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 2008 – 2009

June 2010

James Ford
Brenda Gallagher
Todd Zoblotsky
Lynn Harrison
Carson Hunter
Trisha Nash
Center for Research in Educational Policy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 2

Introduction 9

Study Design 18

Descriptive Analysis Results 27

Student Achievement Results 38

Conclusions 42

References 44

Appendix A: SES Surveys 45

Appendix B: Student Achievement Analysis Tables 51

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 (SEAs) 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 2008-2009 school year.

Research Design

The report includes the results of both a descriptive analysis and an achievement analysis of SES. The descriptive analysis consists of survey results from SES division coordinators, parents of students receiving SES, and SES providers. The achievement analysis utilizes Standards of Learning (SOL) test standardized scale scores (Z-scores) to examine the effect of SES provider services on student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics. As SOL scores from different years and grade levels are not equivalent in terms of interpretation, standardized SOL Z-scores were used as the outcome to make the various scores comparable. The analysis of SOL test scores consisted of a matched program-control design. This design utilized a pre-program/post-program matched samples comparison of students (i.e., students who received SES tutoring versus students who were eligible to receive SES, yet did not participate) to examine SES program effects on student achievement in the 2008-2009 school year. A descriptive analysis (non-statistical) was conducted for students identified as receiving special education, as these students were not included in the more rigorous matched-sample statistical analyses. Additionally, a separate analysis was also conducted for schools in divisions that

participated in the United States Department of Education (USDE) 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. To maintain scientific validity, the analyses were limited to a non-random subset of (1) students who utilized SES tutoring and (2) students who did not receive SES tutoring. Additionally, one cannot generalize the results from this study to all students who participated in SES. In many cases, once the criteria required for students to be included in the statistical models were applied, final sample sizes for providers were much smaller than the initial student data available. As a result, the achievement outcomes of the smaller number of students actually included in the analyses may not be representative of the achievement of the total population of students who attended SES.

SES Implementation

There were 4,879 SES students (5,405 provider contracts) who received SES tutoring services in 2008-2009 from 49 providers across 63 schools in 32 divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The perceptions of parents who participated in the evaluation were positive regarding division efforts to implement SES in their divisions. The majority of parent respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the way their school division helped them obtain SES for their child. Most parents indicated that they were given enough time to decide which tutoring company they wanted for their child and indicated that they were given information on their child's rights under the NCLB law. Most division coordinators who participated in the evaluation expressed overall satisfaction with provider services and reported that providers positively impacted student achievement. The majority of provider respondents

were pleased with the ease of aligning lessons with division or school curriculum and division coordinator cooperation and involvement.

SES Effectiveness

A state-level analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of all SES providers on student achievement. After controlling for prior year achievement, there were no significant differences between SES and control students on adjusted average 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts achievement Z-scores. While not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2008-2009 reading/language arts SOL Z-score of SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring was slightly higher than that of controls. After controlling for prior year achievement, there were no significant differences in adjusted average 2008-2009 SOL mathematics achievement Z-scores between SES and control students. While not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2008-2009 mathematics SOL Z-score of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring was lower than that of controls. However, the adjusted effect sizes in both reading/language arts (+0.01) and mathematics (-0.05) were small or very small.

At the provider level, after controlling for prior year achievement, no significant difference was found for 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts achievement between students who received SES tutoring and control students. As shown in Table i below, while none of the differences were statistically significant, the adjusted mean 2008-2009 reading/language arts SOL Z-scores of SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring from ten providers were higher than control students, while eight providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores compared to controls.

Table i: Adjusted Mean 2008-2009 Reading/Language Arts SOL Z-scores of SES Students Receiving Reading/Language Arts Tutoring Compared to Controls

SES higher* than control students	SES lower* than control students
A+ Markem	Academics Plus, Inc.
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	Millennium Education Music Project
Bright Futures Learning Center	Porter Education and Communications, Inc.
Club Z! Inc.	Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton
Extended Learning Opportunities	Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg
Fresh Wise, Inc.	The Enrichment Centers
NonPublic Educational Services (NESI), Inc.	Total Tutors, LLC
Saturday Scholars, Inc.	
TutorFind	

* Differences are not statistically significant

The provider-level analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in 2008-2009 mathematics SOL test results that favored control students over students who utilized SES for Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI). While the differences were not statistically significant, as shown in Table ii, the adjusted average Z-score of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring from seven providers were higher than control students, while three providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores compared to controls.

Table ii: Adjusted Mean 2008-2009 Mathematics SOL Z-scores of SES Students Receiving Mathematics Tutoring Compared to Controls

SES higher* than control students	SES lower* than control students
ATS Project Success	Academics Plus, Inc.
Bright Futures Learning Center	Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	The Learning Curve
Club Z! Inc.	
Fresh Wise, Inc.	
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	
Total Tutors, LLC	

* Differences are not statistically significant

For students designated as special education who received SES tutoring in reading/language arts, 69.1 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts. There were 13 students (3.4 percent of the 382 total in reading) designated as special education that had zero hours of SES tutoring for reading/language arts in 2008-2009, and were not included. For the special education status students who utilized SES tutoring in mathematics, 65 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in mathematics. There were three students (1.5 percent of the 200 total in mathematics) designated as special education that had zero hours of SES tutoring in mathematics in 2008-2009, and were not included. Overall, most students designated as special education who received SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests.

For the analysis of schools in divisions that participated in the pilot program to reverse SES and Public School Choice options, although not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2008-2009 reading/language arts SOL Z-score of pilot SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring was higher (closer to zero) than that of nonpilot SES students receiving

reading/language arts tutoring. While not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2008-2009 mathematics SOL Z-score of pilot SES students receiving mathematics tutoring was also higher (closer to zero) than that of nonpilot SES students who utilized mathematics tutoring. Overall, the statistical analysis revealed that the effects of SES tutoring on student achievement did not vary for students attending the schools that participated in the pilot program compared to students attending schools that did not participate in the program.

Conclusion

SES providers serving students in Virginia during the 2008-2009 school year received generally positive reactions from parents and division coordinators who participated in the evaluation. Parents were mostly satisfied with provider tutoring services, and the majority of parent respondents were very positive about division and school personnel assistance with SES. Overall, division coordinators were also pleased with provider services. Finally, providers were predominately positive concerning their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2008-2009 school year.

When conducting analyses at the provider level, no SES provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students served in reading/language arts, while two mathematics providers, Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI), had statistically significant negative effects on the students they served. There were no significant differences between SES students and control group students when the data were analyzed at the state-level in either reading/language arts or mathematics, or between pilot and nonpilot SES students in either subject. The majority of students designated as special education who received SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests.

These results should be interpreted with caution. Small sample size, which reduces the ability (power) to detect statistical significance and the reliability of outcomes in general, was a limiting factor for many providers. A more pervasive and substantive issue is 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. A minimum of 18 hours of tutoring was necessary for students to be included in the analyses. At one hour per day, that is slightly less than four weeks of tutoring out of an entire school year. Therefore, one would not expect a limited number of hours of tutoring to make dramatic changes in achievement. Despite the natural and context-specific limitations of the achievement analyses, the present results provide evidence that while no individual providers were able to assist students in achieving significantly higher SOL test results than control students, there were two providers that demonstrated significant negative effects on students' mathematics SOL test scores.

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 or more 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, eight school divisions in Virginia participated in the United States Department of Education (USDE) pilot for reversal of Public School Choice (PSC) and SES during the 2008-2009 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 was to examine SES provider effectiveness through the analysis of SES student achievement outcomes and perceptions from key stakeholders in Virginia school divisions where these services were offered during the 2008-2009 school year. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process that allows the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to meet federal evaluation and monitoring requirements.

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

SES. The second study examined the effectiveness of SES at the state level, individual SES provider level, and achievement differences between SES students attending pilot schools in the 2008-2009 year and other SES students who did not attend pilot schools. Descriptive statistics were provided for students with disabilities who, in Virginia, may participate in traditional SOL assessments or alternative assessments that cannot be aggregated using the methodology applied in this study.

The primary research questions for the stakeholder perceptions study were:

1. To what extent do divisions implement SES for eligible students?
2. What are providers', division coordinators', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?
3. Are providers communicating regularly with division coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?
4. Are providers working with divisions and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
5. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?
6. Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?
7. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?

