



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 2009 – 2010



May 2011

**Todd Zoblotsky
Ying Huang
Kathryn Murphy
Center for Research in Educational Policy**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	11
Study Design.....	20
Descriptive Analysis Results	30
Student Achievement Results	40
Conclusions	46
References	49
Appendix A: 2010-2011 Virginia SES Questionnaires	50
Appendix B: Student Achievement Analysis Tables	56

Executive Summary

Purpose

Title I of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (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 2009-2010 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 that provided input from the various stakeholders concerning SES services. The achievement analyses evaluated Standards of Learning (SOL) test standardized scaled scores (Z-scores) to examine the effect of SES provider services on low-income students' 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 2009-2010 school year. A descriptive analysis (non-statistical) was conducted on SOL proficiency levels for students identified as receiving special education services, as these students were not included in the more rigorous matched-sample statistical analyses. Additionally, a separate statistical analysis was

conducted for schools in divisions that participated in the United States Department of Education (USED) pilot for the reversal of SES and Public School Choice (PSC).

The matched program-control methodology was the most appropriate and scientifically rigorous design available to meet the monitoring requirements of NCLB. 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 who met other criteria required to conduct a rigorous statistical analysis. Additionally, the results from this study cannot be generalized to all students who participated in SES, but only to students similar to those actually included in the analyses. 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 participated in SES.

SES Implementation

A total of 5,630 students received SES tutoring services in 2009-2010 from 68 providers across 73 schools in 33 divisions in Virginia. Of the total 5,630 students, 94.6 percent (n=5,325) of these students were considered Priority for Services, or lowest-achieving low-income students, and were the focus of this evaluation. Students received SES services under a total of 6,233 provider contracts for reading/language arts and/or mathematics. Students could have multiple contracts if they received SES tutoring services in both reading/language arts and mathematics from the same or multiple providers. When describing the types of services SES providers performed, each contract was treated as a unique record.

Parents of students receiving services who responded to the survey as part of the evaluation 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 provider they wanted for their child and indicated that they were given information on their child's rights under the NCLB law. Additionally, parent respondents were satisfied with the number of tutoring hours that their child received. 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 satisfied with the cooperation and involvement of the division coordinator. Responding providers also expressed satisfaction with the ease of aligning lessons with division or school curriculum.

SES Effectiveness

A state-level analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of all SES providers combined on student achievement. After controlling for prior year achievement, there was no statistically significant difference between SES and control students on adjusted average 2009-2010 SOL reading/language arts or mathematics achievement Z-scores. While not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2009-2010 reading/language arts and mathematics SOL Z-score of SES students was slightly higher than that of control students. However, the adjusted effect sizes (which quantify the magnitude of the difference in scores) in both reading/language arts (+0.001) and mathematics (+0.07) were very small or small respectively.

At the provider level, after controlling for prior year achievement, one provider, The Literacy Lab, had a statistically significant difference in 2009-2010 SOL reading/language arts achievement, with SES students outscoring control students. The adjusted effect size of 0.60 was large, indicating that the mean (i.e., average) SOL score of the SES group was at the 73rd percentile of the control group. None of the remaining 19 providers had statistically significant differences in outcomes of SES students as compared to control students in reading/language arts. As shown in Table i below, while none of the differences were statistically significant, the adjusted mean 2009-2010 reading/language arts SOL Z-scores of SES students receiving

reading/language arts tutoring from nine providers were higher than control students, while ten providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores for SES students compared to control students. Positive adjusted effect sizes in reading/language arts ranged from 0.01 (very small) to 0.28 (large), while negative adjusted effect sizes ranged from -0.01 (very small) to -0.51 (large). The wide range in the size of both the positive and negative effect sizes indicates great diversity in the impacts of specific providers. While some providers appear to be making large positive impacts on the students they serve, others appear to not be adequately serving the needs of the students they serve. Based on the data available for the current study, it is not possible to determine why particular providers are having positive or negative effects on student achievement.

Table i: Adjusted Mean 2009-2010 Reading/Language Arts SOL Z-scores of SES Students Receiving Reading/Language Arts Tutoring Compared to Controls

SES students higher* than control students	SES students lower* than control students
ATS Project Success	A+ Ability Plus
Academics Plus, Inc.	A+ Markem
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)
Club Z!, Inc.	Bright Futures Learning Center
Fresh Wise, Inc.	Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)
NonPublic Educational Services (NESI), Inc.	Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.
Shout Church, Inc. (Online)	Sylvan Learning Center Richmond
The Enrichment Centers NCLB, Inc.	Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg
The Literacy Lab **	Sylvan Learning dba J&K Education-Roanoke
Total Tutors, LLC	Sylvan/"Ace It" Tutoring of Hampton Roads

* Differences were not statistically significant

** Difference were statistically significant

The provider-level analysis did not detect a statistically significant difference in 2009-2010 mathematics SOL test results between the SES and control groups. While the differences were not statistically significant, as shown in Table ii, the adjusted average Z-score of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring from nine providers was higher than for control students, while four providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores for SES students compared to control students. Positive adjusted effect sizes in mathematics ranged from 0.001 (very small) to 0.35 (large), while negative adjusted effect sizes were all large, ranging from -0.26 to -0.41. As with the outcomes in reading/language arts, the wide range in the size of both the positive and negative effect sizes indicates large disparities in the impacts of specific providers, with some providers making large positive impacts on the students they serve, and others appearing to not have adequately served the needs of their students.

Table ii: Adjusted Mean 2009-2010 Mathematics SOL Z-scores of SES Students Receiving Mathematics Tutoring Compared to Control Students

SES higher* than control students	SES lower* than control students
1-on-1 BearPaw Tutors Virginia	Academics Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC
A+ Ability Plus	Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)
ATS Project Success	FreshWise, Inc.
Bright Futures Learning Center	Sylvan/"Ace it" Tutoring of Hampton Roads
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	
Club Z! Inc.	
Fairfax Co. Pub. Schools – A Boost for Mathematics	
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	
Total Tutors, LLC	

* Differences were not statistically significant

For students designated as special education who received SES tutoring in reading/language arts, approximately 55 percent took the SOL test in 2009-2010. Of these, 42.2 percent scored Proficient or Advanced on the SOL in reading/language arts in 2009-2010, up from 36.3 percent in 2008-2009. Among students designated as receiving special education services who received SES tutoring in mathematics, approximately 66 percent took the SOL test in 2009-2010. Of these, 53.6 percent scored Proficient or Advanced in mathematics in 2009-2010, up from 40.0 percent in 2008-2009. Overall, about half of students designated as receiving special education services who participated in SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests in 2009-2010.

For the analysis of schools in divisions that participated in the pilot program to reverse SES and PSC options, while not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2009-2010 reading/language arts and mathematics SOL Z-scores of pilot SES students receiving tutoring were lower than those of non-pilot SES students. However, the adjusted effect sizes in both

cases were very small. Therefore, 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.

Conclusions

Parents of SES students and division coordinators who participated in the 2009-2010 evaluation were generally positive regarding SES providers serving students in Virginia. Parents were pleased with school divisions' implementation of SES and assistance in obtaining tutoring for their child. Overall, responding parents were pleased with the services that their children received. Overall, division coordinators were also pleased with provider services. Finally, the majority of responding SES providers were positive concerning their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2009-2010 school year.

Based on the results of the statistical analyses, both SES providers at the state level (i.e., all providers combined), and SES students who attended pilot schools showed no statistically significant difference in SOL achievement in either reading/language arts or mathematics when compared to either control or non-pilot SES students respectively. When conducting analyses at the provider level, The Literacy Lab was the only provider found to have a statistically significant positive impact on the SOL scores of students served in reading/language arts. In mathematics, there were no providers found to have a statistically significant impact in SOL scores of students served. Based on the descriptive analyses, about half of students designated as receiving special education services who participated in SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on 2009-2010 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests, and the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced increased in both subjects from the previous year.

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. In reading/language arts, 17 of the 20 providers included had

fewer than 30 students, while in mathematics, 10 of the 13 providers included had fewer than 20 students. 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, slightly less than four weeks of tutoring were provided out of an entire school year. Therefore, one would not reasonably expect a limited number of hours of tutoring to make dramatic changes in achievement. However, despite the natural and context-specific limitations of the achievement analyses, the present results provide evidence that one provider, The Literacy Lab, was able to assist students in achieving statistically significantly higher SOL reading/language arts scale scores for SES students compared to control students.

Introduction

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in the Commonwealth of 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 of 1965* (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (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 the same subject area), are in corrective action, or are in restructuring status. Additionally, eight school divisions in Virginia participated in the United States Department of Education (USED) pilot for reversal of Public School Choice (PSC) and SES during the 2009-2010 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 2009-2010 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 analyses. The first analysis 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 primary research questions for the stakeholder perceptions analysis 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 second analysis examined the impact of SES attendance on Standards of Learning (SOL) achievement at the state level (i.e., for all providers combined), individual SES provider level, and between SES students who attended pilot schools in the 2009-2010 school year compared to SES students who did not attend pilot schools.

In the second analysis, differences in prior year achievement between SES students included and SES students not included in the state level analyses (based on predetermined guidelines) were also examined. In addition, a descriptive analysis was conducted for students designated as receiving special education services. In Virginia, students with disabilities may participate in either traditional SOL assessments or alternative assessments. As the analyses conducted for this evaluation focused only on traditional SOL assessment outcomes (i.e., no alternative assessments were included), students designated as receiving

special education services who took the SOL assessment would not be representative of the total population of students designated as receiving special education services.

The primary research questions for the SES effectiveness analysis 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 USED pilot for reversal of SES and PSC perform relative to the other students attending schools that were not participating in the USED pilot program?

