



# Supplemental Educational Services in the State of West Virginia

Evaluation Report for 2011-2012



Office of Research  
Division of Curriculum and Instruction



**WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF EDUCATION  
2012-2013**

**L. Wade Linger Jr.**, President  
**Gayle C. Manchin**, Vice President  
**Robert W. Dunlevy**, Secretary

**Michael I. Green**, Member  
**Priscilla M. Haden**, Member  
**Lloyd G. Jackson II**, Member  
**Lowell E. Johnson**, Member  
**Jenny N. Phillips**, Member  
**William M. White**, Member

**Paul L. Hill**, Ex Officio  
Chancellor  
West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

**James L. Skidmore**, Ex Officio  
Chancellor  
West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education

**Jorea M. Marple**, Ex Officio  
State Superintendent of Schools  
West Virginia Department of Education

# Supplemental Educational Services in the State of West Virginia

---

Evaluation Report for 2011–2012

Anduamlak Meharie

**West Virginia Department of Education**

Division of Teaching and Learning

Office of Research

Building 6-Room 722 State Capitol Complex

1900 Kanawha Boulevard East

Charleston, WV 25305

<http://wvde.state.wv.us/>

**August 2012**

**Jorea M. Marple**

*State Superintendent of Schools*

West Virginia Department of Education

**Robert Hull**

*Associate Superintendent*

West Virginia Department of Education

**Larry J. White**

*Executive Director*

Office of Research

**Suggested Citation**

Meharie, Anduamlak (2012). *Supplemental educational services in the state of West Virginia: Evaluation report for 2011–2012*. Charleston, WV: West Virginia Department of Education, Division of Teaching and Learning, Office of Research.

**Content Contact**

Anduamlak Meharie, Ph.D.

*Coordinator*

Office of Research

[ameharie@access.k12.wv.us](mailto:ameharie@access.k12.wv.us)

## Executive Summary

---

Presented in this report are findings of an evaluation of the 2011-2012 supplemental educational services (SES) program in West Virginia, conducted by the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE), Office of Research. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to examine SES provider effectiveness by analyzing (a) achievement outcomes of students who received SES and (b) the perceptions of key stakeholders in participating school districts in West Virginia. A second goal of this evaluation was to fulfill federal evaluation and monitoring requirements.

SES is a component of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), which provides extra academic assistance for eligible children. Specifically, students are eligible to receive these services if they are from low-income families and are attending Title I schools that are in their 2nd year or more of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress [AYP] for 3 or more years), are in corrective action, or are in restructuring status.

During the 2011-2012 school year, 15 school districts in West Virginia were required to offer supplemental educational services because they had school(s) that did not meet AYP for 3 or more years. Statewide, 35 individual tutoring providers were authorized by the WVDE to provide services.

The evaluation study was conducted in two parts:

1. WVDE researchers examined the question, *How have students served by SES providers performed, compared to other students, in terms of reading and mathematics?* For this part of the study, WVDE researchers conducted analyses using the 2011-2012 reading/language arts (RLA) and math score data from the West Virginia Educational Standards Test 2 (WESTEST 2) for Grades 3 through 8.
2. WVDE researchers also investigated stakeholder perceptions about SES implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students receiving SES.

### **Achievement outcomes of students who received SES**

The purpose of the student achievement analysis component of the evaluation was to document academic achievement outcomes for students who received SES during the 2011-2012 school year. Note: student participation data were collected for students who received services until the end of April, approximately 1–4 weeks prior to the administration of WESTEST 2, which took place May 7–25, 2012.

#### *Reading/language arts summary*

Regarding those students for whom 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels were available, the following observations were made:

- Overall, the percentage of SES-participating students with scores at proficient levels was smaller than the median percentage of students who scored at proficient in each of four other comparison groups: (a) students at SES-eligible schools where some students took advantage of SES services; (b) students at SES-eligible schools where no students took advantage of SES services; (c) all other Title I schools across WV; and (d) all remaining (non-Title I) schools. This comparison was limited to low socio-economic status students in Grades 3 through 8 from schools with 10 or more students tested.
- Two providers had at least 10 students available for analysis: Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) 1 and RESA 3.

Of these providers, the proportion of tutored students with scores at a proficient level was lower than the median proficiency percentage of the comparison group schools.

For students who had 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels available and who completed at least 50% of their tutoring contract, the following observations were made:

- Only RESA 1 had at least 10 students available for analysis.  
The percent of students tutored by this provider who reached proficiency was lower than the median percentage proficient among the four other comparable groups.

### *Mathematics summary*

For students who had 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels available, the following observations were made:

- Two providers had at least 10 students available for analysis: RESA 1 and RESA 3.  
RESA 3 demonstrated a median proficiency percentage similar to the four other comparable groups, for students who received RLA and math tutoring combined.

For students who had 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels available and completed at least 50% of their tutoring contract, the following observations were made:

- Only RESA 1 had at least 10 students available for analysis.  
The percent proficiency level of students tutored by this provider was lower than the median proficiency percentage of the four other comparable groups.

## **Summary of stakeholder perceptions about implementation and outcomes**

The summary of findings of stakeholder perceptions is presented in alignment with each of the research questions established for the study. The results summarized below exclude “I don’t know” responses to each survey item. A general discussion follows the presentation of the results of the evaluation questions.

### *1. Do local education agencies (LEAs) make SES available to eligible students?*

- All *principal/site coordinator* submissions (100%;  $n = 7$  of 7) strongly agree or agree they were satisfied with how their district helped their school implement services delivered by SES providers.

- The majority of respondent *parents* (90.3%;  $n = 28$  of 31) strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the way the district helped them get tutoring services to their child.
2. *Do schools and providers work together to meet the needs of eligible SES students?*
- Half of *provider* respondents reported that tutors showed their lesson plans or materials to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they tutored (50% indicated frequently or often;  $n = 5$  of 10).
  - More than half of *district coordinator* responses noted that providers never or seldom collaborated with them to set goals for student growth (55.5%;  $n = 5$  of 9).
  - Only 25% of *principal/site coordinator* submissions ( $n = 2$  of 8) stated that collaboration with tutors to set goals for student growth occurred either frequently or often.
  - Less than half of *teacher* submissions indicated that provider collaboration to set goals for student growth transpired either frequently or often (43.2%;  $n = 16$  of 37).
3. *What are district coordinators', principals'/site coordinators', teachers', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?*
- Almost all *district coordinators* (83.3%;  $n = 5$  of 6) either strongly agreed or agreed that the services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement.
  - All *principal/site coordinator* submissions (100%;  $n = 6$  of 6) strongly agreed or agreed that providers' services positively impacted student achievement.
  - The vast majority of *teacher* responses indicated that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (93.3% strongly agree or agree;  $n = 28$  of 30).
  - The majority of *parents* believed that providers' services helped their child in school (87.1% strongly agree or agree; 27 of 31).
4. *Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?*
- Responses from *providers* who participated in the evaluation indicated that their tutors communicated more frequently or often with parents regarding students' progress (100%,  $n = 10$  of 10) compared with communication with teachers regarding progress of their students (60%;  $n = 6$  of 10).
  - Most *district coordinator* respondents reported that providers communicated with them either frequently or often during the school year (81.8%;  $n = 9$  of 11).
  - Only half of *principal/site coordinator* responses indicated that providers communicated with them during the school year either frequently or often (50%;  $n = 4$  of 8).
  - Only 48.6% of *teachers* indicated that providers communicated with them either frequently or often during the school year ( $n = 18$  of 37).

- Only slightly more than half of responding *parents* reported that providers talked to them about their child's progress and a slightly greater number of parents indicated that providers sent letters/notes home about their child's progress (58.1%;  $n = 18$  of 31).
5. *Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?*
- A little over half of the responding *providers* (60.0%;  $n = 6$  of 10) indicated that tutoring services were integrated with classroom learning activities either frequently or often. Also, 80.0% of provider respondents stated that they were able to adapt the supplemental services to each school's curriculum ( $n = 8$  of 10).
  - The majority of the *district coordinators* (71.4%;  $n = 5$  of 7) reported that providers adapted tutoring services to the school curriculum while more than half (60%;  $n = 3$  of 5) strongly agreed or agreed that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities.
  - The majority of *principal/site coordinator* submissions (83.3%;  $n = 5$  of 6) indicated that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum and integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities, respectively.
  - Most *teacher* respondents strongly agreed or agreed that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities and to the needs of individual students (81.5%;  $n = 22$  of 27).
6. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?*
- The majority of responding *providers* reported that they frequently or often aligned their services with state academic content and standards (80.2%;  $n = 8$  of 10).
  - All *district coordinator* responses (100%;  $n = 10$  of 10) indicated that providers' services were aligned with state and local standards.
7. *Are providers offering services to special education and English language learner (ELL) students?*
- Most of responding *provider* representatives reported that their tutors offered instruction to special education and ELL students frequently or often (80.0%;  $n = 8$  of 10).
  - All responses from *district coordinators* indicated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (100%;  $n = 8$  of 8).
  - All *principal/site coordinator* responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers offered tutoring sessions to special education and ELL students (100%; 6 of 6).
8. *What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?*



- Most *district coordinators* strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with provider services overall (88.9%;  $n = 8$  of 9).
- All *principal/site coordinator* respondents strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with provider services (100%;  $n = 7$  of 7).
- The majority of *teachers* strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with provider services (85.7%;  $n = 24$  of 37).
- The majority of *parents* strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with provider services (83.9%;  $n = 26$  of 31).

## Discussion and Recommendations

During the 2011-2012 school year most students served by providers did not meet or exceed the median percent proficient in math and/or RLA for low-income students across four comparison groups. For the most part, the number of students served by any one SES provider was small (i.e., generally fewer than 10) when spread across subject areas in which students were tutored. RESA 3 was the only provider (with 24 students tutored) that was able to demonstrate a comparable median math proficiency percentage with those of the four comparison groups for students who received RLA and math tutoring combined. In no other case did an SES provider with at least 10 students to analyze by subject area have a large enough percentage of students score at the proficient level to meet or exceed median comparison group proficiency rates in RLA or math.

One limiting factor associated with the analyses was the small sample size for many providers, which reduced the number of providers available for reliable evaluation. In RLA as well as math, only two providers had 10 or more students available with 2011-2012 test data. When limiting the analysis to students with at least 50% attendance rates, these numbers were even smaller. One must note that such small samples may not reliably represent the quality of services provided across the state.

