



Supplemental Education Services
Annual Evaluation Report
2008-2009

Prepared by:

John J. Usera, Ph. D.
Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation®
Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc.
1641 Deadwood Avenue
Rapid City, SD 57702



Table of Contents

Overview 3

Guiding Questions for Evaluating SES Providers 4

Methodology 5

 Effectiveness Measures 5

 Customer Satisfaction Measures 6

Findings 7

 Demographic Profile 7

 Monitoring 22

 Principals Questionnaire Results 31

 Classroom Teacher Questionnaire Results 33

 Parent Questionnaire Results 35

Conclusion 38

Recommendations 40

Overview

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires local education agencies (LEA) to provide supplemental education services to low income students when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement. Title I, Section 1116(e) explains that supplemental education services (SES) are “additional instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement. These services may include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions...”

Supplemental educational services are provided outside of the regular school day to increase student achievement and may include assistance such as tutoring, remediation, and other academic interventions. Parents of eligible students may obtain these services from their child free of charge from an approved SES provider of their choice. The South Dakota Department of Education are responsible for approving SES providers and providing local districts with a list of the approved providers serving the area.¹

South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) issued a request for proposals for agencies to provide supplemental education services (Appendix A) due on April 11, 2008. The proposals were reviewed by a team of educators on April 17 and 18. The applications were reviewed based on several criteria. These included a description of the program, staffing, research and program effectiveness, assessment and monitoring of students, and financial and organizational capacity. The provider was asked to show evidence that the program is aligned to the state standards in the areas of reading and mathematics.

Once the SES provider had successfully completed the request for proposal and successfully completed the review process, then the provider was placed on the DOE approved provider list. The local educational agency (LEA) is required then to notify

¹ U.S. Department of Education (2007). *Giving parents options: Strategies for informing parents and implementing public school choice and supplemental education services under no child left behind*. Washington, D.C.: Author, Office of Innovation and Improvement.

parents when the LEA has reached Level II of school improvement and offer supplemental education services. Parents may elect to have their child participate. Upon receipt of acceptance for supplemental education services, the LEA contacts the SES providers and services are contracted for the child. The services are paid by the LEA through allocated Title I funds. The services are provided before or after school. Depending on the provider, services may be implemented in the school or home.

The purpose of this report is to provide data and information regarding the implementation of supplemental education services in South Dakota during the 2008-09 school year. For the reporting period, there were 10 providers approved in South Dakota. The providers ranged from computer-based programs to face-to-face tutoring and mentoring. The Institute for Educational Leadership and Evaluation® (IELE), a project of the Chiesman Center for Democracy, Inc., was commissioned to conduct the review of the SES proposals and to monitor and evaluate the SES providers for the 2008-09 school year.

Guiding Questions For Evaluating SES Providers

To effectively monitor SES providers, the South Dakota Department of Education in collaboration with the Institute for Educational Leadership & Evaluation, develop a set of guiding questions and protocol to measure the impact of the SES provider's services. There were three major questions asked:

1. Did the provider increase student achievement in reading, language arts, and mathematics? [Effectiveness]
2. Are parents of students who receive SES satisfied? [Satisfaction]
3. Did the provider comply with applicable South Dakota and district laws and contractual procedures associated with the delivery of SES? [Compliance]

The providers were informed of the expectation to demonstrate effectiveness of their respective programs in serving all types of students including English language learners (ELL) and students with special needs and disabilities. Depending upon the specific locations, delivery methodologies, and resources, the providers were expected to provide information and data about:

1. Tutors' experience and qualifications;
2. The amount of tutoring time students received;
3. The individualized instructional strategies used;
4. Instructor to student ratios and grouping formats;
5. Communication protocols with parents and teachers;
6. Promised transportation of students to and from tutoring; and
7. Promised materials and support systems for the students.

Methodology

Effectiveness Measures

Measures of impact on student academic achievement are critical to a state's evaluation of SES providers. This is especially true because the No Child Left Behind Act requires that, a minimum, states remove providers from their approved list if the provider fails to increase students' achievement for two consecutive years.² Data was collected using the Dakota Step to measure annual progress in the areas of reading and mathematics in addition to supplementary individualized assessments, and provider developed assessments to document improved academic achievement.

Many of the providers used pretest and posttest scores to measure changes in student's achievement. The pretest scores served as a guide for developing individualized

² Ross, S., Potter, A. & Harmon, J. (2006). *Evaluating supplemental education service providers: Suggested strategies for states*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Research in Educational Policy.

instructional strategies by the many of the providers. In some case the pretest was used as a diagnostic tool to determine what level and components of instruction were need by the individual student. The validity and reliability of supplementary individualized assessments were monitored and substantiated by the providers when requested. Some of the supplementary assessments were administered at the school site, but in the majority of the cases it was administered during the tutoring period of instruction both on-line and face-to-face.

Provider developed assessments to measure student progress were used in conjunction with specific curriculum materials. The objectivity and validity of the scores could be compromised when the providers themselves were asked to administer and score the tests that would be used to judge the effectiveness of their inventions. For many of the providers, these tests served a diagnostic and formative role rather than a true assessment of achievement.

Customer Satisfaction Measures

Parents, families, and students are SES providers' most important customers. Teachers and school administrators were viewed as passive customers of the SES providers. The school it was important that program was satisfactory or excellent in helping students receiving quality services. To collect information on customer satisfaction regarding the SES providers the **Comprehensive Assessment Systems (CAS)**, a web-based survey system, was designed and implemented by South Dakota Department of Education. The CAS included a Local Education Agency Questionnaire, Provider Questionnaire, Teacher Questionnaire, Principal Questionnaire, and Parent Questionnaire

All the providers and the schools were contacted to complete the CAS questionnaires and provide documentation and logs regarding the students served. Field monitors reported the quality and status of the implementation of services by the providers.

Findings

Demographic Profile

Data was collected by the South Dakota Department of Education on 461 students during the 2007-2008 school year. In 2008-09 school year, data was available for 1,049 students. This was an increase of 127% in the number students enrolled in any available SES program from the previous year. Students who were enrolled in any SES provider's program were tracked using their Student Identification Membership number (SIMS). Data included assessment scores from the Dakota STEP state assessment and the providers' assessments. In the 2008-09 school year, data was collected from 36 schools located in 13 school districts.

