



Supplemental Education Services
Annual Evaluation Report
2006-2007

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

Overview 3

Guiding Questions for Evaluating SES Providers 4

Methodology 5

 Effectiveness Measures 5

 Customer Satisfaction Measures 6

Findings 7

 Demographic Profile 7

 Monitoring 18

 Provider Questionnaire Results 28

 Local Educational Agencies Questionnaire Results 33

 Classroom Teacher Questionnaire Results 37

 Parent Questionnaire Results 38

Conclusion 43

Recommendations 44

Overview

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires local education agencies (LEA) to provide supplemental education services to low income students when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement. Title I, Section 1116(e) explains that supplemental education services (SES) are “additional instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement. These services may include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions...”

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

South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) issued a request for proposals for agencies to provide supplemental education services (Appendix A) in April of 2007. The proposal submission deadline was May 15, 2007. The applications were reviewed based on several criteria. These included a description of the program, staffing, research and program effectiveness, assessment and monitoring of students, and financial and organizational capacity. The provide was asked to show evidence that the program is aligned to the state standards in reading and mathematics.

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

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

The purpose of this report is to provide data and information regarding the implementation of supplemental education services in South Dakota during the 2006-07 school year. For the reporting period, there were 19 providers approved in South Dakota. The providers ranged from computer-based programs to tutoring and mentoring. The Institute for Educational Leadership and Evaluation® (IELE), a project of the Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc., was commissioned to conduct the review of the SES proposals and to monitor and evaluate the SES providers for the 2006-07 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. There were three major questions asked:

1. Did the provider increase student achievement in reading, language arts, and mathematics? [Effectiveness]
2. Are parents of students who receive SES satisfied? [Satisfaction]

-
3. Did the provider comply with applicable South Dakota and district laws and contractual procedures associated with the delivery of SES? [Compliance]

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

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

Methodology

Effectiveness Measures

Measures of impact on student academic achievement are critical to a state's evaluation of SES providers. This is especially true because the No Child Left Behind Act requires that, a minimum, states remove providers from their approved list if the provider fails to increase students' achievement for two consecutive years.² Data was collected using the Dakota Step to measure annual progress in the areas of reading and mathematics in addition to

² Ross, S., Potter, A. & Harmon, J. (2006). *Evaluating supplemental education service providers: Suggested strategies for states*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Research in Educational Policy.

supplementary individualized assessments, and provider developed assessments to document improved academic achievement.

Pretest and posttest scores were collected to measure changes in achievement. The pretest scores served as a guide for developing individualized instructional strategies by the many of the providers. 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.

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

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. The school it was important that program was satisfactory or excellent in helping students receiving quality services. To collect information on customer satisfaction regarding the SES providers the **Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS)**, a web-based survey system, was designed and implemented by South Dakota Department of Education. The CAS included a Local Education Agency Questionnaire, Provider Questionnaire, Teacher Questionnaire, Principal Questionnaire, and Parent Questionnaire

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

Findings

Demographic Profile

Data was collected by the South Dakota Department of Education on 227 students during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years. In 2006-07 school year, data was available for 313 students. 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 2006-2007 school year, data was collected from 14 school districts..

Table 1.0 shows the distribution of reports and surveys returned to the South Dakota Department of Education. There were 7,812 eligible students from the reporting school districts for supplemental educational services. Over three hundred (n = 313) students or 4.0% of the eligible students used the services. Canton School District has the highest rate of participation at 33.3%, while Rapid City Area School District has the lowest rate at 0.5%. A total of 170 classroom teachers completed a survey regarding SES, while 27 principals completed a survey. One hundred parents completed a survey and provided information the provider services and the information given to them.

Tale 2.0 shows the number of students served by nine of the providers used by school site. **Catapult Online** reported the great used by 26.6% of students. One in four students (24.5%) used **Failure Free Reading** as their provider. **Club Z** had the lowest reporting use at less than 1% (0.86%). **Tutoring Promise** and **Excel** were used by 14.1% of the students. Todd County School District had a high preference (100%) for **Failure Free Reading**, while Shannon County School District (100%) preferred **Tutoring Promise**. Both of these school districts are located on reservations.

Table 1.0
Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education
2006-2007

	LEA Report	Principal Survey	Teacher Survey	Parent Survey	Provider Survey (Teacher or Tutor)	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Difference (Not Served)	Percent Served
Lake Andes School District	Yes	Yes	31	21	1	261	31	230	11.9%
Belle Fourche School District	Yes	Yes	9	2	1	155	8	147	5.2%
Canton School District	Yes	Yes	16	15	1	48	16	32	33.3%
Eagle Butte Elementary	Yes	Yes	7	3	1	319	7	312	2.2%
McLaughlin School District	Yes	No	0	0	0	435	0	435	0.0%
Meade School District	No	Yes	0	0	0	231	0	231	0.0%
Milbank Middle School	Yes	Yes	2	2	2	41	2	39	4.9%
Rapid City Area School District.	Yes	Yes (2)	2	7	3	1,447	7	1,440	0.5%
Sioux Falls School District	Yes	Yes (5)	44	26	0	1,345	157	1,188	11.7%
Todd County School District	Yes	Yes (6)	25	12	2	2,078	30	2,048	1.4%
White River School District	Yes	Yes (2)	1	1	1	263	9	254	3.4%
Wagner School District	No	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Smee School District	Yes	Yes (2)	16	10	1	239	13	226	5.4%

Table 1.0
Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education
2006-2007

	LEA Report	Principal Survey	Teacher Survey	Parent Survey	Provider Survey (Teacher or Tutor)	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Difference (Not Served)	Percent Served
Shannon County School District	Yes	Yes (2)	17	1	0	950	33	917	3.5%
Watertown High School	Yes	Yes	5	4	0	187	9	178	4.8%
Winner Middle School	Yes	Yes	1	1	0	107	1	106	0.9%
TOTAL			170	100	13	7,812	313	7,499	4.0%