Furthermore, the results should be interpreted with caution due to the descriptive nature of the study. Although reasonably specified comparison groups were identified, with such small numbers of SES students represented across providers any adequate statistical comparison is not possible. With these considerations in mind, it is problematic to draw definitive conclusions about SES provider effectiveness as it relates to the goal of increasing student achievement in RLA and math.

Additionally, students attended SES services an average of 19.05 hours, a utilization rate of 61.12%. This number of hours, spread over the course of a school year, is much lower than that reported by providers in the previous academic year, and it begs the question as to whether dramatic improvements in proficiency should be expected.

SES providers serving students in West Virginia during the 2011-2012 school year received predominately positive feedback from most respondent groups. District coordinators, principals/site coordinators, and teachers who participated in the evaluation were pleased with provider services overall. Providers, too, were primarily positive regarding their experiences with SES in West Virginia during the 2011-2012 school year.

Although district coordinator, principal/site coordinator, and teacher responses indicated overall satisfaction with providers' services, many fewer reported that providers collaborate with them to set goals for student improvement. If such collaboration were to occur between providers and district as well as school staff, perhaps students served would have a better chance to increase their learning of the specific knowledge and skills measured by the WESTEST 2. In addition, SES provider communication with respondent stakeholder groups also appears to be an area in need of improvement. With the exception of district coordinators, responses from other stakeholder groups indicate lower rates of satisfaction with the frequency with which the provider communicated with them. Furthermore, less than two thirds of contracted hours were utilized by SES qualified students, which points to an area of improvement in the delivery of future SES programming.

The primary areas for program improvement as identified by respondent stakeholder groups were to (a) increase the frequency with which providers communicated with principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents, (b) increase the frequency with which providers collaborated with district and school personnel to set goals for student growth, and (c) increase the rate of attendance and utilization of SES services. Providing opportunities for stakeholders to meet on a regular basis, or soliciting feedback from the respective stakeholder groups on other ways to increase communication and collaboration could lead to improvement of this aspect of the SES program. All stakeholder groups should also continue to encourage students to take advantage of SES services. The WVDE may wish to consider identifying best practices among providers, districts, schools, and parents that would address areas of improvement and share those with all providers, districts, and schools.

As West Virginia moves forward with SES, the WVDE should continue to encourage participation in the evaluation of SES providers. While great strides were made in securing parent and district coordinator responses this year, with the exception of SES providers, relatively fewer principals/site coordinators and teachers completed their surveys. This makes it difficult to provide a reliable evaluation of SES services. District coordinators should continue to promote principals'/site coordinators' and teachers' involvement in the evaluation. Similarly, the WVDE should remain persistent in requiring provider involvement during the evaluation process as every active provider should be represented in the survey findings. Efforts should also be continued to encourage adherence to federal regulations at all levels, while continuing to ensure all eligible students are able to take advantage of this opportunity to improve academic achievement levels.

# Contents

---

Executive Summary .....	iii
Contents .....	ix
Introduction .....	1
Methods .....	3
Investigating Achievement Outcomes .....	3
Participant characteristics .....	3
Sampling procedures .....	3
Measures and covariates.....	3
Research design .....	4
Investigating Stakeholder Perceptions .....	5
Participant characteristics .....	5
Sampling procedures .....	5
Measures .....	5
Research design .....	6
Results.....	7
Achievement Outcomes .....	7
Providers of services .....	7
Overall reading/language arts proficiency comparison .....	11
Reading/language arts proficiency by provider .....	11
Overall mathematics proficiency comparison .....	12
Mathematics proficiency by provider .....	12
Summary of achievement outcomes findings.....	13
Stakeholder Perceptions and Satisfaction .....	14
District coordinator perceptions and satisfaction .....	14
Principal/site coordinator perceptions and satisfaction .....	16
Provider perceptions and satisfaction .....	19
Teacher perceptions and satisfaction .....	23
Parent perceptions and satisfaction .....	25
Respondent group satisfaction with individual providers .....	26
Summary of stakeholder perceptions about implementation and outcomes.....	26
Discussion and Recommendations.....	31

Limitations of the Study ..... 32

Appendix A. Eligible Districts and Schools, and Approved Providers ..... 33

Appendix B. Title I Supplemental Educational Services—District Coordinator Survey ..... 35

Appendix C. Principal/Site Coordinator Survey..... 39

Appendix D. Title I Supplemental Educational Services—Provider Survey..... 43

Appendix E. Title I Supplemental Educational Services—Teacher Survey ..... 47

Appendix F. Title I Supplemental Educational Services—Parent Survey ..... 49

**List of Tables**

Table 1. Four Comparison Groups Used in Achievement Outcomes Analysis and Number of Schools in Each..... 4

Table 2. Distribution of Students in Grades 3–8 by District and SES Provider, 2011-2012.....7

Table 3. Distribution of Students in Grades 3–8 and Contracts Served by Provider and Subject Area ..... 8

Table 4. Average RLA and Math Hours Contracted and Attended for Students in Grades 3–8 by Provider ..... 9

Table 5. Average RLA Hours Contracted and Attended for Students in Grades 3–8 by Provider.....10

Table 6. Average Math Hours Contracted and Attended for Students in Grades 3–8 by Provider.....10

Table 7. Comparison of Percentage Proficient SES Students to Four Comparison Groups by Subject Tutored ..... 11

Table 8. Comparison of Percentage Proficient in RLA Among Participating SES Students by Provider and Subject(s) Tutored .....12

Table 9. Comparison of Percentage Proficient in Math Among Participating SES Students by Provider and Subject Tutored.....13

Table 10. West Virginia 2011-2012 SES Survey Return Overview by District and School-Based Stakeholder Groups\* .....15

Table 11. District Coordinators’ Perceptions About Frequency of Communication/Collaboration and Providers’ Follow-Through .....15

Table 12. District Coordinators’ Perceptions About Quality of the Delivery of SES Services and Overall Satisfaction with the Program.....16

Table 13. Principal/Site Coordinators’ Perceptions About Frequency of Communication/Collaboration and Providers’ Follow-Through ..... 17

---

Table 14.	Principal/Site Coordinators’ Perceptions About Quality of the Delivery of SES Services and Overall Satisfaction with the Program .....	18
Table 15.	Characteristics of SES Providers’ Services.....	19
Table 16.	Providers’ Perceptions About Frequency of Tutor and Teacher Communication .....	21
Table 17.	Providers’ Perceptions About Frequency of Provider Adjustment of Services to Local Context .....	22
Table 18.	Providers’ Satisfaction with the SES Program.....	22
Table 19.	Teachers’ Perceptions About Frequency of Communication/Collaboration and Providers’ Follow-Through.....	23
Table 20.	Teachers’ Perceptions About the Quality of the Delivery of SES Services and Overall Satisfaction with the Program.....	24
Table 21.	Parents’ Perceptions About Frequency of Communication and Timeliness of Tutoring Sessions.....	25
Table 22.	Parents’ Satisfaction With the SES Provider and District Information .....	26
Table 23.	Summary of Overall Satisfaction* by Respondent Group and Provider .....	27
Table A 1.	Districts and Schools Eligible for Title I Supplemental Educational Services (SES), Numbers of Eligible and Participating Students, 2011-2012.	33
Table A 2.	Approved Providers and Topics and Grade Levels Covered, 2011-2012 .....	34



## Introduction

---

Title I supplemental educational services (SES) consist of academic instruction outside of the regular school day that is designed to increase the academic achievement of low-income students.<sup>1</sup> SES is a component of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), and is designed to provide extra academic assistance for eligible children. Specifically, students are eligible to receive SES if they are from low-income families and attend Title I schools that are in (a) their 2nd year or more of school improvement (i.e., schools that have not made adequate yearly progress [AYP] for 3 or more years), (b) corrective action, or (c) restructuring status. SES may include academic services such as tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions, provided that the approaches are consistent with the state's academic content standards. The main purposes of SES are (a) to increase student achievement in reading and math, and (b) to enable children to attain proficiency in meeting the state academic achievement standards.

Local education agencies (LEAs) with SES-eligible schools must arrange for supplemental services to eligible students by providers that have a demonstrated record of accomplishment in terms of the effectiveness of the services provided, or a high probability of success among recipient students. The state education agency, in this case the WV Department of Education (WVDE), is responsible for the compilation of a list of approved providers based on criteria established in accordance with NCLB Section 1116.

In this report, findings are presented from an evaluation of Title I SES in West Virginia during the 2011-2012 school year, which was conducted by the WVDE Office of Research. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to examine SES provider effectiveness by analyzing (a) SES student achievement outcomes and (b) the perceptions of key stakeholders in West Virginia school districts where these services were provided. A secondary purpose was to provide a process by which the WVDE can comply with federal evaluation and monitoring requirements.

During the 2011-2012 school year, 15 school districts in West Virginia were required to offer SES (see Appendix A, Table A-1 for a list of the districts and schools). Within these districts, 19 Title I schools were designated SES-eligible based on their NCLB school improvement status. Parents of students in these schools were informed by the LEA of their children's eligibility for additional academic assistance provided through SES and were given a list of the authorized service providers from which they could choose. The WVDE approved 35 individual tutoring providers for the 2011-2012 school year (see Appendix A, Table A-2 for a list of approved providers). Providers were authorized to provide tutoring services in one or more districts and thus could serve students in multiple schools and, in some cases, in multiple districts.

---

<sup>1</sup> West Virginia Department of Education (n.d.) *Title I. supplemental educational services (SES)*. Charleston, WV: Author. Retrieved from [wvde.state.wv.us/titlei/lea\\_supplemental.html](http://wvde.state.wv.us/titlei/lea_supplemental.html).





## Methods

---

The evaluation study was conducted in two parts: (a) an analysis of achievement outcomes, as measured by the West Virginia Educational Standards Test 2 (WESTEST 2), for students who did and did not receive supplemental educational services (SES); and (b) an investigation of stakeholders' perceptions of provider implementation of SES using survey data collected at the end of the school year.

### Investigating Achievement Outcomes

The research question guiding this component of the evaluation was, *How have students served by SES providers performed, compared to other students, in terms of reading/language arts and mathematics?* The analysis was conducted using the 2011-2012 reading/language arts (RLA) and math score data from WESTEST 2.

