U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

No Child LEFT BEHIND SM

Case Studies of Supplemental Services Under the *No Child Left Behind Act*: Findings From 2003-04

Case Studies of Supplemental Services Under the *No Child Left Behind Act*: Findings from 2003-04

Leslie M. Anderson
Katrina G. Laguarda

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.
Washington, D.C.
Under Subcontract to SRI International

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development

2005

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education under Contract Number ED01CO0091 with SRI International. The project monitors were Kirsten Duncan and Collette Roney. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education
Margaret Spellings
Secretary

Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development
Tom Luce
Assistant Secretary

Policy and Program Studies Service
Alan Ginsburg
Director

Program and Analytic Studies
David Goodwin
Director

September 2005

To order copies of this report, write:

ED Pubs
Education Publications Center
U. S. Department of Education
P. O. Box 1398
Jessup, MD 20794-1398;

via fax, dial (301) 470-1244;

or via electronic mail, send your request to: edpubs@inet.ed.gov.

You may also call toll-free: 1-877-433-7827 (1-877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 1-800-872-5327 (1-800-USA-LEARN); Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY), should call 1-800-437-0833.

To order online, point your Internet browser to: www.edpubs.org.

This report is also available on the Department's Web site at www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/supplementalyear2 and Policy and Program Studies Service's Web site at www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title.

On request, this publication is available in alternate formats, such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at (202) 260-9895 or (202) 205-8113.

Contents

Page

Exhibits

Executive Summary

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), signed into law in January 2002, provides for children from low-income families enrolled in Title I schools that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for three years or more to receive supplemental services, including tutoring, remediation, and other academic instruction.

Implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB involves states, districts, schools, parents, and providers. Each state is required to develop criteria for selecting supplemental service providers and to publish a list of approved providers. School districts are responsible for notifying parents of their children's eligibility to receive supplemental services and for providing parents with adequate information to select providers for their children. Parents may select any approved provider in the area served by the school district or within a reasonable distance of the school district. Supplemental service providers are required to offer academic services that are consistent with the state's academic content standards and with the instruction provided by the school district. Providers are also required to measure students' progress toward meeting their educational goals and report regularly on that progress to teachers and parents.

This report presents findings from case studies conducted during the 2003-04 school year, the second year that the supplemental services provisions of NCLB had been in effect. It follows up on baseline data collected the previous school year.[1] This study conducted interviews in a purposive sample of six states and nine school districts, which were selected to include those that appeared to be relatively far along in implementing supplemental services provisions. It is important to note that the findings presented in this report do not provide a nationally representative picture of the implementation of the supplemental services provisions, both because the sample is very small and because the sample was purposively selected from states and districts that were considered to be further along than others. The purpose of the study was not to evaluate supplemental services but rather to gain insights from the early efforts of these states and districts that could assist others in improving implementation of supplemental services.[2]

Four of the nine districts included in the original case study sample in 2002-03 were not providing supplemental services in 2003-04 because they no longer had schools in their second year or later of improvement. To compensate for these changes, four new districts in two new states were added to the study sample. Case study teams conducted telephone interviews with state administrators responsible for administering the supplemental services provisions of NCLB in each of six sampled states. Between January and April 2004, case study teams visited each of

[1] U.S. Department of Education. Policy and Program Studies Service. *Early Implementation of Supplemental Educational Services Under the* No Child Left Behind Act: *Year One Report*, by Leslie Anderson and Lisa Weiner. Author. Washington, D.C., 2004.

[2] This report contains both stronger and weaker examples of implementation of the supplemental services provisions of NCLB. The examples used here should not necessarily be considered accurate interpretations or representations of the implementation of supplemental services. Rather, these are examples of ways in which some states and districts responded to the supplemental services requirements of the law.

the nine districts in the revised sample. Respondents in each district included district staff involved in planning or implementing supplemental services; teachers and principals in up to three schools; three supplemental service providers; and groups of parents in up to three schools, including those who had enrolled their children for services and those who had not. Schools with the highest number of students receiving services in a given district were selected into the study sample. However, in cases where a district had middle schools and high schools required to offer supplemental services, those schools were always included in the study sample. Similarly, providers serving the largest number of students were selected into the study sample. However, districts that were themselves state-approved providers were always included among the sample of providers for a given district.

Supplemental Services: The View from the Ground

States, districts, schools, and providers are key actors in the implementation of supplemental services, and this report examines the role of each of these agents in turn. The first question to consider, however, is what do supplemental services look like, from a student's perspective? In the case study sites in 2003-04, providers typically offered tutoring services immediately after school, two to three times a week, in sessions lasting 1-2 hours each. Providers worked in school buildings whenever possible, and students usually chose to attend tutoring programs in the same buildings where they attended school. In most cases, providers hired teachers from those same schools or from the district at-large to provide services.

The content and structure of tutoring services varied widely across the case study sites, depending on the provider and in some cases, on the individual tutor. Providers represented a range of philosophies and approaches to the teaching of reading and math. Most providers offered services that focused on reading, with instructional approaches that ranged from detailed diagnosis and scripted lessons to more general help with homework. Some providers had conducted alignment studies and purchased additional instructional materials to ensure that all state standards would be covered; others used state assessment results to develop tutoring plans for individual students; still others were unable to describe any strategy for aligning their services with state standards.

Providers in the case study sites most often worked with students in small groups, where tutor-student ratios ranged from 1:5 to 1:10. With larger groups, tutors used whole-group instruction and individual seatwork to keep students engaged for the entire tutoring session. The total number of tutoring hours each student received also ranged widely, from a low of 18 in our case study districts to a high of 120. At the rate of two to six hours a week, students tended to "cycle out" of supplemental services after 10-20 weeks. As a result, some providers who began services early served two cohorts of students in one academic year.

Student attendance at after-school tutoring was a challenge in each of the case study sites, especially at the middle and high school levels. Several supplemental service providers offered incentives for students to attend regularly, and others were considering the use of incentives.

In the nine case study sites, provider communication with parents and teachers was seldom very effective. Providers sent progress reports to districts as required under the terms of their contracts, and some providers in the study sample reported that they also sent information home to parents monthly or every six weeks. None of the parents or teachers interviewed for the study, however, recalled receiving written progress reports. Many of the teachers interviewed did not know which of their students were receiving supplemental services.

Three of the school districts in the case study sample were approved as supplemental service providers; their services resembled those offered by other providers in the case study sample.

Participation rates varied across the districts, and in most districts participation rates did not exceed the number of students the districts could provide services to with the maximum amount they were required to spend on supplemental services. In six districts, participation rates were between 13 and 62 percent of the students the districts could serve with the maximum required amount of funding. One of these districts went to great lengths to recruit parents and sign students up for services and reached a participation rate of only 28 percent. The other three districts provided supplemental services to 86 percent or more of the students they could provide services to with the maximum amount they were required to spend on supplemental services and one of these three districts went beyond its funding capacity to serve an additional 126 eligible students who requested services in 2003-04 (See Exhibit ES-1).

In six of the case study districts, more students were eligible for supplemental services than the number the district could provide services to with the maximum required amount of funding. The remaining three districts could have provided supplemental services to all eligible students with the maximum required amount of funding. However, in only one district did participation rates among eligible students reach the maximum the district could support using the required amount of funding.

Exhibit ES-1
Supplemental Services
Student Participation Rates in 2003-04

District Name[a]	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Percent of Eligible Students Served	Percent of Eligible Students Served Based on District Funding Capacity (i.e., setting aside an amount equal to 20% of Title I Allocation)
Brooktown School District	12,918	1,787	14%	108%
Oakwood School District	9,781	1,097	11%	99%
Plainfield School District	356	301	86%	86%
Sunnydale School District	40,000	3,400	9%	62%
Longwood Public Schools	190,000	19,000	10%	43%
Emory Public Schools	650	153	14%	42%
Springvale School District	1,199	336	28%	28%
Redding School District	5,264	382	7%	22%
Trainville School District	3,659	472	13%	13%

States' Efforts to Implement Supplemental Services

In 2003-04, the six states included in the case study sample had improved, refined, or expedited procedures related to the implementation of supplemental services.

- ***The number of supplemental service providers approved for the 2003-04 school year increased in all six states, in line with a nationwide increase in the number of approved providers.*** Nationwide, the number of approved providers increased from 997 in late April 2003 to 1,890 in early May 2004, an increase of 90 percent. Among the six states sampled for this study in 2003-04, the rate of increase was much higher in three, with the number of providers doubling or tripling by 2003-04 (these states had all approved fewer than 25 providers in 2003). Two other states in the study sample increased the number of approved providers by half, and a sixth state, which had a large number of approved providers in 2003, had an increase of 10 percent.

- ***Very few providers had been removed from state lists in the six sampled states.*** In a few instances, providers had been removed for financial irregularities, or because they were not actually offering tutoring services. There were no examples of providers who had been removed from the lists because the state had determined that the quality of their services was not adequate. However, states are not required to make this determination until providers have been serving students for two years. At the time of this data collection, states had not yet reached that target date.

[a] To protect their confidentiality, pseudonyms have been used for all the states, districts, schools, and most of the service providers that participated in this study.

- ***State supplemental services coordinators reported that small districts and rural districts continued to be underserved, compared with urban areas.*** While state administrators of supplemental services reported that some providers were approved to serve all schools required to offer services in the state, they remained concerned about the limited supply of providers in small and rural districts. In several states, providers approved to operate statewide were not operating in small and rural districts; in one state, many of the rural areas were only serviced by online providers.

- ***In 2003-04, sampled states continued to consider ways to monitor provider performance, and several had begun the process of contracting with external evaluators to assist with monitoring.*** In most cases, states had not yet put full-blown monitoring systems in place, although they had put some work into planning them. The law requires states to remove providers from the approved list if they fail to increase student achievement after two years, so states had to begin implementing systems for this at the end of the 2003-04 school year. Several states relied heavily on districts for information about the performance of supplemental service providers.

The Districts' Role in Implementing Supplemental Services

District responsibilities for implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB continue to challenge some administrators, but many had developed systems and methods for streamlining operations and procedures to simplify their work, as well as provide supplemental services to families sooner.

District Efforts to Reach Parents

- ***In 2003-04, districts' efforts to inform parents of the availability of supplemental services appeared organized and focused on helping parents understand the services districts were offering them.*** Most of the nine districts in the study sample were mailing letters home to parents that were accompanied by packets of materials that included descriptions of provider services, a selection form for parents to rank their choice of provider, and provider-generated brochures. Examples of district efforts to reach parents included hosting provider fairs, mailing fliers, visiting homes to encourage parents to sign up their children for services, placing announcements in local newspapers, and sponsoring television and radio ads to advertise the availability of a provider fair.

- ***Contacting and communicating clearly with parents about the availability of supplemental services still presented challenges to school districts.*** Although districts generally thought that they were doing a good job informing parents of the availability of supplemental services, providers, teachers, and principals in one district said that the packets of materials districts sent to parents were too complicated and confusing to be helpful.

District Relationships with Supplemental Service Providers

- ***In 2003-04, sampled districts were adept at entering into contracts with service providers.*** In 2003-04, many districts began using boilerplate contracts for providers. These contract templates were created—and vetted—in 2002-03 by many of the districts in the study sample. Accordingly, no confusion or consternation about creating provider contracts was evident in 2003-04.

