



Supplemental Educational Services in the Commonwealth of Virginia:

Center for Research in Educational Policy

2005 – 2006

The University of Memphis

325 Browning Hall

Memphis, Tennessee 38152





Center for Research in Educational Policy

The University of Memphis

325 Browning Hall

Memphis, Tennessee 38152

Toll Free: 1-866-670-6147

Supplemental Educational Services

in the Commonwealth of Virginia:

2005 – 2006

May 2007

Allison Potter

Steven M. Ross

Jangmi Paek

Dawn McKay

Center for Research in Educational Policy

Shana L. Pribesh

John A. Nunnery

Old Dominion University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary.....	2
II.	Introduction.....	5
III.	Study Design and Instrumentation.....	7
IV.	Statistical Methodology.....	8
V.	Survey Results.....	12
VI.	Student Achievement Results.....	21
VII.	Standards of Learning Performance Results.....	24
VIII.	Conclusions.....	25
IX.	Appendix A: SES Questionnaires.....	27
X.	Appendix B: Summary of SOL Performance by SES Provider.....	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), requires state educational agencies to monitor the quality and effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services (SES). This report presents the findings of a study conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) on the implementation and effectiveness of SES in Virginia during the 2005-2006 school year.

Research Design

The report includes the results of both a descriptive study and an evaluative study on SES. The descriptive study consisted of survey results from division coordinators, principal/site coordinators, teachers, parents of students receiving SES, and providers. The evaluative study produced a profile of each provider's effectiveness that incorporated results from the descriptive study and results from an analysis of SES participants' performance on reading/language arts and mathematics Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments.

SES Implementation

In 2005-2006, 19 providers delivered SES to 2,449 students in 15 school divisions. Descriptive study survey results indicated that parents in the majority of school divisions were made aware of their rights under NCLB. Additionally, the survey showed that the majority of parents were satisfied with the way that the school division helped them obtain SES for their child. Survey results also indicated that the majority of division coordinators, principals/site coordinators, and parents felt that providers communicated with them during the school year. Survey results also showed that the

majority of principals and/or site coordinators felt that providers aligned their curriculum with state standards. Survey results indicated that many teachers were not familiar enough with providers' services to respond favorably or negatively about SES implementation. Finally, survey results showed that parents were the most satisfied group of all those surveyed, with the majority expressing satisfaction with provider services.

SES Effectiveness

A pre-test and post-test analysis indicated that, across all providers, students receiving SES were more likely to score at higher proficiency levels on reading/language arts and mathematics SOL assessments.

Four providers served sufficient numbers of students* in reading/language arts to produce statistically reliable results in the pre-test and post-test analysis: 1) Club Z! Inc.; 2) Huntington Learning; 3) Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools; and 4) University Instructors, Inc. Students served by these four providers showed statistically significant improvement in reading/language arts scores.

Two providers, Club Z! Inc. and University Instructors, Inc., served sufficient numbers of students* in mathematics to produce statistically reliable results in the pre-test and post-test analysis. Students served by both of these providers showed no statistically significant difference in mathematics scores.

Ten providers did not serve sufficient numbers of students* in either subject area to produce statistically reliable results: 1) Babbage Net Schools; 2) Compass Learning

* A power analysis of the data indicated that a provider would need to serve 198 students or more in a subject area to produce statistically reliable results.

Inc.; 3) Education Station; 4) Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center; 5) In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center; 6) Knowledgepoints; 7) Nonpublic Educational Services, Inc.; 8) Porter Education and Communications, Inc.; 9) Trust Tutoring; and 10) TutorFind.

Five providers served too few students to report (less than 10 students) descriptive results: 1) Aligned Interventions Educational Services; 2) Champions Tutoring Program; 3) Kumon North America, Inc.; 4) Plato Learning/Lightspan, Inc.; and 5) PowerCommunicators.

Conclusion

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in Virginia during the 2005-2006 school year received mostly positive comments on the questionnaires. The results suggest that school leaders, SES coordinators, and parents were satisfied with the services students received. Four providers, Club Z! Inc., Huntington Learning, Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools, and University Instructors, Inc., served a sufficient number of students and showed statistically significant improvement in reading/language arts scores. Two providers, Club Z! Inc. and University Instructors, Inc., served a sufficient number of students in mathematics to evaluate, but did not show a statistically significant improvement in mathematics scores. Fifteen providers did not serve sufficient numbers of students in either subject to evaluate their effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION:
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA
2005-2006

Supplemental Educational Services, a requirement under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), provide additional academic assistance outside of the regular school day for eligible children. Specifically, students from low-income families who attend Title I schools that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for three consecutive years or more in the same subject area are eligible to receive these services.

Additionally, four school divisions in Virginia participated in a United States Department of Education (USED) pilot for reversal of Public School Choice (PSC) and Supplemental Educational Services (SES) during the 2005-2006 school year. These divisions offered SES to eligible students attending schools that have not made AYP for two consecutive years or more in the same subject area.

In 2005-2006, schools in 15 school divisions were required to provide SES. A total of 34 service providers, approved by the Virginia Board of Education, were available to be selected by parents of eligible students.

The research process consisted of two components, one focusing on school division and school implementation of SES services, and the second focusing on provider services and outcomes. Both components included information related to interaction with parents. The primary research questions for the study were divided into three categories that follow.

Division and Local Educator Questions

1. What roles are school divisions taking and what activities are they performing to make SES available to eligible students?
2. What roles are schools taking and what activities are they performing to make SES available to eligible students?
3. What are teachers' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?

Provider Questions

1. Are providers communicating effectively with principals, teachers, and parents involved with students eligible for SES?
2. Are providers working with principals, teachers, and parents as needed to develop instructional plans geared to the needs of the students?
3. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic standards for students?
4. Are providers offering services as needed to special education students and English Language Learners?
5. Are all involved stakeholders satisfied with provider services?

