator's Report on the Number of Students Served</b>  <b>(n = 11)</b></p>				
	Administrators Reporting	Number of Students	Percent of Total	Satisfaction Rating
1 to 1 Tutor	3	106	10.7%	2.0
A Math Companion	3	95	9.6%	4.3
Academia.Net	4	171	17.2%	4.3
Accel Online	1	10	1.0%	4.0
Achieve High Points	2	27	2.7%	3.5
At Home Advantage	1	38	3.8%	3.0
ATS Project Success	2	34	3.4%	4.0
Babbage Net School	1	16	1.6%	4.0
BH Special Services	1	78	7.9%	4.0
Educate Online	1	2	0.2%	3.0
Club Z!	1	15	1.5%	3.0
Excel Achievement Center	1	0	0.0%	3.0
Failure Free Reading	1	27	2.7%	4.0
Ivy League Tutor, Inc.	3	16	1.6%	3.3
Sylvan Learning Center	1	170	17.1%	4.0
Tutorial Services	6	164	16.5%	3.8
Youth & Family Services	1	24	2.4%	5.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>993</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3.7</b>

## SES Provider Feedback

Twenty-five providers completed a questionnaire regarding the services they provided to fifteen school districts in the past year. Twenty-four (96.0%) of the providers reported having no concerns working with school districts in developing agreements. Comments received from the providers Included:

- Sioux Falls School District was great to work with. They answered all questions quickly and helped out as much as they could.
- We were fortunate to see some growth by the students and they seemed to enjoy themselves.
- Having teachers complete a preliminary learning plan was an excellent addition to the program.
- We need more parent, school, and district involvement in helping throughout the service during the school year.
- We were new to this process. Letting the parents know what we could provide was difficult. We were told that we should not communicate directly with the child's teacher. I think it would be better to send the child's progress reports to the teacher in addition to the parents and coordinators. We really enjoyed working with the students and they showed substantial gains through out program.
- The parents who chose supplemental services chose outside providers and did not choose the school's SES program.

**Table 18.0**  
**Challenges Providers Have Encountered In Providing**  
**Supplemental Education Services**  
**(n = 25)**

	n	Percent
Communication with the school district	2	8.0%
Getting SES information to parents	5	20.0%
Parents can choosing provider	5	20.0%
Monitoring visits conducted by the SD DOE	0	0.0%
Parent communication	8	32.0%
Getting SES information to parents	1	4.0%
Student attendance	11	44.0%
Communication between classroom teacher and SES provider	7	28.0%
Transportation for students	1	4.0%
Finding internet services	5	20.0%
Other	6	24.0%

<b>Table 18.1</b>		
<b>Successes Encountered In Providing Supplemental Education Services</b>		
<b>(n = 25)</b>		
	n	Percent
Attendance at provider fair	15	60.0%
District communication	20	80.0%
Parent communication	20	80.0%
Monitoring visits conducted by the SD DOE	3	12.0%
Student attendance	18	72.0%
Improved student academic performance	20	80.0%
Evaluating supplemental educational service providers	4	16.0%
Technical assistance provided by the SD DOE	4	16.0%
Other	3	12.0%

Eighty percent of the 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 contributors to the success of the services within the district.

When asked about the challenges for the providers, parent communication was highlighted by 32.0% of the respondents. Linked to this was getting information to parents about SES (20.0%). The greatest challenge was student attendance (44.0%). This was noted by the administrators and teachers as an issue. One-fourth (28.0%) of the providers reported that communication between classroom teacher and SES provider as a challenge. Typically, the contact person with a school district was not the teacher but a SES coordinator or Federal Grant Director. In many cases was difficult to know if the teacher received the provider's report. The line of communications was between parents and district office. The providers reported that the majority of the communication was performed through email, direct mail, and telephone calls.

<p align="center"><b>Table 19.0</b>  <b>Providers Report on the Number of Students Served</b>  <b>(n = 25)</b></p>				
	Providers Reporting	Number of Students Served	Percent of Total	Average Number of Students Per Provider
Andes Central	5	53	2.8%	10.6
Belle Fourche	4	11	0.6%	2.8
Bennett County	7	58	3.1%	8.3
Eagle Butte	4	137	7.3%	34.3
Huron	7	47	2.5%	6.7
McLaughlin	5	114	6.1%	22.8
Oelrichs	3	6	0.3%	2.0
Rapid City	16	462	24.6%	28.9
Shannon County	10	196	10.4%	19.6
Sioux Falls	14	509	27.1%	36.4
Sisseton	4	71	3.8%	17.8
Smee	5	23	1.2%	4.6
Todd County	10	87	4.6%	8.7
Watertown	5	8	0.4%	1.6
White River	4	96	5.1%	24.0
Total	25	1,878	100.0%	75.1

---

## Conclusion

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services providers for the 2010-11 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?
- 4 As a result of the supplemental services received, do the student participants demonstrate achievement growth as measured by the Dakota STEP assessments in mathematics and reading?