Participating School Divisions and SES Providers

During the 2009-2010 academic school year, a total of 5,630 SES students participated in SES tutoring. Of the 5,630 SES students, 5,325 (94.6 percent) were considered Priority for Services, or lowest-achieving low-income students, and were the focus of this evaluation. Students received SES services under a total of 6,233 provider contracts for reading/language arts and/or mathematics from 68 providers serving students in 73 Title I schools in 33 Virginia school divisions that were required to offer SES during the 2009-2010 school year. Of these 73 Title I schools, 53 were required to offer SES (i.e., were in year 2 or more of school improvement) and 22 schools in year 1 of improvement were granted a waiver to offer services as pilot schools. Parents of eligible students were informed by the school of their child's eligibility for additional academic assistance provided through SES, and were provided a list of the approved service providers from which they could choose. VDOE authorized 102 individual provider companies to offer SES statewide. 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 low-income students participating in SES (n=5,325) Fairfax County Public Schools, with 22.1 percent of all participants, accounted for the most SES participants. Charles City County Public Schools, with 0.3 percent of all SES participants, accounted for the fewest number of SES participants.

Forty-one providers offered a total of 1,605 contracts in mathematics. Sixty-one providers offered a total of 4,274 contracts in reading/language arts. Among the 41 providers offering mathematics tutoring services, Bright Futures Learning Center had the largest percentage of all contracts (14.1 percent), while MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc., and Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital) each had the lowest percentage (less than one percent). Of the 61 providers offering reading/language arts tutoring services,

Total Tutors, LLC served the largest percentage of contracts (11.7 percent). Global Partnership Schools, Inc., had the lowest percentage of contracts in reading/language arts (0.2 percent, based on one contract). It should be noted that student contracts are not unique. Students could have multiple contracts if they received SES tutoring services in both reading/language arts and mathematics from the same or multiple providers. When describing the types of services SES providers performed, each contract was treated as a unique record.

Table 1: Number and Percentage of Students with Priority for Services+ Participating in SES by School Division during the 2009-2010 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
Accomack County Public Schools*	1,307	350	26.78
Alexandria City Public Schools*	2,430	464	19.09
Arlington County Public Schools	1,109	138	12.44
Charles City County Public Schools	100	14	14.00
Craig County Public Schools	83	25	30.12
Culpeper County Public Schools	440	38	8.64
Essex County Public Schools	450	52	11.56
Fairfax County Public Schools*	6,373	1,177	18.47
Fauquier County Public Schools*	231	97	41.99
Fluvanna County Public Schools	248	47	18.95
Fredericksburg City Public Schools	737	16	2.17
Greene County Public Schools	249	23	9.24
Greensville County Public Schools	316	97	30.70
Hampton City Public Schools*	1,880	345	18.35
Henrico County Public Schools*	2,918	277	9.49
King George County Public Schools	359	109	30.36
Lancaster County Public Schools	68	20	29.41
Newport News City Public Schools	2,898	485	16.74
Northampton County Public Schools	502	123	24.50
Orange County Public Schools	323	28	8.67
Petersburg City Public Schools	1,624	143	8.81
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	1,772	79	4.46
Portsmouth City Public Schools	2,917	163	5.59
Pulaski County Public Schools	422	96	22.75
Richmond City Public Schools*	7,611	378	4.97
Roanoke City Public Schools	2,728	128	4.69
Shenandoah County Public Schools	580	72	12.41
Suffolk City Public Schools	1,165	144	12.36
Sussex County Public Schools	393	28	7.12
Warren County Public Schools	686	34	4.96
Westmoreland County Public Schools	285	24	8.42
Williamsburg-James City County Public Schools*	459	111	24.18
Total	43,663	5,325	12.20

+ Low-income students receive priority for SES services and students with priority for SES services were the focus of this evaluation.

*Participant in USED pilot program.

Table 2: Number of Students Served by SES Providers during the 2009-2010 School Year

Provider	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number**	Percentage	Number**	Percentage	Number**	Percentage
1-on-1 BearPaw Tutors Virginia	NA	NA	55	3.43	55	1.01
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	22	0.51	NA	NA	22	0.41
A Tree of Knowledge Educational Services, Inc.	NA	NA	10	0.62	10	0.18
A+ Ability Plus	201	4.70	142	8.85	250	4.60
A+ Markem	103	2.41	*	*	104	1.92
ATS Project Success [formerly ATS Educational Consulting Services]	45	1.05	29	1.81	72	1.33
Academic Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC	102	2.39	59	3.68	143	2.63
Academic Tutoring Service	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Academics Plus, Inc.	201	4.70	57	3.55	242	4.46
Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville, VA	20	0.47	*	*	24	0.44
Achieve HighPoints (SES from Datamatics, Inc.	NA	NA	*	*	*	*
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	192	4.49	68	4.24	253	4.66
Achieve Tutoring, LLC	23	0.54	23	1.43	40	0.74
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	163	3.81	NA	NA	163	3.00
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	24	0.56	NA	NA	24	0.44
Babbage Net Schools	25	0.58	15	0.93	29	0.53
Believe-N-U Youth Empowerment, LLC	26	0.61	NA	NA	26	0.48
Blessings for You Childcare and Learning Center	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Born To Be Great Youth Empowerment	35	0.82	NA	NA	35	0.64
Brame Institute of Education, Inc.	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bright Futures Learning Center	475	11.11	220	13.71	628	11.57
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	128	2.99	76	4.74	174	3.20
Capitol Educational Support, Inc.	101	2.36	48	2.99	121	2.23
Charity Family Life, Inc.	11	0.26	NA	NA	11	0.20
Club Z! Inc.	224	5.24	128	7.98	304	5.60
Discovery Program, Inc.	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Dynamic Learning Corps, LLC	38	0.89	NA	NA	38	0.70
Educate Online Learning, LLC	NA	NA	*	*	*	*
Educational Tutorial Services	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	77	1.80	NA	NA	77	1.42
Fairfax Co. Pub. Schools - A Boost for Mathematics	NA	NA	84	5.23	84	1.55

Table 2: Number of Students Served by SES Provider and Subject During the 2009-2010 School Year (continued)

Provider	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number**	Percentage	Number**	Percentage	Number**	Percentage
Fredericksburg Learning Enhancement Center	10	0.23	NA	NA	10	0.18
FreshWise, Inc.	181	4.23	64	3.99	227	4.18
Global Partnership Schools, Inc.	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	205	4.80	42	2.62	243	4.48
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	19	0.44	NA	NA	19	0.35
Innovadia (Online SES Tutors)	*	*	*	*	15	0.28
International After School Program	NA	NA	23	1.43	23	0.42
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	13	0.30	NA	NA	13	0.24
Just Us Kidz Tutoring Program	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Kinetic Potential Scholars	*	*	*	*	*	*
Kumon North America, Inc.	*	*	*	*	*	*
L & U Contractors, LLC (Learning & You)	*	*	*	*	10	0.18
Lancaster County Public Schools	15	0.35	NA	NA	15	0.28
Mainstream Development Educational Group	*	*	*	*	14	0.26
MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.	12	0.28	*	*	13	0.24
Millennium Education Music Project	46	1.08	NA	NA	46	0.85
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	77	1.80	19	1.18	93	1.71
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	37	0.87	19	1.18	44	0.81
Professional Tutoring Services	*	0.19	*	*	10	0.18
Scholastic Educational Services, LLC	*	*	*	*	*	*
Shout Church, Inc. (Online)	58	1.36	NA	NA	58	1.07
Stay on Top Tutoring Services, Inc.	*	*	NA	NA	10	0.18
Sylvan Learning Center - McLean, VA	52	1.22	32	1.99	70	1.29
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	55	1.29	*	*	56	1.03
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	*	*	*	0.56	18	0.33
Sylvan Learning Ctrs. Newport News-Yorktown/Wmsbg.	162	3.79	28	1.74	190	3.50
Sylvan Learning dba J & K Education-Christiansburg	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
Sylvan Learning dba J & K Education-Roanoke	37	0.87	NA	NA	37	0.68
Sylvan/"Ace It!" Tutoring of Hampton Roads	169	3.95	99	6.17	266	4.90

Table 2: Number of Student Contracts Delivered by SES Provider and Subject During the 2009-2010 School Year (continued)

Provider	Reading/language arts		Mathematics		Total	All SES Student Contracts
	Number**	Percentage	Number**	Percentage	Number**	Percentage
The Enrichment Centers NCLB, Inc.	126	2.95	NA	NA	126	2.32
The Learning Curve	*	*	NA	NA	*	*
The Literacy Lab	68	1.59	NA	NA	68	1.25
The Richmond Outreach Center/ROC Tutoring	44	1.03	NA	NA	44	0.81
Total Tutors, LLC	485	11.35	128	7.98	591	10.88
Trust Tutoring	*	*	*	*	*	*
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	NA	NA	19	1.18	19	0.35
TutorFind	62	1.45	41	2.55	83	1.53
Total	4,274	100	1,605	100.00	5,430	100.00

N/A indicates that no contracts existed for the subject area and provider.

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

Note: The total number of students (5,430) is less than the number of contracts (5,882) because students could receive multiple contracts from different providers and/or different subjects (reading/language arts and/or mathematics).

** Number of student contracts is the unique count of students by provider.

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 included a quantitative evaluation of student achievement to address the effectiveness of SES at the state level (i.e., all providers combined), individual SES provider level, and achievement differences between SES students attending pilot schools in the 2009-2010 school year and other SES students who did not attend pilot schools, as well as a descriptive analysis of the SOL proficiency levels of SES students designated as receiving special education services. For all achievement analyses, only students designated as low-income were included.