- ***Most of the nine districts in the study had begun to put in place systems for communicating with providers.*** Among districts that participated in the study in 2002-03 and 2003-04, there was a distinct increase in the number of providers offering services in 2003-04 than was the case in 2002-03. To some extent, this created a more pressing need among these districts to develop systems to manage relationships and communicate with providers. In addition, however, these districts had learned from their experience implementing supplemental services in the previous year that communicating directly with providers was necessary to ensure that services ran smoothly.

The Role of Identified Schools in Implementing Supplemental Services

- ***In 2003-04, many districts in the study sample involved schools directly in the process of enrolling students in supplemental services***. Principals in several districts said they often helped with outreach efforts by calling the parents of students they believed could benefit from the services. Many districts also involved schools in the recruitment process by providing schools with sample letters to personalize and send home to the families of students who were eligible for supplemental services. In addition, schools in several districts held parent meetings to discuss the availability of supplemental services and to describe the services providers were offering.

- ***In 2003-04, districts in the study sample increasingly relied upon principals and teachers to help coordinate the implementation of supplemental services.*** Principals in some districts, for example, noted that implementation of supplemental services often required that they get involved in the logistics, including making sure space was available in their schools for providers and that parents turned in their permission slips for students to receive services.

District Funding for the Supplemental Services

- ***Districts varied widely in the percent of their Title I, Part A, allocation that they opted to set aside for choice-related transportation and supplemental services.*** Funds districts set aside in 2003-04 for supplemental services ranged from a minimum of 2 percent to 21 percent. In the four districts that set aside less than 20 percent of their Title I allocation, all four administrators explained that they based their Title I set aside on the previous year's demand for both choice-related transportation and supplemental services. This practice of setting aside Title I resources before gauging demand is likely to bring districts up short if the demand for

services exceeds a district's reserve of resources, and may raise compliance problems as districts are required to spend an amount equal to 20 percent of their Title I, Part A, allocation on supplemental services and Title I choice if demand is sufficient.

- ***The average district per-pupil expenditure for supplemental services among the nine districts included in the study sample was $1,408 in 2003-04.*** Among the five districts included in both the year one and year two samples, the average per-pupil expenditure for supplemental services increased approximately $300 from an average of $967 per student in 2002-03 to an average of $1,280 per student in 2003-04.

- ***Several sampled districts expressed concern about the administrative costs associated with implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB.*** District administrators explained that there continue to be tremendous costs associated with the mailings to parents informing them of the availability of choice and supplemental services, as well as costs associated with working with the providers.

Supplemental Service Providers

The supply of supplemental service providers had increased slightly among the five districts that participated in both years of the study; among the nine districts participating in the study in 2003-04, some common approaches to providing supplemental services emerged.

- ***The number of providers offering services in case study districts increased slightly in 2003-04, but the increases were more modest than increases reported by some states in the sample or all states nationwide.*** In 2003-04, the number of supplemental service providers ranged from 5 to 14 in all but one of the case study districts; one very large urban district had 27 providers operating. The number of providers offering services in each of the five districts included in the study sample in both years of data collection increased in four of the five districts. Online and faith-based providers were relatively rare among the nine districts in the study sample.

- ***In the case study sample, school districts made up a small proportion of all providers available to students, although they enrolled the lion's share of students in two of the three districts where they were offering services.*** There were only three school district providers in the nine case study sites, although nationwide, intermediate education agencies (IEAs), school districts and public schools made up 25 percent of all supplemental service providers. District-sponsored tutoring programs in Plainfield and Longwood enrolled 49 and 76 percent of all the students participating in supplemental services in those districts, respectively. In a third district, the district's policy for assigning school space to providers led to a relatively even distribution of students among the 10 providers available to students.

- ***In general, school and district staff reported that existing providers were able to accommodate the needs of students in the sampled districts.*** In the three sampled

districts with significant proportions of English language learners, district and school staff reported that those students had been able to find tutoring. In none of the sampled sites did district or school staff report problems with special education students' access to services. None of the districts included in the case study sample was small, however, or located in a rural area where state administrators had expressed concern about the limited supply of providers.

- ***Some providers required a minimum number of students to enroll at each site to make their program financially viable, although this minimum varied widely across providers.*** In nearly all districts, some providers opted not to offer services because demand was too low. For some providers, the minimum number needed to make their program viable was 10 students per site; for others, the minimum was as high as 80.

- ***In 2003-04, the majority of providers interviewed for this study hired only certified teachers to staff their programs, typically from the districts where the provider was offering services.*** Fifteen of the 24 providers included in the study reported that a teaching certificate was a requirement for employment. A handful of providers had less stringent staff requirements.

- ***About half of the providers interviewed for this study sought to hire tutors and site coordinators directly from the staffs of the schools where they provided services.*** Many providers went out of their way to recruit these teachers as tutors.

Parents' Role in Supplemental Services

Most parents of children receiving supplemental services interviewed for the case studies were pleased that this resource was available to their children. Nevertheless, some parents had difficulty sorting out the options available to them, others had chosen not to enroll their children in services, and other parents who had enrolled their children gave mixed reviews of the effectiveness of services.

Parents' Criteria for Selecting Providers

- ***Many parents interviewed for the study reported that they had received enough information to choose good providers for their children; nearly as many, however, reported that they knew little or were confused about the services available to them.*** By studying the provider brochures sent out by districts, some parents were well-informed about provider services; other parents had attended open houses where providers had made presentations, or had spoken with providers at their child's school. Some parents, however, were not clear about the range of choices available; they did not realize that they could have selected a provider other than the one operating at the school, or they assumed that the two or three providers most visible in the school were the only choices available.

- ***Parents continued to pay careful attention to teacher and principal recommendations in deciding whether to enroll their student in supplemental services and in choosing a provider.*** Teachers employed by supplemental service providers played a key role in recruiting parents at their schools in all nine of the case study sites. In at least two districts, the schools where teachers and the principal were actively involved in recruiting parents to sign their children up for services had much higher participation rates than schools where teachers and the principal were less active.

- ***In addition to teacher recommendations, parents considered location, hours of operation, and availability of transportation in selecting providers.*** Parents tended to consider those providers offering services in their child's school first; among the parents interviewed, almost none sent their children off-site when given the choice to have their children attend tutoring at the school. As in 2002-03, parents reported that the availability of transportation to and from the school was critical in selecting a provider.

Parent Satisfaction with Provider Services

- ***Many of the parents interviewed for the study reported that they were satisfied with the services their children had received and believed that after-school tutoring had helped their children.*** Some parents noted that their children's grades had improved. Others pointed to improved math or reading skills or credited tutors with improving their children's attitude toward school.

- ***Other parents reported that they observed little benefit from the services.*** Some parents reported that they were disappointed with the services and saw no improvement in their children's reading and math skills. Others questioned whether a few extra hours of tutoring each week could really be expected to make a difference for their children. A few parents objected to the instructional approach of the providers they had selected.

Conclusions

After nearly two full years, there was ample evidence from the study sample that the states, districts, and providers were building on their implementation experiences with supplemental services. The six states had established routines for reviewing applications and with each round of applications, the list of approved providers continued to expand, both statewide and within districts. Sampled districts developed systems and methods for streamlining operations to simplify their work and to provide supplemental services to families sooner. Case study districts also included schools in the work of implementing, coordinating, and monitoring supplemental services. In 2003-04, many of the parents interviewed for the study reported that they had received helpful information about the services available to them, especially from teachers and face-to-face contacts with providers. Many of the parents

interviewed reported that they were pleased with the services their children had received, and believed that their children had benefited from the tutoring provided.

Despite progress, significant challenges remained. The experience of case study sites suggests that support and guidance would likely be useful in the following areas: Increasing participation rates, improving student attendance, maximizing both the number of contact hours and the quality of services provided, evaluating provider performance, improving communication with parents, managing administrative costs, and arranging fair systems for paying providers when student attendance is uneven.

Introduction

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), signed into law in January 2002, expanded the range of choices available to parents whose children attend Title I schools identified for improvement. Children from low-income families enrolled in schools that have not made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for three years or more are eligible to receive supplemental services, including tutoring, remediation, and other academic instruction. Supplemental services are intended to increase the academic achievement of students in low-performing schools.

Implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB involves states, districts, schools, parents, and providers. Each state is required to develop criteria for approving supplemental service providers and to provide school districts a list of available approved providers serving their geographic locations. School districts that have schools that are in their second year or later of improvement are responsible for notifying parents of their children's eligibility to receive supplemental services and for providing parents with adequate information to select providers for their children. Parents may select any approved provider in the area served by the school district or within a reasonable distance of the school district. School districts, in consultation with parents and providers, must develop specific educational goals for each student. Supplemental service providers must measure students' progress toward meeting their educational goals and report regularly on that progress to teachers and parents. NCLB requires that supplemental services be consistent with the state's academic content standards and with the instruction provided by the school district. In addition, services must be provided outside of the regular school day.

The purpose of the study was not to evaluate supplemental services but rather to gain insights from the early efforts of states and districts that could assist others in improving implementation of supplemental services.[3] This report presents findings from case studies conducted during the 2003-04 school year, the second year that the supplemental services provisions of NCLB were in effect, and follows up on baseline data collected the previous school year.[4] It is important to note that the findings presented are based on a small sample purposively selected from states and districts that were considered to be further along than others and, as a result, do not provide a nationally representative picture of the implementation of the supplemental services provisions.

In both years, the study conducted interviews in a purposive sample of six states and nine school districts, which were selected to include those that appeared to be relatively far along in

[3] This report contains both stronger and weaker examples of implementation of the supplemental services provisions of NCLB. The examples used here should not necessarily be considered accurate interpretations or representations of the implementation of supplemental services. Rather, these are examples of ways in which some states and districts have responded to the supplemental services requirements of the law.

[4] U.S. Department of Education. Policy and Program Studies Service. *Early Implementation of Supplemental Educational Services Under the* No Child Left Behind Act: *Year One Report*, by Leslie Anderson and Lisa Weiner. Author. Washington, D.C., 2004.

implementing supplemental services provisions.[5] The six states initially included in the study sample were selected based on whether states had provider lists in place as of late October or early November 2003. States that had finalized their provider lists were contacted and asked to identify districts that were either already offering supplemental services to students or were about to begin offering services. Nine districts that appeared to be relatively far along in implementing supplemental services and that represented the greatest possible variation in terms of size, location, student population served, and range of providers were purposively selected from that list. Four of the nine districts included in the baseline study were no longer providing supplemental services in 2003-04 because they no longer had schools in their second year of improvement or later. To adjust for these changes, four new districts in two new states were added to the study sample. These new districts and states were purposively sampled, using the same criteria employed as in 2002-03.

Implementation of Supplemental Services in Year One (2002-03)

The report on the first year of data collection conducted for this study, *Early Implementation of Supplemental Educational Services Under the* No Child Left Behind Act: *Year One Report* (U.S. Department of Education, 2004) found that implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB in 2002-03 had thrust states, districts, schools, and providers into uncharted territory. In the process of administering supplemental services for the first time, state administrators learned that the provider application process needed to start sooner, require more information about the range of services providers offered, and require more assurances of provider competency and commitment. In addition, states learned that the application process must result in a wider range of applicants with respect to the services they provide, the grade-levels they serve, and the areas in which they work.