The largest area of concern or an issue for everyone continues to be in communication between providers, parents, and teachers. 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.

Program completion and attendance is another area where concerns were expressed by administrators and providers. When parents sign up their child for supplemental education services, they must make an effort to help their child complete the program if he or she is to make any academic progress. Part of issue appears to be linked to communication. Parents and teachers are not informed when students are not attending the scheduled sessions either face-to-face or on-line.

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 (n = 1,940). The number of students did not match with the number of students that the service providers reported (n = 2,179). In both cases, the numbers show a significant gain in serving a larger number of

---

students from the previous year. The percentage of students served ranged were from 21.9% to 25.4% as oppose to 16.4% (n = 1,249) in 2009-10.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed by providers, grade levels, and school districts for the participating students. Results from the spring 2010 and spring 2011 Dakota STEP were compiled and statistical tests showed that there was a statistically significant positive improvement in the standard scores from 2010 to 2011 in the area of mathematics for the participating students ( $p < 0.0001$ ). In the area of reading there the reading level showed no statistical improvement from 2010 to 2011 assessment scores for all participating students ( $p < 0.634$ ).

Each provider used their own assessment to conduct diagnostic or screening assessments in addition to pre and post achievement tests. There was no data collected to document any improvement based of selected interventions using provider assessment tools. Additionally, the type or form of the assessment tools used were not reported to the Department of Education.

Overall, SES appear to be effective in help students' academic achievement in mathematics. The reading areas for all grade levels did not show any gains over a two year period. This has been consistent with findings from previous years. Almost 90% of the parents and half of the educators were pleased with supplemental education services being provided.

---

## Recommendations

Based on the findings in this report, the external evaluator is proposing the following recommendations to be considered for the 2010-11 school year. Some of these recommendations were made in the previous year's evaluation report, but have not been implemented due to technical reasons. These recommendations could strengthen the evaluation report findings.

- 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. Or the provide can report the name or form of assessment being used as part of their intervention strategy. 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. There are many school sites not providing input to determine if the SES is effective at their location.
- Increase the number of eligible students to participate in SES. Currently only one fourth of the eligible students are taking advantage of the program.

---

## **APPENDIX A**

### **PROVIDER APPLICATION**



**south dakota**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Learning. Leadership. Service.**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
**DOE-Title I**  
**SES Providers**

RFP: Notice to potential providers of supplemental educational services of the opportunity to provide services under Section 1116 of Title I Part A and the application procedures for obtaining approval from DOE to be an approved provider of those services.

**PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**

**5:00 PM CST**

**March 18, 2011**

**DEPARTMENT CONTACT:**

**Betsy Chapman**

[betsy.chapman@state.sd.us](mailto:betsy.chapman@state.sd.us)

South Dakota Department of Education  
Office of Educational Services & Support  
800 Governors Drive – Pierre, SD 57501-2291  
Ph: (605) 773-4712 Fax: (605) 773-3782

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER**

---

## Overview

### Background

As part of the federal **Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act (NCLB)**, any school district with a school that is in Level 2, 3, 4, or 5 of School Improvement shall arrange for the provision of supplemental educational services to eligible children in the school from a provider with a demonstrated record of effectiveness or a high probability of success, and that is selected by the parents in cooperation with the school district of residence and approved for that purpose by the State educational agency [Section 1116(e)(1)].

Supplemental educational services are additional academic instruction offered outside of the regular school day and designed to increase the academic achievement of low-income students in low-performing Title I schools. These services may be tutoring or other educational services that provide additional academic assistance to students. Supplemental services must be of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children.

### Purpose

The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to select providers of supplemental services that will be included on South Dakota's Approved Supplemental Educational Services Provider (SES) list. As many providers as possible that meet the criteria specified below may be placed on the list of state approved providers. The list will be maintained by the South Dakota Department of Education and will indicate which of the approved providers offer supplemental services in each school district.

