



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: 2007 – 2008



March 2009

James Ford

Lynn Harrison

Laura Neergaard

Haixia Qian

Todd Zoblotsky

Dawn McKay

Steven M. Ross

Center for Research in Educational Policy

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	2
II. Introduction.....	6
III. Study Design.....	14
IV. Descriptive Analysis Results	17
V. Student Achievement Results	27
VI. Conclusions.....	32
VII. Appendix A: SES Surveys.....	34
VIII. Appendix B: Student Achievement Analysis Tables.....	40

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 2007-2008 school year.

Research Design

The report includes the results of both a descriptive analysis and an evaluative analysis on SES. The descriptive analysis consisted of survey results from division SES coordinators, parents of students receiving SES, and SES providers. The evaluative analysis assessed Standards of Learning (SOL) test scores to examine the effect of SES provider services on student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics. The matched program control design consisted of a pre-program/post-program matched samples comparison of students receiving SES services to students not receiving SES services to examine the Virginia SES program effect on student achievement in the 2007-2008 year. Additionally, a separate analysis was conducted for schools in divisions participating in the United States Department of Education (USED) pilot for the reversal of SES and Public School Choice (PSC).

The matched program-control methodology was the most appropriate and scientifically rigorous design available to meet the monitoring requirements of NCLB, which is focused on evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by approved SES providers. To retain scientific validity, the analyses were limited to a non-random subset of students who received SES in Virginia in 2007-2008, and students not receiving SES services. These results

may not generalize to the majority of students who participated in SES. A summary of achievement findings is provided in this report along with the survey results.

SES Implementation

In 2007-2008, 35 SES providers delivered SES services to 3,344 students in 26 school divisions. Descriptive analysis results indicated that a large majority of parents were pleased with the way their school division implemented SES in their divisions and helped them obtain SES services for their children. Most parents indicated that they were given enough time to decide which SES provider they wanted for their children, and indicated that they were given information on their children's rights under NCLB. The majority of division coordinators indicated overall satisfaction with SES provider services and believed SES providers positively impacted student achievement.

SES Effectiveness

A state-level analysis assessed the effect of all SES providers. The results of the analysis showed no statistically significant difference in 2007-2008 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services.

The SES provider-level analysis revealed a statistically significant negative difference in 2007-2008 SOL reading/language arts performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services for Porter Education and Communications, Inc. No significant differences in reading/language arts performance were found for any other SES providers. While not statistically significant, the 2007-2008 reading/language arts performance of students receiving SES services was higher than that of students not receiving SES services for Academics Plus, Inc., Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO), Huntington Learning

Centers, Inc., and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI). Their performance was lower than students not receiving SES services for A+ Markem, Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors), Aligned Interventions Educational Services, Bright Futures Learning, Inc., Club Z! Inc., and TutorFind.

The SES provider-level analysis revealed no statistically significant differences in 2007-2008 SOL mathematics performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services. While not statistically significant, the 2007-2008 mathematics performance of students receiving SES services was higher than that of students not receiving SES services for A+ Markem, Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors), Club Z! Inc., and Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. Their performance was lower than students not receiving SES services for CompassLearning, Inc., Educate Online, NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI), Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C), and Tsquared Tutors, LLC.

Conclusion

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in Virginia during the 2007-2008 school year received mostly positive reports from those responding to surveys. Parents were generally pleased with the SES services their children received, and the majority of parent respondents were very positive about division and school personnel assistance with SES services. Division SES coordinators were also pleased with SES provider services overall. Lastly, SES providers were mostly positive concerning their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2007-2008 school year.

When conducting analyses at the provider-level, no SES provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students they served in mathematics, while only one

provider in reading/language arts (Porter Education and Communications, Inc.) had a significant negative effect. In nearly all cases, students who were provided SES services scored similarly on the 2007-2008 SOL tests in reading/language arts and mathematics to those who were not served. For the state-level analysis examining the effect of all SES providers combined, there was no significant difference in reading/language arts or mathematics performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services.

These results should be interpreted with caution. Small sample size, which reduces the ability to detect statistical significance and the reliability of results, was a limiting factor for many providers. The degree to which state assessments have adequate sensitivity to detect the contribution of a limited number of hours of SES services during the school year is unknown. Despite the limitations of the achievement analyses, the results provide evidence that while no individual SES providers had a statistically significant impact on SOL outcomes, one individual SES provider did have significant negative effects. As more rigorous achievement analyses are conducted in future years, the ability to detect reliable trends for individual SES providers will continue to increase.

Introduction

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in Virginia, conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis. SES is a component of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), and is designed to provide extra academic assistance for eligible children. Specifically, students are eligible to receive SES if they are from low-income families and attend Title I schools in their second year of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress or “AYP” for three or more years), in corrective action, or in restructuring status. Additionally, seven 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 2007-2008 school year. These divisions offered SES to eligible students attending schools in their first year of school improvement (i.e., have not made AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject area).

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to examine SES provider effectiveness through the analysis of SES student achievement outcomes and perceptions from key stakeholders in the Virginia school divisions where these services were offered during the 2007-2008 school year. A secondary goal of this evaluation is to create a systematic process that allows the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to meet federal monitoring requirements.

The research design consisted of two complementary analyses. The first analysis investigated stakeholder perceptions of SES provider implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, division SES coordinators, and parents of

students receiving SES services. The second analysis examined the effectiveness of SES services on SOL outcomes at the state-level and individual SES provider-level. The primary research questions for the studies were:

1. What are the effects of SES provider services on student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics?
2. Do divisions make SES services available to eligible students?
3. What are SES providers', division SES coordinators', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?
4. Are SES providers communicating regularly with division SES coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES services?
5. Are SES providers working with divisions and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
6. Are SES providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?
7. Are SES providers offering services to students with disabilities and English Language Learner (ELL) students?
8. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of SES provider performance?

Participating School Divisions and SES Providers

In total, 3,344 SES students (3,758 contracts) received SES tutoring services from 35 providers across 53 schools in 26 divisions in Virginia in 2007-2008. Within the 26 divisions, 55 Title I schools were required to offer SES services. Parents of students in these schools were informed by the school of their children's eligibility for SES services, and were provided

applications for SES services which included a list of state-approved SES providers able to serve their school division.

Twenty-six (26) SES providers established 1,357 contracts in mathematics, while 32 SES providers established 2,401 contracts in reading/language arts. Among the 26 providers offering mathematics services, Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors) had the largest percentage of contracts (19.7 percent), while Camelot Learning had the lowest percentage (less than one percent). Of the 32 providers offering reading/language arts services, Huntington Learning Centers, Inc., had the highest number of contracts (17.0 percent). Brain Hurricane and Standards of Excellence Children's Development Center Tutoring Program each had the lowest percentage in reading/language arts (less than one percent).