The primary research questions for the effectiveness of SES study were:

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

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

Participating School Divisions and SES Providers

During the 2008-2009 academic school year, there were 4,879 SES students (5,405 provider contracts) who utilized SES tutoring services from 49 providers serving students in 62 schools in 32 divisions. A total of 32 divisions in Virginia were required to offer SES during the 2008-2009 school year. Within these divisions, a total of 63 schools offered SES to eligible students: 50 Title I schools that were required to offer SES (in year 2 or more of school improvement) and 13 Title I schools in year 1 of improvement that were granted a waiver to offer services as pilot schools. Parents of students in these schools were informed by the school of their child's eligibility for additional academic assistance provided through SES and were provided with a list of the authorized service providers from which they could choose. Statewide, 79 individual provider companies were authorized by the VDOE. Providers were authorized in one or more divisions and could thus offer services to students from multiple schools.

Participation in SES varied among divisions and corresponded with overall school division populations. Of those students participating in SES, Fairfax County Public Schools, with 22.8 percent of all participants accounted for the most SES participants and Louisa County Public Schools, with 2 percent of all SES participants accounted for the fewest number of SES participants. Twenty-eight providers offered 1,438 contracts in mathematics. Forty-five providers offered 3,967 contracts in reading/language arts. Among the 28 providers offering mathematics tutoring services, Bright Futures Learning Center had the largest percentage of contracts (13.4 percent), while CompassLearning, Inc., had the lowest percentage (0.1 percent). Of the 45 providers offering reading/language arts tutoring services, Bright Futures Learning

Center served the largest percentage of contracts (14.8 percent). Istation had the lowest percentage of contracts in reading/language arts (0.0 percent, based on one contract).

Table 1: Number and Percentage of Students with Priority for Services+ Participating in SES by School Division During the 2008-2009 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
Albemarle County Schools*	518	195	37.64
Alexandria City Schools*	1,196	402	33.61
Arlington County Schools	1,123	186	16.56
Charles City County Schools	106	21	19.81
Colonial Beach Town Schools	123	14	11.38
Craig County Schools	68	20	29.41
Culpeper County Schools	407	13	3.19
Essex County Schools	424	64	15.09
Fairfax County Schools*	6,175	1,125	18.22
Fauquier County Schools*	394	152	38.58
Fluvanna County Schools	221	66	29.86
Franklin City Schools	387	57	14.73
Fredericksburg City Schools	911	27	2.96
Hampton City Schools*	1,874	390	20.81
Henrico County Schools*	2,552	105	4.11
King George County Schools	342	82	23.98
Lancaster County Schools	56	20	35.71
Louisa County Schools	334	11	3.29
Montgomery County Schools	702	14	1.99
Newport News City Schools	2,703	545	20.16
Northampton County Schools	496	71	14.31
Orange County Schools	301	35	11.63
Petersburg City Schools	1,697	179	10.55
Pittsylvania County Schools	1,786	25	1.40
Prince Edward County Schools	682	42	6.16
Richmond City Schools*	8,553	662	7.74
Roanoke City Schools	2,247	65	2.89
Stafford County Schools	538	45	8.36
Suffolk City Schools	1,141	124	10.87
Sussex County Schools	230	18	7.83
Warren County Schools	539	21	3.90
Williamsburg-James City County Schools*	426	135	31.69
Total	**39,252**	**4,931**	**12.56**

+ 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 tutoring.
*Participant in USDE pilot program.
Note: The actual number of individual students is 4,879. There were 52 students who received services from different providers and/or schools; therefore, 52 students were counted twice.

Table 2: Number and Percentage of SES-Eligible Students Participating in SES by School Division During the 2008-2009 School Year

Division Name	Number of SES-Eligible Students Participating in SES**	Percentage of Total SES-Eligible Students Participating in SES
Albemarle County Schools*	195	3.95
Alexandria City Schools*	402	8.15
Arlington County Schools	186	3.77
Charles City County Schools	21	0.43
Colonial Beach Town Schools	14	0.28
Craig County Schools	20	0.41
Culpeper County Schools	13	0.26
Essex County Schools	64	1.30
Fairfax County Schools*	1,125	22.81
Fauquier County Schools*	152	3.08
Fluvanna County Schools	66	1.34
Franklin City Schools	57	1.16
Fredericksburg City Schools	27	0.55
Hampton City Schools*	390	7.91
Henrico County Schools*	105	2.13
King George County Schools	82	1.66
Lancaster County Schools	20	0.41
Louisa County Schools	11	0.22
Montgomery County Schools	14	0.28
Newport News City Schools	545	11.05
Northampton County Schools	71	1.44
Orange County Schools	35	0.71
Petersburg City Schools	179	3.63
Pittsylvania County Schools	25	0.51
Prince Edward County Schools	42	0.85
Richmond City Schools	662	13.43
Roanoke City Schools*	65	1.32
Stafford County Schools	45	0.91
Suffolk City Schools	124	2.51
Sussex County Schools	18	0.37
Warren County Schools	21	0.43
Williamsburg-James City County Schools*	135	2.74
Total	**4,931**	**100.00**

*Participant in USDE pilot program.
**Number of SES-eligible students includes students with priority for SES and students without priority for SES.
Note: The actual number of individual students is 4,879. There were 52 students who received services from different providers and/or schools; therefore, 52 students were counted twice.

Table 3: Number of Student Contracts Delivered by SES Provider and Subject During the 2008-2009 School Year

Provider	Reading/language arts		Mathematics		Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	42	1.06	25	1.74	67	1.24
A+ Ability Plus, Inc.	38	0.96	13	0.90	51	0.94
A+ Markem	227	5.72	119	8.28	346	6.4
Academics Plus, Inc.	225	5.67	133	9.25	358	6.62
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	178	4.49	112	7.79	290	5.37
Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville, VA	3	0.08	N/A	N/A	3	0.06
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	156	3.93	N/A	N/A	156	2.89
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	53	1.34	N/A	N/A	53	0.98
ATS Project Success (formerly ATS Educational)	57	1.44	34	2.36	91	1.68
Babbage Net Schools	12	0.30	3	0.21	15	0.28
Blessings for You Childcare and Learning Center	10	0.25	N/A	N/A	10	0.19
Bright Futures Learning Center	587	14.80	192	13.35	779	14.41
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	43	1.08	25	1.74	68	1.26
Capitol Educational Support, Inc.	38	0.96	16	1.11	54	1
Charity Family Life, Inc.	26	0.66	N/A	N/A	26	0.48
Club Z! Inc.	391	9.86	177	12.31	568	10.51
CompassLearning, Inc.	N/A	N/A	1	0.07	1	0.02
Danville Arts and Humanities - The Art of Reading	2	0.05	N/A	N/A	2	0.04
Discovery Program, Inc.	6	0.15	N/A	N/A	6	0.11
Educate Online (formerly Catapult Online)	2	0.05	25	1.74	27	0.5
Educational Tutorial Services	14	0.35	N/A	N/A	14	0.26
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	148	3.73	N/A	N/A	148	2.74
Fresh Wise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	140	3.53	74	5.15	214	3.96
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	387	9.76	79	5.49	466	8.62
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	8	0.20	N/A	N/A	8	0.15
International After School Program	N/A	N/A	2	0.14	2	0.04
istation	1	0.03	N/A	N/A	1	0.02
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	24	0.60	N/A	N/A	24	0.44
Kumon North America, Inc.	15	0.38	14	0.97	29	0.54
Longwood Center for Communication, Literacy and Learning	2	0.05	N/A	N/A	2	0.04
MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.	2	0.05	N/A	N/A	2	0.04
Millennium Education Music Project	52	1.31	N/A	N/A	52	0.96
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	161	4.06	152	10.57	313	5.79
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	128	3.23	31	2.16	159	2.94
Princeton Review, Inc.	8	0.20	13	0.90	21	0.39

Table 3: Number of Student Contracts Delivered by SES Provider and Subject During the 2008-2009 School Year (continued)

Provider	Reading/language arts		Mathematics		Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Professional Tutoring Services	12	0.30	18	1.25	30	0.56
Saturday Scholars, Inc.	61	1.54	N/A	N/A	61	1.13
Smart Stop Leaning Center, Inc. (Peas & Carrots)	30	0.76	N/A	N/A	30	0.56
Stay on Top Tutoring Services, Inc.	30	0.76	2	0.14	32	0.59
StudyDog, Inc.	2	0.05	N/A	N/A	2	0.04
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	43	1.08	37	2.57	80	1.48
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	8	0.20	N/A	N/A	8	0.15
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	125	3.15	N/A	N/A	125	2.31
The Enrichment Centers	154	3.88	N/A	N/A	154	2.85
The Learning Curve	N/A	N/A	31	2.16	31	0.57
Total Tutors, LLC	199	5.02	65	4.52	264	4.88
Trust Tutoring	17	0.43	8	0.56	25	0.46
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	N/A	N/A	11	0.76	11	0.2
TutorFind	100	2.52	26	1.81	126	2.33
Total	**3,967**	**100.00**	**1,438**	**100.00**	**5,405**	**100.00**

N/A indicates that no contracts existed for the subject area and provider.
Note: The total number of students (4,879) is less than the number of contracts (5,405) because students could receive multiple contracts from different providers and/or different subjects (reading/language arts and/or mathematics).