**Title I ESEA (NCLB)** requires that the state promote maximum participation by providers to ensure that parents have as many choices as possible. The state-approved list will be updated at least annually. Each year, there will be an opportunity for new providers to demonstrate that their organization meets the requirements. Providers of supplemental services can also be removed from the list annually.

It is expected that instruction will be in the areas of **reading and mathematics** in order to help students achieve South Dakota's content standards in reading and mathematics, as demonstrated by improved State assessment scores. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is calculated for both reading and mathematics in all public schools in the state of South Dakota based on results of the Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (Dakota STEP).

---

## **Eligibility Requirements**

To be included on the approved list of supplemental educational services providers, applicants must:

- Provide a demonstrated record of effectiveness or have a high probability of increasing student academic achievement
- Provide supplemental educational services that are consistent with state core academic standards in reading and mathematics. The South Dakota content standards are available for download from the South Dakota Department of Education's website at <http://doe.sd.gov/contentstandards/index.asp>
- Provide instruction that is of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase academic achievement of eligible children on state assessments and attain proficiency in meeting the State's academic achievement standards. All instruction must be scientifically based and proven to be effective
- Provide letters of reference
- Be financially sound
- Provide instruction that takes place beyond the regular school day
- Provide instruction that is secular, neutral and non-ideological
- Provide parents of each student receiving services on the progress of the student
- Provide the LEA (Local Education Agency) with information on the progress of the student
- Meet all applicable Federal, State, and local health, safety, and civil rights laws
- Provide evidence of satisfactory background checks for all instructional staff
- Adhere to Code of Ethics as adopted by the EIA Board of Directors (Copy found within this document)
- Be able to begin services in South Dakota no later than October 1, 2011
- **Be aware of the challenges and unique situations involved in providing services in South Dakota:**
  - Ø **Limited or no cell phone service in many areas**
  - Ø **Limited cell phone providers (call the SD DOE for more information)**
  - Ø **Online providers offering to provide internet for students must ensure their method of delivery will work in all areas they are applying to serve or make alternate arrangements with the school districts (limited broadband service in most areas)**
  - Ø **Ensure tutors/monitors will be available for hire (districts will NOT provide tutors)**
  - Ø **Eight Native American Indian Reservations in the state.**

## **Eligible Service Providers**

The term Provider is defined as a non-profit entity, a for-profit entity, or a school district. Entities eligible to apply to provide supplemental educational services may include, but are not limited to:

Community agencies  
Private schools  
Individuals  
Child care centers  
Public schools  
Public school district  
Libraries  
Community colleges  
Universities  
Private companies  
On-line schools or tutoring services, Family literacy programs/Even Start programs  
Faith-based organizations  
After-school programs

---

**Please note: A district or school identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, cannot be an approved supplemental service provider unless a waiver is granted from the US DOE. These waivers are granted on a year-to-year basis and are NOT guaranteed. A school that is making adequate yearly progress within a district identified for improvement may apply to be an approved provider.**

## **Students to be Served**

SES must be made available to all low-income students in low-performing schools. Service providers may not refuse services to a student based on academic standing, identification as a student with disabilities, or limited English proficient status. If situations arise where students cannot benefit from the supplemental educational services, the service provider, parent, teacher, and Title I coordinator should meet and resolve the situation. Services must be made available to all students who are eligible for free/reduced price lunch, to the extent that funds allow. If there are more eligible students than funds can support, schools must prioritize services with students with the greatest achievement need receiving top priority for services.

Students should be served during the entire school year as long as funding allows. In schools following the traditional calendar school year, students are eligible to receive services from the beginning of the school year through June 30th. Each session scheduled must be at least thirty (30) minutes in length. The number of sessions scheduled will vary by student and will be based on the identified needs of each student.

**If a student misses two or more sessions, the service provider must consult with the parent and Title I coordinator to determine the nature of the problem and work to resolve the situation. If no solution can be determined, services may be terminated.**

## **Incentives**

A provider or school district may not provide incentives to entice a student or a student's parent to choose a provider. After a provider has been chosen, the use of incentives to promote academic achievement and/or attendance is allowable and should be educationally appropriate. A school or district may host provider fairs.