Table 1.0 shows the distribution of reports and surveys returned to the South Dakota Department of Education. There were 7,403 eligible students from the reporting school districts for supplemental educational services. One thousand forty-nine (n = 1,049) students enrolled in SES during the 2008-9 school year or 14.2% of the eligible students used the services. In 2007-08 school year 461 students enrolled in SES out of 5,527 eligible students or 8.3% of the eligible students. This was a substantial increase in the number of students served in this two year period.

Oelrichs School District had the highest rate of participation at 100% (n = 23) followed by Smee School District at 36.3% (n = 77), and Sioux Falls School District at 34.4% (n = 647). While three school districts (Belle Fourche, McLaughlin, and Shannon County) reported serving no students during the 2008–09 school year.

A total of 74 classroom teachers completed a survey regarding SES, while 22 principals completed a survey. This was a decrease in the response rate from the previous year of 3.9% for teachers and an increase of 22.2% for the principals. Forty three (n = 43) parents completed a survey as compared to 18 parents from the previous year. The survey asked questions about the delivery and quality of services from the provider and the participating schools.

Table 2.0 shows the number of students served by nine of the providers used by school site. **Club Z** reported the highest use by the participating students at 28.0% (n = 199). This was a from the previous year in which Club Z was used by 160 of the students. **TutorCo** had the lowest use rate for 2007-08 at less than 1% (0.02%, n = 14). Tutorial

Services had the second highest use rate by the students at 17.3% (n = 123). The third high use rate was Sylvan Learning Center at 13.1% (n = 93). Sioux Falls School District used the largest number of providers, 6 out of the 9 (66.7%) being reported. Six of the 12 (50.0%) reporting schools used only one provider for the year.

Table 1.0 Distribution of Surveys & Reports Submitted To The South Dakota Department of Education 2008-2009									
District	LEA Report	Principal Survey	Teacher Survey	Parent Survey	Average Number of Providers Used Per District	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Number of Students Not Using SES	Percent Served
Andes Central	Yes	1	5	11	2	192	28	164	14.6%
Belle Fourche	No	1	0	0	0	108	0	108	0.0%
Bennett County	No	1	8	5	1	0	0	0	0.0%
McLaughlin	No	1	1	0	0	187	0	187	0.0%
Oelrichs	Yes	1	2	2	1	23	23	0	100.0%
Sisseton	Yes	1	0	1	1	243	13	230	5.4%
Rapid City	No	3	0	0	1	1,845	80	1,765	4.3%
Sioux Falls	Yes	8	42	20	6	1,883	647	1,236	34.4%
Todd County	Yes	0	1	1	1	1,913	156	1,757	8.2%
White River	No	2	3	1	2	230	12	218	5.2%
Winner	No	1	12	2	5	100	2	98	2.0%
Smee	No	2	0	0	1	212	77	135	36.3%
Shannon County	No	0	0	0	0	224	0	224	0.0%
Watertown	Yes	1	0	0	1	243	11	232	4.5%
TOTAL	42.9%	23	74	43	1.6	7,403	1,049	6,354	14.2%

Table 2.0
Distribution of Students by SES Provider
2008-2009

District	Academia	Babbage	Club Z	Educate Online	Excel Achieve Center	TutorCo Online	Olaudah SES Program	Sylvan Learning Center	Achieve High Points	Tutorial Services	Total
Andes Central	25	9									34
Bennet County										8	8
Belle Fourche											0
McLaughlin										1	1
Oelrichs		23									23
Rapid City		20	18							16	54
Shannon County											0
Sisseton										8	8
Sioux Falls		12	180	15	28			93		62	390
Smee							77				77
Todd County	55					14				18	87
Watertown		3								3	6
White River	12										12
Winner		2	1							7	10
Total	92	69	199	15	28	14	77	93	0	123	710

In 2006-2007 39.8% of the students were White and 44.4% were American Indian. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls, while the majority of sites report less than two different ethnic groups (Table 3.1). Andes Central, Eagle Butte, and Shannon County reported high numbers of American Indian students due to their location on or near an Indian Reservation. In addition, 54.4% of the students (n = 130) were female and 45.6% (n = 109) were male. One in three students (34.9%) had disabilities and 30.3% of the students had Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for special education.

Table 3.1
Distribution of Students by Ethnicity
2006-2007

School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	0	24	7	0	31
Belle Fourche	0	1	0	0	4	1	6
Canton	0	1	0	0	15	0	16
Eagle Butte	0	0	0	6	1	0	7
Milbank	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Rapid City	0	0	0	1	6	0	7
Shannon County	0	0	0	34	0	1	35
Sioux Falls	2	22	9	8	52	0	93
Smee	0	0	0	21	2	0	23
Todd County	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
Watertown	1	0	0	0	5	0	6
White River	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Winner	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	3	24	9	107	96	2	241
Percent	1.2%	10.0%	3.7%	44.4%	39.8%	0.8%	100.0%

Table 3.2 Distribution of Students by Ethnicity 2007- 2008							
School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	0	1	16	5	0	22
Milbank	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Rapid City	0	0	1	6	5	0	12
Sioux Falls	10	128	95	45	127	0	405
Todd County	0	1	0	17	2	0	20
Watertown	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
TOTAL	10	129	97	84	147	0	467
Percent	2.1%	27.6%	20.8%	18.0%	31.5%	0.0%	100.0%

In 2007-08 (Table 3.2), 31.5% of the students were White and 18.0% were American Indian. Almost sixty percent (59.5%) less American Indian students were served in this reporting year. Black students made up the highest percentage of the non-white students at 27.6% followed by the Hispanics at 20.8%. The most diverse student population was reported by Sioux Falls, while the majority of sites report less than three different ethnic groups (Table 3.2). Over forty percent (43.3%, n = 202) of the students were female and 56.7% (n = 265) were male. One in four students (25.7%, n = 120) were identified as special education students and 54.8% (n = 256) of the students were identified as English Proficient Limited (LEP) students.

In 2008-09 (Table 3.3), 42.9% (n = 6) of the school districts provided an LEA report on the participating students. Of the reporting school districts, 48.5% (n = 286) students did not report their ethnicity. Seventeen percent (17.3%) of the reporting students were American Indian, 15.6% were White, 9.8% were Black, and 8.1% were Hispanic.