### Participant characteristics

A total of 5,281 students were eligible to receive SES from 19 schools located in 15 school districts throughout West Virginia during the 2011-2012 school year. A total of 134 students signed up to receive SES across 12 school districts (Appendix A, Table A 1). The students attended schools that were required to provide SES because they had not met their improvement goals as specified in NCLB. Data were available for 98 students in Grades 3 through 8 from 16 schools in 12 districts. They received services from 12 providers. All of the students served were from low-income families (i.e., eligible for free or reduced-price lunch) and attended schools receiving Title I funds.

### Sampling procedures

Students omitted from the analysis of impact of provider services on achievement outcomes included 35 students in Grades K–2 who do not participate in WESTEST 2, and one fourth-grade student whose identifiers failed to match any student identifier in the WESTEST 2 assessment data file. Additionally, one provider, 1:1 Online Tutoring, provided services to a single student in kindergarten; therefore, the provider was omitted from the analysis of impact of provider services on achievement as measured by WESTEST 2 assessment.

### Measures and covariates

In the first week of April 2012, SES district coordinators were provided by e-mail a data template, and asked to provide data for each student who received SES tutoring until the end of April during the 2011-2012 school year. District coordinators were asked to provide student West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS) identification numbers as well as SES provider service information (name of the provider that offered/supplied services, the number of hours for which services were contracted and served, and the subject tutored).

WESTEST 2 is the only assessment common to all students in West Virginia, whether they were SES eligible or not. Consequently, WESTEST 2 provided the data with which a comparative analysis of student achievement could be made for the purposes of the SES evaluation.

Five performance levels are acknowledged for WESTEST 2: 1 (*novice*), 2 (*partial mastery*), 3 (*mastery*), 4 (*above mastery*), and 5 (*distinguished*). Levels of *mastery* and above (i.e., code value of 3 or greater) are categorized as *proficient*.

### Research design

For the current study, the percentage of the 98 SES students scoring at the *mastery* or higher level (i.e., *proficient*) were compared to the median percentage of low-income students scoring as *proficient* in four other comparison groups as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Four Comparison Groups Used in Achievement Outcomes Analysis and Number of Schools in Each**

Comparison group	Number of schools
Total	689
SES eligible schools where students took advantage of SES services	16
All other SES eligible schools (excluding schools where students took advantage of SES services by end of April, 2012)	3
All other Title I schools across West Virginia	302
All remaining schools	368

The purpose of this comparison was to assess how well SES participating students performed relative to similar students from other school settings. The median percentages *proficient* for schools in these comparison groups were derived from WESTEST 2 data available from the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) website ([wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/pub/assessment/grade3reading.cfm?sy=10](http://wveis.k12.wv.us/nclb/pub/assessment/grade3reading.cfm?sy=10)). These data were filtered for low-income students and for schools with 10 or more students tested; the comparison was limited to Grades 3 through 8. A similar comparison was conducted that broke out proficiency levels among SES students by provider.

The comparisons of 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 results were also examined by subject tutored (i.e., reading/language arts [RLA] and math). The RLA analysis included the 2011-2012 RLA WESTEST 2 scores of those students contracted for services in RLA only and in both RLA and math. Similarly, the math analysis included the 2011-2012 math WESTEST 2 scores of those students contracted for services in math only and in both RLA and math.

## Investigating Stakeholder Perceptions

A second set of evaluation questions guided the assessment of stakeholder perceptions:

1. Do local education agencies (LEAs) make SES available to eligible students?
2. Do schools and providers work together to meet the needs of SES-eligible students?
3. What are district coordinators', principals'/site coordinators', teachers', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?
4. Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?
5. Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
6. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?
7. Are providers offering services to special education and English language learner (ELL) students?
8. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?

### Participant characteristics

Statewide, 35 individual providers were approved to offer SES tutoring to eligible students (see Appendix A, Table A 2 for a list of approved providers). Of the 35 approved providers on the West Virginia SES Provider List, 12 providers actually provided services before the end of April, 2012. District coordinators in participating school districts, principals or site coordinators in participating schools, and teachers of students receiving SES were also involved in facilitating the delivery of the services to students (see Appendix A, Table A 1) for a list of school districts required to provide SES).

### Sampling procedures

All members of the five stakeholder groups were included in the survey.

### Measures

Questionnaires were adapted from instruments used by the WVDE in previous evaluation studies of the SES initiative. As indicated previously, these questionnaires were used to gather data about the opinions and perceptions of the participating stakeholders. Five survey questionnaires were administered, one for each of the stakeholder groups: (a) district coordinators in participating districts (Appendix B), (b) principals or site coordinators in participating schools (Appendix C), (c) SES providers (Appendix D), (d) teachers of students receiving SES (Appendix E), and (e) parents of students who received SES (Appendix F). A set of closed-ended questions that were somewhat consistent across the questionnaires were administered to all groups to enable triangulation of stakeholders' perceptions (e.g., experiences with SES and providers). Questionnaires also varied by including questions unique to each group. For example, providers were asked questions specific to their service such as number, locations, or duration of learning sessions that were not relevant to other stakeholders. To elicit stakeholder perceptions about the delivery of services a 4-point Likert-style

response scale was used (i.e., 1 [*never*], 2 [*seldom*], 3 [*often*], and 4 [*frequent*]). A fifth category, *I don't know*, was included, but not used to calculate mean scores for the items. These questions dealt with issues such as frequency of communication or collaboration with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, or teachers. Likewise, stakeholder satisfaction with the SES program/activities was assessed by respondents' level of agreement on a 4-point response scale with a series of statements about services. The response scale for these questions included 4 (*strongly agree*), 3 (*agree*), 2 (*disagree*), or 1 (*strongly disagree*). A fifth category, *I don't know*, was also included for these items, but not used to calculate mean scores for the items. To illustrate, an example from the district coordinator survey was, "I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement," to which respondents indicated their level of agreement or disagreement.

### Research design

In the spring of 2012, the evaluators provided WVDE Title I program staff with a link to an online survey. Program staff subsequently e-mailed this link to district Title I coordinators with instructions for principal/site coordinators and teachers. District coordinators were asked to distribute login information and instructions to the participating SES schools in their district. All personnel were instructed to complete a separate online survey for each provider currently delivering services to students in their districts (district coordinators), schools (principals/site coordinators) or classrooms (teachers). A paper version of a survey was sent to parents of students who received SES. The letter explained the intent of the survey and provided an option for parents to complete the survey online. At the school level, either the principal or the site coordinator completed the survey, based on program knowledge and contact with providers. Because the district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents were able to evaluate multiple providers, each survey submission was counted as a separate response. Therefore, the total number of responses for these stakeholders does not represent the number of individuals participating in the evaluation. All respondent groups were given several weeks to complete the surveys near the end of the academic year.

Finally, in May of 2012, the evaluators, in collaboration with program staff, sent SES provider representatives an individual e-mail notification with a link and instructions to complete an online survey. Providers were directed to complete an online survey concerning their company's involvement and satisfaction with SES in West Virginia. In cases where more than one provider representative completed the survey, a mean score was calculated for each survey item.

## Results

Results are presented in two parts: (a) achievement outcomes as measured by the West Virginia Educational Standards Test 2 (WESTEST 2), and (b) descriptive data about stakeholder perceptions of provider implementation of supplemental educational services (SES) based on survey data.

### Achievement Outcomes

#### Providers of services

Among responding districts, Clay County reported the largest percentage of SES students (24.2%), followed by Mercer County with 19.4% of the SES participants (Table 2). Seven of the 11 SES providers included in this analysis served students in only one school district. Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) 1 served three districts; and ATS Project Success, Club Z! Tutoring, Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown, and Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston each served two districts (Table 2).

**Table 2. Distribution of Students in Grades 3–8 by District and SES Provider, 2011-2012**

District	Provider	Number of students	% of district	% of state
<b>All</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>		<b>100.00</b>
<b>Barbour</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>
	Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown	2	100.00	
<b>Boone</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>
	ATS Project Success	2	100.00	
<b>Clay</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>24.20</b>
	RESA 3	24	100.00	
<b>Doddridge</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>10.20</b>
	Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown	5	50.00	
	RESA 7	5	50.00	
<b>Grant</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>
	Club Z! Tutoring	2	100.00	
<b>Hampshire</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3.10</b>
	Educate Online Learning, LLC	2	66.70	
	Club Z! Tutoring	1	33.30	
<b>Kanawha</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>
	Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston	2	100.00	
<b>Lincoln</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>5.10</b>
	RESA 2	5	100.00	
<b>McDowell</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>8.20</b>
	RESA 1	6	66.70	
	Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston	3	33.30	
<b>Mercer</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>19.40</b>
	RESA 1	19	100.00	

*Table 2 continued next page*

<b>Monroe</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>7.10</b>
---------------	--------------	----------	---------------	-------------

**Table 2. Distribution of Students in Grades 3–8 by District and SES Provider, 2011-2012**

District	Provider	Number of students	% of district	% of state
<b>Wood</b>	RESA 1	7	100.00	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>14.30</b>
	ATS Project Success	5	35.70	
	Ivy League Tutors	1	7.10	
	Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	8	57.10	

In terms of subjects in which SES program services were provided, 19 students were tutored in reading/language arts (RLA) only (Table 3). Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown, Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston, and Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna served the majority of these students. Twenty students were tutored in math only, and ATS Project Success and RESA 2 served half of these students. More than half of participating students, 59 students, received services in both RLA and math. RESA 1 and RESA 3 served the vast majority of these students (Table 3).

**Table 3. Distribution of Students in Grades 3–8 and Contracts Served by Provider and Subject Area**

Provider	RLA only		Math only		Both RLA and math		Total <i>n</i> Students
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Total	19	100.0	20	100.0	59	100.0	98
ATS Project Success	2	10.5	5	25.0	0	0.0	7
Club Z! Tutoring	1	5.3	2	10.0	0	0.0	3
Educate Online Learning	1	5.3	1	5.0	0	0.0	2
Ivy League Tutors	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1
RESA 1	0	0.0	1	5.0	30	50.8	31
RESA 2	0	0.0	5	25.0	0	0.0	5
RESA 3	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	40.7	24
RESA 7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	8.5	5
Sylvan Learning Center– Bridgeport/Morgantown	4	21.1	3	15.0	0	0.0	7
Sylvan Learning Center– Charleston	5	26.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	5
Sylvan Learning Center– Vienna	5	26.3	3	15.0	0	0.0	8

Overall, providers were contracted to provide an average of 33.35 hours of instruction to SES-eligible students. RESA 1, RESA 3, and Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston had the highest average hours contracted. Students attended SES sessions an average of 19.05 hours. This was an average of 14.30 hours short of the maximum average contracted services, yielding an average utilization rate of 61.12% (Table 4).