Student Achievement Questions

1. What are the effects of provider services on student achievement in reading/language arts?
2. What are the effects of provider services on student achievement in mathematics?

STUDY DESIGN AND INSTRUMENTATION

Design and Participants

The study design consisted of a *descriptive study* of SES implementation in divisions and schools and an *evaluative study* of individual SES providers' compliance and effectiveness.

Descriptive study of SES implementation. The basic design for the descriptive study consisted of surveying the following groups: (a) SES coordinators (or liaisons) in participating school divisions; (b) principals or SES liaisons in participating schools; (c) teachers of students receiving SES; (d) parents of students receiving SES; and (e) SES providers.

Evaluative study of provider effectiveness. The evaluative study used data collected from the descriptive study to develop a profile of each provider's effectiveness in complying with NCLB requirements. The foundation for the evaluation included the following categories: (a) student achievement; (b) communication; (c) instructional plans; (d) local and state standards; and (e) special education/English Language Learners.

Instrumentation

Surveys. The core instruments developed for the study were surveys for participating (a) division coordinators; (b) school principals and/or site coordinators; (c) teachers; (d) parents; and (e) SES providers. The surveys included a common core set of questions for all groups, such as experiences with SES and providers, and questions geared to specific groups, such as reactions to particular providers and the respondent's role. Appendix A contains copies of the surveys distributed to each group.

STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Participating School Divisions and SES Providers

In 2005-2006, 19 SES providers tutored 2,449 students located in 15 school divisions in Virginia. In most cases, students received services in reading/language arts or mathematics from a single SES provider, but in a few cases, students received services from two providers. Because many students received services in more than one subject, certain tables in this report use student contracts¹ as the unit of analysis if appropriate.

Table 1 below provides a summary of SES participation in 2005-2006 by school division.

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Eligible Students Participating in SES by School Division During the 2005-2006 School Year

Division Name	Students Eligible for SES	Eligible Students Participating in SES	Eligible Students Participating in SES
	Number	Number	Percentage
Alexandria City Public Schools*	1,072	144	13.43
Essex County Public Schools	390	47	12.05
Fairfax County Public Schools	438	102	23.29
Henry County Public Schools*	271	109	40.22
King William County Public Schools	109	2	1.83
Louisa County Public Schools	268	7	2.61
Newport News City Public Schools*	2,042	1,099	53.82
Nottoway County Public Schools	200	5	2.50
Petersburg City Public Schools	2,321	152	6.55
Portsmouth City Public Schools	931	305	32.76
Prince Edward County Public Schools	501	40	7.98
Richmond City Public Schools	5,018	179	3.57
Roanoke City Public Schools	1,197	28	2.34
Stafford County Public Schools*	738	99	13.41
Sussex County Public Schools	329	43	13.07
Total	15,825	2,361	14.92

*Participant in USED pilot to reverse the public school choice and SES services.

¹ A student contract represents services provided by one provider to one student in one subject area. Many students received services in two subject areas and some students received services from more than one provider.

SES providers varied in the number of student contracts delivered. *University Instructors, Inc.* and *Club Z! Inc.* delivered the most contracts. Conversely, *Champions Tutoring Program*, *Plato Learning/Lightspan, Inc.*, and *PowerCommunicators* delivered the least contracts. Table 2 provides a summary of the number of contracts delivered by providers in each subject. Note that a minimum sample size of 10 students was established as a criterion for including individual providers in the analysis for the given subject.

Table 2. Number of Student Contracts Delivered by SES Provider and Subject During the 2005-2006 School Year

SES Provider	Reading/ Language Arts	Mathematics	Total	All Student SES Contracts
	Number	Number	Number	Percentage
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	*	*	10	**
Babbage Net Schools	33	19	52	1.5
Champions Tutoring Program	0	*	*	**
Club Z! Inc.	538	198	736	21.0
Compass Learning Inc.	48	22	70	2.0
Education Station	70	30	100	2.9
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	87	14	101	2.9
Huntington Learning	285	124	409	11.7
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	96	83	179	5.1
Knowledgepoints	29	11	40	1.1
Kumon North America, Inc.	*	*	*	**
Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools	256	193	449	12.8
Nonpublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	31	21	52	1.5
Plato Learning/Lightspan, Inc.	*	0	*	**
Porter Education and Communications, Inc.	166	145	311	8.9
PowerCommunicators	0	*	*	**
Trust Tutoring	12	13	25	**
TutorFind	26	18	44	1.3
University Instructors, Inc.	574	342	916	26.1
Total	2,262	1,243	3,505	98.8

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

** Provider served less than 1% of total SES contracts.

Analysis

Pre-test and post-test analysis. A pre-test and post-test analysis was performed to determine the degree to which SES students progressed in attaining proficiency on the SOL assessments in the year they received tutoring (post-test) relative to the prior year (pre-test). Included in these analyses were all students who had both a pre-test and post-test measure available. These students were in grades 4 through 8. Grade 3 was a baseline year for students in grade 4. The pre-test and post-test analysis was based on 895 reading/language arts SOL assessment results and 528 mathematics SOL assessment results for which both 2004-2005 (pre-test) and 2005-2006 (post-test) SOL scores were available. Students scored in one of three proficiency categories for each year: “basic,” “proficient,” or “advanced.” Cross tabulations of 2005 and 2006 SOL proficiency categories were computed for each provider to determine whether students who received SES tended to score in lower, higher, or the same proficiency categories. A power analysis was conducted to determine the minimum number of students a provider would need to serve to show statistically reliable results. Next, a statistical analysis was performed for each provider to determine whether changes in proficiency categories for students who received SES were statistically significant.