Study Design

Design and Participants

The current study consisted of two separate analyses. The first analysis was a descriptive study of the implementation of SES by school divisions and providers. The second analysis was a quantitative evaluation of student achievement to address the effectiveness of SES at the state level, individual SES provider level, as well as descriptive statistics on the proficiency levels of special education status students, and achievement differences between SES students attending pilot schools in the 2008-2009 year and other SES students who did not attend pilot schools.

Descriptive Analysis of SES Implementation

The descriptive portion of the study consisted of surveying the following groups of respondents: (a) SES providers; (b) SES division coordinators in participating SES divisions; and (c) parents of students receiving SES. The first two groups were surveyed using an online survey; while parents were surveyed using a paper instrument. Appendix A contains images of the provider, division coordinator, and parent surveys.

In the spring of 2009, SES provider representatives and SES division coordinators received individual e-mail notifications containing their unique login information and instructions for completing the online surveys. Providers were directed to complete an online survey concerning their company's involvement and satisfaction with SES in Virginia.

Division coordinators were instructed to complete a separate online survey for each provider currently providing services to students in their divisions. Each division coordinator survey was counted as a separate response. All respondent groups were given several weeks to complete the surveys near the end of the academic year. Open-ended comments were reviewed by the evaluators and individual names and phone numbers removed.

Near the end of the 2009 academic year, parents received a paper survey, presented in both English and Spanish, sent home to them by their child's school. Parent surveys with distribution and return instructions were shipped to each division with schools required to offer SES tutoring. Division coordinators then dispersed parent surveys to SES eligible schools for distribution by principals/site coordinators. Each parent survey was secured within an envelope that contained the survey, an introductory letter, and a list of all the SES providers authorized by the state. Parents were asked to identify the provider that had tutored his/her child and mark the provider's number on the survey. Parents were then asked to return the completed survey to the school sealed in the provided envelope. Surveys were collected during the last weeks of school. Once the collection period ended, the principals/site coordinators bundled the returned parent surveys and mailed them to CREP using postage-paid return envelopes. Comments on parent surveys were transcribed verbatim, and identifying names and phone numbers were removed. Spanish comments were translated into English as they were transcribed and annotated as such in the transcriptions.

Achievement Analysis of SES Effectiveness

To examine the Virginia SES program effect on student achievement in the 2008-2009 year, a matched program-control design at the student level, also known as pre-program/post-program matched samples comparison of nonequivalent groups, was employed. In this design, each SES student was paired with a comparable low-income "control" student who attended the same or a similar Title I division school in the 2008-2009 year, but did not receive SES tutoring. Four analyses of SES were conducted separately by subject area (mathematics and reading/language arts). The first analysis examined the statewide effectiveness of all providers combined. The second analysis examined individual SES provider effectiveness. The third

analysis examined the proficiency levels of students designated as special education who received SES tutoring. The fourth analysis examined the achievement differences between SES students attending pilot schools in the 2008-2009 year and other SES students who did not attend pilot schools.

To make the student matches as similar as possible, students were matched on grade level, prior achievement, and when possible, English Language Learner (ELL) status, ethnicity, gender, division, and school. Because Virginia does not have vertically scaled scores on the SOL assessments, meaning that scores from different years and grade levels are not equivalent in terms of interpretation, 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 means to compare student outcomes for students receiving SES and a matched group of students who did not receive SES relative to the Virginia average for Title I schools[1] each year.

Only providers with ten students available to analyze who met the criteria for inclusion were included in the provider-level analysis in order to increase the reliability of findings and the ability to find significant differences between groups where such differences existed. However, all providers, even those with fewer than ten students available to analyze, were included in the state-level analysis. To control (or adjust the means) for influences on test scores other than SES participation an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) statistical procedure was employed. Cohen's *d* effect sizes are also provided to quantify the magnitude of any differences in achievement between SES students and controls.

[1]A positive Z-score indicates that the score is above the mean, while a negative Z-score indicates the given score is below the average. Otherwise, a Z-score of zero indicates that the given score is equal to the mean score.

In order to give a more fair and accurate evaluation of the impact of SES on achievement, students in the analyses detailed in this report had to meet the following criteria:

- Only students who took the SOL tests in both 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 were included. No scores from any alternative assessments, such as the Virginia Grade Level Alternative Program (VGLA), were included due to differences in the assessment methodology and scoring system.
- Only students in grades 4-8 in 2008-2009 were included because students needed two years of data (i.e., results from grades 3-7 in 2007-2008) for the statistical analysis.

For the state-level analyses that examined the impact on mathematics and reading/language arts test performance of all SES providers combined:

- Only students with at least 18 hours of attendance were included in the SES group.
- All providers were included (even those with fewer than ten students to analyze).
- No students designated as special education were included. Without access to detailed information from student records, a student classified as having a mild learning disability might be matched with a student classified as a severely disabled student, leading to false conclusions concerning the effectiveness of providers' services. In addition, the scale score ranges and content covered on the SOL and alternative assessment such as the Virginia Alternative Assessment Program (VAAP), Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA), and Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program (VESP) are not comparable, making it inappropriate to include these alternative scores in the current statistical model.
- Students who attended different schools were removed due to discontinuity in their school experience.

- Students who attended the same school but had different providers were included. For those students with multiple records, their hours of service were combined to see if they met the minimum of 18 hours.

For the provider level analyses, examining the impact of individual providers on students' mathematics and reading/language arts assessment outcomes:

- Only students with at least 18 hours of attendance were included.
- Providers with less than ten students to be analyzed were excluded due to lack of statistical power.
- No students designated as special education were included. Without access to detailed information from student records, a student classified as having a mild learning disability might be matched with a student classified as a severely disabled student, leading to false conclusions concerning the effectiveness of providers' services. In addition, as discussed in relation to students with disabilities, differences in the scale score ranges and content covered on the SOL and alternative assessments make it inappropriate to include these alternative assessments in the current statistical model.
- If a student was served by more than one provider in a subject, that student was not counted in any individual provider analysis due to confounding of services. It would not be possible to attribute to multiple providers the particular amount of influence they had on a student's test score(s).
- Students who changed schools were also removed due to a lack of continuity in their school experience.

For the analysis of proficiency levels for students designated as special education, examining student outcomes on mathematics and reading/language arts assessments of all SES providers combined:

- All students with greater than zero hours of attendance were included.
- All providers were included (even those with fewer than ten students to analyze).
- Students who changed schools were removed due to discontinuity in their school experience.

For the pilot analyses examining the impact of the pilot program student outcomes on mathematics and reading/language arts assessments:

- Only students with at least 18 hours of attendance were included.
- All providers were included (even those with fewer than ten students to analyze).
- Students who changed schools were removed due to discontinuity in their school experience.
- Students who attended the same school, but had different providers were included. For those students with multiple records, their hours of service were combined to see if they met the minimum of 18 hours.
- All SES students who were enrolled in a pilot school were included in the analyses.

When conducting the analyses, SOL results were examined separately by subject tutored. The final SES samples included 548 students in reading/language arts (35 percent of the original 1,560 students in the sample) and 303 students in mathematics (35 percent of the original 872 students in the sample) for state-level matching, and 489 students in reading/language arts (31

percent of the original 1,560 students in the sample) and 250 students (29 percent of the original 872 students in the sample) in mathematics for provider-level matching.

There were 167,349 records initially available for control students with 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 SOL test data from all Title I schools. The final control groups used for matching to SES students included 84,547 control students in reading/language arts and 86,480 control students in mathematics. About 12 percent of the initial pool of control students was excluded for being outside of grades 4-8. For both math and reading, about 11 percent of each group was missing scores for one of the testing years, and 14 percent were excluded for being indicated as special education students.

The final samples for the analyses of proficiency levels of students designated as special education included 369 students in reading/language arts and 197 students in mathematics who had 2008-2009 SOL proficiency levels available. Of the 369 students designated as special education with 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts proficiency levels, 357 also had 2007-2008 SOL reading/language arts results available. One hundred and ninety-five of the 197 students designated as special education with 2008-2009 SOL mathematics proficiency levels also had 2007-2008 SOL mathematics proficiency levels available. There were 13 students (3.4 percent of the 382 total in reading) designated as special education who had zero hours of SES tutoring for reading/language arts in 2008-2009, and were not included. In addition, there were three students (1.5 percent of the 200 total in math) designated as special education who had zero hours of SES tutoring in math in 2008-2009, and were not included. Out of all 4,879 SES students, 925 (19 percent) were students designated as special education. Of the 494 special education status students in grades 4-8, one was deleted for attending two different schools. Two

additional students received services from two different providers. Their records were retained, leaving 495 provider contracts for 493 students.