District administrators recognized that they had to articulate more clearly to parents what the supplemental services options offer them and their children. They also understood that they needed to make provider services available to students earlier in the school year. In addition, districts learned that the process of contracting with providers was complicated and time-consuming, yet they had few ideas about ways to lessen the burden. Schools learned that they knew little about their role in the implementation of supplemental services—they were usually willing to do what they could to help but required more direction from the district regarding how. Finally, service providers learned that they could be putting themselves into something of a bind from a business perspective. While providers wanted to work with school districts, they had few guarantees that providing supplemental services would allow them to generate enough income to cover their costs on a consistent basis. What no one seemed to fully grasp was how to monitor and evaluate provider performance.

Finally, most district administrators believed that although start-up activity in the first year of implementation, in 2002-03, was difficult and error-prone, most of the challenges faced with respect to identifying providers, identifying schools, identifying eligible students, and notifying parents would not dissipate by the second year of implementation. That is, unlike other

[5] To protect their confidentiality, pseudonyms have been used for all the states, districts, schools, and most of the service providers that participated in this study.

programs, these case study districts believed that implementing supplemental services would present many of the same challenges with each passing year. Every year, there would be new providers, new schools, different numbers of students, and different needs to serve.

Data Collection in 2003-04

Data collection for the study in 2003-04 consisted of telephone interviews with state administrators from each of the six states who were responsible for administering the supplemental services provisions of NCLB. Because two of the states were new to the study sample in 2003-04, the interview protocol included specific questions about the state's administration of supplemental services in 2002-03, so that longitudinal comparisons would be possible with the full sample of six states. In addition, two-person teams conducted site visits between January and April 2004 to each of the nine districts. Site visit teams conducted personal interviews with district staff involved in planning or implementing supplemental services. Each team visited up to three schools in each district and interviewed principals, conducted teacher focus groups, and conducted either personal interviews or focus groups with parents of children eligible to receive supplemental services. The site visit teams also interviewed up to three supplemental service providers in each of the nine districts. Schools with the highest number of students receiving services in a given district were selected into the study sample. However, in cases in which a district had middle schools and high schools required to offer supplemental services, those schools were always included in the study sample. Similarly, providers serving the largest number of students were selected into the study sample. However, districts that were themselves state-approved providers were always included among the sample of providers for a given district. Again, because four of the districts were new to the case study sample, interview protocols included some questions about the district's implementation of supplemental services in 2002-03, so that longitudinal comparisons for these topics would be possible with the full sample of nine districts. Other longitudinal comparisons are limited to the five districts in both years of the study.

In 2003-04, as in 2002-03, the study focused on the successes and challenges states, districts, schools, and providers faced in implementing the supplemental services under NCLB. Key evaluation questions included the following:

- How were states and school districts implementing supplemental services?
- How were states selecting providers?
- How were school districts reaching out to and involving parents regarding supplemental services?
- What services were provided?
- What types of providers were offering and providing services?
- What were the challenges and successes regarding implementation?

This report describes and analyzes these important areas of activity in 2003-04 related to implementation of the supplemental services provisions of NCLB. Specifically, it describes the services themselves and the ongoing implementation experiences of: states, school districts, schools, and supplemental service providers. In addition, it describes the experiences of parents who, on behalf of their children, were attempting to access available educational services. The final section of this report summarizes early successes and the challenges to implementation that remain.

Supplemental Services: The View from the Ground

As described above, the implementation of supplemental services begins with the state, which approves providers, and continues with the district, which recruits parents to sign up for services and negotiates contracts with providers. Schools also can play an important part in outreach to parents and coordination with providers. The remainder of this report examines the successes and challenges faced by each of these actors in turn.

What, however, do supplemental services look like, from a student's perspective? To set some context for the remainder of the report, a brief overview of the supplemental services provided in the nine case study districts in 2003-04 follows. While this description is not representative of all supplemental services nationwide, it provides a summary of the basic features of the services being delivered in the case study sites in 2003-04 under the supplemental services provisions of NCLB.

Supplemental service providers in the nine case study sites typically offered tutoring immediately after school, two to three times a week. Tutoring sessions lasted between one and two hours. Supplemental service providers worked in schools whenever possible; students typically attended tutoring programs in the same buildings where they attend school. In most cases, providers hired teachers from those same schools or from the district at large to provide services.

Tutors generally worked with students in small groups, where tutor-student ratios ranged from 1:5 to 1:10. (One-on-one tutoring for an entire session was rare among the providers included in this study.) With larger groups, tutors used whole-group instruction and individual seatwork to keep students engaged for the entire tutoring session.

The content and structure of tutoring services varied widely, depending on the provider and in some cases, on the individual tutor. Providers represented a range of philosophies and approaches to the teaching of reading and math. Many students took diagnostic assessments developed by the provider or built from state assessment items. The results of those assessments then dictated the instructional objectives to be covered in tutoring. With some providers, whole-group reading instruction included guided reading of authentic literature, group discussions, and extension activities to help students develop oral fluency, build vocabulary, and improve comprehension. Other providers focused on developing phonics and decoding skills. Some providers offered self-paced worksheet programs designed to strengthen mastery of basic skills. Other providers did not use a prescribed curriculum, choosing instead to work with students on

class work or home work, organizational strategies, taking notes in class, critical thinking skills, and test preparation. The extent to which providers had aligned their curriculum with state standards was unclear. Some providers had conducted alignment studies and purchased additional instructional materials to ensure that all state standards would be covered; others used state assessment results to develop tutoring plans for individual students; still others were unable to describe any strategy for aligning their services with state standards.

The total number of hours each student received ranged widely, from a low of 18 in the case study districts to a high of 120. At the rate of two to six hours a week, students tended to "cycle out" of supplemental services after 10-20 weeks.

Some providers organized their programs so that they could be attended in combination with other activities. For example, after-school programs of various kinds may operate for three or four hours after school, with tutoring supported by Title I supplemental services taking place for one or two of those hours. In the time remaining, students could participate in character education, leadership development and drug prevention programs, music education, recreation, service learning, and field trips.

Student attendance at after-school tutoring was a challenge in each of the case study sites, especially at the middle and high school levels. Supplemental service providers did not collect comparable information on attendance across sites (the nature of the attendance data collected and reported to districts depended on the terms of their contracts with districts.) In several middle schools visited for the study, teachers and principals estimated that fewer than half of students signed up for services attended tutoring on any given day. In elementary schools, attendance rates were higher, approaching 95 percent in some cases. Several supplemental service providers offered incentives for students to attend regularly, and others were considering the use of incentives.

Some providers in the study sample reported that they sent information on student progress home to parents monthly or every six weeks; others reported that they preferred to communicate informally with parents. None of the parents interviewed for the study, however, recalled receiving written progress reports from supplemental service providers. Instead, they relied on contact with teachers at the school to stay abreast of their child's progress in tutoring. A handful of providers reported that they had developed formal mechanisms for communicating with teachers. However, many of the teachers interviewed did not know which of their students were receiving supplemental services, and none had received written progress reports from providers. In cases where school staff worked as tutors for supplemental service providers, they kept classroom teachers informed through informal conversations.

Participation rates varied across the districts. Three districts provided supplemental services to 86 percent or more of the students they could provide services to with the maximum amount they were required to spend on supplemental services. In the six other districts, participation rates were between 13 percent and 62 percent of the number of students the districts could serve with the maximum required amount of funding. Later sections of this report explore some of the factors that contributed to these participation rates.

States' Efforts to Implement Supplemental Services

By 2003-04, the six states included in the case study sample had improved, refined, or expedited the implementation of the supplemental services under NCLB, compared with their efforts in 2002-03. These six states issued updated lists of approved providers somewhat earlier in the 2003-04 school year, compared with 2002-03. In addition, they continued to refine their application process and their criteria for evaluating providers. The number of approved providers increased in nearly all of the states, although state administrators continued to express concerns about the limited service available in small and rural districts. Although states continued to work on developing systems for monitoring provider performance, efforts were still limited.

Approving Supplemental Service Providers

In 2003-04, five of the six states in the 2003-04 study sample issued an updated list of approved providers much sooner than they had done in 2002-03. Indeed, all six issued lists before the start of the 2003-04 school year. Four of the six issued lists by June 2003, well in advance of the new school year; the remaining two issued their lists over the summer, in July and August. (It is important to note, however, that at least three districts in the case study sample reported receiving the lists from their states several months after the state had reported publishing them, even though states posted their lists online.)

Three of the six states in the sample continued to review and approve additional applications during the school year. Two of these three states reviewed applications on a rolling basis; one issued an additional list of approved providers in November 2003.

In 2003-04, each of the six states in the case study sample followed legislative requirements and the Department of Education's non-regulatory guidance with respect to establishing selection criteria for supplemental service providers. States required providers to meet the following criteria—included in the legislation or regulations—for selection:

- Provider has a demonstrated record of effectiveness in improving student academic achievement;
- Provider will use instructional strategies that are high-quality, based upon research, and designed to increase student academic achievement;
- Provider will provide services that are consistent with the instructional program of the local education agency (LEA) and with state academic content and achievement standards;
- Provider is financially sound;

- Provider will provide supplemental services consistent with applicable federal, state, and local health, safety, and civil rights laws;

- All instruction and content provided by the provider will be secular, neutral and non-ideological;

- Provider's services will be provided in addition to instruction provided during the school day.

In the case of the first four criteria (record of effectiveness, instructional strategies, alignment, and financial soundness), all state applications asked providers to submit evidence that they met these criteria. In the case of the last three criteria, some applications asked providers to simply submit assurances that these criteria would be met, and others required that providers submit evidence.

In addition, all six states also added criteria to their provider applications for 2003-04 that went above and beyond legislative requirements. For example, all six states required applicants to discuss their capacity to serve special populations of students (e.g., students with disabilities and English language learners). One state required providers serving areas where the student population was composed in large part of English language learners to demonstrate experience in improving the achievement of these students. Five of the six states required that providers communicate with parents in their native language. All six states required providers to produce evidence of qualified staff. One state required assurances that staff of supplemental service providers meet the paraprofessional requirements that govern staffing of in-school Title I programs. Specifically, the state application requires that all staff providing tutoring meet at least the standards of quality for new paraprofessionals under NCLB. In addition, the state required that all staff meeting only the qualifications for new paraprofessionals work under the supervision of another staff member who meets the criteria for "highly qualified" teacher under NCLB, though this is not allowable under the Title I regulations. Also, in an effort to address liability and safety issues, all six states required that provider applicants produce evidence that their employees had undergone background checks.

One state had a concern about applicants who do not provide academic services, but who work on related skills that could conceivably enable children to perform better in the classroom. For example, one potential provider trained children to walk on balance beams to help them learn to control the movement of their eyes. This applicant had research demonstrating the effectiveness of this technique for helping children follow a line of text effectively in reading. This state did not approve the organization's application, but worried about the decision, because the applicant claimed the approach was research-based. For some services, the link to state academic standards was indirect, and state coordinators wondered whether these providers should be approved to offer services. In an interview, one supplemental services coordinator asked:

We are getting other kinds of people who might want to apply who are not connected to state academic standards, but want to help kids with organizational skills. How loose or how far from this idea of academic standards does the state have latitude to let other kinds of providers in under supplemental services?