Although some students (12.0 percent) received tutoring in both reading/language arts and mathematics, when conducting the analyses, SOL results were examined separately by subject. As a result, the reading/language arts analyses included the reading/language arts SOL scores of those students contracted for SES services in reading/language arts. Similarly, the mathematics analyses included the mathematics SOL scores of those students contracted for SES services in mathematics. Tables 1 through 3 on the following page provide summaries of SES participation in 2007-2008 by division, by SES provider, and by subject area. Table 1 displays the number and percentage of students with priority for services, or low-income students, participating in SES services by school division during the 2007-2008 school year. Table 2 displays the number and percentage of all students attending Title I schools offering SES services and participating in SES by school division during the 2007-2008 school year. Table 3 displays the total number of contracts established by SES providers in 2007-2008. The total number of students (3,344) is less than the number of contracts (3,758) because students could

receive contracts from different providers in different subjects (reading/language arts and/or mathematics).

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Students with Priority for Services⁺ Participating in SES by School Division During the 2007-2008 School Year

Division Name	Number of Students with Priority for Services	Number of Students with Priority for Services Participating in SES	Percentage of Students with Priority for Services Participating in SES
Alexandria City Public Schools	248	67	27.02
Arlington County Public Schools	1,178	186	15.79
Charles City Public Schools	198	41	20.70
Colonial Beach Public Schools	174	18	10.34
Essex County Public Schools	691	52	7.53
Fairfax County Public Schools**	2,502	615	24.58
Fauquier County Public Schools**	157	91	57.96
Franklin City Public Schools	211	59	27.96
Fredericksburg City Public Schools	363	*	*
Greene County Public Schools**	198	15	7.58
Hampton City Public Schools**	1,352	408	30.18
Henrico County Public Schools**	355	87	24.50
Henry County Public Schools**	315	133	42.22
King George County Public Schools	255	27	10.59
Louisa County Public Schools	313	13	4.15
Montgomery County Public Schools	184	*	*
Newport News City Public Schools**	790	538	68.10
Orange County Public Schools	346	22	6.36
Petersburg City Public Schools	1,770	58	3.28
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	324	28	8.64
Prince Edward County Public Schools	512	40	7.81
Richmond City Public Schools	1,605	132	8.22
Roanoke City Public Schools	1,484	161	10.85
Stafford County Public Schools	558	42	7.52
Sussex County Public Schools	85	16	18.82
Wythe County Public Schools	141	10	7.09
Total	16,309	2,700	16.56

⁺ Low-income students receive priority for SES services. If funding is limited, the lowest achieving students from low-income families receive the highest priority for SES services.

* Providers served too few students with priority for services to report information (less than 10).

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

Table 2. Number and Percentage of SES-Eligible Students Participating in SES by School Division During the 2007-2008 School Year

Division Name	Number of SES-Eligible Students Participating in SES*	Percentage of SES-Eligible Students Participating in SES
Alexandria City Public Schools	67	2.0
Arlington County Public Schools	189	5.7
Charles City Public Schools	79	2.4
Colonial Beach Public Schools	22	0.7
Essex County Public Schools	53	1.6
Fairfax County Public Schools	634	19.0
Fauquier County Public Schools	94	2.8
Franklin City Public Schools	59	1.8
Fredericksburg City Public Schools	15	0.4
Greene County Public Schools	29	0.9
Hampton City Public Schools	477	14.3
Henrico County Public Schools	96	2.9
Henry County Public Schools	133	4.0
King George County Public Schools	27	0.8
Louisa County Public Schools	14	0.4
Montgomery County Public Schools	13	0.4
Newport News City Public Schools	559	16.7
Orange County Public Schools	23	0.7
Petersburg City Public Schools	111	3.3
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	29	0.9
Prince Edward County Public Schools	41	1.2
Richmond City Public Schools	305	9.1
Roanoke City Public Schools	214	6.4
Stafford County Public Schools	42	1.3
Sussex County Public Schools	20	0.6
Wythe County Public Schools	10	0.3
Total	3,355**	100.0

* Number of SES-eligible students includes students with priority for SES services and student without priority for SES services.

**The actual number of students is 3,344. There were 11 students who received services from two different providers; therefore 11 students were counted twice across providers.

**Table 3. Number of Student Contracts Delivered by SES Provider and Subject
During the 2007-2008 School Year**

Provider	Reading/language arts	Mathematics	Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number	Number	Number	Percentage
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	17	0	17	**
Ability Plus, Inc.	62	0	62	1.6
A+ Markem	126	114	240	6.4
Academics Plus, Inc.	50	22	72	1.9
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	351	268	619	16.5
Achieve3000	*	0	*	**
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	73	14	87	2.3
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	20	24	44	1.2
ATS Project Success	*	*	11	**
Babbage Net Schools	*	*	*	**
Brain Hurricane	*	24	25	**
Bright Futures Learning, Inc.	259	65	324	8.6
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	49	17	66	1.8
Camelot Learning	0	*	*	**
Club Z! Inc.	231	127	358	9.5
CompassLearning, Inc.	0	67	67	1.8
Educate Online	15	26	41	1.1
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	152	0	152	4.0
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	0	17	17	**
Fresh Wise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	39	0	39	1.0
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	409	174	583	15.5
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	22	21	43	1.1

**Table 3. Number of Student Contracts Delivered by SES Provider and Subject
During the 2007-2008 School Year
(continued)**

Provider	Reading/language arts	Mathematics	Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number	Number	Number	Percentage
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	14	0	14	**
Kumon North America, Inc.	*	12	21	**
Lighthouse Learning/Educational Consulting Initiative, LLC	*	0	*	**
Longwood Center for Communication, Literacy and Learning	15	0	15	**
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	165	148	313	8.3
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	168	115	283	7.5
Professional Tutoring Services	*	*	11	**
Standards of Excellence Children's Development Center Tutoring Program	*	0	*	**
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	19	*	22	**
The Learning Curve	*	12	15	**
Trust Tutoring	13	*	21	**
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	14	23	37	1.0
TutorFind	83	40	123	3.3
Total	2,401	1,357	3,758	100.0

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

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

Note: The total number of students (3,344) is less than the number of contracts (3,758) because students could receive contracts from different providers in different subjects (reading/language arts and/or mathematics).

Study Design

Design and Participants

The study design consisted of two parts. The first part was a descriptive analysis of SES implementation on the part of the school divisions and SES providers. The second part was an evaluation of the effectiveness of SES services at the state-level and individual SES provider-level.

Descriptive Analysis of SES Implementation

The descriptive portion of the study consisted of surveying the following groups of respondents: (a) SES providers, (b) division SES coordinators in participating divisions, and (c) parents of students receiving SES. The surveys gathered the respondents' perceptions of SES provider activities and effectiveness. The surveys included a common core set of questions for all groups, such as experiences with SES services and SES providers, and questions geared to specific groups, such as reactions to particular SES providers and the respondent's role.