The final pilot samples included 217 pilot students in reading/language arts and 122 in mathematics, while the final non-pilot samples included 328 nonpilot students in reading/language arts and 181 nonpilot students in mathematics. In the end, 194 pilot students in reading/language arts and 110 pilot students in mathematics were matched to nonpilot students.

Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used for the state-level, individual-level, and pilot school analyses to assess the impact of SES program attendance on 2008-2009 SOL standardized reading/language arts and/or mathematics scores (Z-scores) with students' prior year (2007-2008) standardized SOL score (Z-score) used as the covariate. ANCOVA statistically equates (adjusts the means of) the groups in 2008-2009 on the covariate, meaning that any differences in achievement in 2008-2009 can be evaluated as if the groups had similar achievement in 2007-2008. Consequently, any significant difference in 2008-2009 achievement between SES and control students could be more confidently attributed to SES program effects rather than to differences in prior achievement. It is important to note that the mean SOL achievement scores (Z-scores) for all SES groups in 2008-2009 were below average (Z-scores lower than zero), meaning that the analyses included lower performing students compared to the state student sample available.

Cohen's *d* effect sizes are also provided for the state-level, individual-level, and pilot school analyses as an indication of the magnitude of the difference in achievement between groups and was computed as the mean difference (SES – control) divided by the pooled standard deviation. Each effect size indicates the number of standard deviations by which the SES mean differs from the control group mean. A positive effect size would indicate a higher SES mean,

while a negative effect size would indicate a higher control group mean. Thus, an effect size of +0.50 would indicate a half of a standard deviation advantage for SES students' score – a highly substantial educational impact. According to commonly accepted benchmarks (Cohen, 1988), positive or negative effect sizes of 0.20 are thought small, those that are at plus or minus 0.50 are regarded as moderate, and those that are equal to or surpass 0.80 are considered large. More recently, statisticians have argued that an effect size should be interpreted in light of what is typically observed in the literature in similar studies. Therefore, using guidelines proposed by Vernez and Zimmer (2007), positive or negative effect sizes of 0.04 or less were classified as very small, between 0.05 and 0.10 were classified as small, between 0.11 and 0.24 were classified as moderate, and 0.25 and greater classified as large. This is also in keeping with guidelines from the What Works Clearinghouse, part of the research arm of the U.S. Department of Education, which considers an effect size of 0.25 as "substantively important" (U.S. Department of Education (2008)). However, given that SES tutoring is limited in total hours per year, lower effect sizes might be expected.

As two years of data (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) were used in the analyses, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted on baseline (2007-2008) test data for both reading/language arts and mathematics for the state-level, individual-level, and pilot school analyses to ensure the comparability of the SES and control groups on previous achievement.

Descriptive Analysis Results

Three survey instruments were used in the evaluation, one for each of the following stakeholder groups: (1) SES providers; (2) SES division coordinators in participating SES divisions; and (3) parents of students receiving SES. The surveys contained a common core set of questions for all groups (e.g., experiences with SES and providers) to facilitate triangulation of findings. In addition, surveys included some questions geared to specific groups (e.g., reactions to particular providers). For each survey item, the respondent chose from a range of three, four, or five point Likert-style responses (e.g., 3-point: 3=Frequently, Occasionally, 1=Not at all; 4-point: 4=Frequently, Occasionally, Not at all, 1=Don't Know; 5-point: 5=Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, 1=Don't Know), with higher scores indicating a more positive perception of the provided services.

The provider survey collected data about the provider's activities, services, and stakeholder participation, together with multiple opportunities for targeted comments. For the division coordinator, one set of 14 close-ended questions was used to collect data about provider services and an overall assessment of the tutoring program. The parent survey was composed of ten Likert-style response questions addressing the provider's service and the SES information provided to parents by their school division. Each instrument included an "Additional Comments" section.

Division coordinators from 18 of 32 (56 percent) SES eligible divisions submitted at least one online survey about their experiences with and reactions to provider services. A total of 154 surveys were received from 18 division coordinators. Respondents were asked to complete a separate online survey for each provider serving students within the division, and thus multiple submissions were possible.

Unlike division coordinators, parents were asked to complete only one survey. Parents identified the tutoring company serving their child by selecting the company name from the list of statewide approved providers. A total of 2,520 surveys were distributed to SES eligible schools. Of those distributed, 830 (33 percent) were submitted by parents of tutored students in 48 of 63 SES eligible schools (76 percent).

Representatives from 40 of 77 (52 percent) statewide approved provider organizations completed an online survey about their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2008-2009 school year. However, 21 of 77 (27 percent) provider organizations contacted VDOE and/or CREP to indicate that they did not provide services to any students during the 2008-2009 school year. While 40 provider surveys were submitted, overall, 61 of 77 (79 percent) SES providers participated in the 2008-2009 SES evaluation. The following section summarizes the questions and responses from respondent group surveys.

1. **To what extent do divisions implement SES for eligible students?**
    - Nearly all responding providers were either highly satisfied or satisfied with division cooperation and involvement (97.5 percent: n=39/40).
    - Responses from participating parents expressed mostly positive perceptions of division efforts to implement SES in their division. A vast majority of parent respondents noted that they were pleased with the way their school division helped them obtain SES for their child (94.6 percent strongly agree or agree: n=785/830). Most responses by parents either strongly agreed or agreed that they were given enough time to decide which tutoring company they wanted for their child (89.7 percent: n=745/830). Of the 830 parent submissions, 80.7 percent (strongly agree or agree: n=670/830) indicated that they were provided

information about their child's rights under the No Child Left Behind Act by their school division.

2. **What are providers', division coordinators', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?**
    - The majority of provider respondents were highly satisfied or satisfied with their perceived success at raising student achievement levels (95.0 percent: n=38/40).
    - Most division coordinator responses strongly agreed or agreed that services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement (68.1 percent: n=105/154).
    - The majority of parent respondents strongly agreed or agreed that SES tutoring helped their child's achievement (88.5 percent: n=735/830).
3. **Are providers communicating regularly with division coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?**
    - Responding providers indicated that they communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (90.0 percent: n=36/40) and parents (100.0 percent: n=40/40) regarding students' progress.
    - The majority of division coordinator participants reported that provider communication occurred either frequently or occasionally (90.9 percent: n=140/154). Most division coordinator responses (81.2 percent: n=125/154) stated that provider-to-parent communication occurred either frequently or occasionally, while many responses indicated that providers communicated either frequently or occasionally with teachers (63.6 percent: n=98/154).

- Of the 830 parent respondents, 78.2 percent (‘a lot’ or ‘sometimes’: n=649/830) indicated that providers spoke with them about their child’s progress throughout the year. Three-quarters of parent responses stated that providers sent letters or notes home about their child’s progress (75.6 percent ‘a lot’ or ‘sometimes’: n=628/830).

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

- Nearly all participating providers reported that they were able to adapt services to each school's curriculum either frequently or occasionally (97.5 percent: n=39/40). Ninety percent (n=36/40) of provider respondents noted that tutors either frequently or occasionally integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities.
- Many responses from participating division coordinators indicated that providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth either frequently or occasionally (68.2 percent: n=105/154). Over one half of division coordinator respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to each school’s curriculum (51.3 percent: n=79/154). Only 29.2 percent (n=45/154) of division coordinator respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities.
- Most parents who participated in the evaluation indicated that providers helped with subjects their child was studying in school (82.5 percent ‘a lot’ or ‘sometimes’: n=685/830).

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

   - All responding providers reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic content and standards either frequently or occasionally (100.0 percent: n=40/40).
   - Most division coordinators who participated in the evaluation strongly agreed or agreed that providers' services were aligned with state and local standards (77.9 percent: n=120/154). The majority of division coordinator submissions indicated that providers complied with applicable state and local laws (87.0 percent strongly agree or agree: n=134/154). Many responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers complied with federal NCLB laws (79.8 percent: n=123/154).

6. **Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?**

   - Most providers who participated in the evaluation reported that tutors administered services to special education students (80.0 percent: n=32/40) and ELL students (80.0 percent: n=32/40).
   - Most division coordinator respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that providers offered services to special education (88.9 percent: n=137/154) and ELL students (76.0 percent: n=117/154).

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

   - Overall, division coordinator respondents indicated satisfaction with provider services (74.0 percent strongly agree or agree: n=114/154).