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; parents were surveyed using a paper instrument. Appendix A contains images of the provider, division coordinator, and parent surveys.

In the spring of 2010, 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 organization's involvement and satisfaction with SES implementation 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 were removed.

Near the end of the 2010 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 provided 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 their 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 SOL student achievement in the 2009-2010 school year, five analyses were conducted separately by subject area (reading/language arts and mathematics). The first analysis examined the statewide effectiveness of all providers combined, while the second analysis examined effectiveness at the individual provider level. To increase the reliability of findings and the ability to find statistically significant differences between groups where such differences existed, only SES providers with at least ten students available to analyze who met the selection criteria were included in the provider-level analyses.

However, all providers, even those with fewer than ten students available to analyze, were included in the state-level analyses.

For these first two analyses, a matched program-control design at the student level, also known as pre-program/post-program matched samples comparison of nonequivalent groups, was used. In this design, each SES student was paired with a comparable low-income “control” student who attended the same or a similar Title I school in the 2009-2010 school year, but did not receive SES tutoring. 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. Given the inability to randomly assign students to schools and SES providers, a matched-sample comparison approach is one of the most rigorous methods for determining the effect of SES on student achievement (see Slavin (2008) and U.S. Department of Education (2008)).

A separate descriptive (i.e., non-evaluative) analysis examined the SOL proficiency levels of students designated as receiving special education services who participated in SES tutoring. No control students were included in these descriptive analyses. The fourth analysis examined the achievement differences between SES students attending pilot schools in the 2009-2010 school year and SES students who did not attend pilot schools. For the analyses of pilot school outcomes, all SES students enrolled in a pilot school not identified as receiving special education services were matched with SES students who did not attend a pilot school using the same criteria outlined above, and the results tested for statistical significance. The fifth analysis examined differences in prior-year achievement between SES students included (i.e., who had at least 18 hours services) and SES students excluded (i.e., who had fewer than 18 hours services) in the state-level analyses.

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

- Only students who took the SOL tests in both 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 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 with valid SOL scaled scores (greater than zero and less than or equal to 600) were included in the final analyses.
- Only students with a start date of services on or before September 1, 2010, were included in the final analyses.
- Only students in grades 4-8 in 2009-2010 were included because students needed two years of data (i.e., results from grades 3-7 in 2008-2009) for the statistical analysis.
- Only students with at least 18 hours of attendance were included in the SES group.
- Students who attended different schools were removed due to discontinuity in their school experience.
- No students designated as receiving special education services were included in the statistical analyses. This is due to the difficulty of finding suitable control student matches. 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 having a severe learning disability, potentially leading to false conclusions concerning the effectiveness of providers' services. In addition, the scaled 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. Therefore, a descriptive analysis (non-statistical) was conducted on SOL proficiency levels for students identified as receiving special education services.

For the state-level statistical analyses that examined the impact of all SES providers combined on reading/language arts and mathematics SOL performance, the following additional criteria were used:

- All providers were included (even those with fewer than ten students to analyze).
- 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 statistical analyses, that examined the impact of individual providers on students' reading/language arts and mathematics SOL outcomes, the following additional criteria were used:

- Providers with fewer than ten students to be analyzed were excluded due to lack of statistical power.
- 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).

For the descriptive analyses of reading/language arts and mathematics SOL proficiency levels for students designated as receiving special education services for all SES providers combined, the following additional criteria were used:

- All students in grades 3-8 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.
- Only students with valid SOL scaled scores (greater than zero and less than or equal to 600) were included in the final analyses.
- Only students with a start date of services on or before September 1, 2010, were included in the final analyses.

For the statistical analyses examining the impact of SES attendance on pilot program SOL outcomes in reading/language arts and mathematics, the following additional criteria were used:

- All providers were included (even those with fewer than ten students to analyze).
- 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 and were not identified as receiving special education services were included in the analyses.

When conducting the analyses, SOL results were examined separately by subject tutored. The final SES samples for the state-level matching included 662 students in reading/language arts (53 percent of the original 1,257 students in the sample) and 326 students in mathematics (44 percent of the original 744 students in the sample), while the final samples for the provider-level matching included 558 students in reading/language arts (44 percent of the original 1,257 students in the sample) and 246 students (33 percent of the original 744 students in the sample) in mathematics.

There were 99,922 records initially available for control students with both 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 SOL test data from all Title I schools. About 29 percent of the initial pool of

control students was excluded for being outside of grades 4-8, while about 18 percent was excluded for being indicated as receiving special education services.

Out of all 5,630 SES students, 984 (17 percent) were designated as receiving special education services, 467 of whom were in grades 3-8. One of the 467 was removed for attending two different schools. Seven additional students received services from two different providers. Their records were retained, leaving 464 provider contracts for 459 students. The final samples for the analyses of proficiency levels of students designated as receiving special education services included 358 students in reading/language arts in 2009-2010 and 289 students in reading/language arts in 2008-2009, and 426 students in mathematics in 2009-2010 and 360 students in mathematics in 2008-2009 SOL.

The initial pilot samples included 453 pilot students in reading/language arts and 282 in mathematics, while the initial non-pilot samples included 1,870 non-pilot students in reading/language arts and 1,899 non-pilot students in mathematics. For the final samples, 130 pilot students in reading/language arts and 91 pilot students in mathematics who had at least 18 hours of services were matched to non-pilot students.

As 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 scaled scores to standardized scores (Z-scores) for all statistical 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 way to compare student outcomes for students receiving SES and a matched group of students who did not receive SES relative to the Virginia mean (i.e., average) for Title I schools¹ each year.

Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used for the state-level, individual provider-level, and pilot school analyses to assess the impact of SES program participation on 2009-2010

¹A 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.

SOL standardized reading/language arts and/or mathematics scaled scores (Z-scores) with students' prior year (2008-2009) standardized SOL scaled score (Z-score) used as the covariate. ANCOVA statistically equates (adjusts the means of) the groups in 2009-2010 on the covariate, meaning that any differences in achievement in 2009-2010 can be evaluated as if the groups had similar achievement in 2008-2009. Consequently, any statistically significant difference in 2009-2010 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 (i.e., average) SOL reading/language arts and mathematics Z-scores of the SES and control groups in 2009-2010 for the state-level analyses were below average (i.e., Z-scores lower than zero), meaning that the analyses included lower performing students compared to the statewide Title I student sample available.

Hedges's g effect size is also provided as an indication of the magnitude of the difference in achievement between groups. For unadjusted means, Hedges's g was computed as the mean difference of achievement Z-scores (SES-control) divided by the unbiased least squares estimate of the pooled standard deviation. For adjusted means, the adjusted effect size was computed as the mean difference of adjusted achievement Z-scores (SESadj-controladj) divided by the unbiased pooled standard deviation. For both, the resulting Hedges's g was multiplied by a correction term for small samples to get an unbiased estimator of the population effect size (g^*). Each effect size (or g^*) 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, 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), 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 fairly limited in total hours per year, lower effect sizes might be expected.

To help put the effect sizes into context, they were also converted to average percentile standing scores, which range from 1 to 99 and tell the average percentile standing of the average SES student relative to the average control student. For example, a g^* of 0.0 indicates that the mean of the SES group is at the 50th percentile of the control group, while a g^* of 0.1 indicates that the mean of the SES group is at the 54th percentile of the control group and a g^* of -0.1 indicates that the mean of the SES group is at the 46th percentile of the control group.

As two years of data (2008-2009 and 2009-2010) were used in the analyses, one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted on baseline (2008-2009) 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. ANOVA was also employed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in 2008-2009 performance between SES students who were included in the state level analyses (i.e., had 18 or more hours of tutoring), and SES students who were not included in the analyses (i.e., had fewer than 18 hours of tutoring). This was done to determine whether SES students included in the analyses were different in their prior year achievement from SES students not included in the analyses. Any statistically significant differences in the outcomes between SES

students included and controls may not generalize to the total SES population (if the difference in prior year achievement between the two groups was statistically significant). In other words, if there was a statistically significant difference between SES students included and not included in the analyses, any subsequent statistically significant differences between SES students included in the analyses and controls may be related to the type of SES student included (i.e., based on the SES student's prior year achievement) vs. the impact of participating in SES services.

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 32 of 33 (96.97 percent) divisions required to offer SES submitted at least one online survey about their experiences with and reactions to provider services. A total of 262 surveys was received from 32 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 provider(s) serving their child by selecting the company name from the list of statewide approved providers. A total of 1,584 surveys was submitted by parents of tutored students in 63 of the 73 SES eligible schools (86.30 percent) from 32 divisions.

Representatives from 61 of 102 (59.8 percent) statewide approved providers completed an online survey about their experiences with SES implementation in Virginia during the 2009-2010 school year. 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 provider respondents were either highly satisfied or satisfied with the division cooperation and involvement (96.8 percent; n = 59/61).
- Similarly, responses from parents reflected mostly positive perceptions of efforts put forth by the division to implement SES. The large majority of parent respondents indicated that they were pleased with the way their school division helped them obtain SES for their child (91.7 percent strongly agree or agree; n = 1,453/1,584). Most parent respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they were given enough time to decide which tutoring company they wanted for their child (84.5 percent; n = 1,338/1,584). Most parent respondents (76.0 percent; n=1,204/1,584) strongly agree or agree that their school division provided them with information about their child's rights under NCLB.

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 in raising student achievement levels (93.5 percent; n = 57/61).
- Most division coordinator respondents strongly agreed or agreed that services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement (60.3 percent; n = 158/262).
- Most parent respondents, (84.3 percent; n = 1,335/1,584) strongly agreed or agreed that the tutoring services helped their child's achievement.