**Please note: In the Code of Ethics as adopted by the EIA Board of Directors (Copy found within this document), under “Standards Specific to SES Providers”, #7 states that providers will: “Not offer a student, parent or teacher any form of incentive for signing-up a student with a provider. This includes restricting the promotion of any allowable attendance or performance incentives to the period following student enrollment. Only then may the provider inform the student of any incentives that are directly linked to attendance or performance in SES.”**

## **Provider Minimums and Maximums**

Providers will be allowed to set minimum and maximum numbers of students for each LEA in which they agree to provide services. The minimum and maximum may be the number of students the provider will be able to serve on a site-by-site basis or an LEA basis. **Providers will need to make the distinction.** For example, if the minimum number is 5 on a site-by-site basis, then the provider is agreeing to work with any school in that LEA that has at least 5 students enrolled in their program. If it is a minimum of 5 for

---

the LEA, then the provider is agreeing to work with any number at each site as long as the district totals meet the minimum. Once a provider begins services, they will be required to complete services even if the number of students drops below the minimum number. The contract between the LEA and the provider will contain minimum and maximum numbers. The LEA must notify the SEA about any violation in providers serving children as agreed in the contract.

## **Materials and Supplies**

Providers are expected to furnish their own materials to use with students. Schools are neither expected nor required to copy materials or furnish materials for the provider to use with students. The use of worksheets and handouts is discouraged; rather, active learning activities and the use of manipulative usually engage students more fully and result in greater student achievement.

The services and curricula must be aligned with the South Dakota content standards. Providers must work with the LEA to create a Student Learning Plan Agreement for each student. Tutors will have a copy of students' assessment information and the student learning plan on site. Providers must be able to provide verification that the materials to be used with students are aligned and appropriate for student grade levels.

## **Non-Regulatory Guidance**

A copy of the Supplemental Educational Services Non-regulatory guidance can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/suppsvcsguid.doc>

## **Requirements & Responsibilities of the Approved Provider**

Entities included on the Approved Supplemental Services Provider list are responsible for doing the following:

PRIOR to the start of school (July or August), contact each local school district the company is approved to serve and set up a contract that includes:

- The per hour charge
- The location where services will be provided (if the provider will be using district facilities, a separate contract may be needed)
- Provisions for the payment for services to the provider by the school district; Billing must be in hourly increments; Only the time a student spends in actual tutoring will be paid. Providers may not "round up" minutes until the total is calculated
- The means of transporting children to the place of instruction if the services will be provided in a location other than the student's school, if applicable
- Provisions for the termination of such agreement
- An assurance from the provider that the identity of any student eligible for or receiving, supplemental educational services will not be disclosed without the written permission of the parents of the student
- Contact information for customer service, fiscal and who the district will contact concerning Student or Individual Learning Plans
- A start date for services to begin; Failure to meet the start date may be cause for termination of the agreement

---

ONCE notified by a district of students who have selected their service, enter into an agreement (Individual Learning Plan – ILP) with the local school district that includes:

- A statement of specific achievement goals for each student receiving supplemental educational services based upon the specific educational needs of the child.
  - A description of how student progress will be measured.
  - A timetable for improving achievement. In the case of a student with disabilities, the timetable will be consistent with the student’s individual education program.
  - A description of how parents, teacher(s) and the school district will be regularly informed of student progress.
  - Provisions for termination of agreement with regards to student attendance and/or behavior.
  - The amount of instructional time (in hours) to be provided.
- PRIOR to beginning services:
- Be able to obtain a Certificate of Authority or Certificate of Incorporation prior to beginning services. (<http://www.sdsos.gov/contactus/contact.shtm>)

Ensure that the instruction provided is aligned with South Dakota academic achievement standards and in the case of a student with disabilities, is consistent with the student’s individualized education program (IEP) under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

Provide parents of children receiving supplemental educational services and the appropriate school with information on the progress of the children in increasing achievement in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that such parents can understand

Ensure all individuals who will interact with students are fingerprinted and/or background checked pursuant to procedures set forth in SDCL 13-10-12

Comply with district employee requirements (many districts require documentation of fingerprinting and/or background checks of all employees be provided to the district)

Adhere to the provisions of the approved application

Adhere to the provisions of the signed agreement with the LEA

Provide supplemental educational services that are consistent with South Dakota’s core academic standards in reading and mathematics.