Appendix A contains copies of the surveys distributed to each group.

Evaluative Analysis of SES Effectiveness

The student achievement analysis examined potential gains in academic achievement by evaluating students' Standards of Learning (SOL) mathematics or reading/language arts achievement in 2007-2008 as compared to their achievement in 2006-2007. Three different analyses were conducted separately by subject area. The first analysis examined individual SES provider effectiveness. The second analysis examined the statewide effectiveness of all SES providers combined. The third analysis compared the performance of students receiving SES services attending schools in divisions that participated in the USED pilot for reversal of SES and PSC with students receiving SES services who did not attend pilot schools.

For the SES provider-level and state-level analyses, each student who received SES services in 2007-2008 was matched to a student who did not receive services in the same year. Matches included students who had identical or similar scores for the subject of interest (mathematics or reading/language arts) on the SOL assessments in 2006-2007 and were in the same grade and English Language Learner (ELL) status. To the degree possible, students were also matched according to school, division, race, socio-economic status, and gender. Student samples were restricted to grades four through eight because the necessary pre-program scores from the prior school year were available only for these grades (grade levels three through eight in 2006-2007). Because Virginia does not have vertically scaled scores on the SOL assessments, the evaluation team converted SOL scale scores to standardized scores (z-scores) for all analyses in order to make scores from different years and grade levels comparable. This conversion is not a direct measure of student growth, but rather provides a comparison of student outcomes for students receiving SES services and a matched group of students who did not receive SES services relative to the Virginia average for Title I schools each year.

For all three analyses, only students who received a minimum of 18 hours of SES services, the average number of hours of service, were included in the analyses. Additionally, students who participated in Virginia's alternative assessment program, such as the Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program (VGLA), were excluded from the analyses due to differences in the assessment methodology and scoring system. Only SES providers who had at least 10 students to analyze were included in the SES provider-level analyses to increase reliability of findings and the ability to find significant differences between groups where such differences existed. Students who changed schools between years were excluded from the analysis as well.

Three-hundred sixty (360) students receiving reading/language arts services and 306 students receiving SES services in mathematics were included in the state-level analyses. Three-hundred five (305) students receiving SES services in reading/language arts and 254 students receiving SES services in mathematics were included in the SES provider-level analyses. The students included were not randomly sampled; therefore, the results may not generalize to other students who received SES services. Eighty-two (82) students receiving SES services in reading/language arts and 66 students receiving SES services in mathematics at pilot schools were included in the pilot school analysis. Detailed information, including additional information about the inclusion and exclusion of students in the analyses, is available upon request.

Descriptive Analysis Results

School division SES coordinators, parents of students receiving SES, and SES providers from all 26 school divisions were asked to respond to survey questions. The surveys included a common core set of questions for all groups, as well as questions geared to specific groups. Respondents answered each survey question by choosing a Likert-style response (e.g., 3-point scale: 3=Frequently, 2=Occasionally, 1=Not at all; 4-point scale: 4=Frequently, 3=Occasionally, 2=Not at all, 1=Don't Know; or 5-point scale: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Disagree, 2=Strongly Disagree, 1=Don't Know). Each survey included an "Additional Comments" section.

Division SES coordinators were asked to complete separate online surveys for each SES provider serving the school division. One-hundred (100) percent of school division SES coordinators submitted at least one survey about their experiences with and reactions to SES provider services. A total of 132 responses were received from 26 division SES coordinators. Because division SES coordinators were asked to complete a separate survey for each SES provider serving students within the division, multiple submissions from one SES coordinator were possible. Paper surveys were mailed to participating schools to be distributed to parents of students receiving SES services. The percentage of surveys returned by parents is undetermined due to more surveys sent to be distributed than were actually distributed to this group. A total of 1,016 parents from 41 of the 55 schools offering SES services responded to the surveys. Thirty-three (33) of 35 SES providers contracted to provide SES services in 2007-2008 responded to the surveys. The following section summarizes the questions and responses from the surveys.

1. Do divisions make SES available to eligible students?

- A large majority of SES provider representatives (96.4 percent) were either “Highly Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with school division cooperation and involvement.
- A large majority of parents (95.3 percent) had positive perceptions of the school division’s efforts to implement SES in their divisions and noted that they were pleased with the way their school division helped them obtain SES for their children.
- Most parents (89.5 percent) indicated that they were given enough time to decide which SES provider they wanted for their children. Many parents (79.3 percent) indicated that they were given information on their children’s rights under NCLB.

2. What are providers’, division coordinators’, and parents’ experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?

- A large majority of SES provider representatives (96.4 percent) were “Highly Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with their perceived success at positively impacting student academic achievement.
- Most SES coordinators (84.1 percent) responded that services offered by SES providers positively impacted student academic achievement.
- The majority of parents (88.3 percent) responded that SES services positively impacted their children’s academic achievement.

3. Are providers communicating regularly with division SES coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?

- Most SES provider representatives indicated that they communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (89.2 percent) and parents (96.5 percent) regarding students' progress.
- A large majority of division SES coordinator responses (96.2 percent) reported that SES provider communication occurred frequently or occasionally. Over half of the SES coordinator responses (58.3 percent) indicated that SES providers communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers.
- Most parents (75.6 percent) reported that SES providers spoke with them about their children's progress throughout the year. Most parents (73.2 percent) noted that SES providers sent letters or notes home about their children's progress.

4. Are SES providers working with school divisions and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?

- The majority of SES provider representatives (85.7 percent) reported that they were able to adapt services to each school's curriculum either frequently or occasionally. Three-fourths of SES provider representatives (75 percent) noted that tutors frequently or occasionally integrated SES services with classroom learning activities.
- The majority of SES coordinator responses (78.8 percent) indicated that SES providers collaborated to set goals for student growth either frequently or

occasionally. Over half of SES division coordinator responses (68.2 percent) indicated that providers adapted SES services to each school's curriculum.

- Most parents (86.1 percent) participating in the evaluation agreed that SES providers helped their children with subjects their children are working on in school.

5. Are SES providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?

- A large majority of SES provider representatives (96.5 percent) reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic content and standards either frequently or occasionally.
- Most SES coordinator responses (83.4 percent) indicated that SES providers' services were aligned with state and local standards. The majority of SES coordinator responses (93.9 percent) indicated that SES providers complied with applicable state and local laws.

6. Are SES providers offering services to students with disabilities and English Language Learner (ELL) students?

- Most SES provider representatives (78.6 percent) reported that they gave instruction to students with disabilities frequently or occasionally. Many SES provider representatives (71.5 percent) also reported that they offered appropriate instruction to ELL students as needed either frequently or occasionally.

- Many SES coordinator responses (67.4 percent) indicated that SES providers offered services to special education and ELL students.
- Nineteen (19) percent of students receiving SES services (572 students) were students with disabilities.

7. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of SES provider performance?

- The majority of SES coordinator responses (84.1 percent) indicated overall satisfaction with SES provider services.
- The majority of parents (88.7 percent) indicated they were pleased with the services their children received.

Tables four through six on the following pages provide summaries of the survey responses from division SES coordinators, parents of students receiving SES services, and SES providers. Table seven provides a statewide summary by SES provider of the percentage of respondents who “strongly agreed or agreed” with the question, “Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.”

Table 4. Aggregate Division SES Coordinator Survey Responses for the 2007-2008 School Year

*Total Respondents=26 Division SES Coordinators with 132 Survey Submissions**

How often did the provider...	Percentage				
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all		
Communicate with you during the school year?	54.5	41.7	3.0		
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	30.3	48.5	13.6		
	Percentage				
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know	
Communicate with teachers during the year?	28.8	29.5	10.6	29.5	
Communicate with parents during the year?	36.4	40.9	1.5	19.7	
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	82.6	11.4	0.0	3.8	
The provider...	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.	7.6	60.6	9.8	6.8	14.4
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	6.8	35.6	15.2	6.8	34.1
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	7.6	75.8	1.5	0.0	14.4
Offered services to students with disabilities.	7.6	59.8	1.5	0.0	30.3
Offered services to ELL students.	14.4	53.0	0.0	0.0	31.8
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	8.3	80.3	3.0	0.0	7.6
Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	17.4	76.5	1.5	0.0	3.0
Overall provider assessment:	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	15.9	68.2	8.3	1.5	5.3
Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	15.9	68.2	12.9	1.5	0.8

Note: Item percentages may not total 100 percent because of missing input from some respondents.

* Division SES Coordinators were asked to complete one survey for each SES provider serving their division.

Table 5. Aggregate Parent Survey Responses for the 2007-2008 School Year

Total Respondents=1,016 Parent Surveys

How often did the SES provider...	Percentage				
	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all		
Talk to you about your child's progress?	44.7	30.9	21.6		
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	38.3	34.9	21.0		
	Percentage				
	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all	Don't Know	
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	65.4	20.7	3.1	8.8	
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	75.3	10.8	1.7	8.0	
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the SES provider.	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	55.2	34.8	4.8	2.0	2.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	56.0	32.3	4.1	1.7	4.2
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	55.1	33.6	3.7	1.8	3.2
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school division.	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	42.3	37.0	8.5	2.0	7.9
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	47.5	42.0	3.8	1.0	3.1
I am pleased with the way my school division helped me get free tutoring for my child.	61.8	33.5	0.9	0.6	1.4

Note: Item percentages may not total 100 percent because of missing input from some respondents.

Table 6. Aggregate SES Provider Survey Responses for the 2007-2008 School Year

Total Respondents=28 SES Provider Companies

SES Provider Perceptions and Activities	Percentage				
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know	
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	32.1	57.1	7.1	3.6	
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	78.6	17.9	0.0	3.6	
Tutors adapted the SES services to each school's curriculum.	75.0	10.7	10.7	3.6	
Tutors integrated the SES services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	14.2	39.2	25.0	21.4	
Tutors gave instruction to students with disabilities.	42.9	35.7	10.7	10.7	
Tutors gave instruction to students that were English Language Learners.	42.9	28.6	25.0	3.6	
Tutors aligned the SES services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	92.9	3.6	0.0	3.6	
Provider satisfaction with:	Percentage				
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know
Student attendance	28.6	53.6	17.9	0.0	0.0
Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	32.1	57.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the division or school curriculum	32.1	64.3	0.0	0.0	3.6
Parent cooperation/involvement	17.9	46.4	35.7	0.0	0.0
Teacher cooperation/involvement	21.4	42.9	17.6	3.6	14.3
Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	21.4	42.9	17.9	3.6	14.3
Division SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	60.7	35.7	3.6	0.0	0.0
State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	39.3	46.4	0.0	0.0	14.3
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	32.1	64.3	3.6	0.0	0.0

Note: Item percentages may not total 100 percent because of missing input from some respondents.

Table 7. Statewide SES Provider Overall Satisfaction for the 2007-2008 School Year

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services/pleased with the services that my child received.				
Provider	Division SES Coordinators		Parents	
	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree
A+ Markem	4	75.0	96	92.8
A Plus Success , LLC dba Knowledge Points (Abeyon)	3	66.6	0	NA
Ability Plus, Inc.	1	100.0	18	66.7
Academics Plus, Inc.	5	100.0	32	78.2
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors, Inc.)	18	72.3	139	91.3
Achieve3000	0	NA	0	NA
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	5	100.0	19	84.2
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	4	50.0	16	75.1
ATS Educational Consulting Services	6	83.4	5	100.0
Babbage Net Schools	3	66.7	0	NA
Brain Hurricane	1	100.0	15	86.7
Bright Futures Learning, Inc.	12	91.6	105	87.7
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	1	100.0	21	90.5
Camelot Learning	1	100.0	0	NA
Club Z! Inc.	8	100.0	99	88.9
Compass Learning, Inc.	1	100.0	0	NA
Educate Online	5	80.0	16	81.3
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	1	100.0	11	72.8
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	1	100.0	6	66.6
Fresh Wise, Inc. (Knowledge Points)	2	100.0	19	89.5
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	13	76.9	177	88.7
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	1	100.0	0	NA
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Service	1	100.0	5	100.0
Kumon North America, Inc.	1	100.0	9	100.0
Lighthouse Learning/ Educational Consulting Initiative, LLC	1	100.0	2	100.0
Longwood Center for Communication, Literacy and Learning	1	100.0	0	NA
NonPublic Educational Service, Inc. (NESI)	3	100.0	45	95.6
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	9	77.8	75	92.0
Professional Tutoring Services	2	100.0	8	100.0
Standards of Excellence Children's Development Center Tutoring Program	1	100.0	1	100.0
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	3	100.0	7	100.0
The Learning Curve	1	100.0	0	NA
Trust Tutoring	4	100.0	0	NA

**Table 7. Statewide SES Provider Overall Satisfaction for the 2007-2008 School Year
(continued)**

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services/pleased with the services that my child received				
Provider	Division SES Coordinators		Parents	
	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	2	100.0	12	83.3
TutorFind	6	50.0	53	84.9

NA indicates no respondents completed a survey about this provider

Student Achievement Results

Findings

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

For the state-level analysis of the effect of all SES providers combined, the statistical analysis showed no significant differences in 2007-2008 SOL mathematics or reading/language arts performance between students receiving SES services and students not receiving SES services. While not statistically significant, SES students receiving services in mathematics had slightly more favorable results than students not receiving SES services, with a small adjusted effect size of (0.094). Conversely, SES students receiving services in reading/language arts had slightly less favorable results than students not receiving SES services, with a small adjusted effect size of (-0.123).