- The majority of parent respondents were very satisfied with the SES tutoring their child received (90.3 percent strongly agree or agree: n=749/830). Of the 830 parent responses, 88.8 percent (n=737/830) strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the number of tutoring hours their child received.

Tables four through six on the following pages provide summaries of the survey responses from SES division coordinators, parents of students receiving SES, and SES providers. Table seven provides a statewide summary by SES provider of the percentage of division coordinator and parent respondents who strongly agreed or agreed with the following statement: "Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received" for parents, and "Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services" for division coordinators.

Table 4: Aggregate SES Division Coordinator Survey Responses for School Year 2008-2009

*Total Respondents=18 SES Division Coordinators with 154 Survey Submissions**

How often did the provider...	Percentage		
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all
Communicate with you during the school year?	54.5	36.4	9.1
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	24.0	44.2	31.2

	Percentage			
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know
Communicate with teachers during the year?	13.0	50.6	24.0	12.3
Communicate with parents during the year?	31.8	49.4	2.6	16.2
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	72.7	19.5	2.6	5.2

The provider...	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.	4.5	46.8	20.8	5.8	22.1
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	3.2	26.0	22.1	13.0	35.7
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	11.7	66.2	3.9	1.9	16.2
Offered services to students with disabilities.	14.9	74.0	0.6	0.6	9.7
Offered services to ELL students.	6.5	69.5	5.2	3.2	14.9
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	12.3	67.5	9.1	2.6	7.8
Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	16.2	70.8	0.6	0.6	11.7

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.	16.2	51.9	5.8	5.2	20.8
Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	22.7	51.3	17.5	5.2	3.2

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 School Year 2008-2009

Total Respondents=830 Parent Surveys

How often did the tutoring company...	Percentage		
	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all
Talk to you about your child's progress?	41.0	37.2	20.1
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	38.4	37.2	22.4

	Percentage			
	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all	Don't Know
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	60.7	21.8	5.4	9.4
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	71.4	11.9	1.7	11.7

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	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.	50.4	38.4	5.9	2.7	1.8
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	51.0	37.5	4.1	1.9	4.6
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	52.3	38.0	3.6	2.0	2.0

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.	41.4	39.3	6.0	2.9	8.2
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	45.2	44.5	4.5	1.9	2.2
I am pleased with the way my school division helped me get free tutoring for my child.	61.1	33.5	2.2	1.2	1.0

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

Table 6: Aggregate SES Provider Survey Responses for School Year 2008-2009

Total Respondents=40 SES Provider Companies

Provider Perceptions and Activities	Percentage			
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	22.5	67.5	7.5	2.5
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
Tutors adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	72.5	25.0	2.5	0.0
Tutors integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	40.0	7.5	2.5
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	10.0	55.0	30.0	5.0
Tutors gave instruction to students with disabilities.	45.0	35.0	15.0	5.0
Tutors gave instruction to students that were English Language Learners.	57.5	22.5	15.0	5.0
Tutors aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0

Provider satisfaction with:	Percentage				
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know
Student attendance	27.5	57.5	10.0	5.0	0.0
Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	32.5	65.0	2.5	0.0	0.0
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the division or school curriculum	40.0	55.0	2.5	0.0	2.5
Parent cooperation/involvement	22.5	65.0	7.5	5.0	0.0
Teacher cooperation/involvement	30.0	45.0	10.0	2.5	12.5
Principal/Site coordinator cooperation/involvement	25.0	60.0	2.5	2.5	10.0
Division SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	62.5	35.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
State SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	32.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	17.5
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	42.5	52.5	2.5	0.0	2.5

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

Table 7: Statewide SES Provider Overall Satisfaction for the 2008-2009 School Year

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services/pleased with the services that my child received.				
	Division Coordinators		Parents	
Provider	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree
A+ Markem	4	100.0	25	96.0
A Plus Success d.b.a. KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	3	0.0	9	100.0
Ability Plus, Inc.	3	66.7	8	75.0
Academics Plus, Inc.	8	75.0	63	90.5
Academy of Champions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achieve3000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	9	77.7	48	97.9
Advantage Point, Inc. A+ Advantage Point Learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	6	66.6	19	84.2
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	8	62.5	12	91.7
ATS Project Success(formerly ATS Educational Consulting Services)	7	85.7	18	88.9
Babbage Net Schools	2	50.0	N/A	N/A
Blessings for You Childcare and Learning Center	1	100.0	2	50.0
Bright Futures Learning Center	11	100.0	114	94.7
Capitol Educational Support, Inc.	7	28.6	6	83.4
Charity Family Life, Inc.	N/A	N/A	1	0.0
Club Z! Inc.	10	70.0	79	84.8
CompassLearning, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cool Kids Learn, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cornerstone Educational Solutions, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cortez Management Corporation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	1	0.0	16	93.8
Danville Arts and Humanities-The Art of Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Destiny Achievers Tutorial Services, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Discovery Program, Inc.	1	100.0	1	100.0
Educate Online (formerly Catapult Online)	4	50.0	8	100.0
Educational Enterprises, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Educational Tutorial Services	2	100.0	3	66.7
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	1	100.0	20	90.0
Failure Free Reading Instant Achievement Center	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fresh Wise, Inc. (Knowledge Points)	2	50.0	25	100.0
Future Leaders After-School Supplemental Educational Program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade Results/NABSE	N/A	N/A	1	100.0
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	9	88.9	76	85.5
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	1	100.0	1	100.0
International After School Program	1	0.0	1	100.0
Istation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 7: Statewide SES Provider Overall Satisfaction for the 2008-2009 School Year (continued)

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services/pleased with the services that my child received.				
	Division Coordinators		Parents	
Provider	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services	4	100.0	8	100.0
Kaplan K12 Learning Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Knowledge Learning Corporation dba Champions Online	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kumon North America, Inc.	1	100.0	3	100.0
Lighthouse Learning/Educational Consulting Initiative, LLC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Little Scientists of Metro Richmond	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Longwood Center for Communication, Literacy and Learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mainstream Development Educational Group	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Millenium Education Music Project	3	66.7	14	92.9
MyTutor24, a division of Coaxis Services, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Newton Learning: A Division of Edison Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Next Level Educational Programs, LLC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	2	100.0	17	88.2
One-to-One Virginia Academic Support Program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Park Place School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Porter Education and Communications, Inc.	6	66.7	22	90.9
PowerCommunicators	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Princeton Review, The	1	0.0	5	80.0
Professional Tutoring Services	2	100.0	7	85.8
Reach for Tomorrow, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	83.3
Saturday Scholars, Inc.	1	0.0	14	78.6
Scholastic EducatioN/Al Services, LLC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Smart Stop Learning Center, Inc. (Peas & Carrots)	2	100.0	6	83.3
Standards of Excellence Children's Development Tutoring Program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stay on Top Tutoring Services, Inc.	2	50.0	7	57.2
Sylvan Learning Center in Chesapeake	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	1	100.0	37	94.6
Sylvan Learning Center Portsmouth	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	1	100.0	2	100.0
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	2	100.0	10	80.0
Sylvan Learning of Mt. Airy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Enrichment Centers, Inc.	7	57.1	36	94.4
The Learning Curve, Inc.	2	100.0	17	100.0
Total Tutors, LLC	7	100.0	42	85.8
Tree of Knowledge Educational Services, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Trust Tutoring	2	100.0	N/A	N/A
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TutorFind	7	71.4	27	88.9

N/A indicates no respondents completed a survey about this provider
*Did not provide services per communication between provider representatives and VDOE and/or CREP

Student Achievement Results

Findings

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

At the state level, while not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2008-2009 reading/language arts SOL Z-score of SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring was slightly higher than that of controls, while the adjusted average 2008-2009 mathematics SOL Z-score of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring was lower than that of controls. The adjusted effect sizes in both reading/language arts (+0.01) and mathematics (-0.05) were small or very small.

At the provider level, while not statistically significant, the adjusted mean 2008-2009 reading/language arts SOL Z-scores of SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring from ten providers were higher than control students, while eight providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores compared to controls. In mathematics, the mean 2008-2009 adjusted SOL Z-scores of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring from seven providers were higher than control students, while five providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores compared to controls. The lower performance for students receiving services in mathematics was statistically significant for two providers, Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI), with large adjusted effect sizes of -0.93 and -1.48 respectively. Adjusted effect sizes for these two providers were all large and ranged from -1.48 to +0.45 in mathematics and from -0.54 to +0.64 in reading/language arts.