() Number of schools reporting

**Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2006-2007**

	Catapult Online	Discovery Centers	Club Z	Excel	Failure Free Reading	Jump Start Tutoring	Olaudah Learning Center	Three Rivers 21 st Century	Tutoring Promise	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	17	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	31
Belle Fourche Middle School	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Canton Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	16
Eagle Butte Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7
Milbank Middle School	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Rapid City: General Beadle Elementary	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Sioux Falls: Anne Sullivan Elem.	6	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Sioux Falls: Cleveland Elem.	9	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Sioux Falls: Hawthorne Elem.	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Sioux Falls: LB Anderson Elem.	3	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Sioux Falls: Longfellow Elem.	8	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2006-2007**

	Catapult Online	Discovery Centers	Club Z	Excel	Failure Free Reading	Jump Start Tutoring	Olaudah Learning Center	Three Rivers 21 st Century	Tutoring Promise	Not Available	Total
Sioux Falls: Lowell Elementary	5	0	0	4		0	0	0	0	0	9
Todd County School District	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	30
White River School District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
Wagner School District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smee School District	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
Shannon County School District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	33
Watertown High School	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Winner Middle School	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	62	15	2	32	57	16	7	9	33	0	233

Table 3.0 shows that 39.8% of the students were White and 44.4% were American Indian. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls, while the majority of sites report less than two difference ethnic groups. In addition, 54.4% of the students (n = 130) were female and 45.6% (n = 109) were male. One in three students (34.9%) had disabilities and 30.3% of the students had Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education.

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	24	7	0	31
Belle Fourche	0	1	0	0	4	1	6
Canton	0	1	0	0	15	0	16
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	6	1	0	7
Milbank	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Rapid City	0	0	0	1	6	0	7
Shannon County	0	0	0	34	0	1	35
Sioux Falls	2	22	9	8	52	0	93
Smee	0	0	0	21	2	0	23
Todd County	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
Watertown	1	0	0	0	5	0	6
White River	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Winner	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	3	24	9	107	96	2	241

The Dakota STEP results were used as an annual comparison of student progress. Students in grades three through eight, and grade 11 are tested in the spring of each year. Students who are in kindergarten through second grade were not tested. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of students by their proficiency level in reading, while Table 4.2 shows the level of proficiency for mathematics for two years. The purpose of the SES is to provide additional academic support so that students will score at the proficient or advanced levels on the Dakota STEP.

In Table 4.1, 51.7% of the students who received SES during the 2005-06 school year and completed the Dakota STEP scored at the proficient and advanced levels in reading. In the 2006-07, 65.0% of the SES students scored at the proficient and advanced levels. If the 2005-06 scores are used as the pre-test scores and the 2006-07 as the post-test scores for each student, then this translates into a **25.7% improvement** over the year in the area of reading..

Table 4.1 Number of Students' Dakota STEP Results by School District Reading Levels							
School District	2005-06			2006-07			Change in Number of Proficient Students
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	
Andes	1	8	6	2	16	2	9
Belle Fourche	0	3	2	0	4	1	1
Canton	1	5	2	1	14	1	9
Eagle Butte	0	2	2	0	5	2	3
Milbank	0	1	2	1	2	0	2
Rapid City	0	0	4	0	1	3	1
Shannon County	0	8	7	0	10	12	2
Sioux Falls	2	21	20	6	34	20	17
Smee	1	6	4	2	4	9	-1
Todd County	0	1	3	0	0	4	-1
Watertown	0	1	3	0	0	0	-1
White River	0	0	3	0	1	2	1
Winner	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	5	57	58	12	92	56	42

In Table 4.2, 41.7% of the students who received SES during the 2005-06 school year and completed the Dakota STEP scored at the proficient and advanced levels in mathematics. In the 2006-07, 49.4% of the SES students scored at the proficient and advanced levels. If the 2005-06 scores are used as the pre-test scores and the 2006-07 as the post-test scores for each student, then this translates into a **18.5% improvement** over the year in the area of mathematics.

Table 4.2 Number of Students' Dakota STEP Results by School District Mathematic Levels							
School District	2005-06			2006-07			Change in Number of P&A Students
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	
Andes	1	10	4	1	16	3	6
Belle Fourche	0	2	3	0	2	3	0
Canton	1	6	1	0	16	0	9
Eagle Butte	0	3	1	0	5	2	2
Milbank	0	0	3	1	1	1	2
Rapid City	0	0	4	0	2	2	2
Shannon County	0	4	11	0	3	19	-1
Sioux Falls	1	16	26	6	19	35	8
Smee	0	4	7	1	4	10	1
Todd County	0	0	4	0	0	4	0
Watertown	0	1	3	0	0	0	-1
White River	0	0	3	0	1	2	1
Winner	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	3	47	70	9	70	81	29

Table 5.1
Distribution of Students' Dakota STEP Results by SES Provider
2005-2006

	Reading				Mathematics			
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	% P & A	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	% P & A
A to Z	0	4	3	57.1%	0	2	5	28.6%
Babbage	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	1	0.0%
Black Hills Special Services (BHSS)	0	4	2	66.7%	0	2	4	33.3%
Club Z	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	1	0.0%
Discovery Centers	0	0	1	0.0%	0	0	1	0.0%
Excel	2	5	2	77.8%	1	4	4	55.6%
Failure Free	0	9	5	64.3%	0	7	7	50.0%
Failure Free Reading	0	11	8	57.9%	0	11	8	57.9%
Lutheran Social Services	1	4	5	50.0%	1	3	6	40.0%
Summer Reads	4	8	3	80.0%	2	6	7	53.3%
TOTAL	7	45	31	62.7%	4	35	44	47.0%

Table 5.2
Distribution of Students' Dakota STEP Results by SES Provider
2006-2007

	Reading				Mathematics			
	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	% P & A	Advanced	Proficient	Basic & Below	% P & A
BHSS	0	5	4	55.6%	0	4	5	44.4%
Catapult	1	15	2	88.9%	1	15	2	88.9%
Catapult On Line	3	17	13	60.6%	5	10	18	45.5%
Club Z	2	7	3	75.0%	1	4	7	41.7%
Excel	2	11	3	81.3%	1	6	9	43.8%
Failure Free	1	2	1	75.0%	0	2	2	50.0%
Failure Free Reading	2	4	13	31.6%	1	4	14	26.3%
Jump Start	1	14	1	93.8%	0	16	0	100.0%
Olaudah Learning	0	5	2	71.4%	0	5	2	71.4%
Student Nest	0	1	0	100.0%	0	0	1	0.0%
Three River Learning Center	0	1	2	33.3%	0	1	2	33.3%
Tutoring Promise	0	10	12	45.5%	0	3	19	13.6%
TOTAL	12	92	56	65.0%	9	70	81	49.4%

Table 5.1 shows the 2005-06 data compared by service provider, the results showed that the Summer Reads program had 80.0% of their students (n = 12) who were tested in the proficient and advanced levels in reading. The Failure Free Reading program had 57.9% of their students (n = 11) at the proficient and advanced levels in math.