Table 3.3 Distribution of Students by Ethnicity 2008- 2009							
School District	Asian	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	White	Not Available	Total
Andes Central	0	1	0	15	1	11	28
Oelrichs	0	0	0	18	3	24	45
Sisseton	0	0	0	1	3	4	8
Sioux Falls	4	57	48	15	81	239	444
Todd County	0	0	0	53	0	8	61
Watertown	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
TOTAL	4	58	48	102	92	286	590
Percent	0.7%	9.8%	8.1%	17.3%	15.6%	48.5%	100.0%

The *Dakota STEP* results were used as an annual comparison of student progress. Students in grades three through eight, and grade 11 are tested in the spring of each year. Students who are in kindergarten through second grade were not tested. Table 4.1 shows the two-year descriptive statistics of the students' reading scores by school districts. Table 4.2 shows two-year descriptive statistics of the students' mathematics scores by school districts. A measurable outcome of students participating in SES is to provide additional academic support so that students which will contribute to improved *Dakota STEP* scores from year to year.

The *Dakota STEP* is South Dakota's annual statewide assessment of student progress. It is administered to students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 for Reading and Mathematics, grades 5, 8, and 11 for Science, each spring. The *Dakota STEP* fulfills the requirements for statewide assessment contained in the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). The assessment instruments are composed of multiple-choice items for all content domains and grades. All operational (core) multiple-choice items are worth one raw score point and are the basis of student scores. All students are assessed with the same operational items for each content domain. Linking (anchor or equating) items are operational items used to link the current assessment to the previous year's score scale, and are included in the count of core items.

Table 4.1**Dakota STEP Scaled Reading Scores by School District
SES Participants' Unadjusted Reading Scores**

School District	2007-08				2008-09				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (M)	Median (Md)	% Md Change
Andes Central	10	602.6	23.3	603	17	599.0	26.4	600	-4	-3	-0.5%
Oelrichs	23	652.9	27.4	658	21	598.9	26.0	600	-54	-58	-8.8%
Sioux Falls	128	622.1	35.3	623	205	596.3	27.4	594	-26	-29	-4.7%
Sisseton	3	656.3	42.7	665	4	625.0	36.9	626	-31	-39	-5.9%
Todd County	42	640.2	33.7	642	43	583.7	33.5	580	-57	-62	-9.7%
Total/Average	206	634.82	32.48	638.2	290	600.6	30.04	600	-34	-38	-6.0%

Table 4.2								
Dakota STEP Reading Scores by School District								
SES Participants' Adjusted Reading Scores								
School District	2007-08			2008-09 (Normalized)			Score Differences	
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean (M)	% Mean Change
Andes Central	10	602.6	23.3	17	621.5	30.9	19	3.1%
Oelrichs	23	652.9	27.4	21	621.4	30.5	-32	-4.8%
Sioux Falls	128	622.1	35.3	205	618.8	31.9	-3	-0.5%
Sisseton	3	656.3	42.7	4	647.5	41.4	-9	-1.3%
Todd County	42	640.2	33.7	43	606.2	38.0	-34	-5.3%
Total/Average	206	634.8	32.5	290	623.0	34.5	-12	-1.9%

Table 4.3									
Dakota STEP Reading Scores by Grade Level									
Grade	2007-08			2008-09			Paired t-test		
	n	Mean	SE Mean	n	Mean	SE Mean	df	t	p
4	60	606.5	3.88	70	595.1	3.23	59	0.50	0.618
5	60	619.1	3.93	70	600.0	3.66	59	1.97	0.054
6	12	623.0	7.56	11	576.5	10.4	11	1.48	0.170
7	20	633.2	6.77	20	592.1	7.14	20	1.54	0.141
8	27	655.4	5.70	27	597.1	4.95	27	0.34	0.733

In Table 4.1, which shows the Dakota STEP reading scores for SES participants by reporting school district. It shows that 34.9% (n = 206) of the students who received SES during the 2007-08 school year completed the Dakota STEP while in 2008-09, 49.2% (n = 290) of the SES students completed the Dakota STEP. The 2007-08 scores were used as the pre-test scores and were matched with post-test scores from 2008-09. The reading achievement test scores in 2008-09 were obtained from a differently designed test from the previous year and thus are reported as unadjusted scores.

Table 5.1
Dakota STEP Results by School District
SES Participants' Matched Mathematics Scores

School District	2007-08				2008-09				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean (M)	Median (Md)	% M Change
Andes Central	10	589.3	14.6	590	17	597.4	25.9	598	8	8	1.4%
Oelrichs	23	667.7	34.4	667	21	677.4	30.4	676	10	9	1.5%
Sioux Falls	128	601.0	41.5	603	205	614.9	38.5	611	14	8	2.3%
Sisseton	3	689.3	60.7	706	4	688.0	82.2	694	-1	-12	-0.2%
Todd County	42	644.1	36.3	646	43	636.9	37.6	641	-7	-5	-1.1%
Total/Average	206	638.3	37.5	642.4	290	642.9	42.92	644	5	2	0.7%

Table 5.2									
Dakota STEP Mathematic Scores by Grade Level									
Grade	2007-08			2008-09			Paired t-test		
	n	Mean	SE Mean	n	Mean	SE Mean	df	t	p
4	60	591.8	6.32	70	618.7	4.44	59	1.41	0.164
5	60	609.6	3.97	70	633.7	3.73	59	3.26	0.002*
6	12	620.0	8.62	11	633.5	9.83	11	1.63	0.135
7	20	644.9	7.43	20	655.5	9.23	20	0.25	0.807
8	27	672.6	6.79	27	676.0	5.59	27	2.98	0.006*

* Statistically significant different at the alpha 0.01 level

Table 4.2 shows the adjusted reading scores which have been normalized based on the population means and standard deviations for each grade level. The 2007-08 and 2008-09 reading scores were converted to z-scores and tested using matched t-test for statistical significant differences at the 95% confidence level. Table 4.3 shows that there were no significant changes in the reading scores for the SES students in the 4th to 8th grade.