By 2003-04, states had refined their application review process, developing evaluation criteria and rubrics for scoring provider applications and organizing committees of reviewers with representation from stakeholder groups. All of the states in the study sample had developed a rubric that would allow them to evaluate applications from potential providers and to use multiple reviewers. An example of one such rubric, developed by one mid-central state, is included in the box below. This rubric requires that providers score at least 28 points out of a possible 42 to be approved.

A Rubric for Scoring Supplemental Services Provider Applications

(1) *Program (10 points):* Evidence of specific program elements, such as alignment of program to the state's model academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, consistency of instruction between program and local school, location of service delivery, etc.

(2) *Staff (7 points):* Evidence of the qualifications and ongoing support staff will receive.

(3) *Program Effectiveness (10 points):* Evidence of the program's effectiveness in increasing student achievement and evidence that high-quality, research-based instruction supports the program.

(4) Evaluation/Monitoring (10 points): Evidence that the program will be monitored for effectiveness, that the progress of students receiving supplemental services will be measured and that the district, parents, and teachers will be notified of the student's progress, in their native language, if necessary.

(5) Pricing for SES (5 points): Indication of the pricing structure for providing supplemental services.

The number of supplemental service providers approved for the 2003-04 school year increased in five of six states, in line with a nationwide increase in the number of approved providers. Nationwide, the number of approved providers rose from 997 in April 2003 to 1,890 in May 2004, an increase of 90 percent (see Exhibit 1). Among three states sampled for this study, the rate of increase was well above the national rate, with the number of providers doubling or tripling by 2003-04. These three states had approved just a few providers (fewer than 25) the year before. Two other states increased the number of providers by half or more. A sixth state, which had a large number of approved providers in 2003, increased that number by just over 10 percent.

States reported only limited attempts to encourage potential providers to apply to become supplemental service providers. Despite these limited attempts at outreach, the number of organizations expressing interest in becoming supplemental service providers continued to grow.

Exhibit 1
Change in Number of Providers, by State

State	Total Number of Providers Operating in the State			
	April 28-30, 2003	May 3-5, 2004	Number Increase	Percentage Increase
State I	17	65	48	282%
State II	24	74	50	208%
State III	13	31	18	138%
State IV	16	27	11	69%
State V	119	180	61	51%
State VI	174	193	19	11%
All states*	**997**	**1,890**	**893**	**90%**

* Includes the 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. State lists were not available for nine states in 2003 and three states in 2004.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. "Supplemental Service Providers on State Web Sites," (May 3-5, 2004 and April 28-30, 2003), unpublished database.

As of 2003-04, few providers had been removed from state lists. In a few instances, providers had been removed for financial irregularities, or because they were not actually offering tutoring services, only the use of their curriculum materials. These cases were relatively rare, however. There were no examples of providers who had been removed from the lists because the state had determined that the quality of their services was not adequate. The law requires states to remove providers from the approved list only if they fail to increase student achievement after two years, so states did not anticipate removing providers from their approved lists for this reason until the end of the 2003-04 school year.

State supplemental services coordinators reported that small districts and rural districts continued to be underserved, compared with urban districts. While state administrators of supplemental services reported that some providers were approved to serve all schools required to offer services in the state, they remained concerned about the limited supply of providers in small and rural districts. In several states, providers approved to operate statewide were not operating in small and rural districts. In one state, many of the rural areas were only served by online providers. This was especially problematic for rural schools that lacked the computers and high-speed Internet connection to support a Web-based tutoring program. In another state, the supplemental services coordinator criticized providers who, she said, found it difficult to serve students outside of major metropolitan areas. She gave an example of one provider who claimed to be able to serve the whole state but then declined to set up services in several small towns. She noted, "They don't go everywhere. In the really little towns, no one wants to go."

Private providers other than faith-based and online providers were the dominant provider types in four of the six case study states as well as nationally. Intermediate education agencies (IEAs), school districts, and public school-based providers were somewhat more common in four of the six case study states than they were nationwide; the ratio of faith-based and online providers is the same in the case study states as it is nationwide. IEAs, school districts, and school-based providers made up 25 percent of providers nationwide (see Exhibit 2). In four of the six case study states, IEA, school district, and school-based providers were even more common, representing between 31 and 46 percent of providers. In the remaining two states, they were somewhat less common. Where school districts made up a larger share of providers, private providers tended to made up a smaller share; the proportion of online and faith-based providers was low in the six case study states and nationwide. (There was one exception, where 22 percent of providers offered online services in one state.)

Exhibit 2
Types of Supplemental Educational Service Providers, by State and Nationwide, May 2004

State	Number of Providers, by Provider Type													
	Other Private		Faith-Based (private)		Online (private)		Intermediate Educational Agencies, School Districts and Public Schools		Colleges and Universities		Other/ Unknown		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
State III	14	45	2	6	4	13	6	19	0	0	5	16	31	100
State IV	21	78	1	4	1	4	3	11	0	0	1	4	27	100
State II	26	35	0	0	16	22	30	41	1	1	1	1	74	100
State I	31	48	0	0	5	8	20	31	1	1	1	1	0	100
State V	80	44	13	7	11	6	68	38	6	3	2	1	180	100
State VI	89	46	8	4	8	4	88	46	0	0	0	0	193	100
All States*	**1,033**	**55**	**109**	**6**	**172**	**9**	**464**	**25**	**45**	**2**	**67**	**4**	**1,890**	**100**

* Includes the 50 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. State lists were not available for three states. "Other private" providers were private providers that were not faith-based or online.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. "Supplemental Service Providers on State Web Sites," (May 3-5, 2004), unpublished database.

The 13 most commonly approved providers across the nation, all for-profit companies, some of which offered services online, represented 20 percent of all state-approved providers. In the case study states, these providers represented 15 percent of all approved providers. Seventy-two percent of providers in the case study states were approved only in one instance, compared

with 60 percent nationally. (Source: U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. "Supplemental Service Providers on State Web Sites," (May 3-5, 2004), unpublished database.)

Monitoring Providers

In 2003-04, the states in the study sample continued to consider ways to monitor provider performance, and several began the process of contracting with external evaluators to assist with monitoring. The task of monitoring supplemental service providers and of evaluating their performance continued to be a challenge for states. In most cases, states had not yet put full-blown monitoring systems in place, although they had put some work into planning them. The law requires states to remove providers from the approved list if they fail to increase student achievement after two years, so states had to begin implementing systems for this at the end of the 2003-04 school year. For example, as of May 2004, one state planned to begin on-site visits to supplemental service providers across the state. Data collection was to include surveys of district administrators and parents, evaluation of academic performance measures (i.e., assessment data), and an examination of staff quality.

Several states relied heavily on districts for information about the performance of supplemental service providers. In this vein, one state conducted what it called "desktop monitoring," reviewing data sent by districts on the number of students served, the number that had left, and documents sent to parents. In general, the case study states made no attempt to monitor the number of contact hours provided per child or provider costs.

One state supplemental services coordinator reported that her state still had not developed a monitoring process because, she said, "We just don't have the expertise to do it." In her view, an expert evaluator, who can take into account the differences among provider programs and the context within which they work, was needed and the SEA was trying to find someone for this task. Two other states had already contracted with external evaluators to help with monitoring. One state contracted with a local university to develop an evaluation process for providers. Another state used their Comprehensive Assistance Center to develop a survey of districts, students, and parents on supplemental service providers. This particular state used the survey data they had collected for purposes of approving providers for the 2003-04 school year.

While the case study states generally understood the NCLB requirement that providers be removed from state lists if they fail, for two consecutive years, to contribute to increased academic proficiency relative to state standards, they had not yet developed criteria for evaluating providers. One state, an exception, had developed a clear target for provider performance in reading: 90 percent of students served by a provider must show progress on an Individual Reading Inventory (IRI) administered by the student's school. In this same state, however, targets for provider performance in serving students in math remained under development.

Several respondents indicated that they would welcome assistance from the U.S. Department of Education with respect to monitoring providers. They asked for templates or sample data collection instruments that could be used to monitor providers, as well as more frequent interaction with the U.S. Department of Education on these issues.

Districts' Role in Implementing Supplemental Services

District responsibilities for implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB challenged district administrators in 2003-04, but many of them had developed systems and methods for streamlining operations and procedures to simplify their work as well as provide supplemental services to families sooner. District administrators are responsible for identifying eligible students, determining which providers on the state-approved provider list were willing to operate in the district, informing parents of the available services, collecting parent applications and signatures, coordinating provider activities with schools, identifying funding sources, estimating service capacity, contracting with providers to provide services to students who request them, and communicating with providers. Most districts knew that states would remove providers from state lists if the provider failed to contribute to increased student proficiency for two consecutive years. Most districts also expected their state department of education would request that they collect and send data on provider performance.

As was true in 2002-03, the snapshot of districts taken in 2003-04 again revealed that districts varied tremendously by the number of schools they had to work with, the number of providers they had available to students, when they notified parents, and when they began providing services (see Exhibit 3). Accordingly, districts approached the implementation, management, and evaluation of supplemental services in a variety of ways.

District Efforts to Reach Parents

In 2003-04, districts' efforts to inform parents of the availability of supplemental services appeared organized and focused on helping parents understand the services districts were offering them. Most district administrators in the study sample in 2003-04 reported beginning their administration of supplemental services by first contacting all the providers on the state-approved list to determine their availability to offer services in their respective districts. District administrators asked providers to submit a short profile of the type of services they offered, as well as the frequency and duration of those services, the age group providers served, whether they intended to offer transportation (if services were offered outside of the schools), and whether they served the needs of special populations of students.[6] Comments from administrators in at least one of the nine districts indicated that the provider vetting process went beyond determining whether a provider was "able" to serve the district to which providers offered the services. As one administrator explained, "We looked at enrollment and tried to get a balance at the schools with what [providers] offered. Some providers were selected because they offered more language or math, for example." Such vetting by district staff, however, is not allowable under the statute, according to an August 2004 letter issued by the U.S. Department of Education (Simon and Rees, Aug. 26, 2004). The letter, issued after the data were collected for this study, informs states that approving providers is the responsibility of the state departments of education, and school districts may not alter or add to criteria related to program design.

[6] Districts collected basic information about provider services because very little, if any, of this information was provided to the districts by the state.