**Table 4. Average RLA and Math Hours Contracted and Attended for Students in Grades 3–8 by Provider**

Provider	Average hours contracted	Average hours attended	Difference	Avg. % of contract met	Total <i>n</i> students
Total	33.35	19.05	14.30	61.12	98
ATS Project Success	23.73	14.53	9.20	62.01	7
Club Z! Tutoring	21.33	9.00	12.33	38.33	3
Educate Online Learning	17.00	17.00	0.00	100.00	2
Ivy League Tutors	19.38	19.38	0.00	100.00	1
RESA 1	61.42	37.44	23.98	63.42	31
RESA 2	33.00	9.20	23.80	27.88	5
RESA 3	45.00	13.88	31.13	30.83	24
RESA 7	34.00	18.00	16.00	52.94	5
Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown	32.00	17.14	14.86	56.91	7
Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston	43.60	22.60	21.00	53.61	5
Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	36.34	31.38	4.96	86.34	8

The next tables provide a summary of average number of hours served by subject. Providers were contracted to provide an average of 27.49 hours of RLA instruction to SES-eligible students. Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown, Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston, and Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna had the highest average hours contracted (Table 5). Students attended SES sessions an average of 19.37 hours. This was an average of 8.13 hours short of the maximum average contracted services, yielding an average utilization rate of 72.88% (Table 5).

Providers were contracted to provide an average of 24.88 hours of math instruction to SES-eligible students. RESA 1, RESA 2, and Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna had the highest average hours contracted (Table 6). Students attended SES sessions an average of 13.18 hours. This was an average of 11.70 hours short of the maximum average contracted services, yielding an average utilization rate of 52.97% (Table 6).

**Table 5. Average RLA Hours Contracted and Attended for Students in Grades 3–8 by Provider**

Provider	Average hours contracted	Average hours attended	Difference	Avg. % of contract met	Total <i>n</i> students
Total	27.49	19.37	8.13	72.88	78
ATS Project Success	24.23	24.23	0.00	100.00	2
Club Z! Tutoring	24.00	24.00	0.00	100.00	1
Educate Online	20.00	20.00	0.00	100.00	1
Ivy League Tutors	19.38	19.38	0.00	100.00	1
RESA 1	30.87	18.41	12.46	59.64	30
RESA 3	22.50	6.94	15.56	30.84	24
RESA 7	17.00	8.80	8.20	51.76	5
Sylvan Learning Center– Bridgeport/Morgantown	37.00	18.75	18.25	50.68	4
Sylvan Learning Center– Charleston	43.60	22.60	21.00	51.83	5
Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	36.34	30.54	5.80	84.04	5

**Table 6. Average Math Hours Contracted and Attended for Students in Grades 3–8 by Provider**

Provider	Average hours contracted	Average hours attended	Difference	Avg. % of contract met	Total <i>n</i> students
Total	24.88	13.18	11.70	52.97	79
ATS Project Success	24.23	10.65	13.58	43.95	5
Club Z! Tutoring	20.00	1.50	18.50	7.50	2
Educate Online	14.00	14.00	0.00	100.00	1
RESA 1	31.55	19.35	12.20	61.33	31
RESA 2	33.00	9.20	23.80	27.88	5
RESA 3	22.50	6.94	15.56	30.84	24
RESA 7	17.00	9.20	7.80	54.12	5
Sylvan Learning Center– Bridgeport/Morgantown	25.33	15.00	10.33	59.22	3
Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	36.34	32.78	3.56	90.20	3



### Overall reading/language arts proficiency comparison

After filtering for the subject tutored and student WVEIS ID number that matched the WESTEST 2 assessment data file, a total of 78 students who received SES were compared on the WESTEST 2 RLA subscale; of those, 19 received SES services in RLA alone, and 59 were tutored both in RLA and math (Table 7). Among these students, only 21.1% and 25.4% (respectively) were found to be at a proficient level in RLA, compared to proficiency levels of all comparison groups of about 44%; Table 7).

**Table 7. Comparison of Percentage Proficient SES Students to Four Comparison Groups by Subject Tutored**

WESTEST 2 subscale	Students receiving SES and subject(s) tutored: (number tutored) % proficient		Comparison group % proficient			
	RLA only	RLA and math	Schools of SES student participants	All other SES-eligible schools	All other Title I schools	All remaining schools
RLA	(19) 21.1	(59) 25.4	38.31	43.43	45.60	47.84
	Math only	RLA and math	Schools of SES student participants	All other SES-eligible schools	All other Title I schools	All remaining schools
Math	(20) 20.0	(59) 33.9	39.98	42.60	46.07	46.05

### Reading/language arts proficiency by provider

Seven providers tutored students in RLA only, and three tutored students in RLA and math combined. Among those tutoring in RLA only, the number of students served per provider ranged from one to 5, with the percent RLA proficiency ranging from 0% to 50% (Table 8). Sylvan Learning Center-Bridgeport/Morgantown and Sylvan Learning Center-Charleston demonstrated proficiency levels comparable with most of the comparison groups described earlier, yet this was only among four and five students, respectively. The three providers that provided tutoring in RLA and math combined served five to 30 students, with the percentage at RLA proficiency ranging from 23.3% to 40.0% (Table 8). Only RESA 7 demonstrated proficiency levels comparable with most of the comparison groups. When looking at students who received RLA and math tutoring combined and who had at least a 50% attendance rate in their tutoring sessions, only one of three providers, RESA 1, approached proficiency rates comparable with those of the comparison groups. Seven providers tutored a combined 13 students in RLA tutoring only. The number of students ranged from one to five student per provider, but none of the 13 students demonstrated proficiency levels (Table 8).

**Table 8. Comparison of Percentage Proficient in RLA Among Participating SES Students by Provider and Subject(s) Tutored**

Provider	All participating SES students				Students with 50% or greater attendance			
	RLA only		RLA and math		RLA only		RLA and math	
	<i>n</i>	Percent proficient	<i>n</i>	Percent proficient	<i>n</i>	Percent proficient	<i>n</i>	Percent proficient
Total	19		59		13		32	
ATS Project Success	2	0.0	0	N/A	2	0.0	0	N/A
Club Z! Tutoring	1	0.0	0	N/A	1	0.0	0	N/A
Educate Online	1	0.0	0	N/A	1	0.0	0	N/A
Ivy League Tutors	1	0.0	0	N/A	1	0.0	0	N/A
RESA 1	0	N/A	30	23.3	0	N/A	23	30.4
RESA 3	0	N/A	24	29.2	0	N/A	7	14.3
RESA 7	0	N/A	5	40.0	0	N/A	2	0.0
Sylvan Learning Center– Bridgeport/Morgantown	4	50.0	0	N/A	2	0.0	0	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston	5	40.0	0	N/A	1	0.0	0	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	5	0.0	0	N/A	5	0.0	0	N/A

### Overall mathematics proficiency comparison

Following the same filtering process as described above for the RLA comparison, a total of 79 SES students were compared on the WESTEST 2 math subscale, 20 of these students received SES tutoring assistance services in math alone, while the same 59 mentioned above were tutored both in RLA and math. Among these students, 20.0% of those tutored in math alone were at a proficient level which was below the proficiency levels across all other comparison groups (about 44%; Table 9). On the other hand, a significantly greater proportion (33.9%) of those tutored in RLA and math combined were found to be proficient (Table 9).

### Mathematics proficiency by provider

Seven providers served students in math only, while only three providers tutored students in RLA and math combined. Among those tutoring in math alone, the number of students served per provider ranged from one to 5, with the percent math proficiency ranging from 20.0% to 66.7% (Table 9). Club Z! Tutoring and Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown demonstrated proficiency levels above all of the comparison groups, but only with two and three students for each provider respectively (Table 9). Among the three providers tutoring in RLA and math combined, the percentage at math proficiency ranged from 20.0% to 60.0%. RESA 3 demonstrated proficiency levels comparable to all of the comparison groups with 24 students, while RESA 7 demonstrated proficiency levels above the comparison groups, albeit with only five students (Table 9). For those students who received math only tutoring and with at least a 50% attendance rate at tutoring sessions, math proficiency rates were higher for Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown at 66.7% among three students. Among students who received tu-

toring in RLA and math combined, only RESA 7 (with only two students) demonstrated proficiency levels comparable with those of the comparison groups (Table 9).

**Table 9. Comparison of Percentage Proficient in Math Among Participating SES Students by Provider and Subject Tutored**

Provider	All participating SES students				Students with 50% or greater attendance			
	Math only		RLA and math		Math only		RLA and math	
	Percent n proficient	Percent n proficient	Percent n proficient	Percent n proficient	Percent n proficient	Percent n proficient	Percent n proficient	
Total	20		59		10		31	
ATS Project Success	5	0.0	0	N/A	2	0.0	0	N/A
Club Z! Tutoring	2	50.0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Educate Online	1	0.0	0	N/A	1	0.0	0	N/A
RESA 1	1	0.0	30	20.0	1	0.0	22	27.3
RESA 2	5	20.0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
RESA 3	0	N/A	24	45.8	0	N/A	7	14.3
RESA 7	0	N/A	5	60.0	0	N/A	2	50.0
Sylvan Learning Center– Bridgeport/Morgantown	3	66.7	0	N/A	3	66.7	0	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	3	0.0	0	N/A	3	N/A	0	N/A

### Summary of achievement outcomes findings

Regarding those students for whom 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels were available, the following observations were made:

- Overall, the percentage of SES-participating students with scores at proficient levels was smaller than the median percentage of students who scored at proficient in each of four other comparison groups: (a) students at SES-eligible schools where some students took advantage of SES services; (b) students at SES-eligible schools where no students took advantage of SES services; (c) all other Title I schools across WV; and (d) all remaining (non-Title I) schools. This comparison was limited to low socioeconomic status students in Grades 3 through 8 from schools with 10 or more students tested.
- Two providers had at least 10 students available for analysis: Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) 1 and RESA 3.

Of these providers, the proportion of tutored students with scores at a proficient level was lower than the median proficiency percentage of the comparison group schools.

For students who had 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels available and who completed at least 50% of their tutoring contract, the following observations were made:

- Only RESA 1 had at least 10 students available for analysis.  
The percent of students tutored by this provider who reached proficiency was lower than the median percentage proficient among the four other comparable groups.