In Table 5.1, which shows the Dakota STEP mathematics mean scores for SES participants by school district. It shows that 34.9% (n = 206) of the students who received SES during the 2007-08 school year completed the Dakota STEP while in 2008-09, 49.2% (n = 290) of the SES students completed the Dakota STEP. The 2007-08 scores were used as the pre-test scores and were matched with post-test scores from 2008-09. The mathematics achievement test design was not changed over the two year period.

In Table 5.2, which shows the mathematics levels for SES participants by grade level. Students in grade 5 and 8 showed a statistically significant change in Dakota STEP mathematics score over the two year period. Overall there was a 0.7% improvement in the mathematics Dakota STEP score from the spring of 2008 to the spring of 2009.

Table 6.1
Dakota STEP Results by Provider
SES Participants' Matched Reading Scores (Unadjusted & Adjusted)

Provider	2007-08				2008-09					Score Differences	
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean Unadjusted	Mean Adjusted	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean	% M Change
Academia	37	627.3	30.9	628	44	589.7	642.1	27.5	587	14.8	2.4%
Babbage	26	650.5	26.9	652	26	598.8	651.2	26.7	598	0.7	0.1%
Club Z	46	622.4	86.9	606	83	591.7	644.1	26.0	591	21.7	3.5%
Cyberstudy	12	615.4	27.8	617	19	608.4	660.8	29.2	609	45.4	7.4%
Educate Online	7	670.7	145.5	619	10	601.6	654.0	28.1	596	(16.7)	-2.5%
Excel	10	626.9	37.3	630	15	597.7	650.1	29.9	586	23.2	3.7%
Sylvan	28	614.8	32.5	624	45	596.3	648.7	27.4	595	33.9	5.5%
TutorCo	4	681.3	16.0	679	1	558.0	610.4		558	(70.9)	-10.4%
Tutorial	36	644.7	93.4	627	47	596.4	648.8	35.4	588	4.1	0.6%
TOTAL	206	639.3	55.2	631.3	290	593.2	645.6	28.8	589.8	6.3	1.0%

Table 6.2
Dakota STEP Results by Provider
SES Participants' Matched Mathematics Scores

Provider	2007-08				2008-09				Score Differences		
	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mean	Median	% Md Change
Academia	37	628.8	36.5	627	44	627.0	36.4	628	(1.8)	1	0.2%
Babbage	26	659.1	40.9	655	26	661.3	44.0	669	2.2	14	2.1%
Club Z	46	594.3	45.7	584	83	610.7	37.6	603	16.4	19	3.3%
Cyberstudy	12	616.3	37.3	629	19	623.9	45.4	621	7.6	-8	-1.3%
Educate Online	7	607.9	29.6	617	10	638.6	22.3	650	30.7	33	5.3%
Excel	10	617.5	35.3	619	15	612.7	46.1	603	(4.8)	-16	-2.6%
Sylvan	28	607.5	34.2	613	45	613.0	39.6	611	5.5	-2	-0.3%
TutorCo	4	673.5	10.1	674	1	666.0		666	(7.5)	-8	-1.2%
Tutorial	36	611.8	57.2	611	47	626.2	46.6	615	14.4	4	0.7%
TOTAL	206	624.1	36.3	625.4	290	631.0	39.8	629.6	7.0	4	0.7%

Table 6.1 shows a comparison between the reading levels between 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years by service provider. The overall means and medians include all the grade level scores that the provider served during the year. Since the 2008-09 Dakota STEP reading tests were changed from the previous the mean scores were be adjusted to show appropriate differences. All of the providers showed overall improvement the reading scores except Educate Online. The overall percent mean changes was 1.0 for all the providers. The highest change was noted by CyberStudy while the minimum change was Educate Online at -2.5%.

Table 6.2 shows a comparison between the mathematics levels between 2008-08 and 2008-09 school years by service provider. The format for 2007-08 and 2008-09 for the Dakota STEP mathematics tests did not change during the two year period. There was an overall improvement in the mean scores of 0.7%. Three programs showed a small decrease in overall mean scores from 2008 to 2009. Cyberstudy had a 1.3% decrease [t(29) = -0.485, p < 0.631], Sylvan Learning Centers had 0.3% [t(71) = -0.607, p < 0.546] and Excel showed a 2.6% decrease [t(23) = -0.279, p < 0.883]. None of the decreases were statistically significant at the 0.05 alpha level. Educate Online was the only organization that had statistically significant change from 2008 to 2009 [t(15) = 2.45, p < 0.0273].

Table 6.3 shows the a summary of data service reported from 2005 to 2009 regarding the mean number of sessions for the reported student. The number of hours and sessions that a student participated depended on the attendance of the student, the requirements of the provider, and the location of the services. In 2007-08, students participated in an average of 20.6 sessions with minimum number of sessions being 1.0 and the maximum of 62. Half of the students participated in more than 24 sessions. In 2006-07 the mean number of sessions was at 25.1 with a maximum number of 109 sessions. Data for 2008-09 was not available.

Table 6.3 Number of Sessions Served by Providers to Students					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	211	25.1	1	109	21.0
2007-2008	349	20.6	1	62	24.0
2008-2009	616	NA	NA	NA	NA

Parent contact is mandatory for the SES providers. In 2005-06, parents were contacted an average of 22 times (Table 7.0). In 2006-07, the parents were contacted an average of 12 times. But in 2007-08 the average number of contacts per student was 4 times. Half of the 59 students' parents were contacted between 5 and 12 times during the year. In 2008-2009, forty parents reported that they were contacted an average of 4.7 times with half of the respondents report at less four contacts by the provider. Some providers reported contacting parents after each session through the use of the email or on-line services, while other providers sent reports through the mail on a monthly basis. About 27% of the parents who completed the Parent Questionnaire reported never being contacted by the provider in 2008-09.

Table 7.0 Number of Parent Contacts (Parents Report)					
	Number of Students	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2005-2006	139	22.2	1	54	23.0
2006-2007	137	12.5	1	109	10.0
2007-2008	59	4.1	3	12	5.0
2008-2009	40	4.7	0	12	4.0

Table 8.0 shows the cost comparison for serving students. The average per pupil cost was \$875.20 with a median at \$1,100. The cost per hour of service was an average \$71.47 in 2007-08. In the previous year, the mean per pupil cost was \$938.20 with a median at \$927.50. This calculated to be approximately \$75.06 per hour of service. There was no data available for 2008-09.