Demographics

Descriptive statistics were calculated for different demographic groups, including: gender (female, male), grade level, race/ethnicity (black, white, Asian, Hispanic, other), disability status (yes, no), limited English proficiency (yes, no), free or reduced-price lunch eligibility (yes, no), and homelessness (yes, no). Although migrant status was

available, so few students were considered migrant that the category was too small to analyze.

Effects on schools participating in the USED pilot program

Four school divisions, Alexandria City Public Schools, Henry County Public Schools, Newport News Public Schools, and Stafford County Public Schools, were selected by the USED to participate in a SES/PSC reversal pilot program. These divisions offered SES to eligible students attending schools that have not made AYP for two consecutive years or more in the same subject area. A separate analysis was conducted to determine if pilot schools showed different patterns of SES effects than regular SES schools.

SURVEY RESULTS

School division coordinators, principal/site coordinators, teachers, parents, and providers from all 15 school divisions offering SES were asked to respond to survey questions. School division coordinators received e-mails containing information needed to complete an online survey. Seventy-two (72) percent of school division coordinators responded to the survey (51 responses). Principals/site coordinators received information related to the online survey in the form of a letter sent with the school's parent survey packet. Forty-four (44) percent of principal/site coordinators responded to the survey (109 responses). Principal/site coordinators distributed online survey information to teachers and paper surveys to parents of students participating in SES. The percentage of surveys returned by teachers and parents is undetermined due to more surveys sent to be distributed than were actually distributed for this group (37 teachers and 669 parents responded to the surveys). Online surveys were provided for state-approved SES providers. Twenty-six (26) percent of SES providers responded to the surveys (5 responses). The following section summarizes the questions and responses from the survey.

1. What roles are *school divisions* taking and what activities are they performing to make SES available to eligible students?

Educator Responses

- Seventy-six (76) percent of school divisions indicated that they notified parents in their division of their rights under NCLB.

- School divisions described activities and programs for parents they organized to increase awareness of SES services for students, such as provider fairs and other informational programs.

Parent Responses

- Eighty-five (85) percent of parents agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the way their division helped them obtain SES for their child and 81.3 percent agreed or strongly agreed they had enough time to make an informed choice of providers.

2. What roles are *schools* taking and what activities are they performing to make SES available to eligible students?

Educator Responses

- Division coordinators and principals noted that some schools held provider fairs and other informational programs to inform parents about their rights under NCLB and the free tutoring service available to their children.

Parent Responses

- Two parents in different school divisions wrote comments. Both indicated that they asked their school leaders for help in choosing an SES provider and found it challenging to get information on program/provider details from their local school.

3. What are teachers' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?

Educator Responses

- The majority of teachers did not have enough information about providers serving students in their school to respond to their questionnaire. Forty-eight (48) percent responded “don’t know” when asked if the provider met obligations for conducting tutoring services.
- Teachers also struggled to answer the questionnaire item on providers aligning their services with federal, state, and local standards, with 43.8 percent responding “undecided.”
- When asked if they believed the services offered by a particular provider positively impacted student achievement, 8.9 percent of the teachers strongly agreed, 27.4 percent agreed, and 35.2 percent were undecided.

4. Are providers communicating effectively with principals, teachers, and parents involved with students eligible for SES?

Educator Responses

- About forty-eight (48) percent of principals/site coordinators and 60.8 percent of school division coordinators, but only 27.7 percent of teachers, agreed that providers communicated with them frequently or occasionally during the school year. Of note, 57 percent of teachers responded “not at all.”

Parent Responses

- Two-thirds (66.8 percent) of parents agreed that providers talked to them frequently or occasionally about their child's progress.
- A few parents in different school divisions expressed frustration with communication, citing struggles to sign their child up for services. These comments ranged from providers not calling parents back to providers ending services mid-way through the tutoring, with no prior notification.

5. Are providers working with principals, teachers, and parents as needed to develop instructional plans geared to the needs of the students?

Educator Responses

- When teachers were asked if providers had collaborated with them to set goals for student growth, 48.4 percent responded, "not at all."
- Some school divisions (39.2 percent) and principals (56.9 percent) noted provider attempts to gear instructional plans to each school's curriculum.

6. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic standards for students?

Educator Responses

- The majority (60.6 percent) of principals and site coordinators were in agreement that the providers aligned their curriculum with standards.
- A few teachers stated that tutors came to them for curriculum materials because their provider/employer had not given them guidance in this area.

Parent Responses

- Almost one-half (49.8 percent) of parents strongly agreed or agreed that the provider helped their child with subjects they were working on in their classroom at school.

Provider Responses

- Most providers (75 percent) indicated that their services were aligned with the state academic content and achievement standards.

7. Are providers offering services as needed to special education and ELL students?

Educator Responses

- School divisions were pleased with the bilingual tutors available to students and the level of dedication given to help ELL students achieve their goals. Most (84.3 percent) were in agreement that special education and ELL students were being served as needed.
- The majority of principals and site coordinators (77.1 percent) were in agreement that providers offered services as needed to special education and ELL students.
- Many teachers were not familiar enough with provider programs to answer this item, with 46.2 percent responding “undecided.”

8. Are all involved stakeholders satisfied with provider services?

Educator Responses

- Teachers were split on their level of satisfaction with provider services. Approximately one-third (33.8 percent) strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied, while another one-third (33.1 percent) were undecided.
- Principals and school divisions were also split in their perceptions of provider services, with 52.2 percent of principals and 54.9 percent of school division coordinators strongly agreeing or agreeing that they were satisfied.

Parent Responses

- Parents were the most satisfied group of all those surveyed, with the majority (78.3 percent) expressing satisfaction with the services offered to help their child succeed.
- Nine (9) parents in seven different school divisions expressed frustration that provider services did not start sooner in the year, with many students not beginning service until March or April.

Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 provide summaries of the questionnaire responses from parents, teacher, principals, and school divisions. Table 4 provides a statewide summary by provider of the percentage of respondents who “strongly agreed or agreed” with the question, “Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child/student received.”

Table 3.1 Aggregate Educator Questionnaire Responses for School Year 2005-2006

Educator Questionnaire Item	Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Neutral
		Percent	Percent	Percent
Overall assessment:				
I believe the services offered positively impacted student achievement.	Division Coordinators	53.0	7.8	39.2
	Principals/Site Coordinators	39.4	12.9	41.3
	Teachers	36.3	16.4	35.2
Overall, I am satisfied with the services offered to students.	Division Coordinators	54.9	13.7	31.4
	Principals/Site Coordinators	52.2	18.3	23.9
	Teachers	33.8	20.2	33.1
The provider...				
Adapted tutoring services to school's curriculum.	Division Coordinators	39.2	7.8	52.9
	Principals/Site Coordinators	56.9	15.6	22.0
	Teachers	32.2	13.2	41.1
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	Division Coordinators	33.4	11.8	54.9
	Principals/Site Coordinators	46.8	18.4	29.4
	Teachers	24.7	18.8	42.7
Aligned its services with federal, state, and local standards.	Division Coordinators	66.7	4.0	29.4
	Principals/Site Coordinators	60.6	8.3	23.9
	Teachers	33.9	8.6	43.8
Offered services to Special Education and ESL students.	Division Coordinators	84.3	13.7	0.0
	Principals/Site Coordinators	77.1	8.3	9.2
	Teachers	32.2	8.3	46.2
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	Division Coordinators	84.3	2.0	11.8
	Principals/Site Coordinators	63.3	1.8	28.4
	Teachers	29.3	5.4	51.1
Complied with applicable state and local laws.	Division Coordinators	88.2	2.0	9.8
	Principals/Site Coordinators	61.5	1.8	27.5
	Teachers	30.6	5.6	49.7
Educator Questionnaire Item	Respondents	Frequently or occasionally	Not at All	Don't Know
		Percent	Percent	Percent
How often does the provider...				
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring services (start/end on time)?	Division Coordinators	90.4	2.0	7.8
	Principals/Site Coordinators	80.7	6.4	6.4
	Teachers	33.3	7.5	48.4
Communicate with me during the school year (talk about progress)?	Division Coordinators	60.8	5.9	33.3
	Principals/Site Coordinators	47.7	34.9	11.9
	Teachers	27.7	57.0	4.8

Division Coordinators: N= 51
Principals/Site Coordinators: N= 109
Teachers: N= 37

Table 3.2 Aggregate Parent Questionnaire Responses for School Year 2005-2006

Parent Questionnaire Item	Strongly Agree or Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Neutral
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Overall assessment:			
I believe the services offered positively impacted my child's achievement.	77.7	5.7	14.3
Overall, I am satisfied with the services offered to my child.	78.3	6.4	13.3
Division assessment:			
1. I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	76.2	10.6	11.1
2. I was given enough time to decide which service provider I wanted for my child.	81.3	5.8	11.1
3. I am pleased with the way my school division helped me obtain Supplemental Educational Services for my child.	84.5	4.0	10.5
Parent Questionnaire Item	Frequently or occasionally	Not at All	Don't Know
	Percent	Percent	Percent
How often does the provider...			
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring services (start/end on time)?	82.9	3.0	11.5
Communicate with me during the school year (talk about progress)?	66.8	28.7	2.8

Parents: N= 669

Table 4. Statewide by Provider: The percentage of respondents who “strongly agreed or agreed” with the questionnaire item, “Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child/student received.”

Provider	Parents		Teachers		Principal/Site Coordinators		Division Coordinators	
	Number of respondents	Percentage strongly agreed or agreed	Number of respondents	Percentage strongly agreed or agreed	Number of respondents	Percentage strongly agreed or agreed	Number of respondents	Percentage strongly agreed or agreed
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	6	66.7	0	No Responses	1	<0.1	0	No Responses
Babbage Net Schools	12	83.3	19	21.1	7	14.3	6	50.0
Boys and Girls Club of Metro Richmond	1	<0.1	0	No Responses	0	No Responses	0	No Responses
Club Z! Inc.	124	75.8	60	23.3	20	42.9	10	40.0
Compass Learning Inc.	14	78.6	9	44.4	3	66.6	1	<0.1
Cortez Management	0	No Responses	1	<0.1	0	No Responses	0	No Responses
Destiny Achievers Tutorial Services, Inc.	1	100.0	1	<0.1	0	No Responses	0	No Responses
Education Station	18	94.5	0	No Responses	2	100.0	1	100.0
Educational Options, Inc.	0	No Responses	1	100.0	0	No Responses	0	No Responses
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	19	78.9	4	25.0	0	No Responses	0	No Responses
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	4	100.0	14	28.6	5	40.0	3	33.3
Huntington Learning	118	80.5	59	37.3	14	57.2	6	33.3
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	24	79.2	24	29.2	4	25.0	1	100.0
Knowledgepoints	4	75.0	1	<0.1	1	100.0	1	100.0
Kumon North America, Inc.	2	100.0	0	No Responses	1	<0.1	1	<0.1
Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools	95	66.3	71	46.5	4	75.0	1	100.0
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	5	60.0	3	33.3	2	100.0	1	100.0
Porter Education and Communications, Inc.	14	78.5	20	55.0	9	88.9	4	75.0
Trust Tutoring	4	50.0	1	100.0	6	<0.1	1	<0.1
TutorFind	8	75.0	0	No Responses	2	100.0	1	100.0
University Instructors, Inc.	156	80.7	76	26.3	26	57.7	13	69.3
Voyager Expanded Learning	40	95.0	8	37.5	1	100.0	0	No Responses

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS

Findings

1. Have students served by SES providers shown statistically significant academic gains in reading/language arts and mathematics from 2005 to 2006?