For the SES provider-level analysis, no individual SES provider was found to have a significant impact on student achievement in mathematics, while one SES provider (Porter Education and Communications, Inc.) was found to have a significant negative effect on reading/language arts performance. Effect sizes ranged from -0.278 to 0.549 in mathematics and from -0.723 to 0.324 in reading/language arts.

While not statistically significant, the 2007-2008 reading/language arts performance of students receiving SES services was higher than that of students not receiving SES services for the following providers: Academics Plus, Inc., Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO), Huntington Learning Centers, Inc., and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI). Their performance was lower than students not receiving SES services for A+ Markem, Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors), Aligned Interventions Educational Services, Bright

Futures Learning, Inc., Club Z! Inc., and TutorFind. While not statistically significant, the 2007-2008 mathematics performance of students receiving SES services was higher than that of students not receiving SES services for A+ Markem, Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors), Club Z! Inc., and Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. Their performance was lower than students not receiving SES services for CompassLearning, Inc., Educate Online, NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI), Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C), and Tsquared Tutors, LLC.

Out of all 3,344 students receiving SES services in 2007-2008, 572 (19 percent) were students with disabilities. The results of students with disabilities served by all SES providers were aggregated for the descriptive (non-statistical) analysis of 2007-2008 SOL results because of the small students with disabilities population receiving SES services. Without taking hours of attendance into account, 45.4 percent of all students with disabilities were Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts and 50 percent were Proficient or Advanced in mathematics. After excluding students with less than 18 hours of attendance, 44.9 percent were Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts and 44.4 percent were Proficient or Advanced in mathematics.

Table 8. Summary of SES Provider-Level Findings for the 2007-2008 School Year

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No SES provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students they served in either reading/language arts or mathematics. • Only one provider in reading/language arts (Porter Education and Communications, Inc.) had a significant negative effect. 		
Provider	Number of SES Contracts in Reading/language arts	Number of SES Contracts in Mathematics
A. SES Providers included in provider-level analysis		
A+ Markem	126	114
Academics Plus, Inc.	50	22
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	351	268
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	73	14
Bright Futures Learning, Inc.	259	65
Club Z! Inc.	231	127
CompassLearning, Inc.	NA	67
Educate Online	15	26
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	152	NA
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	409	174
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	165	148
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	168	115
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	14	23
TutorFind	83	40
B. SES Providers not included in provider-level analysis**		
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	17	NA
Ability Plus, Inc.	62	NA
Achieve3000	*	NA
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	20	24
ATS Educational Consulting Services	*	*
Babbage Net Schools	*	*
Brain Hurricane	*	24

Table 8. Summary of SES Provider-Level Findings for the 2007-2008 School Year

(continued)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No SES provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students they served in either reading/language arts or mathematics. • Only one provider in reading/language arts (Porter Education and Communications, Inc.) had a significant negative effect. 		
Provider	Number of SES Contracts in Reading/language arts	Number of SES Contracts in Mathematics
B. Providers not included in provider-level analysis**		
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	49	17
Camelot Learning	NA	*
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	NA	17
Fresh Wise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	39	NA
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	22	21
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	14	NA
Kumon North America, Inc.	*	12
Lighthouse Learning/Educational Consulting Initiative, LLC	*	NA
Longwood Center for Communication, Literacy and Learning	15	NA
Professional Tutoring Services	*	*
Standards of Excellence Children's Development Center Tutoring Program	*	NA
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	19	*
The Learning Curve	*	12
Trust Tutoring	13	*

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

** Students served by these providers could not be analyzed because the number of students was too few to produce meaningful results after excluding students not in grades four through eight, special education students, and students with less than 10 hours of SES services.

NA indicated the provider did not offer services in the subject area.

2. How did students who received SES services in the schools participating in the USED pilot for reversal of SES and PSC perform relative to the other students attending schools that were not participating in the USED pilot?

The statistical analysis showed no statistically significant differences in either 2007-2008 SOL reading/language arts or mathematics performance between students who attended schools that participated in the USED pilot and students who attended schools not participating in the USED pilot. The results were slightly less favorable for students attending the pilot schools than for non-pilot students, with a small adjusted effect size in reading/language arts (-0.234), and an effect size near zero for mathematics (-0.081). Overall, the statistical analysis showed no basis for concluding that the effects of SES services on student achievement differed for students attending the schools that participated in the pilot. Appendix B contains student achievement study tables for the state-level, provider-level, and school analyses.

Conclusions

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in Virginia during the 2007-2008 school year received mostly positive ratings from survey respondents. Parents were generally pleased with the SES services their children received, and the majority of parent respondents were positive about division and school personnel assistance with SES services. Division SES coordinators were also pleased with SES provider services overall. Lastly, providers were mostly positive concerning their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2007-2008 school year.

While the survey findings revealed overall satisfaction with SES implementation and services, all respondent groups noted areas for improvement. These areas include: 1) integration of SES services with classroom instruction; 2) parental participation and division assistance in notifying parents about SES services; 3) limited hours of SES services; 4) monitoring of SES services both at the school site and in homes; and 5) transportation to and from SES services.

In the individual SES provider-level analysis, no SES provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students they served in mathematics, while only one SES provider in reading/language arts (Porter Education and Communications, Inc.) had a significant negative effect. For all providers but Porter Education and Communications, Inc., students who received SES services scored similarly on the 2007-2008 SOL tests in reading/language arts and/or mathematics to those who did not receive SES services. In the state-level analysis using data from all SES providers combined, no significant differences in either reading/language arts or mathematics performance were found between students receiving SES services and those not receiving SES services. Similarly, the pilot school analysis found no significant differences in

performance in either subject between students attending pilot schools and students not attending pilot schools.

Student achievement results should be interpreted with caution. Small sample size, which reduces the ability to detect statistical significance and produce reliable results, was a limiting factor for many SES providers. Also, the degree to which state assessments have adequate sensitivity to detect the contribution of only a limited number of hours of tutoring during an entire school year is unknown. A minimum of 18 hours of SES service was used to determine the students included in the analyses. On average, SES students received a little less than four weeks of tutoring during the school year. In addition, the standardized mean achievement scores for all groups in 2007-2008 were below average, meaning that the analyses included lower performing students compared to the entire student sample available. Therefore, it may not be reasonable to expect that a limited number of tutoring hours will have a detectable effect on student achievement as measured by SOL assessments.

As Virginia continues to implement SES in future years, school divisions and SES providers should continue to work together to make sure all eligible students are encouraged to enroll in SES services. The 2007-2008 survey findings indicate that stakeholders believe SES providers are offering potentially beneficial educational services to students. Despite the limitations of the achievement analyses, the results provide evidence that while no individual SES provider was able to achieve significantly better SOL results, one SES provider showed significant negative effects. As more rigorous achievement analyses are conducted in future years, the ability to detect reliable trends for individual SES providers will continue to increase.