Regarding the analysis of proficiency levels for special education students, without taking hours of attendance into account, across the 36 reading/language arts providers that provided

SES to the 369 students designated as special education, 69.1 percent of students were Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts. There were 197 special education students who received mathematics tutoring and who had 2008-2009 SOL mathematics test scores. Without taking hours of attendance into account, across the 24 providers that provided SES to students designated as special education, 65 percent of students were Proficient or Advanced in Mathematics. Appendix B provides detailed information regarding mathematics and reading/language arts proficiency level results.

Table 8: Summary of SES Provider-Level Findings for the 2008-2009 School Year

- **No SES reading/language arts provider was found to have a statistically significant impact on the students they served.**
- **Two SES mathematics providers (Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc.) had statistically significant negative effects on the students they served.**

Provider	Number of SES Contracts in reading/language arts	Number of SES Contracts in Mathematics
A. Providers included in provider-level analysis		
A+ Markem	18	*
Academics Plus, Inc.	28	15
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	12	32
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	33	N/A
ATS Project Success	*	11
Bright Futures Learning Center	52	29
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	*	11
Club Z! Inc.	27	44
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	29	N/A
FreshWise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	17	27
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	85	19
Millennium Education Music Project	14	N/A
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	18	17
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	37	N/A
Saturday Scholars, Inc.	15	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	10	13
Sylvan Learning Centers: Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	19	N/A
The Enrichment Centers	11	N/A
The Learning Curve	N/A	10
Total Tutors, LLC	52	22
TutorFind	12	*

B. Providers not included in provider-level analysis**	
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	Kumon North America, Inc.
Ability Plus, Inc.	MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.
Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville, VA	Princeton Review, Inc. (The)
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	Professional Tutoring Services
Blessings for You Childcare and Learning Center	Smart Stop Learning Center, Inc. (Peas & Carrots)
Capitol Educational Support, Inc.	Stay on Top Tutoring Services, Inc.
Charity Family Life, Inc.	Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea)
Discovery Program, Inc.	Trust Tutoring
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	Tsquared Tutors, LLC
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	

*Provider served too few students to report information (fewer than ten).
**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 status students, and students with less than eighteen hours of SES tutoring.
Note: Table reflects the actual number of contracts analyzed for provider.

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

For the pilot school analysis, while not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2008-2009 reading/language arts SOL Z-score of students in pilot schools receiving reading/language arts tutoring was higher (closer to zero) than that of students from nonpilot schools, and the adjusted average 2008-2009 mathematics SOL Z-score of students in pilot schools receiving mathematics tutoring was also higher (closer to zero) than that of students in nonpilot schools. The adjusted effect size in reading/language arts (0.014) was very small, while the adjusted effect size in mathematics was moderate (0.218). Overall, the statistical analysis showed no basis for concluding that the effects of SES tutoring on student achievement differed for students attending the schools that participated in the pilot program. Appendix A contains student achievement study tables for the state-level, provider-level, and school analyses.

Conclusions

During the 2008-2009 school year, SES providers serving students in Virginia received mostly positive reactions from division coordinators and parents who responded to survey questionnaires. Responding parents were predominantly pleased with the tutoring services their child received, and the majority of parent respondents were highly satisfied with division and school personnel support. Division coordinator respondents were generally positive regarding provider services overall. Provider responses were primarily favorable concerning their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2008-2009 school year.

To gauge provider effects on achievement levels, reading/language arts and mathematics SOL z-scores of students who received SES tutoring were analyzed at two levels: state (all providers combined) and individual provider. A third analysis was conducted to compare the performance of SES students who attended schools in divisions that participated in the USDE's pilot for reversal of SES and PSC with SES students who did not attend schools participating in the pilot program. A descriptive (nonevaluative) analysis was conducted at the state level for students identified as receiving special education services and examined the effect of SES on the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests. At the provider level, no SES provider had a statistically significant impact on the students they served in reading/language arts. However, students receiving services from two mathematics providers, Huntington Learning Centers, Inc. and NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI), showed statistically significant lower adjusted Z-scores compared to the control group with large adjusted effect sizes. There were no significant differences between SES students and control group students at the state level in either reading/language arts or mathematics. Also, there was not a statistically significant difference

found between student outcomes in schools participated in the school choice reversal pilot program and those in schools not participating in the pilot. The majority of students designated as receiving special education services who received SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on 2008-2009 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests.

These results should be interpreted with caution; small sample sizes, which reduces the ability (power) to detect statistical significance and the reliability of outcomes in general, was a limiting factor for many providers. In addition, the limited sample sizes used in the inferential analyses make it difficult to generalize the results to the total population of students who participated in SES as the students who were actually included may not be representative of all students who received services. A more pervasive and substantive issue is the degree to which state assessments have adequate sensitivity to detect the contribution of a limited number of hours of tutoring during an entire school year.

References

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

U.S. Department of Education (2008). What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook (Version 2.0). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved April 22, 2010 from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/wwc_procedures_v2_standards_handbook.pdf

Vernez, G. & Zimmer, R. (2007). Interpreting the effects of Title I supplemental educational services. Retrieved March 29, 2010 from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/implementation/achievementanalysis-sizes.pdf

Appendix A: SES Surveys

Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire

Please complete one survey about your experience offering Supplemental Educational Services across divisions in 2008-2009.

I. Supplemental Educational Services Provider Information

Provider Name: _____ E-Mail: _____

Contact Person: _____ Divisions Served: (mark all that apply) _____

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).	○	○	○	○
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	○	○	○	○
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/ subject teacher of each child they worked with.	○	○	○	○
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	○	○	○	○
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	○	○	○	○
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	○	○	○	○
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	○	○	○	○

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	○	○	○	○	○
9. Student attendance	○	○	○	○	○
10. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	○	○	○	○	○
11. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the division or school curriculum.	○	○	○	○	○
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	○	○	○	○	○
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	○	○	○	○	○
14. Division Coordinator cooperation/involvement	○	○	○	○	○
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	○	○	○	○	○
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	○	○	○	○	○

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

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

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

Provider Name:

Division Name:

Name of Person Completing this Survey:

Title of Person Completing this Survey:

State (SEA) Assessment

1. The state facilitated SES in the following ways: (check all that apply)
   - Developed objective criteria for approving potential providers.
   - Maintained a list of approved providers.
   - Organized or supported provider and LEA meetings.
   - Monitored the quality and effectiveness of provider services.
   - Developed methods for withdrawing approval from providers.
   - Other _____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. Overall, I am satisfied with the way my SEA helped our division implement Supplemental Educational Services.				

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often did the provider...

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all
3. Communicate with you during the school year?			
4. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know
5. Communicate with teachers during the year?				
6. Communicate with parents during the year?				
7. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?				

The provider...

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
8. Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.					
9. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.					
10. Aligned their services with state and local standards.					
11. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.					
12. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.					
13. Complied with state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.					

Overall provider assessment:

14. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.					
15. Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.					

Additional comments:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS. *A Tennessee Board of Regents Institution*
An Equal Opportunity - Affirmative Action University

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. 2 PENCIL 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		Division code		Example: 36	
☐0	☐0	☐0	☐0	☐0	☐0
☐1	☐1	☐1	☐1	☐1	☐1
☐2	☐2	☐2	☐2	☐2	☐2
☐3	☐3	☐3	☐3	■3	☐3
☐4	☐4	☐4	☐4	☐4	☐4
☐5	☐5	☐5	☐5	☐5	☐5
☐6	☐6	☐6	☐6	☐6	■6
☐7	☐7	☐7	☐7	☐7	☐7
☐8	☐8	☐8	☐8	☐8	☐8
☐9	☐9	☐9	☐9		

Indicate your response to each of the following items.	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all
How often did the tutoring company...			
1. Talk to you about your child's progress?	☐3	☐2	☐1
2. Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	☐3	☐2	☐1

	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all	Don't Know
3. Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1
4. Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
5. I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	☐5	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1
6. I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	☐5	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1
7. Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	☐5	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school division.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
8. I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	☐5	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1
9. I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	☐5	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1
10. I am pleased with the way my school division helped me get free tutoring for my child.	☐5	☐4	☐3	☐2	☐1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

Do not fold this questionnaire!

Do not fold this questionnaire!

THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS. *A Tennessee Board of Regents Institution*
An Equal Opportunity - Affirmative Action University

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 Pólizas 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, borre su respuesta completamente.
Ej.

Ejemplo: 36

Nombre de la compañía que provee servicios de tutoría: _____
(Favor de marcar el código de la compañía a la derecha)

Nombre de la división escolar: _____
(Favor de marcar el código de la división escolar a la derecha)

Nombre de la escuela: _____

Código de la compañía	Código de la división escolar
0 0	0 0
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

Por favor responda a cada una de las siguientes preguntas.

¿Qué tan seguido…?