Pre-test and post-test results did not significantly decline overall for any provider. In reading/language arts, students served by four providers made statistically significant gains. In mathematics, no students showed statistically significant gains.²

A power analysis of the available data indicated that a provider needed to have served at least 198 students in a subject area for results of the pre-test and post-test analysis to produce statistically reliable results.³ The pre-test and post-test analysis results for providers serving less than 198 students in a subject area are only descriptive, and do not represent statistically reliable results about provider impact on student achievement. Additionally, student achievement results for an individual provider cannot be directly attributed to the provider's impact on student achievement. Other variables, such as the impact of environmental factors, are not accounted for in the pre-test and post-test analysis. Table 5 displays pre-test and post-test results for each provider.

² It should be noted that statistical significance is strongly influenced by sample size. Lack of statistical significance, therefore, does not necessarily mean absence of positive effects where providers serve smaller numbers of children. On the other hand, a demonstrated gain in proficiency level possibly could be due to interventions and influences other than SES.

³ Students served by these providers showed statistically significant improvement. Statistical power analyses indicated that to detect statistical significance (given an estimated provider effect of .15-.20 SD), sample sizes in a given subject would need to be 198 students or more per provider. Thus, with the exception of four larger providers, the analyses were underpowered for yielding significance (i.e., had reduced probability to corroborate a true positive or negative effect).

Table 5. Summary of Findings by SES Provider for the 2005-2006 School Year

	Students Served in Reading/ Language Arts	Reading/ Language Arts Findings	Students Served in Mathematics	Mathematics Findings
SES Provider	Number	Pre/Post and Pass Rate Results	Number	Pre/Post and Pass Rate Results
A. Statistically Reliable Results (at least 198 student contracts in a subject area)				
Club Z! Inc.	538	+	198	+
Huntington Learning	285	+	See Section B	
Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools	256	+	See Section B	
University Instructors, Inc.	574	+	342	+
B. Descriptive Results- Suggestive Data / Not Statistically Reliable⁴ (more than 10 student contracts but less than 198 student contracts)				
Babbage Net Schools	33	+	19	+
Compass Learning Inc.	48	+	22	-
Education Station	70	+	30	
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	87	+	14	
Huntington Learning	See Section A		124	+
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	96	+	83	+
Knowledgepoints	29	+	11	
Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools	See Section A		193	+
Nonpublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	31	+	21	
Porter Education and Communications, Inc.	166	+	145	+
Trust Tutoring	12	+	13	
TutorFind	26		18	
C. Too Few Students to Analyze (less than 10 student contracts)				
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	*		*	
Champions Tutoring Program	*		*	
Kumon North America, Inc.	*		*	
Plato Learning/Lightspan, Inc.	*		*	
PowerCommunicators	*		*	

* Provider served too few students to report information or provider did not serve any students in this subject.

+ Of the students served by these providers, more students passed in the current year than in the previous year.

- Of the students served by these providers, more students passed in the previous year than in the current year.

Light Grey – Students served by these providers showed statistically significant improvement in the pre-test and post-test analysis.

Dark Grey – Students served by these providers showed no statistically significant improvement in the pre-test and post-test analysis.

Black – Students served by these providers could not be evaluated in the given category because the number of students was too low to produce meaningful results or pre-test or post-test information was not available.

⁴ Power analysis results indicate that a provider would need to serve 198 students or more to produce statistically reliable results. The descriptive data is only suggestive, and does not represent true positive or negative effects.

2. How did students who received SES services in the eight pilot schools perform relative to other students attending schools that were not pilot schools?

In reading/language arts, the effect of pilot school status was not statistically significant, and accounted for less than 1 percent of the variance in reading/language arts SOL scores. In mathematics, the effect of pilot school status was not statistically significant, accounting for only 1.2 percent of the variance in 2006 mathematics SOL scores. Reading/language arts and mathematics results were obtained by controlling for significant influences of school effects and 2005 SOL scores. The implication of these two analyses (reading/language arts and mathematics) is that the impact of SES on student achievement was virtually identical in the two types of schools, pilot and non-pilot. That is, the pilot program did not appear to change how SES impacts student achievement. However, a significantly high percentage of eligible students participated in SES in the pilot schools as compared to the other schools implementing SES.

STANDARDS OF LEARNING PERFORMANCE RESULTS

The chart that follows show performance results on the reading/language arts and mathematics Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments for the 2005-2006 school year.

Individual provider performance results are included in Appendix B.

Table 6: Comparison of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 SOL Performance for All Student Contracts Delivered for the 2005-2006 School Year

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments				
	2005-2006 SES Participants Tested in 2004-2005	2005-2006 SES Participants Passing in 2004-2005 (AYP Target: 65 percent)	2005-2006 SES Participants Tested in 2005-2006	2005-2006 SES Participants Passing in 2005-2006 (AYP Target: 69 percent)
Subgroups	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Students	425	48.00	1,162	57.94
Black	347	45.82	931	57.31
Students with Disabilities	84	28.57	253	57.29
Economically Disadvantaged	410	47.80	1,131	57.29
Hispanic	21	61.90	86	63.90
LEP	14	64.29	55	63.89
White	51	56.86	126	60.98

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments				
	2005-2006 SES Participants Tested in 2004-2005	2005-2006 SES Participants Passing in 2004-2005 (AYP Target: 63 percent)	2005-2006 SES Participants Tested in 2005-2006	2005-2006 SES Participants Passing in 2005-2006 (AYP Target: 67 percent)
Subgroups	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Students	418	57.42	685	52.27
Black	340	54.41	528	50.90
Students with Disabilities	76	42.11	144	43.87
Economically Disadvantaged	404	57.92	657	53.07
Hispanic	23	60.87	56	59.29
LEP	16	50.00	37	61.98
White	50	74.00	81	54.90

CONCLUSIONS

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in Virginia during the 2005-2006 school year received mostly positive outcomes from those responding to questionnaires and the outcomes of the student achievement analysis for some providers reflects gains in student achievement. Parents were generally pleased with the services their children received. Some teachers, principals, and school divisions noted challenges and areas for improvement. Implementation to enroll eligible students into tutoring services varied by division and school. Most of the coordinators in the state indicated that efforts at the state, division, and school level to increase awareness and participation in SES were comprehensive.