Table 8.0 Provider Costs				
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Median
2006-2007				
Per Pupil Cost	\$938.20	\$7.00	\$2,569.00	\$927.50
Cost Per Hour	\$75.06	\$7.00	\$205.52	\$60.00
2007-2008				
Per Pupil Cost	\$875.20	\$10.00	\$3,052.50	\$1,100.00
Cost Per Hour	\$71.47	\$10.00	\$373.00	\$60.00

Monitoring

The South Dakota Department of Education monitored 36 SES eligible schools and 13 districts to determine if supplemental education services were being made available to students and parents. In addition to the reports and surveys completed by each provider and teachers, parents, and administrators from each school site, site visits were performed by Dr. Al Koster throughout the year to determine the level and type of services being provided. It served as opportunity to answer questions about SES and be in compliance with the state's reporting requirements. The following are some the highlights of the field notes from the monitoring process during the year. The districts monitored during the 2008-09 school year included Andes Central (Andes Elementary), Belle Fourche (Belle Fourche Middle School), McLaughlin (McLaughlin Elementary), Oelrichs (Oelrichs Junior High), Rapid City (General Beadle Elementary, Horace Mann Elementary, Knollwood Elementary, Robbinsdale Elementary, North Middle, and Valley View Elementary), Shannon County (Batesland K-8 and Redshirt Table K-8), Sioux Falls (LB Anderson Elementary, Cleveland Elementary, Garfield Elementary, Hawthorne Elementary, Hayward Elementary, Longfellow Elementary, and Lowell Elementary), Sisseton (Westside Elementary and Middle School), Smee (Wakpala Elementary, Wakpala Middle, and Wakpala High), Todd County (Todd County High, Todd County Middle, Rosebud Elementary, He Dog Elementary, Spring Creek Elementary, OKreek Elementary, South Elementary, and North Elementary), Watertown (Watertown High), White

River (White River Elementary, Norris Elementary, and White River Middle) and Winner (Winner Middle).

Andes Elementary School:

- Performed an onsite visit. There were 192 eligible students and 28 students enrolled in SES.
- They had contracts with *Academia.Net*. (19 students enrolled) and a contract with *Babbage* (9)
- Goal was to begin implementation of SES in November but did not start until December. They were surprised that Babbage used a paper and pencil pre assessment that had to be administered at the school. An issue was handling a vision impaired student that qualified for the program.
- The building contact person Sara VanZee who was the contact person in the follow up logistics for the program. They did participate in the Administrator Survey & Teacher Survey.

Belle Fourche Middle School:

- Performed an onsite visit. There were 108 eligible students and no students enrolled in SES.
- Previously they had a contract with *Black Hills Special Services*, but they are no longer an approved provider. They do have a 21st Century program in which they provide SES type services to 80 students. They are considering applying to be a provider for 2009-10.
- They did participate in the mid-year Administrator Survey.

McLaughlin Elementary and Middle School:

- Performed an onsite visit. There were 187 eligible students and no students enrolled in SES.
- There were no responses from their parents for SES for 2008-09. They do use their Friday no school schedule to provide for tutorial help. She did mention that the Boys and Girls Club was considering applying to become a provider in 2009-10.
- They did not participate in the mid-year administrator survey.

Oelrichs Junior High:

- Performed an onsite visit. There were 23 eligible students and 23 students enrolled in SES. They had a contract with *Babbage Net* (23 students enrolled).
- The school is new to SES this year and would not be ready to start the program until the second semester. They planned to use an end of the day time activity

period time frame for the services which would allow students to take the late activity bus home.

- They did participate in the mid-year administrator survey and teacher survey.

Rapid City Area School District:

- Three onsite visits to the central office with administrator and six schools.
- General issues which slowed program delivery initially included a new central office director getting details and agreements worked out with providers, implementing the format with onsite SES contact staff members, extreme weather conditions, communication with online providers, and loss of Black Hill Special Services as a provider.
- They did participate in the mid-year administrator survey.

General Beadle Elementary

- 292 eligible students and 6 students enrolled in SES
- They had a contract with *Tutorial Services*. The principal stated in her Monitoring Report that they sent letters home, did follow ups but had problems with parent response time to get the paper work done and the program going.
- They did not participate in the mid-year teacher survey.

Horace Mann Elementary

- 202 eligible students and 22 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with *Brilliance Academy* (0 students enrolled) and a contract with *Babbage Net* (22)
- They did participate in the mid-year teacher survey.

Knollwood Elementary

- 412 eligible students and 33 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with *Tutorial Services* (17 students enrolled) and a contract with *Club Z* (6).
- They did not participate in the mid-year teacher survey.

Robbinsdale Elementary

- 204 eligible students and 1 student enrolled in SES
- They had a contract with *Tutorial Service* (1 student enrolled).
- Got started late with services as they were waiting for information from the provider.
- They did participate in the mid-year teacher survey.

North Middle School

- 516 eligible students and 4 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with *Brilliance Academy* (2 students enrolled) and a contract with *Tutorial Services* (2 students enrolled).
- The principal did not attend any meetings or make comments on her survey.
- They did participate in the mid-year teacher survey.

Valley View Elementary

- 219 eligible students and 14 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Club Z (6 students enrolled), Tutorial Services (6 students enrolled), and Brilliance Academy (2 students enrolled).
- They did participate in the mid-year teacher survey.

Shannon County School District

- Batesland Elementary had 164 eligible students and no students enrolled in SES.
- Redshirt Elementary had 60 eligible students and no students enrolled.
- There were no students enrolled in SES this year. It was reported that no SES was needed because no parents requested the services. They have a 21st Century program that meets the student needs.
- They did not participate in the mid-year administrator or teacher survey.

Sioux Falls School District

- Performed onsite visits and had meetings with the assigned contact person
- Some issues included: provider advertising, information for ELL students, the District being overcommitted with the numbers of eligible students that wanted services, getting computers from online providers, other providers had to be dropped because they wanted to work in the schools, SFSD staff having to administer the paper and pencil assessment tests.
- Contracts state the providers are to start services within 30 days of receiving a students name.
- They did participate in the mid-year administrator survey.