### Mathematics summary

For students who had 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels available, the following observations were made:

- Two providers had at least 10 students available for analysis: RESA 1 and RESA 3. RESA 3 demonstrated a median proficiency percentage similar to the four other comparable groups, for students who received RLA and math tutoring combined.

For students who had 2011-2012 WESTEST 2 scores and proficiency levels available and completed at least 50% of their tutoring contract, the following observations were made:

- Only RESA 1 had at least 10 students available for analysis. The percent proficiency level of students tutored by this provider was lower than the median proficiency percentage of the four other comparable groups.

## Stakeholder Perceptions and Satisfaction

Of the 12 districts for which data were available, seven district coordinators completed an online survey about one or more SES provider. Six of the 12 districts had at least one principal/site coordinator or at least one teacher complete an online survey about one or more SES providers. Nine of the 12 districts had at least one parent complete a survey about an SES provider. Details of the response rates are reported by stakeholder group below.

### District coordinator perceptions and satisfaction

During the 2011-2012 school year, 11 district coordinator responses were received from seven of the 12 SES-eligible districts (Table 10). Survey questions addressed three areas of service delivery: (a) coordinators' perceptions about the frequency of communication/collaboration with SES providers and providers' follow-through with obligations to provide services, (b) coordinators' perceptions about the quality of the delivery of SES services, and (c) coordinators' satisfaction with the program as it was implemented.

#### ***Frequency of communication/collaboration and providers' follow-through***

Overall, 81.8% (9 of 11) of district coordinators reported that SES providers communicated with them often or frequently during the school year ( $M = 3.09$ ,  $SD = 0.23$ , Table 11). All coordinators (100%) reported providers often or frequently met their obligation to provide tutoring services ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 0.30$ ). Coordinators reported less frequent provider communication with teachers compared to parents throughout the year (Table 11). For these items, excluding "I don't know" responses, only one of four (25.0%) perceived often or frequent communication with teachers and seven of seven (100.0%) perceived often or frequent communication with parents ( $M = 2.25$ ,  $SD = 0.35$  and  $M = 3.57$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ , respectively). Finally, only slightly more than half of coordinators (55.5%) felt that providers never or seldom collaborated with them about setting goals for student growth ( $M = 1.82$ ,  $SD = 0.19$ ; Table 11). These two areas—i.e., communications with teachers and collaboration with coordinators—are potential leverage points for future program improvement.

**Table 10. West Virginia 2011-2012 SES Survey Return Overview by District and School-Based Stakeholder Groups\***

District	School total: SES-eligible	Numbers of SES-eligible schools by stakeholder surveys received**			
		District coordinator survey	Principal/site coordinator survey	Teacher survey	Parent Survey
Total	16	10	8	26	30
Barbour	1	1	1	0	0
Boone	1	1	0	0	3
Clay	1	0	2	9	4
Doddridge	2	0	1	4	1
Grant	1	1	0	0	3
Hampshire	1	3	0	0	0
Kanawha	2	1	2	3	1
Lincoln	1	0	0	0	0
McDowell	2	1	0	0	3
Mercer	1	0	1	5	4
Monroe	1	0	1	5	8
Wood	2	2	0	0	3

\* Since providers often served multiple districts and schools their responses typically could not be disaggregated to single districts, thus are not shown.

\*\* Some respondents did not provide the name of the county in which they work or live. The figures provided in the table are only for those who identified their county.

### **Quality of the delivery of SES services**

Despite coordinators more reserved opinions about providers' communication with teachers and collaboration around student goal setting, respondents reported very high levels of agreement that the delivery of SES services was of high quality. Excluding coordinators who chose the "I don't know" response category, all coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that providers (a) aligned their services with state and local standards ( $M = 3.17$ ,  $SD = 0.40$ ); (b) offered services to students with disabilities and English language learners ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 0.35$ ); (c) complied with applicable state and local laws (e.g., health, safety, civil rights;  $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ ); and (d) complied with applicable federal NCLB laws ( $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 0.32$ ). A majority of respondents (71.4%) also reported that providers adapted the tutoring services to the individual school's curriculum ( $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = 0.24$ ) while over half of coordinators (60.0%) agreed or strongly agreed that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities ( $M = 2.80$ ,  $SD = 0.19$ ; Table 12).

**Table 11. District Coordinators' Perceptions About Frequency of Communication/Collaboration and Providers' Follow-Through**

Questions	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
How often did SES providers ...					
...communicate with you during the school year?	0.0	18.2	54.5	27.3	3.09 (0.23)

...collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	22.2	33.3	44.4	0.0	1.82 (0.19)
...communicate with teachers during the year?	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	2.25 (0.35)
...communicate with parents during the year?	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1	3.57 (0.29)
...meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	3.60 (0.30)

\* Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Often; 4 = Frequently

**Table 12. District Coordinators’ Perceptions About Quality of the Delivery of SES Services and Overall Satisfaction with the Program**

Questions <i>The providers ...</i>	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
...adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	2.86 (0.24)
...integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	2.80 (0.19)
...aligned their services with state and local standards.	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7	3.17 (0.40)
...offered instruction to students with disabilities and English language learners.	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	3.25 (0.35)
...complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	3.33 (0.32)
...complied with applicable state and local laws (e.g., health, safety, civil rights).	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	3.43 (0.29)
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	16.7	50.0	33.3	3.17 (0.22)
Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	3.11 (0.29)

\* Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree

**Overall satisfaction with program implementation**

Responding district coordinators were highly satisfied with the implementation of the SES program (Table 12). Excluding “I don’t know” responses, the majority of respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement that services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement (83.3%,  $M = 3.17$ ,  $SD = 0.22$ ) and reported being satisfied overall with providers’ services (88.9%,  $M = 3.11$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ ).

**Principal/site coordinator perceptions and satisfaction**

Of the 16 schools where supplemental educational services were provided during the 2011-2012 school year, only eight principals/site coordinators from seven schools responded. Survey questions addressed three areas of service delivery: (a) principals’/site coordinators’ perceptions about the frequency of communication/collaboration with SES providers, and providers’ follow-through with obligations to provide services; (b) principals’/site coor-

dinators' perceptions about the quality of the delivery of SES services; and (c) principals'/site coordinators' satisfaction with the program as it was implemented.

**Frequency of communication/collaboration and providers' follow-through**

Only four of the eight principals/site coordinators (50.0%) reported that SES providers communicated with them often or frequently during the school year ( $M = 2.63$ ,  $SD = 0.10$ ; Table 13). Excluding those who chose the "I don't know" option, all others (100.0%,  $n = 6$ ) reported providers having often or frequently met their obligations for providing tutoring services ( $M = 3.83$ ,  $SD = 0.40$ ). One principal/site coordinator selected the response option "I don't know" to a survey item regarding provider communication with teachers throughout the year. Less than half of the remaining respondents (42.9%) perceived often or frequent communication with teachers ( $M = 2.57$ ,  $SD = 0.14$ ). Finally, only two of eight principals/site coordinators (25.0%) thought providers collaborated with them about setting goals for student improvement ( $M = 2.00$ ,  $SD = 0.14$ ; Table 13). The area of communication and collaboration is a potential area of program improvement.

**Table 13. Principal/Site Coordinators' Perceptions About Frequency of Communication/Collaboration and Providers' Follow-Through**

Questions	Percent of responses				Mean (SD)
	Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
<i>How often did SES providers ...</i>					
...communicate with you during the school year?	12.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	2.63 (0.10)
...collaborate with you to set goals for student improvement?	37.5	37.5	12.5	12.5	2.00 (0.14)
...communicate with teachers during the year?	14.3	42.9	14.3	28.6	2.57 (0.14)
...meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	3.83 (0.40)

\* Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Often; 4 = Frequently

**Quality of the delivery of SES services**

Principals/site coordinators reported higher levels of agreement that SES services were well delivered (Table 14). The majority of responding coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that providers adapted the tutoring services to the school's curriculum (83.4%,  $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ ) and that services were integrated with classroom learning activities (83.4%,  $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 0.32$ ). All respondents agree or strongly agree that services were offered to students with disabilities and English language learners ( $M = 3.67$ ,  $SD = 0.32$ ) and that providers started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ ).

**Overall satisfaction with program implementation**

Overall, principal/site coordinator respondents were satisfied with the delivery of the SES program. All agreed or strongly agreed with the statements that SES services positively impacted student achievement and that, overall, they were satisfied with providers' services ( $M = 3.67$ ,  $SD = 0.32$ , both questions). All respondents also indicated that they were satisfied with the way the school districts helped the coordinators' schools implement services from the provider ( $M = 3.71$ ,  $SD = 0.34$ ) (Table 14).

**Table 14. Principal/Site Coordinators' Perceptions About Quality of the Delivery of SES Services and Overall Satisfaction with the Program**

Questions	Percent of responses				Mean (SD)
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
<i>The providers ...</i>					
...started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	3.50 (0.29)
...adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	3.50 (0.29)
...integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7	3.33 (0.32)
...offered instruction to students with disabilities and English language learners.	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	3.67 (0.32)
<b>Overall assessment</b>					
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	3.67 (0.32)
Overall I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	3.67 (0.32)
Overall I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4	3.71 (0.34)
* Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree					



## Provider perceptions and satisfaction

For the 2011-2012 school year, the WVDE approved 35 SES providers, 12 of which were contracted by local districts to deliver services to students. Ten of the 12 contracted providers responded to the request to complete the evaluation survey. The provider questionnaire differed substantively from those for other SES stakeholders, including additional questions to elicit information on the characteristics of services delivered (e.g., program duration, average length of tutoring sessions, setting, etc.). In addition, questions about communication with teachers and parents/guardians were altered to assess the actions of tutors apart from providers as a whole. Finally, the satisfaction questions were framed to be more relevant to the provider's perspective.

### *Characteristics of provider services*

Most of the responding providers (nine of 10, or 90.0%) indicated the duration of their services was 30 weeks or less (Table 15). None responded that services lasted more than 40 weeks. In terms of the length of tutoring sessions, half of the providers (50.0%) indicated the average session was 1.0 to 1.5 hours in length.

For the remaining questions about service characteristics, respondents were permitted to select as many alternatives as applied to their particular situation. As such, some responses were aggregations of available options.

Individual student per tutor was the most frequently reported format for delivering services ( $n = 4$  of 10, Table 15). Three of the 10 providers reported using small groups of two to five students per tutor while the remaining three providers indicated using a combination of individual and small group formats. None of the providers indicated a large group (six to 10 students per tutor) format.