Table 5.2 shows the 2006-07 data compared by service provider, the results showed that the Catapult program had 88.9% of their students (n = 16) who were tested in the proficient and advanced levels in reading. The Jump Start program had 100% of their students (n = 16) at the proficient and advanced levels in mathematics.

A matched pair t-test was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the spring 2006 and spring 2007 Dakota STEP results. There was a significant change in reading scores at the alpha 0.01 level ($t(115) = 7.36, p < 0.0001$). There was an average of 3.1% improvement in individual scores. Also, there was a significant change in the mathematics scores at the alpha 0.01 level ($t(115) = 6.23, p < 0.0001$). There was an average of 4.7% improvement in individual Dakota STEP scores.

Table 6.0 shows the a summary of data service reported in 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 regarding the number of sessions. 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. Students participated in an average of 22.2 sessions with minimum number of sessions being 1.0 and the maximum being 54.0 sessions in 2005-06. In 2006-07 the mean number of sessions increased to 25.1 with a maximum number of 109 sessions.

Table 6.0					
Number of Sessions Served by Providers to Students					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	211	25.1	1	109	21.0

Parent contact is mandatory for the SES providers. In 2005-06, parents were contacted an average 22 times.. In 2006-07, the parents were contacted less at 12 times. Some provides reported contacting parents after each session through the use of the email or on-line services, while other providers sent reports on a monthly basis.

Table 7.0 Number of Parent Contacts					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	137	12.5	1	109	10.0

Table 8.0 shows the cost comparison for serving students. The average per pupil cost was \$938.20 with a median at \$927.50. This calculated to be approximately \$37.37 per hour of service. When adding other expenditures such as transportation, the total cost was \$1,027.70 for each pupil with a median cost of \$1,200.

Table 8.0 Provider Costs 2006-2007				
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
Per Pupil Cost	\$938.20	\$7.00	\$2,569.00	\$927.50
Total Cost	\$1,027.70	\$10.00	\$2,569.00	\$1,200.00

Monitoring

The South Dakota Department of Education monitored the schools and districts for meeting the requirements for supplemental education services. There were 35 schools identified as Level II or higher requiring school improvement. The schools were located in 15 districts. In addition to the reports and surveys completed by each provider and school site, site visits were performed throughout the year to determine the level and type of services being provided. It served as opportunity to answer questions about SES and the state's reporting requirements. The following are some the highlights of the field notes from the monitoring process during the year.

Andes Elementary School

Failure Free and **Catapult Online** were respectively the reading and mathematics programs of choice for Andes Elementary School. They were able to serve 14 students for reading in their school building computer laboratory. They served 17 students for mathematics - 5 students were served at the school and 12 were served from their homes.

-
- Students were bussed home after the sessions were finished, which helped attendance.
 - Leadership and administration of the program for the providers was done with current district staff, which helped communication and services provided. They received payment for this.
 - Failure free is really good for 1st-3rd graders, Catapult is good for 4th-5th graders
 - All but one teacher surveyed (31) felt their student(s) made some or very much progress
 - All but one parent surveyed (21) felt satisfied/very satisfied with the service of the provider
 - They require a certain number of students in order to have the program.
 - Reporting from Catapult were way behind schedule.
 - The tutors indicated that it takes a lot of time to get everything set up for class.
 - Many parents do not know what to do with the computer when it comes for the Catapult on-line program. They do have technical help and able to call, but they do not get the same person when they call,
 - The administration felt the provider was too expensive.
 - None of the teachers surveyed (31) said that they were involved in the development of individual supplemental assistance plans.
 - The provider tutors surveyed (3) felt attendance and student motivation were challenges.

Belle Fourche Middle School

Belle Fourche Middle School uses the ***Black Hills Special Services*** a small group mathematics and reading tutor programs. They served 8 students at the school.

- Of the teachers surveyed (9), 6 stated their students made some or very much progress
- Both parents returning surveys were satisfied and very satisfied with the service of the provider.
- All of the teachers surveyed (9) said they were involved in the development of individual plans.
- Student attendance at the sessions was an issue, especially of those students most in need.
- The provider tutor felt attendance was a challenge.

E.O. Lawrence Elementary School

E.O. Lawrence Elementary School uses ***Jump Start Tutoring***, which involves small group sessions in reading and mathematics held at the school. They served 16 students.

- The provider is a local entity which helps communication and allowed for an early start.
- Grouping of students according to ability would be helpful for this program.
- Of the teachers surveyed (16), 10 felt their student made some or very much progress.
- Of the parents surveyed (15) all felt satisfied/very satisfied with the service provider
- None of the teachers surveyed (16) said that they were involved in the development of the individual plan.
- The provider tutor felt meeting the needs of students with disabilities, students attaining grade level, and servicing multiple grade levels were challenges.

Cheyenne – Eagle Butte Upper Elementary

Eagle Butte Upper Elementary uses ***Olaudah Learning Center*** which is a reading tutorial program serving students at the school. They served 7 students.

- Of the teachers surveyed (7) 5 felt their student made some or very much progress
- Of the parents surveyed (3) all felt satisfied/very satisfied with the service provider
- A challenge for them was getting SES information to the parents.
- Four of the teachers surveyed said they were not involved in developing individual plans.
- The provider tutor felt student motivation was a challenge.