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

- Most provider respondents indicated that they communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (91.8 percent; n = 56/61) and parents (98.3 percent; n = 60/61) regarding students' progress.
- The majority of division coordinator respondents reported that provider communication occurred frequently or occasionally (94.6 percent; n = 248/262). While slightly more than half of the division coordinator respondents noted provider-to-teacher communication occurred frequently or occasionally (55.7 percent; n = 146/262), the majority of division coordinators respondents indicated that provider-to-parent communication occurred frequently or occasionally (85.9 percent; n = 225/262).
- The majority of parent respondents noted that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year a lot or sometimes (72.3 percent; n = 1,145/1,584). Similarly, 73 percent of the parent responses indicated that

providers sent letter or notes home about their child's progress (a lot or sometimes; n = 1,156/1,584).

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

- The majority of provider respondents reported that they were able to adapt services to each school's curriculum frequently or occasionally (91.8 percent; n = 56/61). Most provider respondents indicated that tutors frequently or occasionally integrated services with classroom learning activities (88.5 percent; n = 54/61).
- Most division coordinator respondents indicated that providers frequently or occasionally collaborated with them to set goals for student growth (74.4 percent; n = 195/262). Slightly more than half of division coordinator respondents strongly agreed or agreed that providers adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum (54.6 percent; n = 143/262) or that providers integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities (50.4 percent; n = 132/262).
- More than three-quarters of parent respondents reported that the tutoring company helped their child with subjects their child was studying in school a lot or sometimes (78.8 percent; n = 1,248/1,584).

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

- All provider respondents indicated that they aligned their services with the state academic content and achievement standards (100.0 percent; n = 61/61).
- The majority of division coordinator respondents strongly agreed or agreed that providers aligned their services with state and local standards (82.5 percent; n = 216/262). Also, the majority of division coordinator respondents strongly agreed or agreed that providers complied with applicable federal NCLB laws (86.6

percent; n = 227/262), as well as, applicable state and local laws (84.4 percent; n = 221).

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

- Most provider respondents indicated that tutors administered services to special education students (80.3 percent; n = 49/61) and ELL students (81.9 percent; n = 50/61).
- Most division coordinator respondents strongly agreed or agreed that providers offered services to special education students (93.1 percent; n = 244/262) and ELL students (87.4 percent; n = 229/262).

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

- Overall, division coordinator respondents indicated satisfaction with provider services (79.8 percent; n = 209/262).
- Overall, parent respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the services their child received (86.1 percent; n = 1,364/1,584). Most parent respondents, (87.5 percent; n = 1,386/1,584) strongly agreed or agreed that they were happy with the number of tutoring hours their child received.

On the following pages, tables 3 through 6 provide summaries of the survey responses from division coordinators, parents or students receiving SES, and SES providers. Table 7 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 satisfied with this provider's services" for division coordinators and "Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received" for parents.

Table 3: Aggregate SES Division Coordinator Survey Responses for School Year 2009-2010

*Total Number of Respondents: 32 SES Division Coordinators with 262 survey submissions**

How often did the provider...	Percentage				
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all		
Communicate with you during the school year?	58.0	36.6	5.3		
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	19.8	54.6	25.2		
How often did the provider...	Percentage				
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know	
Communicate with teachers during the year?	16.4	39.3	13.7	30.2	
Communicate with parents during the year?	39.7	46.2	1.5	12.2	
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	82.4	8.8	1.5	7.3	
The provider...	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.	8.4	46.2	19.5	1.9	23.7
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	5.0	45.4	24.8	2.7	21.8
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	23.7	58.8	3.4	1.5	12.2
Offered services to students with disabilities.	33.2	59.9	1.5	3.8	1.1
Offered services to ELL students.	34.0	53.4	0.0	1.9	10.3
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	28.2	58.4	0.4	1.5	11.1
Complied with applicable state and local [health, safety, civil rights] laws.	29.8	54.6	0.8	1.1	13.0
Overall provider assessment:	Percentage				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	15.3	45.0	4.2	3.4	31.7
Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	29.4	50.4	8.4	5.0	6.9

Note: Percentages may not total 100 percent due to missing input from respondents.

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

Table 4: Aggregate Parent Survey Responses for School Year 2009-2010*Total Number of Respondents: 1,584 parent respondents from 63 schools within 32 divisions*

How often did the tutoring company...	Percentage				
	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all		
Talk to you about your child's progress?	33.2	39.1	24.5		
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	34.1	38.9	22.1		
How often did the tutoring company...	Percentage				
	A lot	Sometimes	Not at all	Don't Know	
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	58.4	20.4	4.4	12.3	
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	69.8	10.0	1.6	14.0	
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.	47.6	39.9	5.1	2.1	2.5
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	47.0	37.3	4.3	1.3	6.4
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	48.5	37.6	4.2	1.8	4.3
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	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.	36.6	39.4	6.4	1.8	10.6
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	40.7	43.8	5.3	1.4	4.5
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	56.0	35.7	1.6	0.8	2.3

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

Table 5: Aggregate Provider Survey Responses for School Year 2009-2010*Total Number of Respondents: 61 SES Providers*

Provider Perceptions and Activities	Percentage				
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know	
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student[s].	41.0	50.8	6.6	1.6	
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	80.3	18.0	0.0	0.0	
Tutors adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	59.0	32.8	4.9	3.3	
Tutors integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	41.0	47.5	6.6	4.9	
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	18.0	49.2	23.0	9.8	
Tutors gave instruction to students with disabilities.	45.9	34.4	13.1	4.9	
Tutors gave instruction to students that were English Language Learners.	50.8	31.1	13.1	3.3	
Tutors aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	95.1	4.9	0.0	0.0	
Provider satisfaction with:	Percentage				
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know
Student attendance	18.0	67.2	13.1	1.6	0.0
Student attitudes [e.g., cooperation, motivation]	27.9	68.9	1.6	1.6	0.0
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	27.9	65.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Parent cooperation/involvement	13.1	62.3	19.7	3.3	1.6
Teacher cooperation/involvement	8.2	54.1	21.3	1.6	13.1
Principal/Parent cooperation/involvement	8.2	67.2	11.5	1.6	9.8
Division SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	27.9	68.9	1.6	0.0	1.6
State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	27.9	50.8	0.0	0.0	19.7
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	44.3	49.2	3.3	0.0	3.3

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

Table 6: Statewide SES Provider Overall Satisfaction for the 2009-2010 School Year

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services/pleased with the services that my child received.				
Provider Name	Division Coordinators		Parents	
	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree
1-on-1 BearPaw Tutors Virginia	3	66.6	17	94.1
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	2	50.0	5	100.0
A Tree of Knowledge Educational Services, Inc.	3	66.7	3	66.7
"A+" Ability Plus, Inc.	9	66.7	54	78.1
A+ Markem	8	100.0	27	92.6
Academic Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC	5	100.0	41	85.3
Academic Tutoring Service	1	100.0	1	100.0
Academics Plus, Inc.	11	100.0	81	89.8
Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville, VA	3	100.0	19	84.3
Achieve HighPoints	NA	NA	2	100.0
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	14	92.8	119	87.4
Achieve Tutoring, LLC	3	100.0	15	73.4
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	8	100.0	41	70.7
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	2	100.0	10	100.0
ATS Project Success (formerly ATS Educational Consulting Services)	13	84.7	27	92.6
Babbage Net Schools	7	28.6	12	72.8
Believe-N-U (Community Business Group, LTD)	5	80.0	12	83.3
Blessings for You Childcare and Learning Center	1	100.0	3	100.0
Born To Be Great Youth Empowerment	3	100.0	8	100.0
Brame Institute of Education, Inc.	1	100.0	5	80.0
Bright Futures Learning Center	14	92.9	189	88.4
C2 Educational Systems, Inc. (C2 Educational Centers)	3	100.0	67	88.0
Capitol Education Support, Inc.	4	50.0	25	92.0
Charity Family Life, Inc.	2	100.0	3	66.7
Club Z! Inc.	11	81.8	88	84.1
Digital Network Group	3	NA	1	100.0
Discovery Program, Inc.	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dynamic Learning Corps, LLC	2	100.0	20	90.0
Educate Online Learning, LLC	3	NA	3	66.7
Educational Tutorial Service	3	33.3	2	100.0
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	1	100.0	2	100.0
Fairfax Co. Public Schools – A Boost for Mathematics	1	100.0	32	87.5
Fredericksburg Learning Enhancement Center	1	100.0	NA	NA
FreshWise, Inc. dba KnowledgePoints	6	83.4	50	77.8
Global Partnerships Schools, Inc.	2	0.0	NA	NA
Hamilton and Harris Educational Consulting Group	NA	NA	NA	NA
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	10	80.0	82	75.9
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	1	100.0	2	100.0
Innovadia (Online SES Tutors)	6	83.3	9	88.9
International Afterschool Program	2	50.0	7	100.0
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	2	50.0	2	100.0
Just Us Kidz Tutoring Program	2	50.0	NA	NA
Kinetic Potential Scholars	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table 6: Statewide SES Provider Overall Satisfaction for the 2009-2010 School Year, (Continued)