The instructional activities used with students varied. However, all but two providers (80%) reported using one-on-one tutoring alone, either in person or via electronic communication, or in combination with other forms of activities including direct instruction, computer-based tutoring, and/or independent seatwork (Table 15).

Four of 10 providers reported tutoring services were delivered in either a school building or the provider's location. The remaining six providers (60%) reported services were delivered either at student homes or student homes in combination with other locations including the community and provider's location. Seven of 10 (70%) of providers indicated parents/guardians were responsible for transporting participating students to or from these locations. Only one respondent (10%) indicated that the school/district provided transportation, while three more (30%) reported they provided services online.

Finally, various and multiple combinations of qualifications of tutors delivering SES services were reported. Disaggregating the responses shown in Table 15, nine of 10 providers (90%) indicated that tutors had bachelor's degrees, eight (80%) reported tutors had training to provide tutoring services, and seven (70%) reported tutors were certified teachers.

**Table 15. Characteristics of SES Providers' Services**

Component	Response	Frequency	Percent
-----------	----------	-----------	---------

**Table 15. Characteristics of SES Providers' Services**

Component	Response	Frequency	Percent
Program duration	1–10 weeks	3	30
	11–20 weeks	3	30
	21–30 weeks	3	30
	31–40 weeks	1	10
	More than 40 weeks	0	0
	Other	0	0
Length of the average tutoring session	0–0.5 hour	0	0
	0.5–1.0 hour	2	20
	1.0–1.5 hour	5	50
	1.5–2.0 hours	2	20
	Other: “1–2 hour sessions”	1	10
Setting*	School building	2	20
	Student homes	1	10
	Provider's location	2	20
	Student homes, online	3	30
	Student homes, community location (not the provider's building)	1	10
	Student homes, provider's location	1	10
Format*	Individual, small group (2–5 students per tutor)	3	30
	Small group (2–5 students per tutor)	3	30
	Individual	4	40
Transportation provided to students*	No, parents are responsible for transportation	7	70
	Yes, district/school transports students	1	10
	Other: Online provider	3	30
Qualifications of the tutors*	Tutors have had training, tutors have bachelor's degrees, tutors are certified teachers	6	60
	Tutors have bachelor's degrees, tutors are certified teachers	1	10
	Tutors have bachelor's degrees, tutors have had training	2	20
	Other: online distance learning	1	10
Instructional activities that occur with students*	One-on-one tutoring (in person), direct instruction	2	20
	One-on-one tutoring (via electronic communication)	2	20
	One-on-one tutoring (in person)	2	20
	One-on-one tutoring (in person), direct instruction and independent seatwork	1	10
	Computer-based tutoring	1	10
	Direct instruction, computer-based tutoring	1	10
	One-on-one tutoring (via electronic communication), computer-based tutoring	1	10

\* Denotes items for which respondents could select all response categories that applied to their service delivery.

### Frequency of SES tutor communication with teachers

While all providers (100%) reported that tutors communicated often or frequently with parents about the progress of their children ( $M = 3.90$ ,  $SD = 0.44$ ; Table 16), only 60% reported that tutors communicated often or frequently with teachers ( $M = 3.30$ ,  $SD = 0.19$ ;

Table 16) about the progress of their students. Furthermore, only half of the providers (50%) reported that they showed their lesson plans or materials used in tutoring to the homeroom/subject teachers ( $M = 2.20$ ,  $SD = 0.17$ ; Table 16). Communication and collaboration with teachers may be an area in need of more focused attention in the delivery of future SES programming.

**Table 16. Providers' Perceptions About Frequency of Tutor and Teacher Communication**

Question	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
<i>How often did SES tutors ...</i>					
...communicate with teachers regarding progress of their student(s)?	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	3.30 (0.19)
...communicate with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress?	0.0	0.0	10.0	90.0	3.90 (0.44)
...show lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child with which they worked?	40.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	2.20 (0.17)

\* Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Often; 4 = Frequently

#### ***Frequency of provider adjustment of services to local context***

Providers were asked to assess themselves in terms of the extent to which they made adjustments or modifications to instructional content to coincide with appropriate standards or activities. All responding providers (100%) indicated they often or frequently aligned services with state academic content and achievement standards ( $M = 4.00$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ; Table 17). Lower percentages indicated often or frequent adaptation of supplemental services to each school's curriculum (80.0%) and integration of tutoring services with classroom learning activities (60.0%) ( $M = 3.30$ ,  $SD = 0.24$ ;  $M = 2.90$ ,  $SD = 0.13$ , respectively; Table 17). Additionally, 80.0% reported often or frequently reported offering instruction to students with disabilities and English language learners ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 0.38$ ).

**Table 17. Providers' Perceptions About Frequency of Provider Adjustment of Services to Local Context**

Questions	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
<i>How often did tutors...</i>					
...align the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards?	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	4.00 (0.50)
...integrate tutoring services with classroom learning activities?	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	2.90 (0.13)
...adapt the supplemental services to each school's curriculum?	10.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	3.30 (0.24)
...offer instruction to students with disabilities and English language learners?	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	3.60 (0.38)

\* Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Often; 4 = Frequently

**Satisfaction with program implementation**

Provider satisfaction with the SES program/activities was assessed by respondents' level of agreement on a 5-point response scale. The response scale for these questions included 5 (*strongly agree*), 4 (*agree*), 3 (*neutral*), 2 (*disagree*), or 1 (*strongly disagree*). Providers showed high levels of satisfaction with various elements related to their involvement in the SES program (Table 18). At least 80% of respondents reported agreement or strong agreement that they were satisfied with student attendance ( $M = 4.21$ ,  $SD = 0.20$ ); student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation) toward SES services ( $M = 4.30$ ,  $SD = 0.23$ ); ease of developing lessons aligned with the district/school curriculum ( $M = 4.30$ ,  $SD = 0.23$ ); parent cooperation ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = 0.21$ ); principal/site coordinator cooperation ( $M = 4.30$ ,  $SD = 0.21$ ); district SES coordinator cooperation/involvement ( $M = 4.80$ ,  $SD = 0.35$ ); state SES coordinator cooperation/involvement ( $M = 4.20$ ,  $SD = 0.20$ ); and the success of SES at raising student achievement to desired levels ( $M = 4.50$ ,  $SD = 0.27$ ). However, only half of the 10 providers (50%) reported agreement with the statement about satisfaction with teacher cooperation ( $M = 3.70$ ,  $SD = 0.21$ ). This may indicate an area of more focused attention in the delivery of future SES programming.

**Table 18. Providers' Satisfaction with the SES Program**

Questions	Percent of responses					Mean* (SD)
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	
<i>Providers were satisfied with...</i>						
...student attendance.	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	4.21 (0.20)
...student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation) toward SES services.	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	4.30 (0.23)
...the ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum.	0.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0	4.30 (0.23)

*Table 18 continued next page*

...parent cooperation/involvement.	0.0	0.0	20.0	50.0	30.0	4.10 (0.21)
------------------------------------	-----	-----	------	------	------	-------------

**Table 18. Providers' Satisfaction with the SES Program**

Questions <i>Providers were satisfied with...</i>	Percent of responses					Mean* (SD)
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	
...teacher cooperation/involvement.	0.0	0.0	50.0	30.0	20.0	3.7 (0.21)
...principal/site coordinator cooperation/ involvement.	0.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	4.30 (0.21)
...district SES coordinator cooperation/involvement.	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	4.80 (0.35)
...state SES coordinator cooperation/involvement.	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	4.20 (0.20)
...the success of SES at raising student achievement to desired levels.	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	4.50 (0.27)

\* Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree

### Teacher perceptions and satisfaction

A total of 37 teacher responses from four SES-eligible districts were received during the 2011-2012 school year. Responding teachers represented six schools within five of the 12 districts.

#### **Frequency of communication/collaboration**

Teachers were asked only two questions about communication or collaboration with providers. Only 18 of 37 teacher responses (48.6%;  $M = 2.27$ ,  $SD = 0.12$ ) reported that providers communicated with them often or frequently during the school year (Table 19). Slightly less, 16 of 37 (43.2%;  $M = 2.08$ ,  $SD = 0.17$ ) reported collaboration from providers in setting goals for student improvement. Findings clearly indicate that there may be room for program improvement in these two areas.

**Table 19. Teachers' Perceptions About Frequency of Communication/Collaboration and Providers' Follow-Through**

Questions <i>How often did SES providers ...</i>	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
...communicate with you during the school year?	32.4	18.9	37.8	10.8	2.27 (0.12)
...collaborate with you to set goals for student improvement?	43.2	13.5	35.1	8.1	2.08 (0.17)

\* Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Often; 4 = Frequently

#### **Quality of the delivery of SES services**

Teacher satisfaction with the SES program/activities was assessed by respondents' level of agreement on a 4-point response scale. The response scale for these questions in-

cluded 4 (*strongly agree*), 3 (*agree*), 2 (*disagree*), or 1 (*strongly disagree*). A fifth category, *I don't know*, was provided but was not used to calculate the mean.

Although teachers' responses reflected modest appraisals of providers' communication with them and collaboration in student goal setting, they reported higher levels of agreement that delivery of SES services was of high quality (Table 20). The majority of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that providers adapted the tutoring services to the individual school's curriculum (85.7%;  $M = 3.21, SD = 0.22$ ), integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities of students (92.9%,  $M = 3.39, SD = 0.26$ ), and adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students (81.5%;  $M = 3.19, SD = 0.21$ ) (Table 20).

**Overall satisfaction with program implementation**

Responding teachers were satisfied with the implementation of the SES program (Table 20). Overall, 93.3% indicated agreement or strong agreement that services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement ( $M = 3.41, SD = 0.25$ ), and a slightly lesser percentage reported being satisfied on the whole with the provider's services (85.7%;  $M = 3.32, SD = 0.22$ ).

**Table 20. Teachers' Perceptions About the Quality of the Delivery of SES Services and Overall Satisfaction with the Program**

Questions <i>The providers ...</i>	Percent of responses				Mean (SD)
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
...adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	14.3	0.0	35.7	50.0	3.21 (0.22)
...adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	14.3	3.7	29.6	51.9	3.19 (0.21)
...integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	7.1	0.0	39.3	53.6	3.39 (0.26)
I believe the services offered by this provider(s) positively impacted student achievement.	3.6	3.6	43.3	50.0	3.41 (0.25)
Overall I am satisfied with this provider's services.	3.6	10.7	35.7	50.0	3.32 (0.22)

\* Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree

## Parent perceptions and satisfaction

An invitation letter was sent out to the parents of all 134 students who received SES services during the school year 2011-2012. A total of 31 parents completed the survey. Respondents' children attended 10 SES-eligible schools (including elementary schools) in nine of the 12 districts. Based on parents' responses, researchers were not able to disaggregate their responses by provider.

