



Examples of State Monitoring and Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Service Providers

By Michael Colasanti

November 2007

Part I: Background

Under the requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), schools receiving Title I funds that do not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) are required to implement various interventions, such as offering students the option to change schools and/or make available supplemental educational services (SES). These supplemental services are available to low-income students who are enrolled in a school that has failed to meet AYP for three consecutive years.¹ According to a 2006 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, during the 2004-2005 school year, services (most typically tutoring) were provided to 430,000 students (equivalent to 19% of all SES-eligible students).²

Part II: State Evaluation/Monitoring of SES Providers

States are responsible for oversight of SES providers, including:

- Providing annual notices to parents about availability of services
- Promoting provider participation to maximize choices
- Developing objective criteria for evaluating providers and making public reports available on how provider quality is monitored
- Withdrawing support from providers that fail to contribute to student academic progress over two years
- Maintaining lists of approved providers by school district and descriptions of their services.

The U.S. Department of Education's non-regulatory guidance for districts and states, with regard to supplemental educational services, suggests that state departments of education collect the following information when monitoring/evaluating providers:

- Academic gains made by students who participated in and completed a provider's program, which are measured by student assessments (developed by the provider or the state/district)
- The constancy with which a provider's program, as enacted, reflects its program design, as proposed in its application to the department
- Student enrollment (including English language learners and students with disabilities) and daily attendance
- Parent and student satisfaction with a provider
- How often a provider reports student progress to teachers and parents.

The department also makes it clear that it is the responsibility of the state education agency, not the local district, to monitor providers. Districts are encouraged to aid the state in collecting data; however, when

the district is acting as a SES provider as well, the department suggests that the state exclude the district from the data collection process.³

Supplemental educational service providers who fail to increase academic achievement for two consecutive years must be withdrawn from a state's approved vendor list.⁴ GAO found that over 75% of states reported difficulties in evaluating increases in student academic achievement under SES providers. "Determining sufficient academic progress of students, having the time and knowledge to analyze SES data, and developing data systems to track SES information have been challenges." In fact, the GAO concluded that as of the time of its writing, no state had reported the withdrawal of approval of a SES provider because their program was ineffective at increasing academic achievement.⁵

Part III: State Examples

(These states were chosen because they have evaluation processes that resemble the guidance from the U.S. Department of Education.)

Georgia

The state board of education requires that the Georgia Department of Education monitor all SES providers annually.⁶ According to the department's [Monitoring Standards and Consequences for Providers](#)⁷, the evaluation consists of five categories of standards. Across all categories there are 44 standards that must be met by the providers. For example, within the category of "instructional program," the department assesses the implementation of "quality instruction" ensuring that the goals and objectives of the SES are linked to improving test scores on statewide assessments. The five categories evaluated by the department are:

- Document verification (Six standards)
- Program policies and procedures (13 standards)
- Qualified staff (Five standards)
- Instructional program (16 standards)
- Instructional environment (Four standards).

For evaluation purposes, each standard that is met by the provider is equivalent to one point (totaling 44 points). To receive a rating of "Meets Standards," the SES provider must receive 80% of the total points. If an SES provider receives a rating of "Meets Standards" but is not in compliance with all standards, the provider must take corrective action.

New Mexico

State regulations require that SES providers be removed from the approved vendor list when it is shown through state evaluations that the provider has failed "to contribute to the academic improvement of students."⁸ According to the department of public instruction's [2005 Supplemental Educational Services Evaluation Report](#)⁹, the state evaluation is comprised of on-site visits and analyses of student performance and parent and teacher evaluations. The following variables are used when measuring student performance:

- Pre- and post-test scores of vendor's assessment
- Scores from the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA)
- Student grades
- Parent evaluations of student progress
- Teacher evaluations of student progress.

Each variable has measurement criteria to determine if the student has made progress. For example, parents must indicate a positive response of "some," "a lot," or "extensive" progress to be credited with demonstrated improvement. For the vendor's pre- and post-assessment, any increase in score is used as evidence of progress. In making a final determination of an SES provider's ability to improve academic performance, students must show progress on 50% of the variables for which data are available.

Tennessee

Supplemental educational services are not specifically addressed in the state's statute or in the department of education's regulations; however, services are offered and providers are monitored. The Center for Research in Education Policy conducted an evaluation of the state's SES providers in a report titled, [Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2005-2006](#).¹⁰ In conducting a provider evaluation, six categories of outcomes are assessed:

- Student achievement
- Communication
- Instructional plans
- Local and state standards
- Special ed/ELL students
- Provider overall.

Each category is assessed on a scale of four levels of attainment: above standards, acceptable, marginal quality and below standards. For example, to receive a level of "above standards" in the category of student achievement, over 75% of students must show gains related to the tutoring of the SES provider. In evaluating the provider overall, the percentage agreement/disagreement is determined for the "Overall Satisfaction" question listed for each respondent group (parents, teachers, LEAs, etc.) and the results from the other five outcome categories are taken into account. Each SES provider is evaluated by two independent scorers to ensure more reliability.

Part IV: Other Resources

For more information on state evaluations and monitoring of SES providers, the Center on Innovation and Improvement (www.centerii.org) has a searchable SES database that includes reports on state policies, state progress and links to state Websites and documents. The database is available through the following link: <http://www.centerii.org/centerIIPublic/>.

Michael Colasanti is a researcher in the ECS Information Clearinghouse

© 2007 by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). All rights reserved. ECS is a nationwide, nonprofit organization that helps state leaders shape education policy.

ECS encourages its readers to share our information with others. To request permission to reprint or excerpt some of our material, please contact the ECS Communications Department at 303.299.3669 or e-mail ecs@ecs.org.

Helping State Leaders Shape Education Policy

¹ 20 U.S.C. § 6316

² Shaul, Marnie. *No Child Left Behind: Education Actions Needed to Improve Implementation and Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services*, Washington, D.C. United States Government Accountability Office. 2006.

³ United States Department of Education. *Supplemental Educational Services: Non-Regulatory Guidance*. Washington, D.C. June 13, 2005.

⁴ See *supra* note 1

⁵ See *supra* note 2

⁶ GA. COMP. R. & REGS. r. 160-4-5-.03

⁷ Georgia Department of Education. *Standards for Monitoring Supplemental Educational Service Providers*. September 30, 2007. http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/tss_title_parent.aspx?PageReq=TSSTitleSES (last accessed November 14, 2007)

⁸ N.M ADMIN. CODE tit. 6, § 19.6.10

⁹ New Mexico Department of Education. *Supplemental Educational Services Evaluation*. September, 2005. <http://www.ped.state.nm.us/title/dl08/final%2005%20report.pdf> (last accessed November 14, 2007)

¹⁰ Center for Research in Education Policy. *Supplemental Educational Service Providers in the State of Tennessee*. March, 2007. http://tennessee.gov/education/fedprog/doc/SESrpt05-06with04_05.pdf (last accessed November 14, 2007)