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services/pleased with the services that my child received.				
Provider Name	Division Coordinators		Parents	
	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	Percentage Strongly Agree or Agree
Kumon North America, Inc.	1	NA	NA	NA
L & U Contractors, LLC (Learning & You)	2	50.0	4	50.0
Lancaster County Public Schools	1	100.0	11	100.0
Mainstream Development Educational Group	1	100.0	4	100.0
MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.	NA	NA	1	100.0
Millennium Education Music Project	3	66.6	8	87.5
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	3	100.0	18	100.0
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	2	50.0	NA	NA
Professional Tutoring Services	2	100.0	1	100.0
Scholastic Educational Services, LLC	3	100.0	1	100.0
Shout Church, Inc. (Online)	1	NA	1	100.0
Stay on Top Tutoring Services, Inc.	1	100.0	1	100.0
Sylvan Learning Center in Chesapeake	NA	NA	5	100.0
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	4	100.0	15	86.7
Sylvan Learning Center - McLean, VA	3	66.6	14	85.8
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News Yorktown/Williamsburg	4	75.0	23	78.3
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond (formerly O'Dea Capital)	3	66.6	36	69.4
Sylvan Learning dba J & K Education - Christiansburg	1	NA	3	100.0
Sylvan Learning dba J & K Education - Roanoke	1	100.0	NA	NA
Sylvan/"Ace It!" Tutoring of Hampton Roads	2	100.0	92	89.1
The Achievement Academy, LLC	NA	NA	NA	NA
The Enrichment Centers NCLB, Inc.	9	88.9	37	84.8
The Learning Curve, Inc.	1	100.0	2	100.0
The Literacy Lab	2	100.0	17	94.1
The Richmond Outreach Center/ROC Tutoring	3	100.0	4	100.0
Total Tutors, LLC	12	91.7	177	88.1
Trust Tutoring	2	50.0	NA	NA
Tsquared Tutors, LLC	1	100.0	NA	NA
TutorFind	11	81.8	22	90.9
VA Learning Unlimited, LLC	1	NA	NA	NA

NA indicates that no surveys were submitted for this provider by the respondent and survey was submitted for this provider but there were no attendance data.

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 2009-2010 reading/language arts SOL Z-score of SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring was slightly higher than that of control students. Additionally, the adjusted average 2009-2010 mathematics SOL Z-score of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring was also higher than that of control students. The adjusted effect sizes* in both reading/language arts (+0.001) and mathematics (+0.07) were very small or small respectively.

It should be noted that the prior year SOL achievement of SES students in both subjects was statistically significantly *lower* than control students. However, after adjusting for prior year achievement, there was no statistically significant difference between SES and control students in either subject at the state level.

In addition, there was no statistically significant difference in prior year reading/language arts or mathematics achievement between SES students included (i.e., who had at least 18 hours of services) and SES students excluded (i.e., who had fewer than 18 hours of services) in the state-level analyses. Therefore, the outcomes for SES students do not appear to be a function of a difference in prior achievement of those students actually included in the analyses (i.e., that SES students included in the analyses were lower performing based on prior achievement).

At the provider level, after controlling for prior year achievement, one provider, The Literacy Lab, had a statistically significant difference in 2009-2010 SOL reading/language arts achievement, with students who received SES tutoring outscoring control students. The adjusted

*Finding that is statistically significant is one was not likely due to chance (i.e., the difference between groups in the sample population, and not just found by chance because of the samples of students actually used in the analyses). The effect size tells whether the difference between groups is large enough to be meaningful.

effect size of +0.60 was large, indicating that the mean (i.e., average) SOL score of the SES group was at the 73rd percentile of the control group. While not statistically significant, the adjusted mean 2009-2010 reading/language arts SOL Z-scores of SES students receiving reading/language arts tutoring from nine providers were higher than control students, while ten providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores compared to control students. Positive adjusted effect sizes in reading/language arts ranged from 0.01 (very small) to 0.28 (large), while negative adjusted effect sizes ranged from -0.01 (very small) to -0.51 (large).

While these differences were not statistically significant (i.e., could not be reasonably determined to be real differences and not just chance findings), the effect sizes provide an indication of the size of the difference between SES students and control students. The wide range in the size of both the positive and negative effect sizes indicates great diversity in the impacts of specific providers. While some providers appear to be making large positive impacts on the students they serve, others appear to not be adequately serving the needs of the students they serve. However, these effect size estimates may or may not be true estimates due to lack of statistical significance. Based on the data available for the current study, it is not possible to determine why particular providers are having positive or negative effects on student achievement.

In mathematics, the provider-level analysis did not detect a statistically significant difference in 2009-2010 mathematics SOL test results between the SES and control groups for any of the 13 providers included. While not statistically significant, the mean 2009-2010 adjusted SOL Z-scores of SES students receiving mathematics tutoring from nine providers were higher than control students, while four providers had lower adjusted mean Z-scores for SES students as compared to control students. Positive adjusted effect sizes in mathematics ranged from 0.001 (very small) to 0.35 (large), while negative adjusted effect sizes were all large, ranging from -0.26 to -0.41. As with the outcomes in reading/language arts, the wide range in

the size of both the positive and negative effect sizes indicates large disparities in the impacts of specific providers, with some providers making large positive impacts on the students they serve, and others appearing to not have adequately served the needs of their students.

It should be noted that the prior year SOL achievement of SES students served by one provider in mathematics, Huntington Learning Centers, Inc., was statistically significantly *lower* than control students. However, after adjusting for prior year achievement, there was no statistically significant difference between students who attended Huntington Learning Centers, Inc., and control students. Therefore, when that statistically significant disadvantage in prior achievement was controlled for, the scores of students from Huntington Learning Centers, Inc., were indistinguishable statistically from control students, indicating a positive trend in outcomes.

For the analyses of SOL proficiency levels of students designated as receiving special education services, approximately 55 percent of students designated as receiving special education services who received SES tutoring in reading/language arts took the SOL test while approximately 66 percent who received SES tutoring in mathematics took the SOL test. Without taking hours of attendance into account, 42.2 percent of the 358 students designated as receiving special education services across the 44 reading/language arts providers scored Proficient or Advanced in reading/language arts in 2009-10, up from 36.3 percent in 2008-2009. There were 426 students designated as receiving special education services who received mathematics tutoring and who had 2009-2010 SOL mathematics test scores. Without taking hours of attendance into account, 53.6 percent of students designated as receiving special education services across 48 providers scored Proficient or Advanced in Mathematics, up from 40.0 percent in 2008-2009. Overall, therefore, about half of students designated as receiving special education services who participated in SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests in 2009-2010. Appendix B provides detailed information regarding reading/language arts and mathematics proficiency level results.

Table 1: Summary of SES Provider-Level Findings for the 2009-2010 School Year

Reading/language arts: Only one SES provider, The Literacy Lab, was found to have a statistically significant positive impact on the students it served. Mathematics: No SES provider was found to have a statistically significant effect on the students it served.		
Provider	Number of SES Contracts in Reading/language arts	Number of SES Contracts in Mathematics
A. Providers included in provider-level analyses		
1-on- BearPaw Tutors Virginia	-	23
A+ Ability Plus, Inc.	59	48
A+ Markem	43	*
ATS Project Success	26	20
Academics Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC	*	24
Academic Plus, Inc.	69	*
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	93	36
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	42	-
Bright Futures Learning Center	118	66
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	*	37
Club Z! Inc.	60	55
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	39	-
Fairfax Co. Pub. Schools - A Boost for Mathematics	-	85
Fresh Wise, Inc.	64	30
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	77	21
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	30	*
Shout Church, Inc. (Online)	33	-
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond	19	*
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	52	*
Sylvan Learning dba J & K Education-Roanoke	20	-
Sylvan/"Ace It" Tutoring of Hampton Roads	60	60
The Enrichment Centers	46	-
The Literacy Lab	50	-
Total Tutors, LLC	236	91
B. Providers not included in provider-level analyses due to not meeting minimum student sample size **		
Reading/language arts	Mathematics	
A Plus Success, LLC dba KnowledgePoints (Abeyon)	A Tree of Knowledge Educational Services, Inc.	
Academic Tutoring Service	Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville, VA	
Ace It! Tutoring in Lynchburg and Danville, VA	Achieve Highpoints (SES from Datamatics, Inc.)	
Achieve Tutoring, LLC	Achieve Tutoring, LLC	
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc.	Babbage Net Schools	
Babbage Net Schools	Capitol Educational Support, Inc.	
Believe-N-U Youth Empowerment, LLC	Educate Online Learning, LLC	
Blessings for You Childcare and Learning Center	Innovadia (Online SES Tutors)	
Born To Be Great Youth Empowerment	International After School Program	
Capitol Educational Support, Inc.	Kinetic Potential Scholars	
Charity Family Life, Inc.	Kumon North America, Inc.	

**Table 1: Summary of SES Provider-Level Findings for the 2009-2010 School Year
(Continued)**

B. Providers not included in provider-level analyses due to not meeting minimum student sample size**	
Reading/language arts	Mathematics
Discovery Program, Inc.	L & U Contractors, LLC (Learning & You)
Dynamic Learning Corps, LLC	Mainstream Development Educational Group
Educational Tutoring Services	MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.
Fredericksburg Learning Enhancement Center	Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)
In-Agape Family Life and Educational Center	Sylvan Learning Center –McLean, VA
Innovadia (Online SES Tutors)	Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton
It Takes A Team Private Tutoring Services, LLC	Trust Tutoring
Just Us Kidz Tutoring Program	Tsquared Tutors, LLC
Kinetic Potential Scholars	TutorFind
Kumon North America, Inc.	
L & U Contractors, LLC (Learning & You)	
MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.	
Millennium Education Music Project	
Porter Education and Communications, Inc. (PE&C)	
Scholastic Educational Services, LLC	
Stay on Top Tutoring Services, Inc.	
Sylvan Learning Center – McLean, VA	
Sylvan Learning Center in Hampton	
Sylvan Learning dba J&K Education-Christiansburg	
The Learning Curve	
The Richmond Outreach Center/ROC Tutoring	
Trust Tutoring	
TutorFind	
C. Providers not included in provider-level analyses due to test data issues or inclusion criteria***	
Reading/language arts	Mathematics
Brame Institute of Education, Inc.	Brame Institute of Education, Inc.
Global Partnership Schools, Inc.	Professional Tutoring Services
Lancaster County Public Schools	Scholastic Educational Services, LLC
Mainstream Development Educational Group	
Professional Tutoring Services	

-Provider did not offer tutoring service in the subject area.