Exhibit 3
Characteristics of Supplemental Services in Sampled Districts in 2003-04

District Name	Demographics[a]	Number of Schools Required to Offer Services	Number of Providers in District	Date of Parent Notification	Date Services Began
Brooktown School District	Large Central City; 80% minority; 27% LEP	24	14	October 2003	December 2003
Plainfield School District	Large Central City; 56% minority; 7% LEP	1	5	May 2003	September 2003
Oakwood School District	Mid-size Central City: 99.4% minority 1% LEP	20	6	November 2003	March 2004
Sunnydale School District	Large Central City; 91% minority; 2% LEP	42	10	July 2003	September 2003
Emory Public Schools	Urban Fringe of Large City; 23% minority; LEP N/A	3	12	September 2003 (ES) and March 2004 (MS)	November 2003
Springvale School District	Mid-size Central City 70% minority; 7% LEP	4	12	October 2003	November 2003
Redding School District	Mid-size Central City; 71% minority; 1% LEP	10	6	September 2003	January 2004
Trainville School District	Large Central City; 77% minority; 28% LEP	5	5	September 2003	October 2003
Longwood Public Schools	Large Central City; 90% minority; 43% LEP	104	27	September 2003	January 2004

Once districts collected all the relevant information from providers, district administrators began mailing letters home to parents informing them of the availability of supplemental services. Most of the nine districts in the study sample accompanied those letters with packets of materials that included descriptions of provider services, a selection form for parents to rank their choice of provider (which sometimes included a prepaid envelope for parents to mail their form back to the district—in other cases, parents were expected to either mail the form back on their own, call the district, or call the school), and provider-generated brochures. Some districts even included answers to frequently asked questions among the materials they sent home to parents, as well as checklists for applying for supplemental services

[a] Large Central City: Central city of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) with a population greater than or equal to 250,000. Mid-size Central City: Central City of an MSA with a population less than 250,000. Urban Fringe of Large City: Place within an MSA of a Large Central City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau (Common Core of Data, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education).

and dates when applications and provider selection forms were due back to the district. One district included a set of questions that parents could ask when talking to providers about the services they offered.

In addition to the provider information and materials, most districts in the study sample sent parents a short letter. Less than a page long, these letters were relatively straight-forward, and referenced the availability of "tutorial services" or "extra help" for children in reading and math. Several districts in the study sample did not mention the *No Child Left Behind Act* in the letters they sent home to parents. The following are excerpts from letters to parents sent by three separate districts:

> *District 1: I am sending you this letter to strongly encourage you to enroll your child in the Supplemental Services After-School Tutoring. This is a wonderful opportunity for your child to receive extra help and assistance in reading and math. This extra tutorial assistance is offered at* **NO COST** *to you.*
>
> *District 2: We are pleased to inform you that your child has been approved to receive free tutoring services for the 2003-2004 school year. You have the right to choose the tutoring service you prefer for your child. Attached you will find flyers for supplemental service providers who will be tutoring eligible students in the [school district].*
>
> *District 3: The [DISTRICT NAME] is on the move in addressing improved student achievement and our number one goal is to close the achievement gap and to provide the support necessary to ensure all students have ample opportunities to improve their academic achievement. With this goal in mind, we are pleased to inform you that your child may be eligible for extra academic assistance under the federal law, The No Child Left Behind Act.*

Two of the districts lapsed into legislative jargon when describing supplemental services to parents. The parents in one of the districts, in fact, complained that the language of NCLB was inaccessible to them. For instance, terms such as "Supplemental Services" and "Adequate Yearly Progress" did not have much meaning for some parents in this community. The following is an example of a jargon-filled school district letter:

> *The [DISTRICT NAME] has always worked to provide our students with a positive educational experience. Our district receives funding from many sources, one of which is Title I, Part A, a grant provided by the federal government through the recent legislation, No Child Left Behind. As a requirement for receiving funds under this program each school must meet the guidelines for 'adequate yearly progress' in each subject area using a system approved by the [STATE] Board of Education. The Title I program's assessment of this school indicates that we need to strengthen achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. As an option of the No Child Left Behind legislation, some students in your school have the opportunity to receive supplemental services. This letter is to inform you that your student has been identified to participate in this program.*

As the parent coordinator at one of the high schools where students were eligible to receive supplemental services explained: "[It's a problem because] a lot of times parents are afraid to say that they don't understand the jargon of the law." A parent of an eligible student had this to say about the letter:

> *The language of the parent letter is not something that parents can easily understand…. There was a good amount of confusion…. It was a very lengthy letter.*

In addition to the print materials districts sent home to parents, other efforts were made to reach parents. Indeed, districts reported being eager to reach parents. For example, one district held two provider fairs at the schools required to offer supplemental services and sent fliers and other reminders home starting in the spring on at least five separate occasions. The principal reported that staff visits were also made to homes to encourage parents to enroll their children in supplemental services. Another district placed an announcement about the availability of tutoring services in the local newspaper; the announcement ran for two days. A third district sent fliers and sponsored television and radio ads to advertise a provider fair. A fourth district decided to call eligibility for tutoring "scholarships" because it had learned from another district that this approach gave supplemental services a more positive spin and might yield higher participation rates. One district's efforts to reach parents, however, seemed well above the norm among the nine districts included in the study sample. This district described its outreach process as encompassing nine steps, each of which suggested a good deal of time, thought, and energy was devoted to the task of reaching parents (see box, next page). This district served a total of 336 students or 28 percent of the eligible students it had the funding capacity to serve.

Contacting and communicating effectively with parents about the availability of supplemental services challenged most school districts. Although districts generally thought that they were doing a good job informing parents of the availability of supplemental services, some providers, teachers, and principals disagreed. In one district, for example, some teachers and principals said that the packet of materials the district sent home to parents was too complicated and confusing to be helpful. As one principal explained:

> *The packet was overwhelming. Parents really didn't understand all of the information until teachers really made the connection. Teachers would call home and explain to parents that [supplemental services] would benefit them if they attended…. [Without the phone call] they just saw this big bulky packet. . . The language was really difficult….*

One District's New Steps for Reaching Parents

Step 1: Assistant superintendent sends a letter home to parents informing them of the availability of supplemental services.

Step 2: The district sends a brochure home to parents about provider services along with a business reply postcard that allows parents to check which provider they have selected. Information about each provider includes answers to questions such as the following: (1) What programs are available for my child? (2) When and where will services be provided? (3) How often will services be provided? (4) What kind of experience does this provider have? and (5) what is the demonstrated effectiveness of the provider?

Step 3: Elementary schools send home fliers about supplemental services along with student report cards.

Step 4: School newsletters will contain information about supplemental services each time they are sent home.

Step 5: The district mails monthly postcards home to parents.

Step 6: School principals discuss supplemental services on the radio.

Step 7: School principals, Title I teachers, and counselors contact parents about supplemental services.

Step 8: The district's Title I parent liaison calls every parent and informs them of the availability of supplemental services.

Step 9: Churches in the school attendance areas are sent information about supplemental services.

Similarly, another district reported that while parents received ample detailed information on supplemental services, many simply did not read it. According to the Title I director, parents and others suggested that in the future "[W]e [should] do sound bites, billboards, and radio ads, something quick to get away from written things." She continued: "We want to find out how to get good information to parents without overwhelming them. We did not do a good job to make sure they were not overwhelmed…."

Schools in another district complained that they did not receive enough information from the district about providers and, as a result, they were unable to help parents when they called the school to inquire as to which provider would be best suited to the needs of their child. As one principal explained:

> *The one-page description of providers wasn't sufficient—it gives you basic information… a one-page flier telling you the services of [providers]. They all sound the same and you don't know one from the next and don't know who's good and who's not.*

Districts in the study sample also cited the problem of communicating to parents which students were eligible for services. As one district administrator explained, it was difficult for parents to understand that their children did not qualify for services because they did not attend a school identified for improvement, or they were not eligible for free or reduced-price school

lunches. Other parents wondered why they received a letter when their child was doing well in school.

Targeting Students for Services

Seven of nine districts in the 2003-04 sample offered supplemental services to all students from low-income families in schools required to offer supplemental services. In the previous year, the majority of case study districts had also considered student achievement—in addition to whether a student was from a low-income family—when offering services. Three of the five districts that participated in this study in 2002-03 and 2003-04 changed their targeting procedures as a result of low rates of participation in supplemental services in 2002-03 (see Exhibit 6). That is, several district administrators explained that opening the services up to any student from a low-income family who attended a school required to offer supplemental services might raise levels of participation in supplemental services. By contrast, in 2002-03, several districts thought it was necessary to prioritize students for services because they believed that supplemental services would be so popular among families that districts would not be able to serve all eligible students based solely on poverty status. In practice, supplemental services did not prove to be as high in demand as districts had anticipated in their first year of implementation. And district experiences in 2003-04 suggest that targeting is again unnecessary. For example, one district began supplemental services in 2003-04 by prioritizing students for services based on family income and academic need. As the supplemental services administrator explained, the district had determined how many students it could serve based on the per-pupil allocation (as defined by the state) divided into an amount equal to 20 percent of the district's Title I allocation:

> *[We didn't] know if we would be able to serve all the kids, [so we] prioritized the kids by test score in case everybody signed up. [However, we] only had 42 kids whose parents said they wanted to receive services.*

The district administrator went on to explain that because so few parents enrolled their children in supplemental services when the initial letters went out, the district eventually opted to send letters to all low-income parents whose children were attending schools required to offer services.

District Relationships with Supplemental Service Providers

District relationships with supplemental service providers varied. Among the districts included in the study sample in 2003-04, many were skillful in developing provider contracts and, in many cases, had put in place procedures for improving their efficiency in writing, reviewing, revising, and approving provider contracts.

In 2003-04, districts in the study sample were adept at entering into contracts with service providers. Many districts used boilerplate contracts for providers that they created—and

vetted—in 2002-03. Accordingly, no confusion or consternation about creating provider contracts was evident in 2003-04. Among the three districts in the study sample that provided supplemental services for the first time in 2003-04, all were using contract templates or samples they had obtained from their state education agency or from other districts. Most of the districts used one standard contract for all providers; one district, however, used various formats and structures for its contracts for providers, appearing to simply amend contract templates received from the various providers rather than working from an original contract designed by the district.

Most district contracts with service providers, while varying in length, contained much the same content, referenced many of the same issues, and included specifications for each of the following:

- Number of hours of tutoring services for each student
- Duration and frequency of tutoring sessions (i.e., number of sessions per week)
- Maximum dollar amount paid per student served
- Type of instructional program (e.g., reading or math instruction)
- Provision of services on-site vs. off-site
- Administration of pre- and post-tests to students
- Student attendance reports delivered monthly to the district (usually as a condition for payment of provider invoices)
- Student progress reports (delivered to parents and to the district at regular intervals, usually every four to six weeks)
- Annual program evaluation report
- Agreements regarding student goals and progress (required in eight of nine district contracts)
- Termination of services
- Liability insurance
- District responsibilities (e.g., identify eligible students and deliver list to providers four to six weeks before the provision of services; provide a contact person for providers; provide and disseminate student contact information, grades, test score data, etc.)
- Terms of payment or compensation

Finally, most district contracts were accompanied by a series of attachments that amounted to examples of forms (e.g., student attendance forms, student agreement forms, etc.) that providers were required to complete periodically. One district, however, made contract

approval contingent upon providers submitting additional information, including background check clearance forms; results of TB tests; signed building rental lease agreements if they were using district facilities; a business license to work in the district; transportation schedules for students receiving tutoring services; and information on the square footage of the instructional classrooms providers intended to use when working off-site. Another unique aspect of this district's provider contracts was the requirement that providers offer transportation to all students receiving supplemental services. Moreover, transportation had to be provided by "a licensed company approved by the district." Every supplemental service provider ultimately contracted to use the same bus services that the district used. While districts are allowed to impose reasonable administrative and operational requirements through agreements with providers that are consistent with requirements imposed generally on the districts' contractors, a letter from the U.S. Department of Education (Simon and Rees, Aug. 26, 2004)—issued after the study data were collected—makes clear that districts are not allowed to impose conditions on providers related to program design. In addition, any such requirements should not limit educational options for parents.