	Muy seguido/ frecuentemente	De vez en cuando	Nunca
1. ¿Se comunicaba la compañía de tutoría acerca del progreso académico de su hijo/a?	1	2	3
2. ¿Se comunicaba la compañía que provee tutoría por escrito a su domicilio acerca del progreso de su hijo/a?	1	2	3

	Muy seguido/ frecuentemente	De vez en cuando	Nunca	No estoy segura/o
3. ¿Ayudaba la compañía de tutoría a su hijo/a con la materia escolar que esta aprendiendo diariamente en la escuela?	4	3	2	1
4. ¿Comenzaban y terminaban a tiempo las sesiones de tutoría?	4	3	2	1

Indique su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada una de las siguientes declaraciones referente a la compañía de tutoría:	Completamente de acuerdo	De acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Completamente en desacuerdo	No estoy segura/o
5. Estoy satisfecho/a con la cantidad de sesiones de tutoría gratuita recibidas por mi hijo/a este año.	5	4	3	2	1
6. Creo que las sesiones de tutoría gratuita mejoraron los logros académicos de mi hijo/a.	5	4	3	2	1
7. En general, estoy satisfecho/a con los servicios recibidos por mi hijo/a.	5	4	3	2	1

Indique su nivel de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada una de las siguientes declaraciones referente a la división escolar:	Completamente de acuerdo	De acuerdo	En desacuerdo	Completamente en desacuerdo	No estoy segura/o
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."	5	4	3	2	1
9. Recibí el tiempo necesario para elegir la que compañía de tutoría de mi hijo/a.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Estoy satisfecho/a con el modo de asistencia proveído por la división escolar para obtener tutoría gratuita para mi hijo/a.	5	4	3	2	1

Comentarios:

_____

_____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS. *Una Institución del Comité de Regentes*
Una universidad de acción afirmativa que brinda oportunidades equitativas para todos

¡No doble este cuestionario!

Appendix B: Student Achievement Analysis Tables

Table B1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2007-2008) 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	18	-0.960	0.874		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	18	-0.962	0.875		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.002				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.765; *F*=0.00; *p*=.996				*NA*		
Academics Plus, Inc.	SES Students	28	-1.453	0.528		15	-0.663	0.750
	Control students	28	-1.453	0.526		15	-0.669	0.747
	Effect Size	*d*=0.002				*d*=0.004		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.278; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.997				*M*SE=0.561; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.981		
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	SES Students	12	-0.430	0.658		32	-0.780	0.884
	Control students	12	-0.430	0.658		32	-0.776	0.884
	Effect Size	*d*=0.000				*d*=-0.004		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.432; *F*=0.00; *p*=1.000				*M*SE=0.781; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.988		
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	SES Students	33	-0.629	0.902		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	33	-0.627	0.900		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.002				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.811; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.994				*NA*		
ATS Project Success (formerly ATS Educational)	SES Students	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.545	0.946
	Control students	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.545	0.946
	Effect Size	*NA*				*d*=0.000		
	One-way ANOVA	*NA*				*M*SE=0.896; *F*=0.00; *p*=1.000		
Bright Futures Learning Center	SES Students	52	-0.877	0.914		29	-0.829	1.009
	Control students	52	-0.875	0.912		29	-0.830	1.007
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.002				*d*=0.001		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.834; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.994				*M*SE=1.016; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.997		
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	SES Students	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.894	1.154
	Control students	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.892	1.150
	Effect Size	*NA*				*d*=-0.002		
	One-way ANOVA	*NA*				*M*SE=1.328 *F*=0.00; *p*=0.996		
Club Z! Inc.	SES Students	27	-0.663	1.055		44	-0.797	0.826
	Control students	27	-0.662	1.055		44	-0.797	0.825
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.001				*d*=0.000		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=1.113; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.999				*M*SE=0.682; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.998		
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	SES Students	29	-1.096	0.718		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	29	-1.097	0.718		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.001				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.516; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.998				*NA*		

Table B1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes* (continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Fresh Wise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	SES Students	17	-0.433	1.143		27	-0.784	0.829
	Control students	17	-0.435	1.145		27	-0.785	0.830
	Effect Size	*d*=0.002				*d*=0.001		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=1.309; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.996				*M*SE=0.687 *F*=0.00; *p*=0.997		
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	SES Students	85	-0.849	0.904		19	-1.105	0.786
	Control students	85	-0.851	0.906		19	-1.105	0.786
	Effect Size	*d*=0.002				*d*=0.000		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.819; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.987				*M*SE=0.618; *F*=0.00; *p*=1.000		
Millennium Education Music Project	SES Students	14	-0.514	0.846		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	14	-0.514	0.846		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.000				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.715; *F*=0.00; *p*=1.000				*NA*		
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	SES Students	18	-0.896	0.914		17	-0.577	0.890
	Control students	18	-0.896	0.914		17	-0.580	0.891
	Effect Size	*d*=0.000				*d*=0.004		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.835; *F*=0.00; *p*=1.000				*M*SE=0.793; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.992		
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	SES Students	37	-0.911	0.788		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	37	-0.908	0.786		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.003				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.619; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.988				*NA*		
Saturday Scholars, Inc.	SES Students	15	-1.353	0.939		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	15	-1.355	0.940		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.002				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.883; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.996				*NA*		
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	SES Students	10	-1.094	0.612		13	-1.357	0.753
	Control students	10	-1.091	0.609		13	-1.351	0.756
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.005				*d*=-0.008		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.373; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.992				*M*SE=0.569; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.985		
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	SES Students	19	-0.561	0.911		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	19	-0.560	0.910		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.001				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.829; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.998				*NA*		
The Enrichment Centers	SES Students	11	-0.669	1.328		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	11	-0.668	1.328		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.001				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=1.763; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.998				*NA*		

Table B1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes* (continued)

Provider	Group	reading/language arts				Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
The Learning Curve	SES Students	NA	NA	NA		10	-1.375	0.709
	Control students	NA	NA	NA		10	-1.376	0.711
	Effect Size	*NA*				*d*=0.002		
	One-way ANOVA	*NA*				*M*SE=0.504; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.997		
Total Tutors, LLC	SES Students	52	-0.953	1.008		22	-0.817	0.857
	Control students	52	-0.953	1.008		22	-0.814	0.857
	Effect Size	*d*=0.000				*d*=-0.003		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=1.016; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.999				*M*SE=0.734; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.992		
TutorFind	SES Students	12	-0.375	0.849		NA	NA	NA
	Control students	12	-0.375	0.847		NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.000				*NA*		
	One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.719; *F*=0.00; *p*=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 +/-0.25 were considered meaningful and fairly strong.

Table B2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes*

		reading/language arts					Mathematics			
Provider	Group	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean		n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
A+ Markem	SES Students	18	-0.528	1.094	-0.529		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	18	-0.919	0.795	-0.918		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.41					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.64					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.372; F=3.661; *p*=0.064					NA			
Academics Plus, Inc.	SES Students	28	-1.009	0.669	-1.009		15	-0.593	0.872	-0.595
	Control students	28	-0.994	0.736	-0.994		15	-0.337	1.003	-0.334
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.02					*d*=-0.27			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.02					*d*=-0.34			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.393; F=0.008; *p*=0.927					MSE=0..594; F=0.861; *p*=0.362			
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	SES Students	12	-0.127	0.950	-0.127		32	-0.775	0.724	-0.774
	Control students	12	-0.382	0.418	-0.382		32	-0.688	0.945	-0.689
	Effect Size	*d*=0.35					*d*=-0.10			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.36					*d*=-0.11			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.502; F=0.779; *p*=0.387					MSE=0.575; F=0.201; *p*=0.656			
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	SES Students	33	-0.461	0.977	-0.460		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	33	-0.502	0.889	-0.503		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.04					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.06					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.513; F=0.059; *p*=0.809					NA			
ATS Project Success (formerly ATS Educational)	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.434	0.672	-0.434
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.601	0.637	-0.601
	Effect Size	NA					*d*=0.26			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA					*d*=0.27			
	ANCOVA	NA					MSE=0.379; F=0.405; *p*=0.532			
Bright Futures Learning Center	SES Students	52	-0.611	0.852	-0.611		29	-0.560	1.050	-0.560
	Control students	52	-0.630	0.977	-0.630		29	-0.604	1.019	-0.604
	Effect Size	*d*=0.02					*d*=0.04			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.03					*d*=0.06			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.510; F=0.019; *p*=0.891					MSE=0.516; F=0.054; *p*=0.818			
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.589	1.173	-0.588
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA		11	-0.847	1.082	-0.848
	Effect Size	NA					*d*=0.23			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA					*d*=0.45			
	ANCOVA	NA					MSE=0.339; F=1.089; *p*=0.310			
Club Z! Inc.	SES Students	27	-0.405	0.961	-0.405		44	-0.382	0.938	-0.381
	Control students	27	-0.541	0.933	-0.541		44	-0.450	1.031	-0.450
	Effect Size	*d*=0.15					*d*=0.07			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.18					*d*=0.10			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.551; F=.458; *p*=0.501					MSE=0.514; F=0.202; *p*=0.654			