Appendix A: SES Surveys

Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire

Please complete one survey about your experience offering Supplemental Educational Services across divisions in 2007-2008.

I. Supplemental Educational Services Provider Information

Provider Name:	<input type="text"/>	E-Mail:	<input type="text"/>
Contact Person:	<input type="text"/>	Divisions Served: (mark all that apply)	<input type="text"/>

Please describe the following aspects of your services.

1. Program duration

- 1-10 weeks
- 11-20 weeks
- 21-30 weeks
- 31-40 weeks

2. Average sessions attended by students each week

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

3. Length of the average tutoring session

- 0.5 - 1.0 hour
- 1.5 - 2.0 hours
- 2.5 - 3.0 hours
- Other _____

4. Setting (mark all that apply)

- School building
- Provider's location
- Student homes
- Community location (not the provider's building)

5. Format (mark all that apply)

- Individual
- Small group (2-5 students per tutor)
- Large group (6-10 students per tutor)
- Other _____

6. Is transportation provided to students?
(mark all that apply)

- Yes, division/school transports students
- Yes, provider transports students
- No, parents are responsible for transportation
- Other _____

7. Qualifications of tutors (mark all that apply)

- Tutors are certified teachers
- Tutors have bachelor's degrees
- Tutors have had training
- No set qualifications
- Other _____

8. Instructional activities (mark all that apply)

- One-to-one tutoring (in person)
- Computer-based tutoring
- Direct instruction
- Independent seatwork
- Other _____

Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire (continued)

II. Provider Perceptions and Activities

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

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Not Applicable
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/ subject teacher of each child they worked with.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Based on your perceptions and experiences, rate the degree of satisfaction with each of the following areas.

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know
8. Parent cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
9. Student attendance	<input type="radio"/>				
10. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	<input type="radio"/>				
11. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the division or school curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>				
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
14. Division Coordinator cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	<input type="radio"/>				

Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire (continued)

Overall Impressions

17. What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?

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

19. Additional Comments/Recommendations

Commonwealth of Virginia Supplemental Educational Services Division Coordinator Questionnaire

2008 © Paek, J., McKay, D., 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

Provider Name:

Division Name:

Name of Person Completing this Survey: Title of Person Completing this Survey:

State (SEA) Assessment	<p>1. The state facilitated SES in the following ways: (check all that apply)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Developed objective criteria for approving potential providers. <input type="checkbox"/> Maintained a list of approved providers. <input type="checkbox"/> Organized or supported provider and LEA meetings. <input type="checkbox"/> Monitored the quality and effectiveness of provider services. <input type="checkbox"/> Developed methods for withdrawing approval from providers. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ 	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div>
<p>2. Overall, I am satisfied with the way my SEA helped our division implement Supplemental Educational Services.</p>		<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Frequently</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Occasionally</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Not at all</div>

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often did the provider...

3. Communicate with you during the school year?	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Frequently</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Occasionally</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Not at all</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
4. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Frequently</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Occasionally</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Not at all</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
5. Communicate with teachers during the year?	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
6. Communicate with parents during the year?	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
7. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>

The provider...

8. Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
9. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
10. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
11. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
12. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
13. Complied with state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>

Overall provider assessment:

14. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>
15. Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Agree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Strongly Disagree</div> <div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 2px; font-size: x-small;">Don't know</div>

Additional comments:

Commonwealth of Virginia Supplemental Educational Services (Free Tutoring) Parent Questionnaire

2008[©] Paek, J., McKay, D., McDonald, A.J., & Ross, S. M.
Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis. All Rights Reserved.

Instructions: Your child is receiving free tutoring. Please fill in the name of your child's tutoring company, division, and school.
A list of tutoring company names, division names and codes are enclosed.

DIRECTIONS
USE NO PENCILS ONLY
MAKE DARK MARKS
EX:
ERASE COMPLETELY TO CHANGE

Tutoring Company Name:

(Please, fill in the company code to the right)

Division Name:

(Please, fill in the division code to the right.)

School Name:

Company code

<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 0
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 1
<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 3
<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 4
<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> 5
<input type="radio"/> 6	<input type="radio"/> 6
<input type="radio"/> 7	<input type="radio"/> 7
<input type="radio"/> 8	<input type="radio"/> 8
<input type="radio"/> 9	<input type="radio"/> 9

Division code

<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 0
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 1
<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 2
<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 3
<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 4
<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> 5
<input type="radio"/> 6	<input type="radio"/> 6
<input type="radio"/> 7	<input type="radio"/> 7
<input type="radio"/> 8	<input type="radio"/> 8
<input type="radio"/> 9	<input type="radio"/> 9

Example: 36

<input type="radio"/> 0	<input type="radio"/> 0
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 1
<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 2
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 3
<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 4
<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> 5
<input type="radio"/> 6	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 6
<input type="radio"/> 7	<input type="radio"/> 7
<input type="radio"/> 8	<input type="radio"/> 8

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often did the tutoring company...

1. Talk to you about your child's progress?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

A lot
Sometimes
Not at all

A lot
Sometimes
Not at all
Don't Know

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.

5. I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	<input type="radio"/>				
6. I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	<input type="radio"/>				
7. Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	<input type="radio"/>				

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't know

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school division.

8. I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	<input type="radio"/>				
9. I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	<input type="radio"/>				
10. I am pleased with the way my school division helped me get free tutoring for my child.	<input type="radio"/>				

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't know

Comments:

Do not fold this questionnaire!

Do not fold this questionnaire!

La Mancomunidad de Virginia
Cuestionario Para Padres de Familia en Respecto a los Servicios Educativos Suplementarios
(Tutoría Gratuita)

2008 © Paek, J., McKay, D., McDonald, A.J., & Ross, S.M.
 Centro de Investigaciones de Políticas Educativas, Universidad de Memphis. Todos los derechos reservados.

Instrucciones: Su hijo/a esta recibiendo tutoría gratuita. Por favor indique cual compañía provee los servicios de tutoría, el distrito escolar, y la escuela a la cual atiende su hijo/a. Una lista de las compañías de tutoría, divisiones escolares, y códigos esta incluida.

INSTRUCCIONES
 Marque respuestas fuertemente.
 Para hacer cambios, borrar su respuesta completamente.

Nombre de la compañía que provee servicios de tutoría: <input type="text"/>	Código de la compañía	Código de la división escolar	Ejemplo: 36
(Favor de marcar el código de la compañía a la derecha)	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 0
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1
Nombre de la división escolar: <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2
(Favor de marcar el código de la división escolar a la derecha)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
Nombre de la escuela: <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 5
	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 8
	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 <input type="checkbox"/> 9

Por favor responda a cada una de las siguientes preguntas.

¿Qué tan seguido...?