Although most districts seemed skilled at writing provider contracts, the time it took to finalize them in 2003-04—even when working from well-vetted boiler-plate templates—was significant. One district administrator reported that contract development continued to be a long and difficult process. "I had to work with the providers for about two months…. There was lots of e-mailing. We need software to track the changes to save time. I worked on the contracts late at night…2 a.m., 3 a.m." This Title I director also noted that she even occasionally called upon the knowledge and expertise of her husband, an attorney, to help her. The burden was overwhelming for her. "During the contract period I'm sure I worked all day every day for a couple of weeks…five hours each night for 10 nights straight." She noted that she spent more than 50 percent of her time on supplemental services and, as a result, she was "fatigued" and unable to take care of the "details in my regular Title I duties." One source of the problem was that, in cases in which the providers were subsidiaries of large corporations, the contract negotiations involved dealing with additional people in cities far away. These lengthy negotiations slowed the contracting process and made it more protracted.

In two other districts, the contracting process was slowed dramatically by the local school boards involving themselves in the provider vetting process. In one district, for example, the providers were vetted by three different committees of the local school board. The goal of each committee meeting was to ensure that providers met certain district and state regulations such as being registered with the state fire marshal and having completed background checks for all of their employees. Moreover, these meetings were open to the public and broadcast on public access television. The district saw the meetings as "another opportunity" for parents to learn about how providers could help their children by offering tutoring services. Nevertheless, it delayed the contract approval process—and therefore the provision of supplemental services to students—by several months. While, as noted above, districts may impose reasonable operational and administrative requirements through their agreements with providers, such requirements should not undermine the parents' opportunity to select the most appropriate provider for their children from among providers approved by the state to offer services in the district or area where the child lives.

Most districts had begun to put in place systems for communicating with providers. Among four of the five districts that participated in the study in 2002-03 and 2003-04, there was an increase in the number of providers offering services (see Exhibit 4). Accordingly, there was a more pressing need among those districts to develop systems to communicate with providers. In 2002-03, in fact, many districts worked with no more than one provider. In 2003-04, however, districts were approaching their supplemental services work quite differently. These districts had learned from their experience implementing supplemental services in the previous year that managing relationships and communicating directly with providers was necessary to ensure that services ran smoothly. For example, several district administrators said they kept in regular contact with providers by telephone and e-mail and that they kept records on provider invoices and mapped those against the number of students served. Indeed, an indicator of districts' commitment to improving the management of supplemental services was that at least three of the nine districts in the study sample had found ways to fund a supplemental services coordinator position in their district (using funding sources other than Title I).

In some districts, the distinction between district management of providers' contractual agreements and monitoring provider performance (a state responsibility), was blurred. For example, several districts said they sent supplemental services coordinators into provider facilities as well as schools to monitor tutoring sessions and to talk to students, teachers, principals, and parents about provider services. District administrators also reported that supplemental services coordinators were interested in looking at whether providers were meeting students' needs, as well as examining the logistics of the program, such as security and safety issues. One district's supplemental services coordinator described her position as including certain activities relating to administrative and operational requirements, including: assisting principals in collecting student assessment data and tracking student progress, monitoring student attendance and communicating with parents to ensure their children attend regularly, and ensuring that there are clear lines of communication between schools and providers. However, this same coordinator described her work as also including activities that are more appropriate at the state level, rather than district, such as monitoring all service providers to ensure services "are of a high quality" and monitoring tutors' attendance and work and, if necessary, contacting the provider when a problem arises.

One district administrator explained that there had been, heretofore, little accountability for the providers and that the district had been running supplemental services "on an assumption about humanity," which is that providers will do what they agreed to in the contract. Two districts said they purchased and used heavily a commercial newsletter that covers compliance with NCLB requirements.

Exhibit 4
Changes in the Number of Schools and Providers, and the Timing of Supplemental Services in Sampled Districts Between 2002-03 and 2003-04[a]

District Name	Number of Schools Required to Offer Services		Number of Providers in District		Date of Parent Notification		Date Services Began	
	2002-03	2003-04	2002-03	2003-04	2002-03	2003-04	2002-03	2003-04
Brooktown School District	3	24	13	14	September 2002	October 2003	November 2002	December 2003
Plainfield School District	3	1	4	5	August 2002	May 2003	January 2003	September 2003
Sunnydale School District	59	42	6	10	November 2002	July 2003	January 2003	September 2003
Redding School District	12	10	3	6	August 2002	September 2003	January 2003	January 2004
Trainville School District	5	5	12	5	August 2002	September 2003	April 2003	October 2003

Although most districts in the study sample had begun requiring agreements regarding student goals and progress—developed by the district in consultation with parents and the selected provider for every student receiving supplemental services—few districts were able to enforce this requirement. Three of the districts even attached templates to the contract for providers to use when writing student agreements. Most districts, however, could not say whether these agreements were fashioned in the manner mandated under NCLB. One district created a system for ensuring that student agreements were properly designed (see box, next page) for every student participating in supplemental services. That is, once parents had chosen their preferred provider, the district hosted an event for parents, teachers, and providers to come together to discuss the services that students would receive. The district administrator described the event this way:

> *[We] brought parents, teachers, providers together in one room…[and had] all of the principals and district folks there, too. [We started by making] introductions, [and told parents] about the law.... Then [the child's] teacher and the parent sat with the provider and talked about each child.... They talked about what the student needed the most help with.*

Similarly, another district hosted goal-setting sessions in 2003-04 that included the provider, parent, and the Title I director. Lasting about 15-20 minutes, the sessions were conducted at whatever location the parent chose—usually at the school. This district reported conducting 300 of these sessions in the 2003-04 school year.

[a] Three of the nine case study districts were providing supplemental services for the first time in 2003-04. Accordingly, these districts are not represented in this table because there were no comparative data available for the 2002-03 school year. A fourth district offered only summer services in 2002-03.

Producing Supplemental Service Agreements for Students

While sitting down with parent(s) and the teacher, the provider gives an overview of their services and the teacher discusses the student's progress and areas of need. In addition, the provider, teacher, and parent fill out the Individual Supplemental Service Agreement (ISSA), which contains: (1) goals for the student; (2) the means by which progress will be measured; (3) a timeline of services and progress; (4) procedures for notification of progress to teachers and parents; (5) days, times, and types of services; (6) attendance policies; (7) termination of services; and (8) method of payment. In addition, the district administrator gives every parent her business card so that if their child is having trouble or isn't satisfied with their services, they can call her. Once all parties agree on the terms of the agreement, it's signed by the student, parent, teacher, and provider.

The need for additional district staff to assist with supplemental services was evidenced by the provider coordination, management problems and misunderstandings that continued to frustrate some district implementation efforts. For example, one district administrator told the story of a provider going door-to-door in the community trying to recruit students. When word got back to the district, the provider was told that all recruitment efforts had to go through the district in order to ensure that parents know all the provider options available during the school year. In this case, the district went beyond its authority in telling the provider that all recruitment efforts had to go through the district. According to U.S. Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance on supplemental services (Aug. 22, 2003, Item F-10), "Providers are allowed to market their services to members of the community or to provide general information to the public about the availability of supplemental services. LEAs may not restrict them from doing so."

Another district found that some students were receiving services from two separate providers, one providing services three days a week and the other providing services on the other two days. This example made it clear that the district needed to closely monitor provider attendance lists before paying for services. An administrator in another district said she did not feel she had enough time or support to manage the providers and the supplemental services:

> *Supplemental services is labor intensive—not hard—but intense… parents are always calling with questions, providers are calling with questions. [I spend time] checking to make sure whether the providers [are showing up] or not, checking with principals, and [making sure] invoices and progress reports are done correctly.*

In 2003-04, several districts had set student attendance policies for providers. Policies ranged from providers dropping students who missed three consecutive tutoring sessions to providers dropping students after five absences total. In one district, if a student was absent for three consecutive weeks, the student was dropped and the provider was not paid. However, the provider got paid the full per-pupil allocation if a student was absent for fewer than three consecutive weeks. Another district described a stringent attendance policy whereby if students missed services two times they were dropped. As the district administrator explained: "We are

not paying providers for empty seats. If a kid is dropped, [providers] don't get paid." Providers in another district said that they did not like their contract because it stipulated that they would not be reimbursed for a student unless the student actually attended any given session, which is somewhat outside the control of the provider.

Most districts in the study sample required providers to include monthly attendance and progress reports for each participating student when submitting their monthly invoices. In most cases, providers were paid for the number of hours they tutored, although some providers were not required to submit attendance sheets and tutoring logs; they simply submitted an invoice to the district for services rendered. Nevertheless, district administrators said that attendance was an especially complicated issue to monitor. Indeed, in some districts, it was very complicated for providers to manage attendance policies in a way that ensured that they got paid for all of the participating students and for all of the sessions that they offered. One district's policy for verifying student attendance, for example, asked for documentation to support the providers' invoices and thus wanted to see the student sign-in sheet and have parents sign a form indicating that their child attended tutoring on the specified days. Providers disliked this practice because it was difficult for them to get parent signatures—the attendance forms often didn't make it out of children's backpacks.

Although monitoring providers is a state responsibility, district administrators perceived a need to collect data on provider performance at the local level as well, both to assist the state in its monitoring of providers and to ensure compliance with the terms of the contracts they had negotiated with providers. Most districts were familiar with the requirement that providers be removed from state lists if they fail to contribute to increased student proficiency for two consecutive years. Although the states generally had not formalized procedures for evaluating provider performance, there were indications that districts would have a role in collecting the data to be used in these evaluations. For instance, one state's application noted that state monitoring would occur in cooperation with districts. Several districts wrote into provider contracts that providers must share any data they collect from their programs with the state. In addition, at least two districts planned to survey parents and school staff at the end of the tutoring period to gauge their level of satisfaction with the supplemental services provided. One of these districts, for example, intended to use the survey results to help determine whether providers were abiding by the stipulations of their contracts with the district. The parent survey, for example, asked parents whether the provider had "given you and your child regular feedback on his or her learning." The other district planned to administer a survey to parents and schools at the end of the 2003-04 school year to evaluate provider performance. The surveys were going to ask respondents about provider dependability, student engagement in provider services, and parent satisfaction with provider services.

In 2003-04, at least one district had teachers, principals, and even parents express concern over the impact providers would have on student performance. As one teacher explained, "It is hard to say whether or not 30 hours of extra tutoring will really be enough to advance a population of students that are highly mobile and ELL from not proficient to proficient." She believed that monitoring providers should focus not on whether students succeed or fail, but on whether services were provided. Nevertheless, providers recognized that a provider performance measure from the state was not long in coming and were attempting to do what they could to prepare for it. Indeed, one provider said that he knew that if his program were to receive an

unfavorable performance report for two consecutive years, then the program would be removed from the list of state-approved providers. He added: "That's why we do pre- and post-testing to show what we have been doing [especially] given that we only have a conditional, one year [contract with district]."