Provide instruction that is of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase academic achievement of eligible children on state assessments and attain proficiency in meeting the State’s academic achievement standards

· Provide instruction that takes place beyond the regular school day

· Implement the student learning plan as written and agreed upon by the LEA and parents

- 
- Submit to the LEA and SD DOE a final report that summarizes the individual academic progress of each student provided with supplemental services, along with hours of services and total amount billed, by June 15, 2011 of each participating year. The only exception is if services will continue until June 30, 2011. In that case, a final report will be due by July 15, 2011.
  - Adhere to Code of Ethics as adopted by the EIA Board of Directors (Copy found within this document)

\*Note: Approved providers are expected to deliver services. Providers may hire tutors/teachers at a school site to provide tutoring. However, they MUST provide initial training along with on-going support. Providers must continually monitor their programs provided by tutors. A provider must be prepared to deliver services once approved. If parents have signed up for a provider and the provider is not ready to begin by the start date in the contract between the LEA and the provider, the students will be moved to the parents' next choice

## **Responsibilities of the School District**

Participating school districts are responsible for:

Prior to the start of school: Enter a financial contract, contingent on selection as a provider by parents within the district, with the following items:

- The location where services will be provided
- The means of transporting children to the place of instruction if applicable.
- A description of how parents, teacher(s) and the school district will be regularly informed of student progress
- Provisions for the termination of such agreement
- Provisions for the payment for services to the provider by the school district
- An assurance from the provider that the identity of any student eligible for or receiving, supplemental educational services will not be disclosed without the written permission of the parents of the student
- The qualifications of staff responsible for the delivery of the instructional program

Identify eligible students (Eligible students are all students from low-income families who attend Title I schools that are in Level 2 of school improvement, Corrective Action, or in restructuring.)

Notify parents annually (in an understandable and uniform format, and, to the extent practicable, in a language the parents can understand) of:

- The availability of supplemental educational services
- The approved providers whose services are available to their students
- A brief description of the services, qualifications, and demonstrated effectiveness of each approved provider to assist the parent in selecting a provider

Contact providers selected by the parents and enter into a contractual agreement on behalf of the student

In addition to the fiscal contract, enter into an agreement that has:

- A statement of specific achievement goals for each student receiving supplemental educational services based upon the specific educational needs of the child
- Description of how the student progress will be measured
- Timetable for improvement; in the case of a student with disabilities, the timetable will be consistent with the student's individual education program
- A description of how student progress will be measured
- A description of how parents, teacher(s) and the school district will be regularly informed of student progress

---

Ensure that eligible students with disabilities under IDEA and the students covered under Section 504 receive appropriate services with proper accommodations. Districts must share information that will allow providers to know what type of accommodations are necessary to provide appropriate services once a parent has chosen that provider and an agreement for that student has been signed. This could include student goals and/or classroom accommodations.

Ensure that eligible students who have limited English proficiency receive appropriate services with language assistance

Monitor the “Responsibilities of the Approved Provider”

Apply fair and equitable procedures for serving students if the number of spaces at approved providers is not sufficient to serve all students. Providers may, with parent permission, provide a delayed start of services in order to accommodate all students

Do not disclose to the public the identity of any student who is eligible for, or receiving, supplemental educational services without the written permission of the parents of the student

Please note: Districts are NOT required to provide transportation home for those students with services provided at the school facility after school hours or to those student with services offered away from the school location, unless arrangements are made with the provider to cover the costs. School districts may make suggestions to parents on transportation methods and may provide transportation if funding allows. Districts are not required to provide space or resources (i.e., computer, materials, copies, or staff). If the provider and district both agree, a contract can be written for use of district facility. A district may require additional fees for the use of space and equipment, and the provider must ensure that there will be on-site supervision of students.

## **Service Discrepancies and Dissatisfaction**

Parents/guardians or school personnel who are dissatisfied with the services provided will notify the LEA. The LEA will notify the SD State SES Coordinator with these concerns. The State Coordinator will then investigate the complaints and make a decision about further action for the service provider.

## **Monitoring**

The South Dakota Department of Education, in cooperation with the applicable school districts, is required to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by providers and to withdraw approval from providers that fail, for two years, to contribute to increasing the academic proficiency of students to whom they provide services or that fail to meet any of the other provider requirements or assurances. SEA monitoring will be conducted through contact with local school districts to ascertain an evaluation and demonstration of the effectiveness of providers and through on-site monitoring. Failing to operate in accordance with Provider responsibilities or assurances will constitute grounds for immediate removal from the state-approved list. Providers not being utilized in the state within a two-year period will need to reapply.

SD DOE has contracted with an external evaluator to help determine the effectiveness of approved providers. Approved providers will be made aware of the requirements of the evaluation system.