LB Anderson Elementary

- 222 eligible students with 117 enrolled in SES

-
- They had contracts with Tutorial Services (6 students registered), Club Z (66 students registered), Cyberstudy 101 (10 students registered), Excel Achievement (6 students registered), Sylvan Learning (26 students registered)
 - They did participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey

Cleveland Elementary

- 295 eligible students with 115 enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Tutorial Services (12 students registered), Club Z (64 students registered), Excel Achievement (5 students registered), Sylvan Learning (18 students registered), Educate Online (2 students registered), and Babbage (9 students registered)
- They did participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey

Garfield Elementary

- 281 eligible students with 70 enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Club Z (24 students registered), Cyberstudy (7 students registered), Educate Online (2 students registered), Excel Achievement (9 students registered), Sylvan Learning (21 students registered), Tutorial Services (7 students registered).
- They did participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey

Hawthorne Elementary

- 337 eligible students with 120 enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Club Z (73 students registered), Cyberstudy 101 (8), Excel Achievement (9), Sylvan Learning (9), Tutor Co (1), Tutorial Services (13)
- They did participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey.

Hayward Elementary

- 325 eligible students with 65 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Babbage (1 student registered), Club Z (6), Cyberstudy 101 (14), Excel Achievement (9), Student Nest (1), Sylvan Learning (25), Tutorial Services (9)
- They did participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey.

Longfellow Elementary

- 188 eligible students with 102 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Babbage (1 student enrolled), Club Z (47), Cyberstudy 101 (3), Excel Achievement (3), Educate Online (8), Student Nest (2), Sylvan Learning (11), Tutorial Services (27)
- They did participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey.

Lowell Elementary

- 235 eligible students with 58 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Club Z (9 students enrolled), Cyberstudy 101 (13), Excel Achievement (6), Sylvan Learning (12), Educate Online (4), Tutorial Services (14)

Sisseton School District

Westside Elementary

- 170 eligible students with 10 students enrolled in SES

Sisseton Middle School

- 73 eligible students with 3 students enrolled in SES
- There were two onsite visits
- They had a contract with Tutorial Services (13) students enrolled
- Dr. April Moen, who was the new LEA Representative this year, stated the issues they dealt with included; clarifications for eligible students, setting up provider contracts (completed in December), provider advertising practices, billing procedures
- They participated in both the Administrator and Teacher (2) mid-year surveys

Smee School District

Wakpala Elementary

- 156 eligible students with 70 students enrolled in SES

Wakpala High School

- 56 eligible students with 7 students enrolled in SES
- The Smee School District is an approved provider.
- SES program is run in conjunction with their 21st Century program during the school year and also for 4 weeks in the summer. The biggest issue this year was the

extreme winter weather which affected early school dismissals and no after-school SES programming.

- They participated in both the Administrator and Teacher (1) mid-year surveys

Todd County School District

- LEA Representative is Wilda Wooden Knife, who said at the onsite meeting that she had 6 signed provider contracts. Some changes for this year includes use of the dorms computer lab to hold the SES programs. This has greatly increased the number of students receiving services. Outlying schools still struggle for the most part with getting SES services requested.
- They participated in the mid-yr Administrator Survey.

He Dog Elementary K-8

- 138 eligible students with no students enrolled
- No report has been received even though I asked for one after the onsite meeting. They had no program this year.
- They did not participate in the Teacher mid-year survey.

Rosebud Elementary

- 325 eligible students with 3 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with *Babbage*. (2 students are enrolled) and Tutorial Services (1).
- They did not participate in the Teacher mid-year survey

Spring Creek Elementary

- 54 eligible students with no students enrolled in SES
- No report has been received even though they were asked for one after the onsite meeting.
- They had no program last year either.
- They did not participate in the Teacher mid-year survey

South Elementary 4-5

- 161 eligible students with 20 students enrolled in SES

-
- They had contracts with Failure Free (19 students enrolled), Tutorial Services (1)
 - They did not participate in the Teacher mid-year survey

O’Kreek Elementary K-8

- 28 eligible students with 28 students enrolled in SES
- They had a contract with Tutorial Services (28 students enrolled).
- They did not participate in the Teacher mid-year survey

North Elementary

- 325 eligible students with 14 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Tutorial Services (1 student enrolled) and Club Z (13)
- They did not participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey

Todd County Middle School

- 374 eligible students with 47 students enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with Academia Net (42 students enrolled), and Tutorial Services (5)
- They participated in the mid-year Teacher Survey

Todd County High School

- 508 eligible students with 44 enrolled in SES
- They had contracts with TutorCo (40 students enrolled), and Tutorial Services (4)
- They did not participate in the mid-year Teacher Survey

Watertown High School

- 243 eligible students with 11 enrolled in SES
- LEA Representative is Sandie Jungers and the go-to-person at the school is Troy Terronez. They both commented that things were going well this year and all four grades had participants.
- They had contracts with Babbage (4 students enrolled) Club Z (4), Tutorial Services (3)
- They participated in both the Administrator and mid-year Teacher Surveys.

White River School District

White River Elementary

- 125 eligible students with 2 students enrolled in SES

Norris Elementary

- 30 eligible students with 3 students enrolled in SES

White River Middle School

- 75 eligible students with 7 enrolled in SES
- LEA Representative Peri Strain is the new go-to-person this year.
- They had contracts with Academia.Net (4 students enrolled), and Failure Free Reading (8)
- They participated in the mid-year Administrator Survey

Winner Middle School:

- 100 eligible students with 2 students enrolled in SES
- LEA Representatives include Judy Audiss is the contact person, Lynnelle Anderson is the School Improvement Coordinator, and Brian Naasz is the go-to-person at the school.
- They had a contract with Babbage (2 students enrolled)
- In discussions with the SES coordinators during the onsite visit they expressed frustration with the communication gap with the provider, parent and school. They still feel it takes too long to get the provider services going. Even after all of the communication with parents by mail and at school most contacts still are happening by chance in Winner, like at the gas station or grocery store.
- They participated in the mid-year Administrator Survey.