Both providers and teachers expressed a desire for better communication with each other. It is recommended that divisions and schools continue to find ways to improve communication between parents, providers, and division SES coordinators.

It is also recommended that parents have access to provider status reports and other information regarding the performance of tutors working with their children. Additionally, it is recommended that division SES coordinators continue to encourage principals, teachers, and parents to participate in the SES survey so that parents can play a more active role in the SES evaluation.

The pre-test and post-test analysis approach to evaluating providers has limitations. Large percentages of students scored below the proficient level at pre-test, so they could only advance to the proficient level or advanced level or stay the same. There were relatively few instances where students could have declined in performance. Thus, the analysis is somewhat biased toward finding neutral or positive results.

The design and methods used to evaluate the impact of SES on student achievement in Virginia can continue to evolve as more detailed student-level data become available for comparison. As the state moves into its next year of SES implementation, the knowledge gained through evaluating providers will provide valuable insight into areas for improvement and areas of success for all stakeholders working to help students achieve their academic goals within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

APPENDIX A

Commonwealth of Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Division Coordinator Questionnaire

2006 © A. Potter, McDonald, A.J., & Ross, S. M.
Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.
All Rights Reserved.

DIRECTIONS

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY
MAKE DARK MARKS
EX ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

Division Name:

Name and Title of Person
Completing this Survey:

Provider Name:	Provider Code:																																																												
<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: small; margin-bottom: 5px;">Instructions: Please indicate the particular provider to which this survey pertains. Use only one 2-digit provider code listed on the back of this page. A separate survey is needed for each provider.</div> <input style="width: 95%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	<input type="radio"/>																																																	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0																																																				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																																																				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																																																				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																																																				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																																																				
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																																																				

What was the start date of provider services?

Month	Date
<input type="radio"/> September 2005	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> October 2005	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> November 2005	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> December 2005	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> January 2006	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> February 2006	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> March 2006	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> Other	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2
	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2

In which subjects did your students receive services from this provider?

- Reading/Language Arts only
 - 1-25
 - 26-50
 - 51-100
 - Over 100
- Mathematics only
 - 1-25
 - 26-50
 - 51-100
 - Over 100
- Both Reading/LA and Mathematics
 - 1-25
 - 26-50
 - 51-100
 - Over 100

Continue to page 2.

Commonwealth of Virginia
 Supplemental Educational Services
 Division Coordinator Questionnaire, continued

Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey? Yes No

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often does the provider...

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't know
Communicate with you during the school year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate with teachers during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate with parents during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The provider...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>				
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	<input type="radio"/>				
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	<input type="radio"/>				
Offered services to Special Education and ESL students.	<input type="radio"/>				
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	<input type="radio"/>				
Complied with state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	<input type="radio"/>				

Overall assessment:

I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	<input type="radio"/>				
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	<input type="radio"/>				

Additional comments can be provided on the back of this form.

**Commonwealth of Virginia
Supplemental Educational Services
Principal/Site Coordinator Questionnaire**

2006 © A. Potter, McDonald, A.J., & Ross, S. M.
Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.
All Rights Reserved.

DIRECTIONS
USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY
MAKE DARK MARKS
EX
ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

Division Name:

School Name:

Name and Title of Person
Completing this Survey:

Provider Name:	Provider Code:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Instructions: Please indicate the particular provider to which this survey pertains. Use only one 2-digit provider code listed on the back of this page. A separate survey is needed for each provider.	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02 <input type="radio"/> 03 <input type="radio"/> 04 <input type="radio"/> 05 <input type="radio"/> 06 <input type="radio"/> 07 <input type="radio"/> 08 <input type="radio"/> 09 <input type="radio"/> 10 <input type="radio"/> 11 <input type="radio"/> 12 <input type="radio"/> 13 <input type="radio"/> 14 <input type="radio"/> 15 <input type="radio"/> 16 <input type="radio"/> 17 <input type="radio"/> 18 <input type="radio"/> 19 <input type="radio"/> 20

What was the start date of provider services?	
Month	Date
<input type="radio"/> September 2005	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> October 2005	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> November 2005	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> December 2005	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> January 2006	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> February 2006	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> March 2006	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02
<input type="radio"/> Other	<input type="radio"/> 01 <input type="radio"/> 02

In which subjects did your students receive services from this provider?
<input type="radio"/> Reading/Language Arts only <input type="radio"/> 1-10 <input type="radio"/> 11-20 <input type="radio"/> 21-30 <input type="radio"/> Over 30
<input type="radio"/> Mathematics only <input type="radio"/> 1-10 <input type="radio"/> 11-20 <input type="radio"/> 21-30 <input type="radio"/> Over 30
<input type="radio"/> Both Reading/LA and Mathematics <input type="radio"/> 1-10 <input type="radio"/> 11-20 <input type="radio"/> 21-30 <input type="radio"/> Over 30

Continue to page 2.

Commonwealth of Virginia
 Supplemental Educational Services
 Principal/Site Coordinator Questionnaire, continued

Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey? Yes No

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often does the provider...	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't know
Communicate with you during the school year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate with teachers during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate with parents during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The provider...