Table B2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes* (continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts					Mathematics			
		n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean		n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	SES Students	29	-0.765	0.966	-0.765		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	29	-0.845	0.927	-0.845		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.08					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.12					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.478; F=0.193; *p*=0.662					NA			
Fresh Wise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	SES Students	17	-0.147	1.026	-0.148		27	-0.486	0.917	-0.486
	Control students	17	-0.596	1.197	-0.595		27	-0.628	0.775	-0.628
	Effect Size	*d*=0.40					*d*=0.17			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.62					*d*=0.23			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.514; F=3.312; *p*=0.078					MSE=0.370; F=0.734; *p*=0.396			
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	SES Students	85	-0.757	0.843	-0.758		19	-1.073	0.816	-1.073
	Control students	85	-0.741	0.989	-0.740		19	-0.591	0.969	-0.591
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.02					*d*=-0.54			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.02					*d*=-0.93			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.603; F=0.022; *p*=0.882					MSE=0.266; F=8.323; *p*=0.007**			
Millennium Education Music Project	SES Students	14	-0.729	1.007	-0.729		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	14	-0.560	0.802	-0.560		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.19					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.24					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.516; F=0.389; *p*=0.064					NA			
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	SES Students	18	-0.844	0.988	-0.844		17	-0.853	0.689	-0.854
	Control students	18	-0.944	0.874	-0.944		17	0.006	0.813	0.007
	Effect Size	*d*=0.11					*d*=-0.89			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.16					*d*=-1.48			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.372; F=3.661; *p*=0.539					MSE=0.326; F=19.315; *p*<0.001**			
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	SES Students	37	-0.673	0.908	-0.672		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	37	-0.612	0.869	-0.613		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.07					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.08					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.523; F=0.120; *p*=0.730					NA			
Saturday Scholars, Inc.	SES Students	15	-1.284	1.108	-1.285		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	15	-1.432	0.903	-1.431		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.15					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.23					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.409; F=0.392; *p*=0.537					NA			

Table B2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes* (continued)

		Reading/language arts					Mathematics			
Provider	Group	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean		n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	SES Students	10	-0.729	0.582	-0.728		13	-0.962	0.722	-0.961
	Control students	10	-0.615	0.873	-0.615		13	-1.297	1.191	-1.298
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.15					*d*=0.34			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.17					*d*=0.35			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.445; F=0.143; *p*=0.710					MSE=0.936; F=0.789; *p*=0.384			
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/ Williamsburg	SES Students	19	-0.837	1.003	-0.837		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	19	-0.405	0.731	-0.405		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.49					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.54					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.641; F=2.756; *p*=0.106					NA			
The Enrichment Centers	SES Students	11	-0.617	0.750	-0.617		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	11	-0.293	1.317	-0.293		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.30					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.32					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=1.000; F=0.578; *p*=0.456					NA			
The Learning Curve	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA		10	-1.231	0.594	-1.231
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA		10	-0.894	0.520	-0.894
	Effect Size	NA					*d*=-0.60			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA					*d*=-0.66			
	ANCOVA	NA					MSE=0.259; F=2.190; *p*=0.157			
Total Tutors, LLC	SES Students	52	-0.681	0.943	-0.681		22	-0.794	0.930	-0.793
	Control students	52	-0.607	1.034	-0.607		22	-1.017	0.878	-1.019
	Effect Size	*d*=-0.07					*d*=0.25			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=-0.10					*d*=0.44			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.513; F=0.275; *p*=0.601					MSE=0.259; F=2.161; *p*=0.149			
TutorFind	SES Students	12	-0.234	1.107	-0.234		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	12	-0.349	1.106	-0.349		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	*d*=0.10					NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	*d*=0.13					NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.742; F=0.106; *p*=0.748					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 +/-0.25 were considered meaningful and fairly strong.
**Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table B3: SES Program Effect at the State-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes

Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
SES Students	548	-0.828	0.925		303	-0.800	0.865
Control students	548	-0.828	0.925		303	-0.800	0.865
Effect Size	***d*=0.000**				***d*=0.000**		
One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.855; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.999				*M*SE=0.748; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.999		

Table B4: SES Program Effect at the State-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2008-2009) 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	548	-0.635	0.926	-0.635		303	-0.615	0.905	-0.615
Control students	548	-0.644	0.950	-0.644		303	-0.577	0.957	-0.577
Effect Size	***d*=0.01**					***d*=-0.04**			
Adj. Effect Size	***d*=0.01**					***d*=-0.05**			

Table B5: Pilot School Effect: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2007-2008) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes

Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pilot students	194	-0.809	0.818		110	-0.758	0.828
Nonpilot students	194	-0.812	0.816		110	-0.789	0.829
Effect Size	***d*=0.004**				***d*=0.038**		
One-way ANOVA	*M*SE=0.668; *F*=0.00; *p*=0.967				*M*SE=0.686; *F*=0.08; *p*=0.780		

Table B6: Pilot School Effect: Matched Pairs Current Year (2008-2009) 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	194	-0.647	0.851	-0.648		110	-0.524	0.940	-0.536
Nonpilot students	194	-0.657	0.892	-0.656		110	-0.667	0.853	-0.655
Effect Size	***d*=0.01**					***d*=0.16**			
Adj. Effect Size	***d*=0.01**					***d*=0.22**			

Table B7: All Students by SOL Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	375	658	42,729	66,211	6.9	12.2	25.5	39.6
Proficient	934	1,438	48,004	67,307	17.3	26.6	28.7	40.2
Basic	829	910	19,039	22,459	15.4	16.8	11.4	13.4
Below Basic	184	201	3,052	3,773	3.4	3.7	1.8	2.3
Not Available	3,083	2,198	54,525	7,599	57.0	40.7	32.6	4.5
Total	5,030	4,747	124,620	101,138	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B8: All Students by SOL Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	413	743	39,032	54,868	7.6	13.7	23.3	32.8
Proficient	1,012	1,563	53,030	80,544	18.7	28.9	31.7	48.1
Basic	715	721	17,318	19,874	13.2	13.4	10.4	11.9
Below Basic	129	153	2,853	3,577	2.4	2.8	1.7	2.1
Not Available	3,136	2,225	55,116	8,486	58.1	41.2	32.9	5.1
Total	5,405	5,405	167,349	167,349	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B9: Sample for State-Level Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	43	54	43	65	14.2	17.8	14.2	21.5
Proficient	127	143	127	146	41.9	47.2	41.9	48.2
Basic	118	96	118	77	38.9	31.7	38.9	25.3
Below Basic	15	10	15	15	5.0	3.3	5.0	5.0
Total	303	303	303	303	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B10: Sample for State-Level Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	60	75	60	84	10.9	13.6	10.9	15.3
Proficient	243	315	243	307	44.3	57.5	44.3	56.0
Basic	215	139	214	128	39.3	25.4	39.1	23.4
Below Basic	30	19	31	29	5.5	3.5	5.7	5.3
Total	548	548	548	548	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B11: Sample for Pilot Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students		Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	16	25	15	15	14.5	22.7	13.6	13.7
Proficient	48	52	46	57	43.7	47.3	41.8	51.8
Basic	45	30	47	0	40.9	27.3	42.8	0.0
Below Basic	1	3	2	38	0.9	2.7	1.8	34.5
Total	110	110	110	110	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B12: Sample for Pilot Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students		Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	18	21	17	26	9.3	10.8	8.8	13.4
Proficient	95	124	96	112	49.0	63.9	49.5	57.7
Basic	74	45	74	47	38.1	23.2	38.1	24.3
Below Basic	7	4	7	9	3.6	2.1	3.6	4.6
Total	194	194	194	194	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B13: Sample for Special Education Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number		Percentage	
	SES Students		SES Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	39	55	20.0	27.9
Proficient	61	73	31.3	37.1
Basic	73	56	37.4	28.4
Below Basic	22	13	11.3	6.6
Total	195	197	100.0	100.0

Table B14: Sample for Special Education Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number		Percentage	
	SES Students		SES Students	
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2007-2008	2008-2009
Advanced	75	123	21.0	33.3
Proficient	125	132	35.0	35.8
Basic	121	82	33.9	22.2
Below Basic	36	32	10.1	8.7
Total	357	369	100.0	100.0