*Provider did not have at least 10 students to be analyzed in the subject area after excluding students not in grades four through eight, students designated as receiving special education services, and students with fewer than 18 hours of SES tutoring.

**Students served by these providers could not be analyzed at all because the number of students was too few (i.e., fewer than 10) to produce meaningful results after excluding students not in grades four through eight, students designated as receiving special education services, and students with fewer than 18 hours of SES tutoring.

***Students served by these providers could not be analyzed at all because they either did not have legitimate achievement scores (i.e., SOL scores within the proper scale score range) or were not in grades four through eight.

Note: Table reflects the actual number of contracts provided by provider.

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

For the pilot school analysis, while not statistically significant, the adjusted average 2009-2010 reading/language arts SOL Z-score of SES students in pilot schools receiving reading/language arts tutoring was lower than that of SES students from non-pilot schools. The adjusted average 2009-2010 mathematics SOL Z-score of SES students in pilot schools receiving mathematics tutoring was also lower than that of SES students in non-pilot schools. In both cases, the adjusted effect sizes in reading/language arts (-0.07) and mathematics (-0.04) were small. Therefore, the statistical analyses showed no basis for concluding that SOL achievement was statistically significantly different between SES students who attended and did not attend schools that participated in the pilot program. It should be noted that the prior year SOL reading/language arts scores of SES students attending pilot program schools were statistically significantly *lower* than control students. This is due to the fact that most control students performed better than SES students. The matched control students scored an average of 5 scale score points higher than the SES students.

Appendix B contains student achievement outcomes tables for the state-level, provider-level, and pilot school analyses in addition to the tables of outcomes for the analyses of students designated as receiving special education services.

Conclusions

During the 2009-2010 school year, division coordinators and parents who submitted surveys offered mostly favorable responses concerning SES providers serving students in Virginia. The majority of division coordinator responses were positive regarding provider services overall. Likewise, responding parents were predominantly pleased with the tutoring services their child received. The large majority of parent respondents were very satisfied with division and school personnel support. Provider responses were primarily favorable concerning their experiences with SES in Virginia during the 2009-2010 school year.

Overall, the statistical analyses of SOL outcomes between SES students and matched control students found in nearly all cases that after controlling for prior year achievement, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in SOL achievement in 2009-2010. Only one analysis found a statistically significant difference between SES students and matched control students: At the provider level, one SES provider, The Literacy Lab, had a statistically significant positive impact on the students it served in reading/language arts, with a large adjusted effect size (0.60). No other individual providers in reading/language arts and none of the individual providers in mathematics had a statistically significant difference in SOL outcomes, either positive or negative for SES students, compared to control students. While not statistically significant, a larger percentage of individual providers in reading/language arts (53 percent) had *lower* adjusted effect sizes for SES students compared to control students, while a larger percentage of individual providers in mathematics (69 percent) had *higher* adjusted effect sizes for SES students compared to control students.

No statistically significant differences were found between SES students and control students at the state level in either reading/language arts or mathematics. Also, no statistically significant difference in SOL outcomes was found in either subject between SES students who

attended schools participating in the school choice reversal pilot program and SES students in schools not participating in the pilot. Adjusted effect sizes for the state analyses were positive in both subjects (with the adjusted effect size in mathematics being larger), while the adjusted effect sizes for the pilot analyses were negative in both subjects (with the adjusted effect size in mathematics being smaller (e.g., better)). Therefore, while the analyses at the state level and for the pilot program analyses were not statistically significant (i.e., could not be reasonably determined to be real differences and not just chance findings), the effect size estimates indicate a positive trend for the state analyses and a negative trend for the pilot analyses. Finally, about half of students designated as receiving special education services who received SES tutoring scored Proficient or Advanced on 2009-2010 SOL reading/language arts and mathematics tests, with the percentage in mathematics higher than in reading/language arts and the percentage increasing in both subjects from the previous year. Therefore, it appears that SES impacts were stronger in mathematics compared to reading/language arts.

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. In reading/language arts, 17 of the 20 providers included had fewer than 30 students, while in mathematics, 10 of the 13 providers included had fewer than 20 students. 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 reasonably expect a limited number of hours of tutoring to make dramatic changes in achievement. However, despite the natural and context-specific limitations of the achievement analyses, the present results provide evidence that

one provider, The Literacy Lab, was able to assist SES students in achieving statistically significantly higher SOL reading/language arts scale scores compared to control students.

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: 2010-2011 Virginia SES Questionnaires

Figure A 1: Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire

[Home](#)

Center for Research in Educational Policy

The University of Memphis

Supplemental Educational Services
Provider Questionnaire

Commonwealth of Virginia, Academic Year 2009-2010

I: Supplemental Educational Services Provider Information

Provider Name: _____

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 number of sessions attended by students each week

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

3. Length of the average tutoring session

- .5 to 1.0 hour
- 1.5 to 2 hours
- 2.5 to 3 hours
- Other _____

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)

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

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

Figure A 1: Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire (Continued)

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

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

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

	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	Don't Know
9. Student attendance	<input type="radio"/>				
10. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	<input type="radio"/>				
11. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	<input type="radio"/>				
12. Parent cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
13. Teacher cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
14. Principal Parent cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				

Figure A 1: Virginia SES Provider Questionnaire, (Continued)

15. Division SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
16. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
17. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	<input type="radio"/>				

Overall Impressions

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

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

20. Additional Comments/Recommendations

Figure A 2: Virginia SES Division Coordinator Questionnaire

**Supplemental Educational Services
Division Coordinator Questionnaire**

Commonwealth of Virginia, Academic Year 2009-2010

Section II: Assess SES Providers

In this section, you will rate each SES provider serving students in your division.

Provider Name: _____

Division Name: _____

Title of Person Completing this Survey:

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often did the provider...	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all		
1. Communicate with you during the school year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		

	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Don't Know
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The provider...	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
6. Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.	<input type="radio"/>				
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	<input type="radio"/>				
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	<input type="radio"/>				
9. Offered services to students with disabilities.	<input type="radio"/>				
10. Offered services to ELL students.	<input type="radio"/>				
11. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	<input type="radio"/>				
12. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	<input type="radio"/>				

Overall provider assessment:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
13. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	<input type="radio"/>				
14. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	<input type="radio"/>				

Additional Comments

15. Additional comments

Back
Print
Save as a draft
Submit

Figure A 3: 2009-2010 Virginia SES Parent Questionnaire (English version)

Refierase al dorso para español



11205

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

2008 © Pask, 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 a No. 2 pencil

● 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		
0	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8
9	0	1
2	3	4
5	6	7
8	9	0
1	2	3
4	5	6
7	8	9
0	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8
9	0	1

Division Code	
0	1
2	3
4	5
6	7
8	9
0	1
2	3
4	5
6	7
8	9
0	1
2	3
4	5
6	7
8	9

Example: 36	
0	1
2	3
4	5
6	7
8	9
0	1
2	3
4	5
6	7
8	9
0	1
2	3
4	5
6	7
8	9

Indicate your response to each of the following items.

How often did the tutoring company...

1. Talk to you about your child's progress?
 A lot Sometimes Not at all

2. Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?
 A lot Sometimes Not at all

3. Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?
 A lot Sometimes Not at all Don't know

4. Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?
 A lot Sometimes Not at all Don't know

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

5. I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

6. I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

7. Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

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

8. I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

9. I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

10. I am pleased with the way my school division helped me get free tutoring for my child.
 Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

Comments:

Appendix B: Student Achievement Analysis Tables

Table B 1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
1-on-1 BearPaw Tutors Virginia	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.870	1.049
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.667	1.051
	Effect Size	NA			$g=-0.19$		
	Percentile Standing	NA			0.42		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			MSE=1.102; F=0.23; p=0.640		
A+ Ability Plus	SES Students	14	-0.495	0.660	11	-0.496	1.036
	Control students	14	-0.404	0.591	11	-0.398	0.734
	Effect Size	$g= -0.14$			$g=-0.11$		
	Percentile Standing	0.44			0.46		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.392; F=0.15; p=.704			MSE=0.805; F=0.06; p=0.802		
A+ Markem	SES Students	20	-0.833	1.075	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	20	-0.587	0.977	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g= -0.23$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.41			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=1.055; F=0.57; p=0.454			NA		
ATS Project Success	SES Students	13	-0.513	0.784	15	-0.355	0.906
	Control students	13	-0.365	0.586	15	-0.111	0.791
	Effect Size	$g= -0.21$			$g=-0.28$		
	Percentile Standing	0.42			0.39		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.479; F=0.30; p=0.589			MSE=0.723; F=0.62; p=0.438		
Academic Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	11	-0.286	1.030
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	11	-0.264	0.940
	Effect Size	NA			$g=-0.02$		
	Percentile Standing	NA			0.49		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			MSE=0.972; F=0.00; p=0.959		
Academics Plus, Inc.	SES Students	24	-0.573	0.777	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	24	-0.414	0.799	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g= -0.17$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.43			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.621; F=0.49; p=0.487			NA		
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	SES Students	27	-0.385	0.998	12	-0.231	1.025
	Control students	27	-0.151	0.937	12	-0.315	0.713
	Effect Size	$g= -0.24$			$g=-0.09$		
	Percentile Standing	0.41			0.54		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.937; F=0.79; p=0.377			MSE=0.779; F=0.05; p=0.818		