McLaughlin Elementary and Middle School

They did not have any parents interested in this type of assistance, so they offered a Friday School program through their 21st Century grant.

Sturgis Williams Middle School

Sturgis Williams Middle School sent out 231 parent letters and applications 8/25/07 and received 6 responses of interest. After meeting with the principal all the parents signed a statement declining services. There was a followup letter by ***Club Z*** indicating that they

have not centers in the the Sturgis area. This could have added to the lack of interest. The principal said he had no success in providing SES services for the eligible students.

Milbank Middle School

Milbank Middle School had parents of 5 students interested in **Club Z**. When the parents of three students found out they had to be present in the home when the tutor was there they declined services. Two siblings however (both classified as special education students) signed up and received some supplemental materials for reading and mathematics at the tutor's discretion.

They also tried to use **Student Nest** for 3 students but it never got started, so there were no services delivered at this school.

- The parent surveyed were very satisfied with the service provider.
- the two teachers surveyed felt the students made little progress.
- Club Z did not provide a SPED assessment, so none was given.
- The principal said the capacity to monitor students receiving SES was a challenge
- The coordinator did not get a bill for services until 4/16/07.
- Communication with the provider was difficult and very limited.

General Beadle Elementary School

General Beadle Elementary School (Rapid City) uses the **Black Hills Special Services Cooperative (Discovery Centers)** a small group tutoring program in math and reading, which is located at the school. Two students were served.

- The principal believes the students improved their attendance and behavior.
- The teachers (2) felt their student did make a little academic progress.
- The parents (2) felt satisfied/very satisfied with the service of the provider.
- The principal was concerned that students were not attending sessions.
- The teachers (2) were not involved in developing individual student plans.
- A parent was not informed that the tutoring had stopped and said it needed to continue.
- The provider felt that student attendance and motivation were a challenge.

Horace Mann Elementary School

Horace Mann Elementary School used the **Black Hills Special Services Cooperative (Discovery Centers)** a small group tutoring program in math and reading, which is located at the school. Five students were served.

-
- The parents surveyed (5) felt satisfied with the service of the provider.
 - Four of the parents surveyed felt their child had made a little academic progress.
 - The principal felt that the provider did not provide information regarding student progress.
 - One parent felt that a change of tutors caused their child to make only a little progress
 - The provider felt student attendance and motivation were a challenge.

Shannon County Schools

All the schools in Shannon County School District used the *Tutoring Promise*, a small group tutoring program in reading and mathematics. Thirty-three (n = 33) students are listed as receiving services onsite in the schools. From the report I could not tell how many students were from each school. Three of the provider tutors felt attendance and student motivation were challenges

Rockyford Elementary School

The principal stated there is no SES provider serving their school due primarily to lack of staff and school location.

Wolf Creek Elementary School

One parent surveyed felt very satisfied with the service from the provider. The principal says a challenge is the provider does not provide information regarding student progress. Of the teachers surveyed (n = 12), four stated that the students lacked supervision and just ran around the school during SES sessions. Eight teachers stated they were not involved in developing individual plans.

Batesland Elementary School

Five teachers were surveyed and four felt they were involved in the development of an individual plan. Two teachers felt their student made a little academic progress.

Sioux Falls School District:

The SFSD had 67 students enrolled in SES provider programs. Those numbers are broken down in the narrative for each of the six Title I schools offering SES. The SFSD will also

have students attending the **Summer Reading Adventure Camp** to be held at the Washington Pavilion.

- 32 students of 35 (3 were disenrolled) received services from **Excel Achievement Center** and there has been good communication.
- **Excel Achievement Center** pulled students from school for assessment.
- 60 parents wanted **Club Z** however even though there was a signed contract none known were served.
- 35 students of 51 (16 were disenrolled) registered received services from **Catapult** however it took a long time to get the program going and the progress reports were behind what was actually happening.
- The LEA representative believes the SES providers available are too expensive.

All SFSD schools providing SES services had students enrolled at the **Excel Achievement Center** (see information below), which has its own center for testing and tutoring in reading and math, and also receiving services from **Catapult Online** a program offering math and reading tutoring to students in the home using a computer furnished by the provider.

LB Anderson Elementary School

- Of the six teachers surveyed, three (3) stated their student made little or very much progress by participating in the **Excel Achievement Center**.
- Of the four parents surveyed, three stated they were satisfied/very satisfied with the **Excel Achievement Center** provider's service.
- Challenges for the principal are: communication with the provider, transportation to get students to and from the provider, provider does not provide information on student progress.
- The six teachers surveyed were not involved in developing individual plans (one was asked for suggestions).

Hawthorne Elementary School

- Four of the five teachers surveyed felt their student made little or very much progress from **Excel Achievement Center & Catapult Online**.
- Three of the five parents surveyed felt they were dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with the provider's service (one did not fill in any answers).
- Challenges for the principal are: students not attending sessions, capacity to monitor SES provider, students in need not receiving services, communication with the provider, transportation to get students to and from the provider,

provider does not provide. information on student progress. Says she has not experienced success in providing SES

- All of the teachers surveyed were not involved in developing individual plans and did not receive any information for the provider.

Longfellow Elementary School

- Nine of the 11 teachers surveyed stated their student made little or very much progress from **Excel Achievement Center & Catapult Online**.
- All of the parents surveyed stated they were satisfied/very satisfied with the provider's service.
- Challenges for the principal are; students not attending sessions.
- Nine of the eleven teachers surveyed were not involved in developing individual plans (one was, one said a little).

Anne Sullivan Elementary School

- Nine of the 11 teachers surveyed stated their students made little or very much progress from **Excel Achievement Center & Catapult Online**.
- All the parents surveyed stated they were satisfied/very satisfied with the provider's service.
- Challenges for the principal are; students not attending sessions, capacity to monitor SES provider, students in need not receiving services, communication with the provider, transportation to get students to and from the provider, provider does not provide information on student progress.
- Eight of the 11 teachers surveyed were not involved in developing individual plans (three were and another got a copy by email)

Lowell Elementary School

- One teacher who made the effort to contact the provider and monitor her student was contacted several times by the provider
- Four of the seven teachers surveyed stated their student made little or very much progress from **Excel Achievement Center & Catapult Online**.
- Challenges for the principal are; students not attending sessions, capacity to monitor SES provider, students in need not receiving services, communication with the provider, transportation to get students to and from the provider, provider does not provide information on student progress. Says she has not

experienced success in providing SES and feels it is disjointed, expensive and an ineffective way to provide services to students.