The provider...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>				
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	<input type="radio"/>				
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	<input type="radio"/>				
Offered services to Special Education and ESL students.	<input type="radio"/>				
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	<input type="radio"/>				
Complied with state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	<input type="radio"/>				

Overall assessment:

I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	<input type="radio"/>				
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	<input type="radio"/>				

Additional comments can be provided on the back of this form.

Commonwealth of Virginia
Supplemental Educational Services Teacher Questionnaire
Continued

Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey? Yes No

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often does the provider...

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't know
Communicate with you during the school year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate with the principal or school site coordinator during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicate with parents during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The provider...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>				
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	<input type="radio"/>				
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	<input type="radio"/>				
Offered services to Special Education and ESL students.	<input type="radio"/>				
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	<input type="radio"/>				
Complied with state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	<input type="radio"/>				

Overall assessment:

I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	<input type="radio"/>				
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	<input type="radio"/>				

Additional comments can be provided on the back of this form.

Virginia's Approved Supplemental Educational Service Providers for the 2005-2006 School Year

Please use the 2-digit code listed beside each provider to complete the provider code on page 1 of this survey.

01. Achieve 3000
02. Aligned Interventions Educational Services
03. Babbage Net Schools
04. Boys and Girls Clubs of Metro Richmond in partnership with Compass Learning, Inc.
05. Camelot Learning
06. Club Z! In-House Tutoring Services of Virginia
07. Compass Learning Inc.
08. Cortez Management
09. Destiny Achievers Tutorial Services, Inc.
10. EdSolutions, Inc.
11. Educational Options, Inc.
12. Education Station
13. Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)
14. Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center
15. Huntington Learning
16. I CAN Learn Education Systems
17. In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center
18. Knowledge Points
19. Kumon North America, Inc. North American Headquarters
20. Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes
21. Little Sicientists of Richmond
22. Master Mind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.
23. Mathematics and Science Center (Richmond)
24. NCLB Tutors
25. Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools
26. NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)
27. One-to-One Virginia Academic Support Program
28. Park Place School
29. PLATO Learning/Lightspan, Inc.
30. Porter Education and Communications, Inc
31. Princeton Review
32. Science Museum of Virginia
33. Trust Tutoring
34. TutorFind
35. University Instructors, Inc.
36. Voyager Expanded Learning

(Optional) Please use this space to provide comments about this provider. You may also wish to comment about Supplemental Educational Services in general and what could be done to make this program better for low performing students.

<p>(Optional) Please use this space to provide comments about this provider. You may also wish to comment about Supplemental Educational Services in general and what could be done to make this program better for low performing students.</p>
--

(Optional) Please use this space to provide comments about this provider. You may also wish to comment about Supplemental Educational Services in general and what could be done to make this program better for your child.

Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire



Please make copies of this form and complete a separate survey for each division with which you have/had a contract to serve students with Supplemental Educational Services in 2005-2006.

I. Supplemental Educational Services Provider Information

Provider Name: <input type="text"/> Contact Person: <input type="text"/> Address: <input type="text"/> Telephone: <input type="text"/> E-Mail: <input type="text"/> Division Served: <input type="text"/> Name of School served in this division: <input type="text"/>	Please describe the format of your services by completing the following items: Program duration (e.g., 10-weeks; academic year) <input type="text"/> Weekly duration (e.g., each student attends twice per week for two hours total) <input type="text"/> Setting (e.g., school, your building) <input type="text"/> Format (e.g., small group, individual) <input type="text"/> If groups are used, what is the average size? <input type="text"/> Is transportation provided to students? If so, by whom (you, district, school, etc.)? <input type="text"/>
--	--

What is your general instructional approach during the tutoring sessions: (e.g., students work one-on-one with the tutor and then complete practice/review exercises on a computer)?

Is there anything else that you would like to say regarding the format/process of your services?

Qualifications of tutors (certified teachers, teaching aide, training, etc):

Are background checks done on tutors or other personnel that come into contact with students? (If yes, please describe).

Form completed by (if other than contact person):
Address, Telephone, and Email

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

II. Information Regarding Students You Served in this Division

1. Complete the table below based on data for this division. If unable to respond to a particular section, provide an explanation in the space provided below the table.

Grade Level	# of Total Students Served	# of Special Ed Students Served	# of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Students Served	# of Students Who Achieved Their Specific Achievement Goals	# of Students Who Made Progress In Their Specific Achievement Goals	# of Students Who Showed No Improvement In Their Specific Achievement Goals	% of Tutoring Sessions Attended by Students

Notes: (Use the space below to comment on missing data or any special circumstances relevant to the above outcomes.)

2. For those students who did not achieve their stated goals, explain why this did not happen, either generally or on an individual basis.

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

3. Indicate the number of students served in each curriculum area in which your organization offered services in this division. Indicate numbers in all that apply.

<input type="radio"/> Reading	<input type="radio"/> Writing	<input type="radio"/> Math	<input type="radio"/> Other _____
K _____	K _____	K _____	K _____
1 _____	1 _____	1 _____	1 _____
2 _____	2 _____	2 _____	2 _____
3 _____	3 _____	3 _____	3 _____
4 _____	4 _____	4 _____	4 _____
5 _____	5 _____	5 _____	5 _____
6 _____	6 _____	6 _____	6 _____
7 _____	7 _____	7 _____	7 _____
8 _____	8 _____	8 _____	8 _____
9 _____	9 _____	9 _____	9 _____
10 _____	10 _____	10 _____	10 _____
11 _____	11 _____	11 _____	11 _____
12 _____	12 _____	12 _____	12 _____

III. Provider Perceptions and Activities

(Indicate your response to each of the following items as they apply to your staff.)