1. ¿Se comunicaba la compañía de tutoría acerca del progreso académico de su hijo/a?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
2. ¿Se comunicaba la compañía que provee tutoría por escrito a su domicilio acerca del progreso de su hijo/a?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
3. ¿Ayudaba la compañía de tutoría a su hijo/a con la materia escolar que esta aprendiendo diariamente en la escuela?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
4. ¿Comenzaban y terminaban a tiempo las sesiones de tutoría?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3

Muy seguido/frecuentemente
De vez en cuando
Nunca
No estoy segura

Indique su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada una de las siguientes declaraciones referente a la compañía de tutoría:

5. Estoy satisfecho/a con la cantidad de sesiones de tutoría gratuita recibidas por mi hijo/a este año.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
6. Creo que las sesiones de tutoría gratuita mejoraron los logros académicos de mi hijo/a.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
7. En general, estoy satisfecho/a con los servicios recibidos por mi hijo/a.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

Completamente de acuerdo
De acuerdo
En desacuerdo
Completamente en desacuerdo
No estoy segura

Indique su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada una de las siguientes declaraciones referente a la división escolar:

8. Recibí información de los derechos estudiantiles autorizados por la nueva ley educativa que ofrece apoyo a todos los estudiantes, conocida como "No Child Left Behind."	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
9. Recibí el tiempo necesario para elegir la que compañía de tutoría de mi hijo/a.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
10. Estoy satisfecho/a con el modo de asistencia proveído por la división escolar para obtener tutoría gratuita para mi hijo/a.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

Completamente de acuerdo
De acuerdo
En desacuerdo
Completamente en desacuerdo
No estoy segura

Comentarios:

Appendix B: Student Achievement Analysis Tables

Table 9. SES Program Effect at the Provider Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2006-2007) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes*

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
A+ Markem	SES Students	28	-0.4571	0.8385	17	-0.6187	0.5634
	Control students	28	-0.4571	0.8385	17	-0.6187	0.5634
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			<i>d</i>=0.000		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.703; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000			<i>MSE</i> =0.317; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000		
Academics Plus, Inc.	SES Students	11	-0.9965	0.7882	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	11	-1.0002	0.7955	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.005			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.627; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.991			NA		
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	SES Students	43	-0.6934	0.9105	80	-0.9798	0.7213
	Control students	43	-0.6934	0.9092	80	-0.9804	0.7228
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			<i>d</i>=0.001		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.828; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000			<i>MSE</i> =0.521; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.996		
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	SES Students	16	-0.8692	0.9467	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	16	-0.8692	0.9467	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.896; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000			NA		
Bright Futures Learning, Inc.	SES Students	35	-0.5906	0.9689	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	35	-0.5902	0.9686	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.939; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.999			NA		
Club Z!, Inc.	SES Students	26	-0.4038	0.8581	28	-0.9269	0.6176
	Control students	26	-0.4012	0.8564	28	-0.9285	0.6176
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=-0.003			<i>d</i>=0.003		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.735; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.991			<i>MSE</i> =0.381; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.992		
CompassLearning	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	38	-1.2162	0.7843
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	38	-1.2215	0.7789
	Effect Size	NA			<i>d</i>=0.007		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			<i>MSE</i> =0.611; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.976		
Educate Online	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	11	0.1224	1.0188
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	11	0.1284	1.0165
	Effect Size	NA			<i>d</i>=-0.006		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			<i>MSE</i> =1.036; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.989		

**Table 9. SES Program Effect at the Provider Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year
(2006-2007) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes*
(continued)**

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Extended Learning Opportunities	SES Students	16	-0.6105	0.8665	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	16	-0.6138	0.8598	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.004			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.745; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.991			NA		
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	SES Students	80	-0.7636	0.7215	31	-0.4202	0.8982
	Control students	80	-0.7627	0.7189	31	-0.4202	0.8927
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=-0.001			<i>d</i>=0.000		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.519; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.994			<i>MSE</i> =0.802; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000		
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc.	SES Students	17	-0.7633	0.5739	12	-0.8438	0.7340
	Control students	17	-0.7641	0.5740	12	-0.8427	0.7340
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.001			<i>d</i>=-0.002		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.329; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.997			<i>MSE</i> =0.539; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.997		
Porter Education and Communications, Inc.	SES Students	18	-0.7569	0.7385	24	-0.6764	1.1116
	Control students	18	-0.7569	0.7385	24	-0.6799	1.1134
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			<i>d</i>=0.003		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.545.; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000			<i>MSE</i> =1.238.; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.991		
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	11	-1.7299	0.4213
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	11	-1.7299	0.4225
	Effect Size	NA			<i>d</i>=0.000		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			<i>MSE</i> =0.178; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000		
TutorFind	SES Students	13	-0.7372	0.7476	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	13	-0.7372	0.7476	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.559; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =1.000			NA		

*Effect size was computed as the mean difference of achievement z-scores divided by the pooled standard deviation, and indicated the number of standard deviations by which the SES and non-SES group means differed. Effect sizes exceeding +/-0.20 were considered meaningful and fairly strong when obtained for a whole-school intervention.

Table 10. SES Program Effect at the Provider Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes*

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
A+ Markem	SES Students	28	-0.3102	0.8692	-0.3102	17	-0.0783	0.8996	-0.0783
	Control students	28	-0.1335	1.0128	-0.1335	17	-0.4907	0.6863	-0.4907
	Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.191				<i>d</i> =0.531			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.258				<i>d</i> =0.549			
Academics Plus, Inc.	SES Students	11	-0.6667	0.8785	-0.6684	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	11	-0.8368	0.9248	-0.8351	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i> =0.198				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i> =0.324				NA			
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	SES Students	43	-0.5365	0.9774	-0.5365	80	-0.5239	0.8551	-0.5241
	Control students	43	-0.4862	0.9702	-0.4862	80	-0.6902	0.7888	-0.6899
	Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.052				<i>d</i> =0.203			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.064				<i>d</i> =0.262			
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	SES Students	16	-1.1226	0.6998	-1.1226	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	16	-0.6913	1.1917	-0.6913	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.456				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.674				NA			
Bright Futures Learning, Inc.	SES Students	35	-0.6209	0.9425	-0.6208	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	35	-0.5033	0.9099	-0.5034	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.129				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.161				NA			
Club Z!, Inc.	SES Students	26	-0.3286	0.8995	-0.3274	28	-0.4498	0.8672	-0.4503
	Control students	26	-0.1775	1.2010	-0.1786	28	-0.5041	0.9095	-0.5037
	Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.145				<i>d</i> =0.062			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i> =-0.202				<i>d</i> =0.066			
Compass Learning	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	38	-1.0034	0.8595	-1.0049
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	38	-0.8030	0.8697	-0.8015
	Effect Size	NA				<i>d</i> =-0.235			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				<i>d</i> =-0.278			
Educate Online	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	0.2104	0.6807	0.2128
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	0.3232	1.2030	0.3209
	Effect Size	NA				<i>d</i> =-0.121			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				<i>d</i> =-0.200			