- All seven teachers surveyed were not involved in developing individual plans and 4 did not receive any information for the provider.
- Parents surveyed stated they were very satisfied with the provider's service.

Cleveland Elementary School

- Four teachers (4) surveyed stated their student made a little progress
- All of the parents (5) surveyed were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of service their child was receiving (3) Excel Achievement Center and (2) Catapult Learning
- Three of the four teachers surveyed said they were not involved in the development of the individual plan
- The principal did not complete and return a survey.

Wakpala Elementary and High School

Smee School District used **Failure Free Reading** an online web-based program. They served 13 students. They received regular student progress reports.

- Of the parents surveyed (n = 11), 8 felt satisfied or very satisfied with the service provider.
- Of the teachers surveyed (n = 16), 14 felt that student progress either regressed or stayed about the same.
- None of the teachers surveyed (16) said that they were involved in the development of individual plans.
- Challenges for the principal & LEA Representative are; students not attending sessions, capacity to monitor SES provider, students in need not receiving services, communication with the provider, setting up transportation for students, getting parents involved.
- Challenges for the provider tutor are; student attendance and motivation.

Todd County School District

The TCSD used **Failure Free** an online web-based reading program. They had 30 students enrolled. They also tried to enroll students with other providers including; **Braintree, Student Nest, Club Z, Brain Fuse and Babbage**, however they were frustrated with not being contacted back after they initiated interest with each one. Some providers did sign contracts but did not respond to follow up messages or correspondence. There was also

confusion with **Catapult Online** as there was a grant allowing some students (9) to use them as a provider, but through SES. The LEA Representative also felt there were some conflicts between the approach and curriculum offering and that of the TCSD.

- Other challenges; parents choose the provider, receiving progress reports from the provider, getting SES information to parents, students who would benefit the most do not attend the session, collecting student information from the provider, and communication between the teacher and SES provider.
- The provider tutors felt the biggest challenges were student attendance and motivation.

He Dog Elementary School

He Dog Elementary School uses **Failure Free**.

- Of the eight teachers surveyed,) 4 felt their student made some or very much progress. The other 4 did not check to box and said, "I don't know"
- Of the eight parents surveyed, 6 felt satisfied or very satisfied with the service provider. The other 2 stated, "I have no feelings on this"
- The principal has not experienced success in providing SES. They had contracts with **Student Nest** and **Brain Fuse** but no services for those 8 students
- None of the teachers surveyed (n = 8) said that they were involved in the development of individual plans or received any information from the provider

Rosebud Elementary School

Rosebud Elementary School uses **Failure Free**. 12 students started the program. The principal said the provider was good to work with and had not faced any challenges. Of the ten teachers surveyed, 4 felt their student made some or very much progress. The others stated that their student had not been in the program long enough to rate it. Seven teachers said that they were not involved in the development of individual plans, 4 had not received any information from the provider.

Spring Creek Elementary School

According to the principal and staff there is no program at this school. They tried to get **Student Nest** as a provider for two students as they signed a contract but no services were given. The principal stated he has not experienced success with SES.

South Elementary

The principal had one student sign up for **Failure Free** but did not receive services.

O’Kreek Elementary

No SES services or report given.

Todd County Middle School

There were no SES services at the middle school. They did have a grant to implement **Catapult Online** however. The principal stated she has no experienced success with SES.

Todd County High School

There were no SES services at the school. They did have a grant to implement **Catapult Online**. The principal reported no success with SES.

Watertown High School

Watertown High School used **Catapult Online** a web-based reading and math program. They served 9 students. The LEA Representative says now that it is going he is pretty pleased with the program.

- All of the parents surveyed (4) felt that they were satisfied with the quality of instruction and service from the provider.
- The timing in getting the contract signed and beginning the program was very slow as the provider kept trying to get them to drum up more students, and he did not get timely progress reports.
- All of the teachers surveyed (5) stated they had no input in the individual plan and did not receive any information from the provider.

White River Elementary & Middle Schools

White River uses **Three Rivers Cooperative – 21st Century** program. One student received services. During the summer 8 students signed up for the program.

- The teacher was involved in the development of the individual plan.
- The parent was satisfied with the quality of service, but felt their academic performance stayed about the same.
- The biggest challenge for the LEA Representative has been getting students who qualify signed up.

-
- The principals stated they have not experienced success in providing SES and the provider does not provide information regarding student progress.
 - The provider tutor did not do pre and post assessments.

Winner Middle School

Winner Middle School used **Catapult Online** a web-based reading and math program. They served one student.

- The LEA Representative felt the SES provider was too expensive and that they are having a terrible time getting parents interested to participate.
- The principal stated he has not experienced success in providing SES and feels there is a challenge in communicating with the provider and monitoring students.
- The teacher was not involved in the development of the individual plan and did not receive any information from the provider
- The parent stated dissatisfaction with the provider because, "I felt that my child would be tutored exclusively while online but the tutor works with other students at the same time and it took along time to get started".

Provider Questionnaire Results

Twelve of the 19 approved providers (63.2%) completed a **Comprehensive Assessment Questionnaire** in the spring of 2007. Table 10.0 shows the sites and the number of employees delivering SES to the nineteen eligible school districts. Excel Achievement Center and Failure Free report the largest number of employees at 6 each. There were a total of 25 employees in the reporting sites, with 90.9% having a bachelors degree of higher in education. Sixty percent (60%) of the employees reported elementary school teacher licentiate, 4% reported secondary school teacher licentiate and 16% reported special education teacher licentiate. The average years of teacher experience was 9.09 years (s = 8.24; range = 1.0 to 29.0 years) with 3.02 years of academic tutoring experience (s = 3.21, range = 0.15 to 13.0 years). Ninety-two percent (92.0%) were female employees with 16.0% being American Indian, 80.0% White, and 4.0% Hispanic.