Table B 1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Alighted Interventions Educational Services	SES Students	27	-0.494	0.776	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	27	-0.287	0.899	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.24$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.41			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.705; F=0.81; p=0.371$			NA		
Bright Futures Learning Center	SES Students	48	-0.206	1.147	31	-0.382	0.857
	Control students	48	-0.078	1.011	31	-0.236	0.788
	Effect Size	$g = -0.12$			$g = -0.18$		
	Percentile Standing	0.45			0.43		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=1.170; F=0.34; p=0.563$			$MSE=0.669; F=0.49; p=0.485$		
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.426	0.499
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.527	0.374
	Effect Size	NA			$g = -0.22$		
	Percentile Standing	NA			0.59		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			$MSE=0.194; F=0.31; p=0.581$		
Club Z! Inc.	SES Students	15	-0.660	1.021	28	-0.178	0.884
	Control students	15	-0.092	1.025	28	-0.112	0.804
	Effect Size	$g = -0.54$			$g = -0.08$		
	Percentile Standing	0.29			0.47		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=1.046; F=2.31; p=0.139$			$MSE=0.714; F=0.09; p=0.771$		
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	SES Students	22	-0.827	0.785	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	22	-0.471	0.942	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.40$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.34			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.751; F=1.85; p=0.181$			NA		
Fairfax County Public Schools – A Boost for Mathematics	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	44	-0.747	0.760
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	44	-0.426	0.948
	Effect Size	NA			$g = -0.37$		
	Percentile Standing	NA			0.36		
	One-way ANOVA	NA			$MSE=0.738; F=3.08; p=0.083$		
Fresh Wise, Inc.	SES Students	19	-0.312	0.991	19	-0.166	0.877
	Control students	19	-0.339	0.825	19	0.073	1.062
	Effect Size	$g = 0.03$			$g = -0.24$		
	Percentile Standing	0.51			0.41		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.831; F=0.01; p=0.928$			$MSE=0.949; F=0.57; p=0.455$		

Table B 1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	SES Students	54	-0.605	0.970	18	-0.875	0.701
	Control students	54	-0.255	0.908	18	0.093	0.889
	Effect Size	$g = -0.37$			$g = -1.18^{**}$		
	Percentile Standing	0.36			0.12		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.882; F=3.74; p=0.056$			$MSE=0.641; F=13.16; p=0.001$		
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	SES Students	21	-0.406	0.934	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	21	-0.124	1.252	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.25$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.40			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=1.219; F=0.68; p=0.413$			NA		
Shout Church, Inc. (Online)	SES Students	29	-0.706	0.898	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	29	-0.643	0.754	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.07$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.47			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.687; F=0.08; p=0.777$			NA		
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond	SES Students	11	-0.528	1.066	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	11	-0.522	1.109	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.01$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.50			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=1.183; F=0.00; p=0.990$			NA		
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	SES Students	28	-0.452	0.914	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	28	-0.358	0.697	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.12$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.46			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.661; F=0.19; p=0.667$			NA		
Sylvan Learning dba J & K Educaiton-Roanoke	SES Students	14	-0.029	0.950	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	14	-0.199	0.716	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = 0.20$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.58			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.707; F=0.28; p=0.598$			NA		
Sylvan/"Ace It!" Tutoring of Hampton Roads	SES Students	18	-1.108	0.936	15	-0.974	1.065
	Control students	18	-0.541	0.894	15	-0.436	0.737
	Effect Size	$g = -0.61$			$g = -0.57$		
	Percentile Standing	0.27			0.28		
	One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.837; F=3.46; p=0.072$			$MSE=0.839; F=2.59; p=0.119$		

Table B 1: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
The Enrichment Centers NCLB, Inc.	SES Students	26	-0.184	1.032	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	26	0.003	0.854	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.19$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.42			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.897; F=0.51; p=0.479			NA		
The Literacy Lab	SES Students	15	-0.648	0.887	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	15	-0.578	0.765	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.08$			NA		
	Percentile Standing	0.47			NA		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.687; F=0.05; p=0.819			NA		
Total Tutors, LLC	SES Students	113	-0.482	0.907	18	-0.420	0.798
	Control students	113	-0.301	0.930	18	-0.360	0.949
	Effect Size	$g = -0.20$			$g = -0.07$		
	Percentile Standing	0.42			0.47		
	One-way ANOVA	MSE=0.844; F=2.22; p=0.138			MSE=0.768; F=0.04; p=0.839		

*Hedges' g corrected for small samples. The 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 B 2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
1-on-1 BearPaw Tutors Virginia	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.387	1.078	-0.338
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.358	1.015	-0.407
	Effect Size	NA				$g = -0.03$			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.49			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				$g = 0.06$			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.52			
	ANCOVA	NA				MSE=0.885; F=0.03; p=0.861			
A+ Ability Plus	SES Students	14	-0.289	0.672	-0.251	11	-0.183	0.859	-0.158
	Control students	14	-0.171	0.818	-0.209	11	-0.326	0.958	-0.351
	Effect Size	$g = -0.15$				$g = 0.15$			
	Percentile Standing	0.44				0.56			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = -0.05$				$g = 0.20$			
	Percentile Standing	0.48				0.58			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.294; F=0.04; p=0.842				MSE=0.646; F=0.32; p=0.580			
A+ Markem	SES Students	20	-0.613	0.912	-0.553	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	20	-0.488	0.711	-0.548	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.15$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.44				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = -0.01$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.50				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.424; F=0.00; p=0.983				NA			
ATS Project Success	SES Students	13	-0.435	0.714	-0.368	15	-0.054	1.206	0.058
	Control students	13	-0.307	1.014	-0.374	15	-0.048	0.747	-0.160
	Effect Size	$g = -0.14$				$g = -0.01$			
	Percentile Standing	0.44				0.50			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.01$				$g = 0.21$			
	Percentile Standing	0.50				0.58			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.395; F=0.00; p=0.979				MSE=0.410; F=0.85; p=0.364			
Academics Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	-0.100	1.158	-0.093
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	0.272	0.852	0.265
	Effect Size	NA				$g = -0.35$			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.36			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				$g = -0.34$			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.37			
	ANCOVA	NA				MSE=0.682; F=1.04; p=0.322			

Table B 2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Academics Plus, Inc.	SES Students	24	-0.093	1.117	-0.137	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	24	-0.275	0.714	-0.331	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = 0.17$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.57				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.21$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.59				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.583; F=0.77; $p=0.384$				NA			
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors)	SES Students	27	-0.384	1.095	-0.297	12	-0.191	0.914	-0.228
	Control students	27	-0.022	0.836	-0.108	12	0.009	1.081	0.045
	Effect Size	$g = -0.37$				$g = -0.19$			
	Percentile Standing	0.36				0.42			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = -0.19$				$g = -0.26$			
	Percentile Standing	0.42				0.40			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.451; F=1.05; $p=0.310$				MSE=0.430; F=1.04; $p=0.319$			
Aligned Interventions Educational Services	SES Students	27	-0.487	0.797	-0.430	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	27	-0.464	0.764	-0.520	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = -0.03$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.49				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.11$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.54				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.406; F=0.27; $p=0.608$				NA			
Bright Futures Learning Center	SES Students	48	-0.292	1.076	-0.246	31	-0.007	0.868	0.038
	Control students	48	0.052	1.047	0.006	31	-0.149	1.059	-0.194
	Effect Size	$g = -0.32$				$g = 0.14$			
	Percentile Standing	0.37				0.56			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = -0.24$				$g = 0.24$			
	Percentile Standing	0.41				0.59			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.525; F=2.89; $p=0.092$				MSE=0.693; F=1.20; $p=0.278$			
C2 Educational Systems, Inc.	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	0.156	0.912	0.116
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	-0.205	0.596	-0.166
	Effect Size	NA				$g = 0.45$			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.67			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				$g = 0.35$			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.64			
	ANCOVA	NA				MSE=0.500; F=0.94; $p=0.342$			

Table B 2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Club Z! Inc.	SES Students	15	-0.400	0.759	-0.249	28	0.170	1.071	0.195
	Control students	15	-0.189	1.085	-0.340	28	0.015	1.093	-0.011
	Effect Size	g= -0.22				g= 0.14			
	Percentile Standing	0.41				0.56			
	Adj. Effect Size	g= 0.09				g= 0.19			
	Percentile Standing	0.54				0.58			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.602; F=0.10; p=0.760				MSE=0.752; F=0.79; p=0.379			
Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO)	SES Students	22	-0.870	0.737	-0.770	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	22	-0.231	1.179	-0.331	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	g= -0.64				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.26				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	g= -0.44				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.33				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.670; F=0.58; p=0.450				NA			
Fairfax County Public Schools – A Boost for Mathematics	SES Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	44	-0.319	1.012	-0.187
	Control students	NA	NA	NA	NA	44	-0.255	0.993	-0.388
	Effect Size	NA				g= -0.06			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.48			
	Adj. Effect Size	NA				g= 0.20			
	Percentile Standing	NA				0.58			
	ANCOVA	NA				MSE=0.508; F=1.69; p=0.197			
FreshWise, Inc.	SES Students	19	-0.125	0.957	-0.131	19	0.174	0.819	0.225
	Control students	19	-0.353	0.578	-0.347	19	0.636	0.885	0.584
	Effect Size	g= 0.28				g= -0.53			
	Percentile Standing	0.61				0.30			
	Adj. Effect Size	g= 0.28				g= -0.41			
	Percentile Standing	0.61				0.34			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.451; F=0.98; p=0.329				MSE=0.561; F=2.14; p=0.153			
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	SES Students	54	-0.553	0.810	-0.449	18	-0.823	0.962	-0.361
	Control students	54	-0.141	0.943	-0.245	18	0.100	0.988	-0.362
	Effect Size	g= -0.47				g= -0.93			
	Percentile Standing	0.32				0.18			
	Adj. Effect Size	g= -0.23				g= 0.001			
	Percentile Standing	0.41				0.50			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.462; F=2.34; p=0.129				MSE=0.433; F=1.76; p=0.196			