In summary, the monitoring process was able to document that they top three providers were Club Z with an enrollment of 328 students, Tutorial Services with an enrollment of 176 students, and Sylvan Learning Center with an enrollment of 122 students. Of the thirteen districts visited 12 administrators reported completing the mid-year survey and 56 teachers from eight districts completed the mid-year teacher survey. From the site visits some of the comments included:

-
- A successful way to inform parents about SES was through the fall parent/teacher conferences, building parent meetings and having a direct contact person at the building site.
 - Personal contacts was the most success for both the parents and providers.
 - Providers had the best success when they followed Department of Education guidelines, sent a copy of the contract and work to be provided to the SES coordinator and business offices. Getting school board approve for contracts served as good way to move the SES process forward.
 - Some of the administrators indicated a lack of follow through which included not being able to deliver computers, difficulty in getting computers set up for use, not starting the program until 2nd semester, billing issues, difficult to get to and/or understand “help line” phone conversations.
 - Biggest challenges with their SES program was student attendance for have of schools visited. Also, communication between provider, teachers, and parents was a challenge.

Principal’s Questionnaire Results

There were 22 principals that responded to a survey asking questions about the supplemental educational services in their respective schools. The principals were asked how they assessed the quality of the SES provider in their respective schools (Table 9.0). The majority of the principals (54.4%) said that they used the pre and post assessment scores obtained from the instruments used by the provider and 36.4% (duplicated count) used the DakotaStep assessment scores. Less than half of the principals talked to the either the teacher or parents about a student’s progress based on services received.

Table 9.0		
How Quality of SES Is Assessed In Your School		
Principals' Responses (n = 22)		
	n	Percent
Pre & Post assessment scores administered by the SES provider	12	54.5%
Student state assessment scores (DakotaStep)	8	36.4%
Talk with the teacher regarding student's progress	9	40.9%
Talk with the parent regarding their child's progress	6	27.3%
I do not evaluate the quality of the SES provider	5	22.7%
Other	1	4.5%

Table 10.0		
Where Successes Have Been Experienced		
Principals Responses (n = 22)		
	n	Percent
Improvement in DakotaStep reading assessment scores	5	22.7%
Improvement in DakotaStep mathematics assessment scores	4	18.2%
Improvement in student's attendance in school	3	13.6%
Improvement in student's behavior	3	13.6%
Students who need the support are receiving SES	8	36.4%
SES has small group sessions	4	18.2%
I have not experience any success in providing SES	4	18.2%
Other	8	36.4%

The two top ways in which principals judged success of the SES program were by the number of students who needed the help received supplemental educational services (36.4%) and improvement in the student's Dakota STEP reading assessment scores (22.7%). About one in three principals (36.4%) reported commented on the reasons why they had not experienced a successful program at their school. This included the difficulty in measuring a long-term impact improvement based on short term intervention although some teachers noted

some skills improvement in their classroom. Some principals noted the difficulty they had working with the provider and lack of communication (Table 10.0).

Table 11.0		
Challenges Principals Faced in Providing SES in Their Building		
Principals Responses (n = 22)		
	n	Percent
Communication with SES provider	8	36.4%
Students needing academic assistance are not receiving SES	8	36.4%
Capacity to monitor SES provider	6	27.3%
Capacity to monitor students involvement in SES	3	13.6%
Students not attending sessions	8	36.4%
Provider curriculum not aligned with state standards	1	4.5%
Transportation to get students to and from SES location	6	27.3%
SES provider does not provide information regarding student progress	6	27.3%
I have not faced any challenges in providing SES	3	13.6%

The principals were asked what were some of the challenges in providing SES in their school. About one-third of the principals (36.4%) indicated getting to students to attend SES sessions, communication with SES providers, and getting academic assistance to students who needed SES. One in four of the principals (27.3%) faced challenges in their capacity to monitor the SES provider, providing transportation to students to and from the SES location, and getting information from the provider. About 14% of the principals report having not challenges with providing SES.

Teacher’s Questionnaire Results

There were 74 teachers who completed the teacher questionnaire regarding SES. The majority of the respondents taught in elementary school (75.7%, n = 56) with 21.6% (n = 16) teaching in the middle school level, grades 6 to 8, and 1.4% (n = 1) teaching in high school. Three-fourth of the teachers (79.1%, n = 53) indicated that the SES provided developed and shared an individual supplemental education plan for their student. One half of the teachers

(52.7%) indicated that they were involved in the development of this plan or at least in identifying specific educational goals of their students with the provider.

Table 12.0		
Information Received From SES Provider Regarding Student's Progress		
Teacher Responses (n = 74)		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	16	21.6%
Student participation	26	35.1%
Course work information	31	41.9%
Provider assessment scores	41	55.4%
I did not receive any information from the provider	17	23.0%

Table 12.0 shows what type of information teacher's received from the SES provider regarding their participating students. Over half of the teachers (55.4%) reported receiving assessment scores from the provider and one-third of the teachers (35.1%) reported receiving information about student's participation in the program. One in five teachers (21.6%) received information about student's attendance and course work information. About one in five of the teachers (23.0%, n = 17) did not receive any information from their student's SES provider.

Teachers' relationship and communication with the SES providers varied from "outstanding" to "I did not know that there was a student being helped in any way." Some providers were opened to suggestions from teachers in order to help the student in need of SES. "I was able to approve, change and adjust according to the individual needs of the student." "I gave suggestions for services that would benefit my students." "I was able to tell the provider what to focus on in regard to the student's weaknesses especially in the areas of writing." Other comments included:

- Club Z did a great job!
- I think it helped the students practice areas worked on in the classroom and maintain their skills, however it didn't catch the students up to their peers if they were behind.
- I saw one boy improve greatly in his reading and math understanding.
- I was very disappointed at the timing of the services. They did not begin until late March and progress was not seen by me in the classroom. Hopefully it will still help her.