Table 9.0		
Number of Employees By Provider		
	n	percent
Black Hills Special Services	1.5	6.0%
Catapult	1	4.0%
Cheyenne-Eagle Butte	1	4.0%
Club Z	2	8.0%
Excel Achievement Center	6	24.0%
Failure Free	6	24.0%
Failure Free / Catapult	1	4.0%
Jumpstart Tutoring	1	4.0%
Rapid City Area School	1.5	6.0%
Three Rivers	1	4.0%
Tutoring Promise	3	12.0%
Total	25	100.0%

Table 10.0							
Number of Teachers Serving Students Per Session							
	Number of Students						Total Number of Teachers
	0	1	2	3	4	5+	
SES students served per session	0	7	1	4	2	5	19
SES students with disabilities or special needs served per session	4	8	3	1	7	2	25
SES students with ESL served per session	10	0	7	2	0	3	22

Table 11.0 shows the teacher workload for working with students with special needs. One in five teachers reported working with 5 or more students in a session. One-third of the teachers (36.8%) reported working with one student per session. Four in five teachers (84.0%) reported working with special needs students in one or more of their sessions. Thirty-two percent (32.0%) tutored with one special needs student in a session. Over half of

the teachers (52.0%) worked with two or more special needs students per session. Fifty-five percent (54.5%) of the teachers reported tutoring ESL students.

The providers reported that they are able to meet the needs of students with disabilities, special learning needs, or ESL through a variety of strategies. Some of the comments included using student's IEPs to guide tutoring, using instructional strategies that were more enjoyable for the students, and doing assignments at slower and deliberative rate. For the ESL students, using more visuals with appropriate instructional strategies and tools were a priority for the tutors.

Over half of the providers (52.0%) reported student attendance as a challenge for reaching students for supplemental instruction. One-third of the providers (36.0%) found helping students to attain their appropriate grade level of achievement to be a challenge. Although this could be attributed to the students' special needs and English language deficiencies, it was not a barrier, but a factor in students not reaching their targeted grade level in reading and mathematics.

As a consequence of the tutoring, three out of four providers (72.0%) felt they were most successful in having students improve upon their academic performance. Improved confidence (64.0%) and motivation (56.0%) by students was also noted by the providers. One in three providers (32.0%) reported that when students worked in small groups that they appear to show a high level of success in their achievement and performance.

Specialized training and education were made available to the tutors and teachers by the providers. While the majority of the tutors were licensed teachers, additional training was provided in order to use the special software and materials available for helping students. The delivery methods for many of the tutors was computer-based and web-based, but many reported attending workshops and seminars throughout the year at various locations. Other sources for training and education were provided by the state universities.

In Table 11.0, the providers reported student's progress in a variety of ways to parents and their regular teachers. In most cases, the report was made in two or more ways. Most of the reports were given written or in person (72.0% to 80.0%).

Table 11.0 Communication of Student Progress				
	Parents		Teachers	
	n	percent	n	percent
In person	18	72.0%	17	68.0%
Written report	20	80.0%	18	72.0%
Telephone	15	60.0%	8	32.0%
Notes	9	36.0%	8	32.0%
E-mail	7	28.0%	8	32.0%
Other	1	4.0%	0	0.0%
Total	25	100.0%	25	100.0%

Three fourths of the providers (76.0%) used pre and post assessment tools to measure student progress. Additionally, the providers used observation (84.0%), workbook scores (48.0%), quizzes (20.0%), and Dakota Step scores (20.0%). It was not clear if there were some specific check lists used for observation assessments.

Over 96% of the students received services in the areas of reading and language arts. Four out of five students (84.0%) completed a pre and post assessment to measure changes before and after receiving services for reading. Three-fourths of the assessment tools (76.0%) were commercially developed by another firm, while 24.0% were developed by the providers. Some of the pre and post reading assessment tools used by the providers were: Failure Free, Catapult, KTEA II, Woodcock, El Paso Phonics, DAR, CBM, and Sails Literacy Charting Progress Kit.

Over 68% of the students received services in the area of mathematics. Three fourths of the students (73.7%) completed a pre and post assessment to measure changes before and after receiving services for mathematics. Over half of the assessment tools (56.0%) were commercially developed by another firm, while 4.0% were developed by the providers. Some of the pre and post mathematics assessments tools used by the providers were: Catapult, Structure of Intellect, Scott Forsman, DACS, KTEA II, and Houghtin Mifflin Assessment Series.

Table 12.0 shows what type of progress was made by the students as measured by the various pre and post instruments used for reading and mathematics. About 44.0% of the

students made substantial progress in reading, while in mathematics 66.7% of made little progress.

Table 12.0				
The Extent To Which Students Made Progress From the Tutoring & Special Services Received				
	Reading		Mathematics	
	n	percent	n	percent
The student's academic performance has regressed.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
The student's academic performance has stayed about the same as when the services started.	5	27.8%	3	12.0%
The student's academic performance has made little progress	5	27.8%	6	24.0%
The student's academic performance has made very much progress.	8	44.4%	1	4.0%
Unknown	7		15	
Total Reporting	25	72.0%	25	40.0%

Local Educational Agencies (LEA) Questionnaire Results

Fourteen (n = 14) of the 15 of the eligible school district sites completed the LEA Questionnaire. Meade School District was the only school that did not complete the questionnaire. Table 13.0 shows the number of students served by the reporting LEAs.

	Eligible	Received	Percent
American Indian	5,211	120	2.3%
Asian American	15	2	13.3%
Black	45	13	28.9%
Hispanic	86	6	7.0%
White	1,180	91	7.7%
English Language Learners	1,303	56	4.3%
Students with Disabilities	1,056	53	5.0%
Low Income	7,558	222	2.9%
All Students	7,873	226	2.9%
Total	24,327	789	3.2%

Tables 14.1 to 14.3 show how the school district receives information from their providers regarding the progress of the individual students. The majority of the progress reports are received through written reports (71.4%) and emails (57.1%). The information includes attendance (85.7%), pre and post testing results (50.0%), student participation in class (21.2%), and lesson test scores (7.1%). Three of the four LEAs (78.6%) used the written reports to monitor the quality of SES received. Over forty percent of the LEAs (42.9%) used parent feedback and direct contact with the providers to monitor the quality of the SES services provided.