### *Frequency of communication and quality of service delivery*

Parents were asked only two questions about communication with providers. Only 18 of 31 parents (58.1%) reported that providers communicated with them often or frequently about their child's progress ( $M = 2.48$ ,  $SD = 0.11$ ; Table 21). Less than half, 45.2% ( $M = 2.19$ ,  $SD = 0.12$ ) reported having received letters or notes from providers about their child's progress. Communication, thus, appears to be an area of potential program improvement.

Overall, parents had a more positive opinion about the alignment of tutoring with subjects their child worked on in school and the timeliness of tutoring sessions. The majority of parents agreed or strongly agreed that the provider helped the child with subjects he or she worked on in school (75.8%,  $M = 3.21$ ,  $SD = 0.19$ ) and began and ended tutoring sessions on time (90.0%,  $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 0.29$ ; Table 21).

**Table 21. Parents' Perceptions About Frequency of Communication and Timeliness of Tutoring Sessions**

Questions	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Never	Seldom	Often	Frequently	
<i>How often did the tutoring company...</i>					
...talk to you about your child's progress?	29.0	12.9	38.7	19.4	2.48 (0.11)
...send letters or notes about your child's progress?	38.7	16.1	32.3	12.9	2.19 (0.12)
...help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	6.9	17.2	24.1	51.7	3.21 (0.19)
...start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	6.7	3.3	23.3	66.7	3.50 (0.29)

\* Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree

### *Satisfaction with provider and district*

Overall, parents reported very high levels of agreement that tutoring services their children received were of high quality (Table 22). A large majority (93.6%;  $M = 3.39$ ,  $SD = 0.25$ ) agreed or strongly agreed that they were happy with the number of hours of free tutoring provided to their child. A slightly smaller percentage of parents reported that the tutoring has helped their child (87.1%;  $M = 3.26$ ,  $SD = 0.22$ ) and that they are pleased with the services provided to their child (83.9%;  $M = 3.23$ ,  $SD = 0.20$ ).

In regards to the district, parent responses indicate that they were overall satisfied with the role the district played in the SES program. A good majority reported that they were given information about students' rights as stated under the No Child Left Behind law (83.9%;  $M = 3.23$ ,  $SD = 0.20$ ; Table 22), were given enough time to decide the tutoring pro-

vider they wanted for their child (90.4%;  $M = 3.26$ ,  $SD = 0.24$ ), and were pleased with the district in helping them get free tutoring service to their child (90.3%;  $M = 3.35$ ,  $SD = 0.24$ ).

**Table 22. Parents' Satisfaction With the SES Provider and District Information**

Questions <i>I [Parents]...</i>	Percent of responses				Mean* (SD)
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	
...am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	3.2	3.2	45.2	48.4	3.39 (0.25)
...believe that the free tutoring has helped my child in school.	9.7	3.2	38.7	48.4	3.26 (0.22)
...am, overall, pleased with the services that my child received.	6.5	9.7	38.7	45.2	3.23 (0.20)
...was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	6.5	9.7	38.7	45.2	3.23 (0.20)
...was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	9.7	0.0	45.2	45.2	3.26 (0.24)
...am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	6.5	3.2	38.7	51.6	3.35 (0.24)

### Respondent group satisfaction with individual providers

Based on the very limited number of stakeholder group surveys received, results on overall satisfaction with each provider's services are presented (**Error! Reference source not found.**). There were, however, a number of approved providers for whom no stakeholder surveys were received. This is either because the provider served no SES-eligible students, stakeholders did not provide the name of the provider in their responses, or no responses were received from any stakeholder from the districts/schools served by the provider (Table 24).

### Summary of stakeholder perceptions about implementation and outcomes

The summary of findings of stakeholder perceptions is presented in alignment with each of the research questions established for the study. The results summarized below exclude "I don't know" responses to each survey item. A general discussion follows the presentation of the results of the evaluation questions.

#### 1. Do local education agencies (LEAs) make SES available to eligible students?

- All principal/site coordinator submissions (100%;  $n = 7$  of 7) strongly agree or agree they were satisfied with how their district helped their school implement services delivered by SES providers.



**Table 23. Summary of Overall Satisfaction\* by Respondent Group and Provider**

Provider	District coordinators		Principals/site coordinators		Teachers		Parents	
	Number of responses	% Agree/Strongly agree	Number of response	% Agree/Strongly agree	Number of responses	% Agree/Strongly agree	Number of responses	% Agree/Strongly agree
1:1 Online Tutoring	1	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ATS Project Success	2	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	100
Club Z! Tutoring	2	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	66.6
Educate Online	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ivy League Tutors	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RESA 1	1	100	2	100	14	92.8	9	88.8
RESA 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RESA 3	N/A	N/A	1	100	7	85.7	4	100
RESA 7	N/A	N/A	1	100	3	100	1	100
Sylvan Learning Center–Bridgeport/Morgantown	N/A	N/A	1	100	2	50	N/A	N/A
Sylvan Learning Center–Charleston	3	100	1	100	1	100	4	75
Sylvan Learning Center–Vienna	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	100

\*Responses to the question, “Overall, I am satisfied with this provider’s services.”

Note: N/A indicates no respondents completed a survey about this provider

**Table 24. Approved Providers 2011-2012, No Survey Data Available**

Providers	
#1 in Learning	Ivy League Tutors
1 to 1 tutor, LLC	Kinetic Potential Scholars
A Better Grade Tutoring, LLC	Laureate Learning Center, Inc.
Achieve High Points	Learning Ladder, Inc
Believe-N-U-Youth Empowerment, LLC	Learning It Systems, LLC
Brainfuse One-to-One Tutoring	RESA 2
Clay County Schools 21st Century Community Learning Centers	RESA 4
Educate Online, Inc.	RESA 5
Florida Virtual School	RESA 6
Focus First Tutoring	RESA 8
FreshWise Inc.	Summit Learning Services, Inc.
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	Tutors With Computers
	Tutorial Services

- The majority of respondent *parents* (90.3%;  $n = 28$  or 31) strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the way the district helped them get tutoring services to their child.
2. *Do schools and providers work together to meet the needs of eligible SES students?*
    - Half of *provider* respondents reported that tutors showed their lesson plans or materials to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they tutored (50% indicated frequently or often;  $n = 5$  of 10).
    - More than half of *district coordinator* responses noted that providers never or seldom collaborated with them to set goals for student growth (55.5%;  $n = 5$  of 9).
    - Only 25% of *principal/site coordinator* submissions ( $n = 2$  of 8) stated that collaboration with tutors to set goals for student growth occurred either frequently or often.
    - Less than half of *teacher* submissions indicated that provider collaboration to set goals for student growth transpired either frequently or often (43.2 %;  $n = 16$  of 37).
  3. *What are district coordinators', principals'/site coordinators', teachers', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?*
    - Almost all *district coordinators* (83.3%,  $n = 5$  of 6) either strongly agreed or agreed that the services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement.
    - All *principal/site coordinator* submissions (100%,  $n = 6$  of 6) strongly agreed or agreed that providers' services positively impacted student achievement.
    - The vast majority of *teacher* responses indicated that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (93.3% strongly agree or agree;  $n = 28$  of 30).
    - The majority of *parents* believed that providers' services helped their child in school (87.1% strongly agreed or agreed; 27 of 31).
  4. *Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?*
    - Responses from *providers* who participated in the evaluation indicated that their tutors communicated more frequently or often with parents regarding students' progress (100%,  $n = 10$  of 10) compared with communication with teachers regarding progress of their students (60%;  $n = 6$  of 10).
    - Most *district coordinator* respondents reported that providers communicated with them either frequently or often during the school year (81.8%;  $n = 9$  of 11).
    - Only half of *principal/site coordinator* responses indicated that providers communicated with them during the school year either frequently or often (50%;  $n = 4$  of 8).
    - Only 48.6% of *teachers* indicated that providers communicated with them either frequently or often during the school year ( $n = 18$  or 37).

- Only slightly more than half of responding *parents* reported that providers talked to them about their child's progress and a slightly greater number of parents indicated that providers sent letters/notes home about their child's progress (58.1%;  $n = 18$  of 31).
5. *Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?*
- A little over half of the responding *providers* (60.0%;  $n = 6$  of 10) indicated that tutoring services were integrated with classroom learning activities either frequently or often. Also, 80.0% of provider respondents stated that they were able to adapt the supplemental services to each school's curriculum ( $n = 8$  of 10).
  - The majority of the *district coordinators* (71.4%;  $n = 5$  of 7) reported that providers adapted tutoring services to the school curriculum while more than half (60%;  $n = 3$  of 5) strongly agreed or agreed that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities.
  - The majority of *principal/site coordinator* submissions (83.3%;  $n = 5$  of 6) indicated that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum and integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities, respectively.
  - Most *teacher* respondents strongly agreed or agreed that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities and to the needs of individual students (81.5%;  $n = 22$  of 27).
6. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?*
- The majority of responding *providers* reported that they frequently or often aligned their services with state academic content and standards (80.2%;  $n = 8$  of 10).
  - All *district coordinator* responses (100%;  $n = 10$  of 10) indicated that providers' services were aligned with state and local standards.
7. *Are providers offering services to special education and English language learner (ELL) students?*
- Most of responding *provider* representatives reported that their tutors offered instruction to special education and ELL students frequently or often (80.0%;  $n = 8$  of 10).
  - All responses from *district coordinators* indicated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (100%;  $n = 8$  of 8).
  - All *principal/site coordinator* responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers offered tutoring sessions to special education and ELL students (100%; 6 of 6).
8. *What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?*

- Most *district coordinators* strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with provider services overall (88.9%;  $n = 8$  of 9).
- All *principal/site coordinator* respondents strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with provider services (100%;  $n = 7$  of 7).
- The majority of *teachers* strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with provider services (85.7%;  $n = 24$  of 37).
- The majority of *parents* strongly agreed or agreed they were satisfied with provider services (83.9%;  $n = 26$  of 31).