Don't Know
Not at all
Occasionally
Frequently

1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such communications:

2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such communications:

3. Tutors adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such adaptations:

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

III. Provider Perceptions and Activities (Continued)

Don't Know
Not at all
Occasionally
Frequently

4. Tutors aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such alignments:

5. Tutors integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such processes:

6. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such communications:

7. Tutors gave instruction to students with disabilities, consistent with their Individualized Education Plans or Individualized Services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such activities:

8. Tutors protected from public disclosure the identities of all students served and all students eligible for services.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such activities:

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

III. Provider Perceptions and Activities (Continued)

9. Tutors give appropriate instruction to English Language Learners if it is needed.

Don't Know
Not at all
Occasionally
Frequently

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such activities:

10. Tutors use appropriate timetables for improving each student's achievement.

If applicable, briefly describe the process for such activities:

Based on your perceptions and experiences, rate the degree of satisfaction with each of the following areas. Use the accompanying "Comments" section to elaborate if desired, especially where "highly dissatisfied" or "highly satisfied" is indicated.

Highly Dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Don't Know
Satisfied
Highly Satisfied

11. Parent cooperation/involvement

Comments:

12. Student attendance

Comments:

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Don't Know	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied
13. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation) <i>Comments:</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<input type="radio"/>				
14. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the division or school curriculum. <i>Comments:</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<input type="radio"/>				
15. Teacher cooperation/involvement <i>Comments:</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<input type="radio"/>				
16. Division cooperation/involvement <i>Comments:</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<input type="radio"/>				
17. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels <i>Comments:</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<input type="radio"/>				

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

Planning, Measuring and Reporting on Progress:

18. What achievement data did you use to plan, measure, and report on students' progress for the year?
Mark all that apply. Please specify where needed.

- Standards of Learning (SOL) Reading Language Math
 Science Social Studies

Specify:

- Use of local division or school academic achievement data

Specify:

- Teacher/Division input

Specify:

- Provider assessments (developed by your organization)

Specify:

- Use of other standardized tests

Specify:

- Other

Specify:

**Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Provider Questionnaire
(continued)**

Overall Impressions

19. What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work with the division this year?

20. What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work with this division this year?

21. Additional Comments/Recommendations

APPENDIX B

Table 7: Summary of SOL Performance by Provider for the 2005-2006 School Year

Provider: Babbage Net Schools

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	17	70.59
Black	11	63.64
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	17	70.59
Hispanic	*	
LEP	0	
White	*	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	*	
Black	*	
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	*	
Hispanic	0	
LEP	0	
White	*	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Club Z! Inc.

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	257	57.34
Black	210	57.68
Students with Disabilities	63	57.29
Economically Disadvantaged	255	57.69
Hispanic	17	65.53
LEP	11	48.18
White	27	55.95

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	108	46.02
Black	77	43.96
Students with Disabilities	35	42.29
Economically Disadvantaged	105	45.43
Hispanic	13	67.31
LEP	14	50.00
White	14	47.14

Provider: Compass Learning Inc.

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	25	56.00
Black	25	56.00
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	24	54.17
Hispanic	0	
LEP	0	
White	0	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	21	35.71
Black	21	35.71
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	21	35.71
Hispanic	0	
LEP	0	
White	0	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Education Station

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	34	55.15
Black	29	59.95
Students with Disabilities	10	75.96
Economically Disadvantaged	34	55.15
Hispanic	0	
LEP	0	
White	*	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	20	55.00
Black	16	58.33
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	20	55.00
Hispanic	0	
LEP	0	
White	*	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	48	38.19
Black	43	40.70
Students with Disabilities	12	43.06
Economically Disadvantaged	47	37.41
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	*	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	*	
Black	*	
Students with Disabilities	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	*	
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	0	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Huntington Learning

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	126	65.39
Black	90	64.46
Students with Disabilities	36	54.70
Economically Disadvantaged	110	63.83
Hispanic	10	75.00
LEP	11	81.82
White	24	65.67

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	75	56.14
Black	46	51.84
Students with Disabilities	13	52.31
Economically Disadvantaged	59	62.26
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	18	56.06

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	46	58.55
Black	38	60.00
Students with Disabilities	15	53.11
Economically Disadvantaged	46	58.55
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	*	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	41	46.59
Black	34	50.88
Students with Disabilities	15	48.22
Economically Disadvantaged	41	46.59
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	*	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Knowledgepoints

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	12	91.67
Black	*	
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	12	91.67
Hispanic	*	
LEP	0	
White	*	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	*	
Black	*	
Students with Disabilities	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	*	
Hispanic	*	
LEP	0	
White	*	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Newton Learning, A Division of Edison Schools

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	161	70.92
Black	131	70.22
Students with Disabilities	21	74.24
Economically Disadvantaged	161	70.92
Hispanic	16	75.75
LEP	*	
White	11	72.92

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	117	66.99
Black	96	67.51
Students with Disabilities	13	64.10
Economically Disadvantaged	117	66.99
Hispanic	11	60.26
LEP	*	
White	*	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: Porter Education and Communications, Inc.

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	74	48.93
Black	67	48.05
Students with Disabilities	17	45.93
Economically Disadvantaged	74	48.93
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	*	

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	67	53.82
Black	61	53.01
Students with Disabilities	16	45.19
Economically Disadvantaged	67	53.82
Hispanic	*	
LEP	*	
White	*	

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.

Provider: University Instructors, Inc.

Reading/Language Arts Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 69 percent)
All Students	339	53.71
Black	265	52.22
Students with Disabilities	61	55.88
Economically Disadvantaged	328	53.86
Hispanic	25	65.24
LEP	19	65.30
White	46	55.82

Mathematics Performance on Standards of Learning Assessments for 2005-2006		
Subgroups	Number of SES Participants Tested	Percent Passing (State AYP Target: 67 percent)
All Students	194	45.13
Black	152	42.17
Students with Disabilities	31	32.06
Economically Disadvantaged	185	46.25
Hispanic	12	56.11
LEP	*	
White	28	54.74

* Provider served too few students (fewer than 10) to report information.