Table 14.1		
How do supplemental education service providers communicate with your district about the degree of progress made by the individual students they serve?		
	n	percent
Direct contact	6	42.9%
Written reports	10	71.4%
On phone	4	28.6%
Notes	1	7.1%
Email	8	57.1%
Other	1	7.1%

Table 14.2		
What type of information do the supplemental education service providers give to your district about the degree of progress made by the individual students they serve?		
	n	percent
Information on attendance	12	85.7%
Information on student class participation	3	21.4%
Information on Pre and Post test	7	50.0%
Information on quiz/test scores	1	7.1%

One of the reporting LEAs commented that there was a lack of communication to district and parents by SES providers. They would leave a message and not getting a call back. SES providers did not clearly state in their materials the parents responsibility in the process or what the parents need to have, i.e., access to the internet or being present during tutor sessions. They did not make clear how to contact the SES provider and when services begin or end. For example, “the school district test in April, Club Z began services on Feb. 15th. Services was provide for two students who had to take the Alternative Test. Due to their low level the company had to use alternative materials. I don't believe this is the intent of SES. These students already have one-on-one or small group instructions during the school day.”.

Table 14.3		
How does your district monitor the quality of supplemental services received by those students who receive the services?		
	n	percent
Provider reports	11	78.6%
Talk to tutors of SES provider	4	28.6%
Student feedback	2	14.3%
Monitoring visits	1	7.1%
State assessments	5	35.7%
Talk to directors of SES provider	6	42.9%
Parent feedback	6	42.9%
Other	2	7.1%

Table 15.0		
How do students receive supplemental education services?		
	n	percent
Via e-learning opportunities (e.g. CD, web-based services)	6	42.9%
In school facilities (your buildings and classrooms)	9	64.3%
In other facilities (church, community organization, etc)	0	0.0%
In provider's facilities	1	7.1%

The LEAs reported that 64.3% of the students received SES services in their school facilities, while 42.9% used e-learning opportunities (Table 15.0). The most successful components of implementing SES has been location (21.4%), receiving progress reports from the provider (57.1%), and parents being able to choose their provider (35.7%).

Table 16.0 Challenging In Implementing SES		
	n	percent
Parent attendance at provider fair	3	21.4%
Parents can choose provider	5	35.7%
District monitoring visits	1	7.1%
Receiving student progress reports from provider	3	21.4%
Getting SES information to parents	3	21.4%
Not all applicants attend sessions	5	35.7%
Students who would benefit the most do not attend sessions	7	50.0%
Keeping the confidentiality of students who receive free and/or reduced lunch	1	7.1%
Collecting student information from SES provider	2	14.3%
Communication between classroom teacher and SES provider	4	28.6%
SES provider too expensive	4	28.6%
Setting up transportation for students	2	14.3%
Other	7	50.0%

Among the many challenges of implementing SES, attendance was a major concern. Students who could benefit the most from SES do not attend sessions regularly (50.0%) and eligible students do not attend any sessions (35.7%). LEAs stated that “students who qualify do not sign up for services.” “Students who would benefit the most, do not qualify based on income guidelines.” Additionally, “students attendance is not good, thus little progress is made with those who do not attend.”

One LEA reported that “most providers do not figure out a way to serve our district because they can't hire tutors or homes do not have internet or we are in too remote of an area. Also, there are concerns that tutor to students ratio is often higher than provider information materials indicate and students are not remaining in the rooms for their tutoring sessions, they are coming and going at will and not getting their full hour of tutoring.”

Another challenge reported by a LEA was “the length of time it took to initiate services. **Catapult** kept wanting us to resurvey parents to drum up more students for them and then they were slow at initiating services. Students finally received their computers in mid- March.”

Classroom Teacher Questionnaire Results

One hundred sixty two teachers (n = 162) responded to the CAS questionnaire. One in four teachers (25.9%) reported that an individual plan for SES services was developed for each student. While 66.7% of the responding teachers did not know if a plan had been developed by the provider for the student. Fourteen percent (13.8%) of the teachers were involved in the creation of the plan.

	n	percent
Student attendance	22	13.6%
Quiz & course work information	11	6.8%
Student behavior	11	6.8%
I do not receive any information from the provider	77	47.5%
Student participation	27	16.7%
Pre and post assessment scores	65	40.1%
Total of Respondents	162	

Almost half of the teachers (47.5%) reported not getting any feedback from the providers regarding their students. Those who did get feedback, received information regarding pre and post assessment scores (40.1%), student participation (16.7%), and attendance (13.6%). Some of teachers reported “not being aware of any services being provided to their students.” “I have no way of knowing my student’s progress. There is no feedback.”

Since many of the teachers reported getting feedback from the SES provider, 137 teachers (84.5%) could only based their student’s progress from either direct observation or SES reports. Table 18.1 shows that one in four students (28.5%) have made very much academic progress, while 43.8% of teachers reported that their students had made little progress. Table 18.2 shows how the teachers were able to ascertain the level of progressed achieved. The majority of the teachers (60.6%) used marking period grades while 46.7% used student’s motivation in the classroom.

Table 18.1 Based on your own observations and classroom assessment please describe the extent to which this student has made progress.		
	n	percent
The student's academic performance has regressed.	4	2.9%
The student's academic performance has stayed about the same as when the services started	34	24.8%
The student's academic performance has made little progress	60	43.8%
The student's academic performance has made very much progress	39	28.5%
Total	137	100.0%

Table 18.2 How did you determine if the student made progress?		
	n	percent
Provider pre and post assessment	32	23.4%
The students' motivation in your classroom	64	46.7%
The students' attendance in your classroom	15	10.9%
The students' state assessment scores	6	4.4%
The students' marking period grades	83	60.6%
Other	25	18.2%
Total	137	

Parent Questionnaire Results

Ninety one parents responded and completed the CAS questionnaire. Table 19.0 shows the providers used by the parent respondents. The largest number of parents reported using **Failure Free** (26.4%) and **Catapult** (25.3%). Table 20.0 shows that 45.1% of parents selected their provided without any recommendations, while 26.4% used teacher input and 13.2% used principal input in selecting the SES provider for their child.