Table B 2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
NonPublic Educational Services, Inc. (NESI)	SES Students	21	-0.169	1.230	-0.080	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	21	-0.059	1.283	-0.149	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.09				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.46				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>g</i> = 0.05				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.52				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=1.042; F=0.35; p=0.555				NA			
Shout Church, Inc. (Online)	SES Students	29	-0.768	0.692	-0.752	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	29	-0.844	0.839	-0.859	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>g</i> = 0.10				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.54				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>g</i> = 0.14				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.56				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.423; F=0.39; p=0.534				NA			
Sylvan Learning Center Richmond	SES Students	11	-0.742	0.648	-0.740	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	11	-0.330	1.320	-0.332	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.38				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.35				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.38				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.35				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.530; F=1.73; p=0.205				NA			
Sylvan Learning Centers Newport News-Yorktown/Williamsburg	SES Students	28	-0.156	0.862	-0.130	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	28	0.049	0.756	0.023	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.25				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.40				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.19				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.42				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.470; F=0.70; p=0.407				NA			
Sylvan Learning dba J &K Education-Roanoke	SES Students	14	-0.372	0.749	-0.372	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	14	0.033	0.911	0.015	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.39				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.35				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	<i>g</i> = -0.51				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.31				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.486; F=2.69; p=0.113				NA			

Table B 2: SES Program Effect at the Provider-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*) (Continued)

Provider	Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Sylvan/ "Ace It!" Tutoring of Hampton Roads	SES Students	18	-0.963	0.857	-0.845	15	-0.882	0.790	-0.702
	Control students	18	-0.614	0.822	-0.732	15	-0.189	0.980	-0.369
	Effect Size	$g = -0.41$				$g = -0.76$			
	Percentile Standing	0.34				0.22			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = -0.13$				$g = -0.36$			
	Percentile Standing	0.45				0.36			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.576; F=0.18; $p=0.675$				MSE=0.433; F=1.76; $p=0.196$			
The Enrichment Centers NCLB, Inc.	SES Students	26	-0.135	0.890	-0.074	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	26	-0.280	0.996	-0.342	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = 0.15$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.56				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.28$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.61				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.513; F=1.80; $p=0.186$				NA			
The Literacy Lab	SES Students	15	-0.013	1.115	0.017	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Control students	15	-0.563	0.846	-0.594	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Effect Size	$g = 0.54$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.71				NA			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.60^{**}$				NA			
	Percentile Standing	0.73 ^{**}				NA			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.461; F=6.08; $p=0.020$				NA			
Total Tutors, LLC	SES Students	113	-0.249	0.837	-0.194	18	-0.147	1.004	-0.125
	Control students	113	-0.324	1.003	-0.379	18	-0.220	1.039	-0.243
	Effect Size	$g = 0.08$				$g = 0.07$			
	Percentile Standing	0.53				0.53			
	Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.08$				$g = 0.11$			
	Percentile Standing	0.53				0.54			
	ANCOVA	MSE=0.545; F=3.54; $p=0.061$				MSE=0.640; F=0.20; $p=0.661$			

*Hedges' g corrected for small samples. The 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. The adjusted effect size was computed as the mean difference of achievement adjusted Z-scores (i.e., adjusted for prior year achievement) divided by the pooled standard deviation. Effect sizes exceeding +/-0.25 were considered meaningful and fairly strong.

**Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table B 3: SES Program Effect at the State-Level: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g*)

Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
SES Students	662	-0.479	0.959	326	-0.455	0.916
Control students	662	-0.307	0.919	326	-0.234	0.876
Effect Size	$g = -0.18^{**}$			$g = -0.25^{**}$		
Percentile Standing	0.43			0.40		
One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.882; F=11.06; p=0.001$			$MSE=0.803; F=9.89; p=0.002$		

*Hedges's g corrected for small samples

**Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table B 4: SES Program Effect at the State-Level: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g*)

Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
SES Students	662	-0.368	0.924	-0.314	326	-0.134	0.982	-0.056
Control students	662	-0.262	0.957	-0.315	326	-0.042	0.986	-0.121
Effect Size	$g = -0.11$				$g = -0.09$			
Percentile Standing	0.46				0.46			
Adj. Effect Size	$g = 0.001$				$g = 0.07$			
Percentile Standing	0.50				0.53			
ANCOVA	$MSE=0.546; F=0.00; p=0.979$				$MSE=0.560; F=1.21; p=0.271$			

*Hedges's g corrected for small samples

Table B 5: Pilot School Effect: Matched Pairs Prior Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g*)

Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pilot students	130	-0.600	0.997	91	-0.396	0.919
Nonpilot students	130	-0.352	0.971	91	-0.214	0.928
Effect Size	$g = -0.25^{**}$			$g = -0.16$		
Percentile Standing	0.40			0.44		
One-way ANOVA	$MSE=0.968; F=4.13; p=0.043$			$MSE=0.853; F=1.76; p=0.186$		

*Hedges's g corrected for small samples

**Statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table B 6: Pilot School Effect: Matched Pairs Current Year (2009-2010) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*)

Group	Reading/language arts				Mathematics			
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
Pilot students	130	-0.351	0.956	-0.271	91	0.028	1.166	0.100
Nonpilot students	130	-0.122	0.948	-0.202	91	0.209	1.074	0.138
Effect Size	$g = -0.24$				$g = -0.04$			
Percentile Standing	0.41				0.48			
Adj. Effect Size	$g = -0.07$				$g = -0.04$			
Percentile Standing	0.47				0.48			
ANCOVA	$MSE=0.508; F=0.60; p=0.440$				$MSE=0.731; F=0.09; p=0.767$			

*Hedges's g corrected for small samples

Table B 7: State-Level: Students Included vs. Students Excluded Prior Year (2008-2009) Standard Score Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Sizes (g^*)

Group	Reading/language arts			Mathematics		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Students Included	666	-0.485	0.960	326	-0.455	0.916
Students Excluded	405	-0.442	0.991	334	-0.439	0.915
Effect Size	$g = -0.07$			$g = -0.02$		
Percentile Standing	0.47			0.49		
ANOVA	$MSE=0.944; F=0.51; p=0.476$			$MSE=0.838; F=0.06; p=0.815$		

*Hedges's g corrected for small samples.

Table B 8: All Students by SOL Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	254	257	34,336	35,794	12.4	12.6	33.1	34.5
Proficient	989	1,148	53,278	53,156	48.5	56.3	51.4	51.3
Basic	648	523	13,912	12,509	31.8	25.6	13.4	12.1
Below Basic	134	105	2,077	2,144	6.6	5.1	2.0	2.1
Not Available	16	*	20	20	0.8	*	0.0	0.0
Total	2,041	2,041	103,623	103,623	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Too few students to report information (less than 10).

Table B9: Sample for State-Level Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	78	91	96	103	11.8	13.8	14.5	15.6
Proficient	328	370	371	389	49.6	55.9	56.0	58.8
Basic	218	178	166	143	32.9	26.9	25.1	21.6
Below Basic	38	23	29	27	5.7	3.5	4.4	4.1
Total	662	662	662	662	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table B 10: All Students by SOL Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	362	563	42,309	46,891	15.9	24.8	39.3	43.6
Proficient	1,018	1,046	47,117	44,014	44.8	46.0	43.8	40.9
Basic	746	519	15,883	14,164	32.8	22.8	14.8	13.2
Below Basic	132	136	2,230	2,383	5.8	6.0	2.1	2.2
Not Available	14	*	57	144	0.6	*	0.1	0.1
Total	2,272	2,272	107,596	107,596	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Too few students to report information (less than 10).

Table B10: Sample for State-Level Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	SES Students		Control Students		SES Students		Control Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	48	95	67	107	15.1	29.1	20.6	32.8
Proficient	153	142	170	147	46.9	43.6	52.2	45.1
Basic	111	76	81	60	34.1	23.3	24.9	18.4
Below Basic	14	13	*	12	4.3	4.0	*	3.7
Total	326	326	326	326	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Too few students to report information (less than 10).

Table B 11: Sample for Pilot Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students		Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	13	15	19	24	10.0	11.5	14.6	18.5
Proficient	60	74	65	72	46.2	56.9	50.0	55.4
Basic	47	36	41	34	36.2	27.7	31.5	26.2
Below Basic	10	*	*	0	7.7	*	*	0.0
Total	130	130	130	130	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Too few students to report information (less than 10).

Table B 12: Sample for Pilot Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number				Percentage			
	Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students		Pilot Students		Nonpilot Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	9	29	14	30	9.9	31.9	15.4	33.0
Proficient	51	39	52	47	56.0	42.9	57.1	51.7
Basic	27	18	22	11	29.7	19.8	24.2	12.1
Below Basic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total	91	91	91	91	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Too few students to report information (less than 10).

Table B13: Sample for Special Education Analysis by Proficiency Level: Reading/language arts

Proficiency Level	Number		Percentage	
	SES Students		SES Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	16	21	5.5	5.9
Proficient	89	130	30.8	36.3
Basic	130	143	45.0	39.9
Below Basic	54	64	18.7	17.9
Total	289	358	100.0	100.0

Table B 14: Sample for Special Education Analysis by Proficiency Level: Mathematics

Proficiency Level	Number		Percentage	
	SES Students		SES Students	
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Advanced	18	54	5.0	12.7
Proficient	126	174	35.0	40.9
Basic	166	152	46.1	35.7
Below Basic	50	46	13.9	10.8
Total	360	426	100.0	100.0