The Role of Identified Schools in Implementing Supplemental Services

In 2003-04, many districts in the study sample involved schools directly in the process of enrolling students in supplemental services. In every case but one, district administrators described relying heavily on school principals, teachers, and staff to help implement supplemental services. One district reported that the teachers and principals in all the identified schools played a major role in getting students to enroll in supplemental services. As the district supplemental services coordinator explained: "The principals have done their own advertising for the program…. They have called parents whose kids really need help." Teachers said they were encouraged by the principals to call the parents of students who they believed could benefit from supplemental services. An administrator in another district reported that teachers were instrumental in explaining the various programs to parents and were relied upon by many:

> *The teachers were available to help explain the various choices and to help parents fill out the necessary forms. When parents would ask 'What is my child having problems with?' or 'Which [provider] is going to help my child with word problems?' the teachers were available to help.*

Several teachers in this district said that many parents were persuaded to sign their child up for services simply because their child's teacher was the one providing the services. In fact, many parents in this district apparently selected the district as their preferred provider simply because so many of the identified school's teachers were employed as tutors in this program. Another teacher explained it this way: "When teachers are tutors, the parents are just more comfortable."

In other districts, many of the principals in the identified schools said they helped with outreach efforts by calling the parents of students they believed could benefit from the services. In one district, the principals explained that the district did not have enough staff to implement supplemental services and that they tried to fill in as they could in contacting parents. In another district, the school principal summed up the value of having schools involved in reaching parents: "If it weren't for teachers at that school calling parents, the numbers [of students participating in supplemental services] wouldn't be so high…"

The school staff members in yet another district described themselves as having an informal responsibility for recruiting students for services. That is, they received a list of priority students from the district, and they would sometimes make calls and encourage parents to enroll. One principal said, "What I believe happened is the teachers made mention of [supplemental services] to the parents of students who they felt really needed services." However, schools in this district said there was no formal system in place for outlining schools' roles in identifying

and recruiting students for services. One principal explained her school's level of involvement in supplemental services recruitment this way:

> *When parents had questions [about supplemental services], they would call us and we would do our best to answer questions. We mostly referred them to the providers because they knew [best] what services they were providing. We only had limited information. One thing we did do was, if a provider said they could only come if at least 10 students signed up, as I talked to parents, I would say this provider will come for this many and this is how many are interested. So I would give these folks a call—not trying to recommend anyone but just trying to help reach the numbers.*

Many districts in the 2003-04 study sample also involved schools in the recruitment process by providing them with sample letters to personalize and send home to the families of students who were eligible to receive supplemental services. In addition, schools in several districts held parent meetings to discuss the availability of supplemental services and to describe the services providers were offering. Some schools hosted provider "fairs" to give parents an opportunity to hear from the providers directly about the services they offered. Indeed, administrators in at least two districts explained that it was the schools, not the district, that were responsible for coordinating forums in which providers could give presentations to parents on the kinds of services they offer to students. Moreover, in one of these districts, the parent coordinators at the identified schools called the parent of every eligible student to inform them of their child's eligibility and to explain supplemental services in terms that parents could understand. Using the school-based Title I parent coordinators or district Title I Parent Liaisons to contact parents occurred in at least two districts in the study sample. In both these districts, rates of participation in supplemental services were relatively high.

The practice of involving schools more centrally in the recruitment process had some unexpected consequences. One district, for example, wrote a grant to the state for funding to cover the cost of a supplemental services coordinator to work directly at the school where supplemental services were offered. As the district Title I director explained:

> *The program was putting an extra burden on the principal and staff, so I wrote a state grant to get a supplemental services coordinator. We were really concerned about the drain of energy [from the school as a result of implementing this program].... The coordinator needed to be someone who is not a full-time teacher at the school.*

In another district, principals and teachers had a significant amount of control over parents' selection of providers. For example, one elementary principal described screening 20 providers and ending up with only two who were willing to provide services at the school and who passed muster with him—people he would trust with the students. Another principal said the following about his role in the provider selection process: "I pretty much chose the providers because I had the time to call them. I knew our needs and looked at who had the experience and infrastructure to do this." However, principals determining whether and when providers can present their services to parents at a provider "fair" and whether they'll make space available to providers may result in the elimination of much of the "choice" afforded parents in their selection of providers. As noted earlier, principal involvement should not undermine parents' opportunities to select the most appropriate, state-approved provider in the district or area.

Some districts in the study sample handed over control of the student selection process to the schools, permitting principals and teachers to determine the eligibility of students—beyond low-income status—for supplemental services. An administrator in one district explained that it was up to the principals' discretion to recruit students. The principals relied on teachers to determine which students needed services the most. Teachers were encouraged by their principals to make calls to parents of students who they thought would greatly benefit from supplemental services. One teacher explained, "I called select students to make sure they understood they have this opportunity." Similarly, teachers in another district played a significant role in ensuring that the most academically needy students were signed up by their parents to receive supplemental services. "The list [of providers] went out to everyone but if the parents did not select anyone, we contacted them if we thought the kids needed it," explained one teacher.

In another district, teachers in identified schools explained that they put together a list of students getting D's and F's. The parents of those students received a letter from the principal and the grade-level teachers saying that their child must attend tutoring. This district's effort to target services to low-achieving students was reasonable, but according to U.S. Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance on supplemental services (Aug. 22, 2003), the option for these students to participate should have been the parents' choice and not a requirement. Another teacher said that although only about 12 percent of parents attend conferences, "We make lots of phone calls and tutoring is always brought up…." School staff in some districts said they wanted to play a bigger role in determining the eligibility of students. As a principal in one district explained: "We would like to have input about who are the most at-risk and educationally disadvantaged [students] and make sure that they're contacted first." Despite the desires of school staff to identify the students whom they deem most in need of supplemental services, the law makes clear that students can only receive supplemental services if they are from low-income families and attend a school that has been identified for improvement for two or more years.

In 2003-04, districts increasingly relied upon principals and teachers to help coordinate the implementation of supplemental services. Principals in some districts noted the fact that supplemental services often required that they get involved in the logistics of the services, including making sure space was available for providers and that parents turned in their permission slips for students to receive services. A principal in one district, for example, complained that the parents didn't understand that permission forms were supposed to be mailed back to the district, so the school collected them and forwarded them to the district. In another district, a principal said she had to adjust the schedule of the administrative staff to accommodate supplemental services and ensure that the school building was secure. In 2002-03, the principal explained, the administrative staff schedule was 11 a.m. to 4 p.m., while in 2003-04, the schedule was from noon to 5 p.m. The supplemental services administrator in this district understood why principals might be a bit frustrated with them: "The biggest complaint from schools is the additional work hours for principals and administrators. Their paperwork needs to be done after school, but the burden is placed on them to oversee the after-school component as well."

Still, some districts had schools in which teachers did not know many of the details about what takes place during tutoring sessions or which students participate in the various after-school programs available at the school. Nevertheless, most agreed that the role of schools in helping to

coordinate supplemental services was critical. One provider stressed the importance of a school embracing supplemental services:

> *The school plays a key role. If [it doesn't] embrace the program with rooms, leadership, and resources, there is no way it can be successful. It has to be a partnership. In the schools that have embraced it, attendance is high. Principals know what works best with their students. I wish they would share some of that information with us.*

School principals were often asked by the district to monitor provider performance even though monitoring is a state responsibility. Administrators in at least three districts reported relying on principals to monitor provider performance. One district required that principals in the identified schools visit provider facilities once every two weeks to monitor tutoring sessions. The district supplied principals with an observation checklist for their visits. The checklist included the following:

- Total number of students served
- Student-to-teacher ratio
- Number of assigned staff
- Number of classrooms
- Equipment needs
- Transportation schedules
- Schedule of instructional days and times
- Number of students bused
- Class lists and attendance forms
- Regular materials and supplies to support instruction
- Supplemental materials and supplies
- Individual learning plan for students
- Provider assessments (pre and post-tests)
- Schedule for regularly informing parents of student progress
- Schedule for regularly informing teachers of student progress
- Process for how student progress will be measured

Another district opted to rely on principals observing tutoring sessions—on their own—and informing the district when they identified issues or concerns. As the district administrator explained, no one from the district office had time to drop in "to see how things are going" with the providers.

Still, although principals were asked to monitor provider performance, they did not often receive the feedback reports that providers were expected to share with schools regarding student progress. As a principal in one school noted:

> *There is no time for SES [supplemental services] providers to give me feedback on what they are doing or on how kids are performing. It's not intentional. I get some feedback from the in-house providers but not the off-site ones. I get reports from in-house providers that are copied and forwarded to classroom teachers. But I get no paperwork or any information whatsoever from off-site providers. Curriculum-wise, I have no idea what [providers] are doing.*

School staff sometimes found themselves in the somewhat awkward position of explaining to parents the difference between supplemental services and other after-school programs provided by the school. Communicating the differences between supplemental services and other after-school programs to parents was among the more difficult tasks facing schools in 2003-04. Many school staff said they did not understand the differences themselves. Recognizing that there may be problems in distinguishing among as well as coordinating with the various after-school activities available, schools in more than one district hired after-school program coordinators. As one principal explained, "We have four after-school programs so we had to pay an administrator with an administrative background to oversee all the programs." A program coordinator at another school said she tried to schedule all eligible students for all available slots in the after-school programs: "We try not to make it a competition between the programs. We made sure there was no overlap between them." In another district, one school principal noted that parents heard about supplemental services and think that their children can no longer participate in other after-school programs: **"**We're trying hard to create a vision that kids can take advantage of all of these [after-school opportunities], but it's difficult." Another principal in this district pointed out that schools with several after-school programs that have parent participation components may require parents to attend numerous meetings. This principal was working to better coordinate the after-school programs so that there was only one monthly parent meeting.

District Funding for the Supplemental Services

NCLB establishes a joint funding mechanism for supplemental services and Title I choice-related transportation of an amount equal to 20 percent of a district's Title I, Part A, allocation, before any reservations. This means that the amount of funding that a district must devote to supplemental services depends in part on how much it spends on choice-related transportation. However, if the cost of satisfying all requests for supplemental services exceeds an amount equal to 5 percent of a district's Title I, Part A, allocation, the district may not spend less than that amount on those services. NCLB also sets the per-child cost for supplemental

services as the lesser of either the district's per-child allocation under Part A of Title I or the actual cost of the services.

Districts varied widely in the percent of their Title I, Part A, allocation that they opted to set aside for supplemental services. As shown in Exhibit 6, the percent of Title I (or other) funds that districts set aside in 2003-04 for supplemental services ranged from a minimum of 2 percent to 21 percent. According to NCLB and subsequent guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, districts must spend an amount equal to 5 percent of their Title I allocation (and up to 20 percent) to fund supplemental services provisions of NCLB, unless demand for services requires less funding. In the case of two of the districts that set aside less than 20 percent of their Title I allocations, district administrators explained that they had set aside enough resources to meet the needs of all the eligible students enrolled in the identified schools. In the four other districts that set aside less than 20 percent of their Title I allocation, all four administrators explained that they based their Title I set aside on the previous year's demand for both choice-related transportation and supplemental services. This approach, however, demonstrates that at least some districts were determining funding needs based not on actual demand for choice-related transportation and supplemental services—which the legislation says districts must do—but on anticipated demand. This practice of setting aside Title I resources before gauging demand is likely to bring districts up short if the demand for services ever exceeds the amount the districts reserved. As Exhibit 5 demonstrates, if three of the nine districts had set aside the full 20 percent of their Title I allocation, they would have had the capacity to serve far greater numbers of eligible students if they did not have costs associated with choice-related transportation.