Table 19.0 Providers Reported By Parents		
	n	percent
Catapault	23	25.3%
Club Z	2	2.2%
Darla Schieffer	5	5.5%
Discovery	2	2.2%
Excel Achievement	5	5.5%
Failure Free	24	26.4%
Frankie White Dress	1	1.1%
Jason Reinders	6	6.6%
Jump Start	9	9.9%
Lisa Ducheneaux	3	3.3%
Rose Ruff	2	2.2%
Teri Sneider	4	4.4%
Three Rivers	1	1.1%
Not Known	4	4.4%
Total	91	100.0%

Table 20.0 How did you make the decision to select your child's supplemental educational service provider?		
	n	percent
I made the decision on my own.	41	45.1%
My child's principal helped me.	12	13.2%
My child's teacher helped me.	24	26.4%
Other	14	15.4%
Total	91	100.0%

The majority of the parents received information about their child's pre and post assessment scores (59.3%). One in three parents receive information regarding their child's attendance

(33.0%), participation (36.3%) and course work information (37.4%). About one in five parents reported not receiving any information (18.7%). As one parent commented, “after calling, non one returned my call in discuss my child’s progress.”

Table 21.0		
What kinds of information do you receive from the service provider about the progress your child is making?		
	n	percent
Student attendance	30	33.0%
Course work information	34	37.4%
Student behavior	21	23.1%
I do not receive any information from the provider	17	18.7%
Student participation	33	36.3%
Pre and Post Assessment scores	54	59.3%
Other	8	8.8%
Total	91	

Table 22.1		
How satisfied are you with the class size of the tutoring session your child has been attending from the service provider listed above?		
	n	percent
Very satisfied	42	48.8%
Satisfied	37	43.0%
Dissatisfied	4	4.7%
Very dissatisfied	3	3.5%
Total	86	100.0%

Table 22.2		
How satisfied are you with the quality of instruction by your child's supplemental service tutor?		
	n	percent
Very satisfied	40	46.0%
Satisfied	41	47.1%
Dissatisfied	2	2.3%
Very dissatisfied	4	4.6%
Total	87	100.0%

Table 22.3		
How satisfied are you with the quality of service your child has been receiving from the service provider listed above?		
	n	percent
Very satisfied	41	45.6%
Satisfied	40	44.4%
Dissatisfied	7	7.8%
Very dissatisfied	2	2.2%
Total	90	100.0%

Over 90% of the responding parents (93.1%) were very satisfied to satisfied with the quality of instruction their child was receiving through SES. They were also satisfied with the class size for the tutoring sessions (91.8%). Comments from the parents included how they were “very pleased with the help their child was receiving,” and how their child “enjoyed the program.”

Table 23		
Extent to which your child has made progress from the tutoring or special services received.		
	n	percent
My child's academic performance has regressed.	2	2.4%
My child's academic performance has stayed about the same as when the services started.	15	17.6%
My child's academic performance has made little progress.	18	21.2%
My child's academic performance has made very much progress.	50	58.8%
Total	85	100.0%

The majority of the responding parents (58.8%) reported that their child's academic performance was greatly improved. While the remaining parents had note little or no progress. This was significantly different from what the teachers reported in Table 18.1, where 28.1% teachers had noted very much progress. The difference can be attributed to the parents who reported were positive about the providers and the work being performed for students. Teachers were more cognizant of daily and semester progress for all students involved in SES.

Conclusion

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services providers for the 2006-2007 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?

Twelve of the 19 SES providers answered a questionnaire using the Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS). The input was obtained from twenty-five of the provider tutors and instructors. SES providers reported serving 313 students in South Dakota. They reported making parent contact weekly or monthly as reported using the email, written reports, and direct contact.

Another data source was the monitoring process. Interviews and site visits with students, parents, school personnel, and SES providers were conducted in 17 of the 35 eligible sites. The results showed that most of the individuals were satisfied with the programming that had been occurring. Some individuals reported that they had evidence that the SES providers were helping a representative target population. The schools and providers were actively involved in recruiting eligible students into a SES program.

Data was collected through the Department of Education regarding the demographics of students served, assessment data, and service data. The names of students who received services were submitted by the school districts directly to the state. The number of students did not match with the number of students that the service providers reported. The LEAs and providers reported serving 789 students, while the state had documentation and completed records for 313 students.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed for the participating students. Results from the spring 2006 and spring 2007 Dakota STEP were compiled and statistical tests (paired t-test) showed that

there were statistically significant differences in the standard scores from 2006 to 2007 in the area of reading [$t(115) = 7.36, p < 0.0001$] and in the area of mathematics [$t(115) = 6.23, p < 0.0001$]. Each provider used their own assessment to conduct pre and post testing. However, the data was unable to be used as there was no standard for scoring established across all service providers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this report, the external evaluator is proposing the following recommendations to be considered for the 2007-2008 school year:

- Expand the monitoring process to **all** schools, parents, students, and SES providers to ensure a broader evaluation.
- Implement a standard criteria check list for the monitors obtaining consistent observational data regarding the delivery of services, types of services, obstacles, and successes. Additionally, the data should serve to confirm that quantitative data being submitted by the LEA and provider regarding the number of students being served, assessment results, demographics, parental and teacher involvement in the child's educational plan.
- Identify a set of reading and mathematics standardized assessment tools that all providers can use to measure academic progress for their respective delivery modality. This will provide a consistent pre and post testing data comparative analysis of academic progress. Currently, only the Dakota STEP can be used to validate any progress.
- In order to maintain an accurate data base of students receiving services, supplemental education service providers should submit their rosters and enrollment directly to the Department of Education.
- More parents and teachers should be recruited to complete the CAS questionnaires. Additionally, all providers and LEAs offering SES should be required to complete the CAS.