**Table 10. SES Program Effect at the Provider Level: Matched Pairs Current Year
(2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes*
(continued)**

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Extended Learning Opportunities	SES Students	16	-0.4093	1.0374	-0.4104	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	16	-0.5846	0.7354	-0.5835	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d=0.201</i>				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d=0.244</i>				NA			
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	SES Students	80	-0.4931	0.8471	-0.4927	31	-0.1826	0.7368	-0.1826
	Control students	80	-0.5479	0.8161	-0.5483	31	-0.3225	0.8708	-0.3225
	Effect Size	<i>d=0.066</i>				<i>d=0.176</i>			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d=0.086</i>				<i>d=0.226</i>			
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc.	SES Students	17	-0.5512	0.8140	-0.5515	24	-0.7292	1.0392	-0.7289
	Control students	17	-0.6566	0.9826	-0.6563	24	-0.6195	0.5571	-0.6198
	Effect Size	<i>d=0.120</i>				<i>d=-0.134</i>			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d=0.141</i>				<i>d=-0.104</i>			
Porter Education and Communications, Inc.	SES Students	18	-0.7330	1.0076	-0.7330	24	-0.6324	0.9830	-0.6338
	Control students	18	-0.3186	0.9899	-0.3186	24	-0.5402	1.2243	-0.5388
	Effect Size	<i>d= -0.427</i>				<i>d=-0.085</i>			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d=-0.723**</i>				<i>d=-0.137</i>			
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	-0.9903	0.7044	-0.9903
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	-0.9870	0.6596	-0.9870
	Effect Size	NA				<i>d=-0.005</i>			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				<i>d=-0.006</i>			
TutorFind	SES Students	13	-0.7856	0.8968	-0.7856	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	13	-0.5751	0.9822	-0.5751	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>d=-0.233</i>				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>d=-0.306</i>				NA			

*Effect size was computed as the mean difference of achievement z-scores divided by the pooled standard deviation, and indicated the number of standard deviations by which the SES and non-SES group means differed. Effect sizes exceeding +/- 0.20 were considered meaningful and fairly strong when obtained for a whole-school intervention.

** p < 0.05.

Table 11. SES Program Effect at the State Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2006-2007) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes

Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
SES Students	358	-0.6455	0.8341	304	-0.8410	0.8692
Control students	358	-0.6454	0.8331	304	-0.8418	0.8696
Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.000			<i>d</i>=0.001		
One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.695 ; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.998			<i>MSE</i> =0.756 ; <i>F</i> =0.00; <i>p</i> =0.992		

Table 12. SES Program Effect at the State Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes

Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
SES Students	358	-0.5409	0.8877	-0.5408	303	-0.5176	0.9164	-0.5179
Control students	358	-0.4568	0.9330	-0.4568	303	-0.5830	0.9324	-0.5828
Effect Size	<i>d</i>=-0.093				<i>d</i>=0.071			
Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i>=-0.123				<i>d</i>=0.094			

Table 13. Pilot School Effect: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2006-2007) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes

Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pilot students	82	-0.7033	0.6832	66	-0.8299	0.8116
Non-pilot students	82	-0.7192	0.6983	66	-0.8538	0.7933
Effect Size	<i>d</i>=0.023			<i>d</i>=0.030		
One-way ANOVA	<i>MSE</i> =0.477; <i>F</i> =0.02; <i>p</i> =0.883			<i>MSE</i> =0.644; <i>F</i> =0.03; <i>p</i> =0.859		

Table 14. Pilot School Effect: Matched Pairs Current Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes

Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Pilot students	82	-0.7260	0.8574	-0.7320	66	-0.4361	0.8682	-0.4452
Control students	82	-0.5858	0.8009	-0.5798	66	-0.3928	1.0432	-0.3837
Effect Size	<i>d</i>=-0.170				<i>d</i>=-0.046			
Adj. Effect Size	<i>d</i>=-0.234				<i>d</i>=-0.081			

Table 15. All Students by SOL Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008
Advanced	176	335	13,327	25,967	5.3	10.0	16.4	31.9
Proficient	513	812	20,457	33,770	15.3	24.3	25.2	41.5
Below Proficient	0	0	2	25	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic	537	608	9,748	14,778	16.1	18.2	12.0	18.2
Below Basic	138	133	1,539	2,264	4.1	4.0	1.9	2.8
Did Not Attempt	7	7	170	305	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4
Not Available	1,973	1,449	36,062	4,196	59.0	43.3	44.4	5.2
Total	3,344	3,344	81,305	81,305	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 16. All Students by SOL Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008
Advanced	143	231	11,807	20,609	4.3	6.9	14.5	25.3
Proficient	584	850	21,468	38,346	17.5	25.4	26.4	47.2
Below Proficient	0	0		14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic	455	539	9,511	13,571	13.6	16.1	11.7	16.7
Below Basic	140	115	1,676	1,848	4.2	3.4	2.1	2.3
Did Not Attempt	17	29	210	640	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.8
Not Available	2,005	1,580	36,633	6,277	60.0	47.2	45.1	7.7
Total	3,344	3,344	81,305	81,305	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 17. Sample for State Level Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008
Advanced	30	55	30	53	9.9	18.1	9.9	17.4
Proficient	132	128	132	113	43.4	42.1	43.4	37.2
Below Proficient	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic	120	105	120	114	39.5	34.5	39.5	37.5
Below Basic	22	16	22	24	7.2	5.3	7.2	7.9
Total	304	304	304	304	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 18. Sample for State Level Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008
Advanced	41	41	41	48	11.5	11.5	11.5	13.4
Proficient	173	200	172	211	48.3	55.9	48.0	58.9
Below Proficient	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic	126	105	128	84	35.2	29.3	35.8	23.5
Below Basic	18	12	17	15	5.0	3.4	4.7	4.2
Total	358	358	358	358	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 19. Sample for Pilot Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	Pilot Students		Non-Pilot Students		Pilot Students		Non-Pilot Students	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008
Advanced	7	14	7	17	10.6	21.2	10.6	25.8
Proficient	31	30	28	20	47.0	45.5	42.4	30.3
Below Proficient	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic	25	20	29	26	37.9	30.3	43.9	39.4
Below Basic	3	2	2	3	4.5	3.0	3.0	4.5
Total	66	66	66	66	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 20. Sample for Pilot Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	Pilot Students		Non-Pilot Students		Pilot Students		Non-Pilot Students	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008
Advanced	5	7	5	8	6.1	8.5	6.1	9.8
Proficient	46	44	43	48	56.1	53.7	52.4	58.5
Below Proficient	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic	29	27	32	24	35.4	32.9	39.0	29.3
Below Basic	2	4	2	2	2.4	4.9	2.4	2.4
Total	82	82	82	82	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0