---

## **Removal Policy**

The State Education Agency is required to monitor the quality and effectiveness of state approved Supplemental Educational Service (SES) providers in accordance with Public Law 107-110 Section 1116(e)(4)(D) of Title I Part A of No Child Left Behind, corresponding regulation 200.47(a)(4)(ii), and South Dakota Administrative Rule 24:42:02:48. The South Dakota Department of Education (SD DOE) has developed the following policy for removal of SES providers from the state approved list.

The SD DOE will withdraw approval for SES providers that fail, for two years, to contribute to increasing the academic proficiency of students to whom they provide services. Providers that fail to meet any of the other provider requirements or assurances may be removed from the approved list. Failing to operate in accordance with certain provider requirements or assurances will constitute grounds for immediate removal from the state-approved list.

### **Procedure**

The South Dakota Department of Education will use the following procedure for removal from the state approved provider list.

#### **Gathering Information**

- s DOE reviews submitted district and provider reports along with its own monitoring reports.
- s DOE reviews evaluation reports from a third-party evaluator.
- s Potential violations cited.
- s District and parent complaint through the district received by DOE

#### **Evaluation of Information**

- s Notification to provider of complaints and/or violations
- s DOE further investigates alleged violations.
- s Committee convened to review findings if warranted. Recommendations provided to DOE.
- s DOE renders decision for removal based upon findings and committee recommendations.

#### **Resulting Action**

- s First violations for the provider will be noted and the provider is informed of the decision.
- s If the offence is the second violation in two years, the provider's approval status will be removed. Provider may appeal the decision through the appeals process.
- s Decision and timeline for appeal process communicated to the provider.
- s Removal from the state approved provider list. Provider will be immediately notified.
- s Districts will be immediately notified of provider's removal from state approved list.
- s Provider may reapply during the application next window.

#### **Application Review Committee**

The Committee to review the findings will consist of DOE staff, Committee of Practitioners, School Support Team members, and representation from Title I districts with schools with experience with Supplemental Educational Services. The Committee will make recommendations to the South Dakota Department of Education.

---

## Appeals Process

If a provider believes that removal from the state's approved SES provider list is unwarranted due to statistical or other substantive reasons, the provider may submit evidence to the SD DOE to support such belief.

### Appeal

- The provider will submit a letter and supporting evidence to the DOE indicating the appeal no later than ten working days after receipt of the notice of removal.
- The Department of Education will review the evidence provided.
- Based on the evidence, the Department of Education may either rescind or retain its decision to remove the provider from the list.
- If the decision for removal stands, the Department of Education will activate the appeals committee and inform the provider of details of the appeals committee review.

### Appeals Committee Review

- The provider will be given the opportunity to present evidence in person, by written correspondence, or by conference call to the appeals committee.
- The appeals committee will notify the Department of Education of its decision within 10 working days after the review.
- The appeals committee's decision is final.
- The Department of Education will notify the provider of the appeals committee's decision within 20 days of the review.

### Appeals Committee

The appeals committee will consist of 3 to 5 members representing state practitioners with expertise in Title I Part A programs. Members of the appeals committee will be neutral to the SES process; they are not part of the application approval process, nor represent a district where services from the provider have been used.

### ***Timeline***

Providers will be evaluated each summer. If violations are cited, the review committee will be convened in a timely manner in order that removal from the state's approved provider list, if necessary, takes place prior to the start of the school year. Violations of certain requirements may constitute immediate removal. Department of Education retains the right to convene the review committee on an as-needed basis throughout the year.

### **Reporting**

**No later than June 15** of each participating year, providers will submit to the LEA and SD DOE a final written report that summarizes the individual academic progress of each student provided with supplemental services, along with the number of hours served and total amount billed for the services. **Failure to submit a report to the LEA and SD DOE in a timely fashion may be grounds for removal from the state's approved provider list.** The LEA (Local Education Agency) will then submit their report, including each student's SIMS number, to the South Dakota Department of Education's Title I Office for review, **no later than June 30**. This information will be used to help determine if a provider will remain on the state-approved list. All state approved providers are strongly encouraged to maintain documentation of their communication with the parents, school and LEA on the academic progress of

---

each student throughout the school year. **The only exceptions are for providers that serve students until June 30<sup>th</sup>. The final report will be due within two weeks of the last day of service or by July 15<sup>th</sup>.**

**The providers and tutors must also complete online surveys at the end of the services or by June 15.** The online survey links will be emailed to each provider's state contact. They will then be responsible for ensuring that providers administering the program and the tutors complete the survey.