-
- This student was a very bright student so I don't his lack of gains this year doesn't necessarily reflect the tutor. He did not have a lot of room for improvement. I did not hear from the service after the initial communication.
 - From their pretest they worked on standards one grade level below and were able to show growth. However, he mastered end of year kindergarten standards and now we are at the end of first grade so he is still one grade level behind. I was hoping for acceleration.
 - I didn't even know this student was receiving any services.
 - Wonderful program for two kids in my class that received services. I will recommend more students next year!
 - I was very happy to get updates and be continually informed of my student's progress.
 - My student made great gains with her tutor. He did a great job keeping me informed and asking about her classroom work.
 - The growth this student made this year can be partially credited to the time spent with his SES tutor. The program was wonderful.
 - Thank you--it made a tremendous difference this year!!
 - I did not know that one of my students was getting any external help.
 - Have seen no progress, student has actually gone backwards
 - I have not been very impressed with the program. The students quickly lost interest and, in some cases, refused to do any work on the computers. They would rather go to the office and get chewed out than work on the program.
 - I feel that my two students who started the program didn't go to enough classes to show improvement.
 - I would like to have had access to the information about students taking this service.

Parent Questionnaire Results

Forty-three parents responded to a survey regarding SES received by their child. When the parents were asked how they made their decision regarding the selection of a SES provider, 20.9% (n = 9) said the principal helped them. Eight parents (18.6%) said that their child's teacher help them in selected a SES provider, while 48.8% (n = 21) made the decision on their own.

When asked how their received information about their child's progress in SES, 39.5% (n = 17) said they received it in person, while 7.0% (n = 3) received a progress report in the mail and 16.3% (n = 7) by telephone. About sixteen percent (16.3%) received a progress report monthly, 16.3% received a progress report weekly, and 16.3% received before and after each completed

session. In five parents (27.9%) never received any progress report or received any information about their child.

Table 13.0 Providers Reported By Parents (n = 43)		
	n	Percent
Tutorial Services	11	25.6%
Club Z	5	11.6%
Educate Online	2	4.7%
Excel Achievement	1	2.3%
Babbage Net	8	18.6%
Sylvan Learning Center	5	11.6%
Academia Net	10	23.3%
Other	1	2.3%

Table 14.0 What type of information do you receive from your child's SES provider? (n = 43)		
	n	Percent
Student attendance	10	23.3%
Student participation	14	32.6%
Student behavior	1	2.3%
Quiz and course work information	13	30.2%
Pre & post assessment scores	11	25.6%
I do not receive any information	9	20.9%

One in four of the parents (25.6%) received information about their child's pre and post assessment scores. About one in four parents receive information regarding their child's

attendance (23.3%), participation (32.6%) and course work information (30.2%). About one in five parents reported not receiving any information (20.9%).

Table 15.0						
How satisfied are you with the quality of service your child has been receiving from the service provider listed above?						
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Very satisfied	41	45.6%	4	23.5%	22	59.5%
Satisfied	40	44.4%	6	35.3%	13	35.1%
Dissatisfied or No Information	7	7.8%	7	41.2%	2	5.4%
Very dissatisfied	2	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	90	100.0%	17	100.0%	37	100.0%

In 2008-09 over half of the parents (59.5%) were very satisfied and 35.1% were satisfied with the quality of instruction being provided by the SES programs. When asked about the size of the SES class, 62.2% were very satisfied and 35.1% were satisfied. Nine out of ten parents (91.1%) were very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of services being made available to their child. When asked how this has impacted their child's performance, 35.1% has noted a lot of improvement for their child. While 64.9% has noted little or no progress for their child.

Conclusion

The South Dakota Department of Education commissioned the evaluation of the Supplemental Education Services providers for the 2008-2009 school year. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine:

1. Do the schools and school district in Level II school improvement provide parents the opportunity to enroll their children in supplemental education services?
2. Are supplemental education service providers implementing their programs in the South Dakota schools and districts?
3. How effective are the supplemental education services in South Dakota schools and districts?

Information about the quality and satisfaction with SES providers was obtain through reports and questions sent to the South Dakota Department of Education by administrators, teachers, and parents. The response rate from all three data sources was low and therefore the statistical power was low for this evaluation report. Although, the effect size was low, the information was still valuable in determining the impact of the SES providers in 36 schools located in 13 school districts. The satisfaction level for the SES programs available within the school districts was high for both the teachers and parents. But when asked about the level improvement for the students about one-third respondents noted any change in progress for the students. This is supported by the Dakota STEP achievement tests in which the overall improvement in both reading and mathematics was about 1% over a one year period.

Another data source was the monitoring process. Interviews and site visits with students, parents, school personnel, and SES providers were conducted in all the eligible school sites. The results showed that many of the respondents were satisfied with the programming that had been occurring, but there were still a significant number that had concerns with provider feedback and accountability. The monitor reported that schools and providers were actively involved in recruiting eligible students into a SES program.

Data was collected through the Department of Education regarding the demographics of students served, assessment data, and service data. The names of students who received services were submitted by the school districts directly to the state. The number of students did

not match with the number of students that the service providers reported. The state had documentation and completed records for 290 of the 710 students served by SES providers for 2008-09 school year.

Dakota STEP data was analyzed by provider and school district for the participating students. Results from the spring 2008 and spring 2009 Dakota STEP were compiled and statistical tests showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the standard scores from 2008 to 2009 in the area of reading and in the area of mathematics. Each provider used their own assessment to conduct pre and post tests. However, the data was unable to be used as there was no standard for scoring established across all service providers.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in this report, the external evaluator is proposing the following recommendations to be considered for the 2008-2009 school year. Some of these recommendations were made in the previous year's evaluation report, but were not implemented due to changes in staffing and attention to other priorities.

- Need to get provider reports and feedback regarding student performance, attendance (dosage levels), types of measures being used, communication (reporting) schedules, and tutor questionnaires. This will provide the evaluator enough data to support positive or negative changes in the annual assessment result using appropriate statistical analytical tools.
- Identify a set of reading and mathematics standardized assessment tools that all providers can use to measure academic progress for their respective delivery modality. This will provide a consistent pre and post testing data comparative analysis of academic progress. Currently, only the Dakota STEP can be used to validate any progress.
- In order to maintain an accurate data base of students receiving services, supplemental education service providers should submit their rosters and enrollment directly to the Department of Education on monthly reporting cycle.
- Although there was improvement from the previous year, there is still a need to recruit more parents, administrators, and teachers to complete the CAS questionnaires. Additionally, all providers and LEAs offering SES should be required to complete the CAS.
- Increase the number of student records for SES students in the area of Dakota STEP scores and demographics. Currently only one third of the SES participants have matched pre/post data to measure progress and change in the areas of reading and mathematics achievement.