## Discussion and Recommendations

---

During the 2011-2012 school year most students served by providers did not meet or exceed the median percent proficient in math and/or reading/language arts (RLA) for low-income students across four comparison groups. For the most part, the number of students served by any one SES provider was small (i.e., generally fewer than 10) when spread across subject areas in which students were tutored. RESA 3 was the only provider (with 24 students tutored) that was able to demonstrate a comparable median math proficiency percentage with those of the four comparison groups for students who received RLA and math tutoring combined. In no other case did an SES provider with at least 10 students to analyze by subject area have a large enough percentage of students score at the proficient level to meet or exceed median comparison group proficiency rates in RLA or math.

Additionally, students attended SES services an average of 19.05 hours, a utilization rate of 61.12%. This number of hours, spread over the course of a school year, is much lower than that reported by providers in the previous academic year, and it begs the question as to whether dramatic improvements in proficiency should be expected.

SES providers serving students in West Virginia during the 2011-2012 school year received predominately positive feedback from most respondent groups. District coordinators, principals/site coordinators, and teachers who participated in the evaluation were pleased with provider services overall. Providers, too, were primarily positive regarding their experiences with SES in West Virginia during the 2011-2012 school year.

Although district coordinator, principal/site coordinator, and teacher responses indicated overall satisfaction with providers' services, many fewer reported that providers collaborated with them to set goals for student improvement. If such collaboration were to occur between providers and district as well as school staff, perhaps students served would have a better chance to increase their learning of the specific knowledge and skills measured by the WESTEST 2. In addition, SES provider communication with respondent stakeholder groups also appears to be an area in need of improvement. With the exception of district coordinators, responses from other stakeholder groups indicate lower rates of satisfaction with the frequency with which the provider communicated with them. Furthermore, less than two thirds of contracted hours were utilized by SES qualified students, which points to an area of improvement in the delivery of future SES programming.

The primary areas for program improvement as identified by respondent stakeholder groups were to (a) increase the frequency with which providers communicated with principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents, (b) increase the frequency with which providers collaborated with district and school personnel to set goals for student growth, and (c) increase the rate of attendance and utilization of SES services. Providing opportunities for stakeholders to meet on a regular basis, or soliciting feedback from the respective stakeholder groups on other ways to increase communication and collaboration could lead to improvement of this aspect of the SES program. All stakeholder groups should also continue to encourage students to take advantage of SES services. The WVDE may wish to consider

identifying best practices among providers, districts, schools, and parents that would address areas of improvement and share those with all providers, districts, and schools.

As West Virginia moves forward with SES, the WVDE should continue to encourage participation in the evaluation of SES providers. While great strides were made in securing parent and district coordinator responses this year, with the exception of SES providers, relatively fewer principals/site coordinators and teachers completed their surveys. This makes it difficult to provide a reliable evaluation of SES services. District coordinators should continue to promote principals'/site coordinators' and teachers' involvement in the evaluation. Similarly, the WVDE should remain persistent in requiring provider involvement during the evaluation process as every active provider should be represented in the survey findings. Efforts should also be continued to encourage adherence to federal regulations at all levels, while continuing to ensure all eligible students are able to take advantage of this opportunity to improve academic achievement levels.

### **Limitations of the Study**

One limiting factor associated with the analyses was the small sample size for many providers, which reduced the number of providers available for reliable evaluation. In RLA as well as math, only two providers had 10 or more students available with 2011-2012 test data. When limiting the analysis to students with at least 50% attendance rates, these numbers were even smaller. One must note that such small samples may not reliably represent the quality of services provided across the state.

Furthermore, the results should be interpreted with caution due to the descriptive nature of the study. Although reasonably specified comparison groups were identified, with such small numbers of SES students represented across providers any adequate statistical comparison is not possible. With these considerations in mind, it is problematic to draw definitive conclusions about SES provider effectiveness as it relates to the goal of increasing student achievement in RLA and math.

## Appendix A. Eligible Districts and Schools, and Approved Providers

**Table A 1. Districts and Schools Eligible for Title I Supplemental Educational Services (SES), Numbers of Eligible and Participating Students, 2011-2012**

District	School	Amount Spent for SES	Number of SES Participants*
Total of SES Participants			134
Barbour	Philippi Elementary	N/A	2
Boone	Brookview Elementary	N/A	6
Clay	Clay Middle	N/A	24
Doddridge	Doddridge Elementary	N/A	6
	Doddridge County Middle		7
Grant	Petersburg Elementary	N/A	11
Hampshire	Romney Elementary	N/A	6
Kanawha	Cedar Grove Elementary	N/A	2
	Watts Elementary	N/A	1
Lincoln	Guyan Valley Middle	N/A	5
McDowell	Southside K-8	N/A	10
	Welch Elementary	N/A	3
Mercer	Bluefield Intermediate	N/A	19
Mineral	Keyser Primary/Middle	N/A	0
Monroe	Mt. View Elementary/Middle	N/A	14
Nicholas	Cherry River Elementary	N/A	0
Roane	Geary Elementary/Middle	N/A	0
Wood	Franklin Elementary	N/A	7
	Van Devender Middle		11

\*Figures account only the number of participants who have received services until the end of April, 2011.

**Table A 2. Approved Providers and Topics and Grade Levels Covered, 2011-2012**

Provider	Topics	Grades
#1 in Learning	Reading and mathematics	K-12
1:1 Online Tutoring Services*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
1 to 1 Tutor, LLC	Mathematics	K-12
A Better Grade Tutoring, LLC	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Achieve High Points	Mathematics	3-12
Achievers' Tutoring of West Virginia	Reading and mathematics	K-12
ATS Project Success*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Believe-N-U-Youth Empowerment, LLC	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Brainfuse One-to-One Tutoring	Reading and mathematics	3-12
Clay County Schools 21st Century Community Learning Centers	Reading and mathematics	PreK-12
Club Z! Tutoring*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Educate Online Learning, LLC*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Florida Virtual School	Reading, writing, and mathematics	6-12
Focus First Tutoring	Reading and mathematics	3-12
FreshWise Inc.	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Ivy League Tutors*	Reading and mathematics	PreK-12
Kinetic Potential Scholars	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Laureate Learning Center, Inc.	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Learning Ladder, Inc.	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Learn It systems, LLC	Reading and mathematics	K-8
RESA 1*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
RESA 2*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
RESA 3*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
RESA 4	Reading/language arts and mathematics	K-12
RESA 5	Reading and mathematics	K-12
RESA 6	Reading and mathematics	K-12
RESA 7*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
RESA 8	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Summit Learning Services, Inc.	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Sylvan Learning Center #4802–Bridgeport and #4805–Morgantown*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Sylvan Learning Center #4801–Charleston*	Reading and mathematics	K-12
Sylvan Learning Center #4800–Vienna*	Reading and mathematics	PreK-12
Tutors With Computers	Reading	3-12
Tutorial Services	Reading and mathematics	K-12

\*Provider actually delivered SES during the 2011-2012 school year (12 of 35)



## Appendix B. Title I Supplemental Educational Services— District Coordinator Survey

---

Provider Name:

District(s) Served:

How often did SES providers communicate with you during the school year?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

How often did SES providers collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

How often did SES providers communicate with teachers during the year?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

How often did SES providers communicate with parents during the year?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

How often did SES providers meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

### District Coordinator Satisfaction

The provider adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider aligned their services with state and local standards.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider offered services to Special Education and ELL students.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider complied with applicable state and local (e.g., health, safety, civil rights) laws.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Overall Assessment**

I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Thank you for your time!**



## Appendix C. Principal/Site Coordinator Survey

---

District Name:

School Name:

### Perceptions and Activities

How often did the provider communicate with you during the school year?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the provider collaborate with you to set goals for student improvement?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the provider communicate with teachers during the year?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the provider meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

The provider started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider offered services to Special Education and ELL students.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

### Overall Assessment

I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**District Assessment**

Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Thank you for your time!**





## Appendix D. Title I Supplemental Educational Services— Provider Survey

---

Provider Name:

District(s) Served:

Program Duration

- 1-10 weeks
- 11-20 weeks
- 21-30 weeks
- 31-40 weeks
- More than 40 weeks
- Other:

Average number of sessions attended: Please provide a single number, not a range (e.g., 15).

Length of the average tutoring session

- 0 to .5 hour
- .5 hour to 1 hour
- 1 hour to 1.5 hours
- 1.5 hours to 2.0 hours
- More than 2.0 hours
- Other:

Setting (mark all that apply)

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

Format (mark all that apply)

- Individual
- Small Group (2-5 students per tutor)
- Large Group (6-10 students per tutor)

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

- Yes, district/school transports students
- No, parents are responsible for transportation
- Other:

Please describe the qualifications of the tutors (mark all that apply).

- Tutors have had training
- Tutors have bachelor's degrees
- Tutors are certified teachers
- Other:

Please identify the instructional activities that occur with students (mark all that apply).

- One-on-one tutoring (in person)
- One-on-one tutoring (via electronic communication)
- Direct instruction
- Independent seatwork
- Computer-based tutoring
- Other:

### **Provider Perceptions and Activities**

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

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

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

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

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

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English language learners.

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Frequently

### Provider Satisfaction

I am satisfied with student attendance.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation) toward SES services.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with the ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with parent cooperation/involvement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with teacher cooperation/involvement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with principal/site coordinator cooperation/involvement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with district SES coordinator cooperation/involvement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with state SES coordinator cooperation/involvement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am satisfied with the success of SES at raising student achievement to desired levels.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

## Appendix E. Title I Supplemental Educational Services— Teacher Survey

---

District Name:

School Name:

### Perceptions and Activities

How often did the provider communicate with you during the school year?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the provider collaborate with you to set goals for student improvement?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

### Teacher Satisfaction

The provider adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.

- Strongly Disagree

- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Overall Assessment**

I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Thank you for your time!**

## Appendix F. Title I Supplemental Educational Services— Parent Survey

---

District Name:

School Name:

My child's provider:

### Perceptions and Activities

How often did the tutoring company talk to you about your child's progress?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the tutoring company send letters or notes home about your child's progress?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the tutoring company help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

How often did the tutoring company start and end the tutoring sessions on time?

- Never
- Seldom
- Often
- Frequently

### Parent Satisfaction

I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

I believe that the free tutoring has helped my child in school.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

### Satisfaction with District Information

I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

**Thank you for your time!**







*Students deserve it • The world demands it*



Jorea M. Marple, Ed.D.  
State Superintendent of Schools