Exhibit 5
Districts' Capacity to Serve Eligible Students in 2003-04

District Name	Criteria for Prioritizing Students for Services	Maximum Possible Expenditure Per Student	Percent of Title I Funds Set Aside for Supplemental Services [a]	Number of Eligible Students	Number of Students Receiving Services	Percent of Eligible Students Served	Number of Eligible Students District Had Capacity to Serve Based on Percentage of Title I Allocation *Actually* Set Aside	Number of Eligible Students District Had Capacity to Serve IF it Set Aside and Spent an Amount Equal to the Full 20% of their Title I Allocation	Percent of Eligible Students Served Based on District Funding Capacity (i.e., setting aside an amount equal to 20% of Title I Allocation)
Brooktown School District	Students from low-income families	$1,264	20% ($1,600,000) +$500,000 of other district funding	12,918	1,787	14%	1,661	1,661	108%
Plainfield School District	Students from low-income families	$1,197	2% ($418,950)	356	301	86%	350	N/A: District had capacity to serve ALL eligible students without setting aside 20 percent	86%
Oakwood School District	Prioritized based on income and achievement [b]	$1,963	21% ($2,275,178)	9,781	1,097	11%	1,159	1,103	99%
Sunnydale School District	Students from low-income families	$1,212	15% ($5,000,000)	40,000	3,400	9%	4,125	5,500	62%
Emory Public Schools	Students from low-income families	$1,520	10% ($275,528) +5% of state funding	650	153	14%	272	363	42%
Springvale School District	Students from low-income families	$1,449	15% ($3,003,077)	1,199	336	28%	2,073	N/A : District had capacity to serve ALL eligible students without setting aside 20 percent	28%
Redding School District	Students from low-income families	$1,377	6% ($712,000)	5,264	382	7%	517	1,724	22%
Trainville School District	Prioritized based on income and achievement [c]	$1,340	10% ($25,000,000)	3,659	472	13%	18,657	N/A : District had capacity to serve ALL eligible students without setting aside 20 percent	13%
Longwood Public Schools	Students from low-income families	$1,352	20% ($60,000,000)	190,000	19,000	10%	44,379	44,379	43%

[a] All the districts in the study sample elected to set aside a percentage of their Title I allocation for choice-related transportation and supplemental services, but districts have the option of setting aside funds from sources other than Title I.

[b] Oakwood School District targeted services to low-achieving students even though the district had not reached its funding capacity to serve all students from low-income families. By identifying only low-achieving students from low-income families for services, the district's count of the number of eligible students was 1,159 rather than 9,781. Of these 1,159 students, 95 percent received supplemental services (compared with 11 percent of all low-income students).

[c] Trainville School District also targeted services to low-achieving students even though the district had not reached its funding capacity to serve all students from low-income families. By identifying only low-achieving students from low-income families for services, the district's count of the number of eligible students was 2,000 rather than 3,659. Of these 2,000 students, 24 percent received services (compared with 13 percent of all low-income students).

The average district per-pupil expenditure for supplemental services among the nine districts included in the study sample was $1,408 in 2003-04 (see Exhibit 5). Among the five districts included in both the year one and year two samples, the average per-pupil expenditure for supplemental services increased from an average of $967 per student in 2002-03 to an average of $1,280 per student in 2003-04 (see Exhibit 6). This represents an average increase of about $300 per student. The increase in the average per-pupil expenditure may be the result of districts' better understanding—as a result of state and federal guidance—of how the costs of supplemental services are meant to be distributed among students. That is, in 2002-03, few districts in the study sample had a strong grasp of their capacity to serve eligible students based on the maximum amount they were required to spend on supplemental services. Rather, districts in the study sample looked at their maximum required amount for spending on supplemental services and planned to assigned students to provider services until the funding was expended; (none of the districts reached this limit). In 2003-04, every district knew that it could estimate the number of students it could serve by calculating 5-20 percent of the district's Title I allocation and dividing this amount by the maximum required per pupil expenditure (the latter being the district's Title I allocation divided by the Census poverty count).

Several sampled districts expressed concern about the administrative costs associated with implementing supplemental services. District administrators explained that there were still costs associated with the mailings to schools and parents, as well as costs associated with working with the providers. Although districts may use Title I administrative funds to pay for the implementation of supplemental services, the cost of these implementation activities is not insignificant. In one large district, the annual cost of producing and mailing the choice and supplemental services letters was $250,000. Another large district reported spending more than $100,000 in postage on the supplemental services and choice letters. An administrator in yet another district noticed that the copying costs to administer supplemental services were immense: "We are noticing that the volume of copies needed for recording data, student work, and communication to parents is depleting our copying capacity each month." Although districts may use Title I administrative funds to pay for these activities, there are also the legal costs associated with writing provider contracts was mentioned again as a significant expense to districts. Another district complained that the time required to implement supplemental services takes district staff away from their regular duties. For example, the Title I literacy coach in one district spends half of her time on supplemental services, and this detracts from the time she can spend in schools that need her services. As has already been mentioned, districts continue to need additional staff to manage implementation of the supplemental services provisions.

When asked about the administrative costs associated with supplemental services, the Title I director in one district said the following:

> *[Supplemental services] is mammoth. Last year it was my baby. It is very, very time consuming. It encompasses a lot of time. For one person with other responsibilities, it is very hard to do, especially in large systems with this many children, providers, principals, and buses. There are a lot of complaints—providers complaining, schools complaining, parents complaining…. I assigned it to [another staff member] who says it could be a full-time job by itself. Even with her being responsible, still she and I have to collaborate so it takes time. Not a day goes by that I don't receive at least five calls [about supplemental services]. Some calls come from parents who just heard about*

[supplemental services] or from a principal who is upset with a provider or from a provider who is upset with a principal.

Student Participation in Supplemental Services

Student participation rates in supplemental services varied across the districts included in the study sample. In most districts, participation rates did not exceed the number of students the districts could serve with the maximum amount they were required to spend on supplemental services. In six districts, participation rates were between 13 and 62 percent of the students the districts could serve with the maximum required amount of funding. One of these districts went to great lengths to recruit parents and sign students up for services and reached a participation rate of only 28 percent. The other three districts provided supplemental services to 86 percent or more of the students they could provide services to with the maximum amount they were required to spend on supplemental services and one of these three districts went beyond its funding capacity to serve an additional 126 eligible students who requested services in 2003-04 (See Exhibit 5).

In terms of the number of students eligible to receive supplemental services—which may exceed the number to which a district can provide services based on the maximum required amount of funding—eight of the nine districts in the study sample provided services to between 7 percent and 28 percent of all the eligible students. In one district, 86 percent of eligible students received services.

In six of the case study districts, more students were eligible for supplemental services than the number the district could provide services to with the maximum required amount of funding. The remaining three districts could have provided supplemental services to all eligible students with the maximum required amount of funding. However, in only one district did participation rates among eligible students reach the maximum the district could support using the required amount of funding.

Among the districts with less than 50 percent participation, several explanations were offered as to why districts' participation levels in supplemental services were not higher. Districts reported that some students did not participate in supplemental services because they were achieving at proficient or advanced levels in reading and math and did not need the service. Districts reported that some students may have needed the services but had family responsibilities that precluded them from staying after school. Districts also reported that students had parents who, because of their work schedules, could not pick their children up after school, and the regulations specifically prohibit districts from counting the costs of transportation for supplemental services toward the minimum amount they are required to spend on choice-related transportation and supplemental services.[7] Parents offered several reasons their children were not enrolled in supplemental services: they found other after-school options more accessible; they thought their children had sufficient amounts of assistance from the regular

[7] However, districts may, if they choose, provide transportation for supplemental services and not count it against the 20 percent requirement.

after-school program or tutoring services offered by the classroom teacher; or they wanted their children to participate in other recreational or church-based activities after school.[8]

Nevertheless, the case study districts were largely embracing supplemental services. Indeed, the superintendent in one district expressed strong commitment to supplemental services as a way to help low-achieving students and explained that many steps had been taken to promote implementation in the district:

> *We took that [supplemental services] provision seriously. I've been active with my staff to get the word out. When I first checked with them only 11 percent of eligible students were participating—that was unacceptable. I convinced the staff to get the parent, student, and provider connected—some say I ask for the impossible…. The focus is not compliance. You can comply [with NCLB] and still have few participants. I want higher numbers participating. We need to do things differently. Regular Title I isn't working well. Here's an opportunity to have one-on-one or [a staff-student ratio of 1-to-5]…. This is an opportunity to do something for the forgotten kids of [this district]—their parents can't provide this—we are improving learning for the neediest [students].*

Both the number and percent of eligible students served varied across the five districts included in the study in both 2002-03 and 2003-04. Three of these five districts included in both years of the study changed their criteria for targeting students for supplemental services between 2002-03 and 2003-04 (see also Exhibit 6). In addition, changes in the number of eligible schools increased the number of eligible students dramatically in two districts and, to a smaller extent, in a third district. A fourth district had virtually no change in the number of eligible students, and a fifth district experienced a substantial decline. (Four of the nine case study districts sampled in 2003-04 did not offer services in the 2002-03 school year.) The two districts with the most dramatic increases in the number of eligible students also reported large increases in the number of students served; the other districts reported small increases or declines.

[8] For a more complete description of parents' reasons for not enrolling their children in supplemental services, see the parent section of this report.

Exhibit 6
Changes in Supplemental Services Eligibility, Spending, and Participation Between 2002-03 and 2003-04, by District[a]

District Name	Criteria for Prioritizing Students for Services		Per Pupil Expenditure for Services		Number of Eligible Students		Number of Students Receiving Services	
	2002-03	2003-04	2002-03	2003-04	2002-03	2003-04	2002-03	2003-04
Brooktown School District	Prioritized based on income and achievement	Students from low-income families	$950	$1,264	900	12,918	138	1,787
Plainfield School District	Prioritized based on income, grade-level, and achievement	Students from low-income families	$1,036	$1,197	973	356	397	301
Sunnydale School District	Phased in based on school and student performance	Students from low-income families	$850-$1,000	$1,212	4,500-6,000	40,000	1,900	3,400
Redding School District	Students from low-income families	Students from low-income families	$986	$1,377	5,292	5,264	326	382
Trainville School District	Prioritized based on income and achievement, but served all who requested services	Prioritized based on income and achievement, but served all who requested services	$940	$1,340	2,600	3,659	510	472

[a] Three of the nine case study districts were providing supplemental services for the first time in 2003-04. Accordingly, these districts are not represented in this table because there were no comparative data available for the 2002-03 school year. A fourth district offered only summer services in 2002-03.

Supplemental Service Providers and Services

Although there were exceptions, most supplemental services offered in the nine case study districts shared the same basic features. Supplemental services were typically offered in schools, with tutoring provided after school several times a week (but not every day). The total number of contact hours varied widely, depending on provider costs. Instruction took place in small groups that ranged in size from 3 to 15 students, and tutors were typically certified teachers, very often recruited from the schools where the services were provided. As they did last year, instructional strategies varied widely from provider to provider, and communication among providers, parents, and school staff was limited. Three of the school districts in the case study sample were approved as supplemental service providers; their services resembled of those offered by other providers in the case study sample.

Number and Types of Providers Operating in Sampled Districts

The number of providers offering services in the case study districts increased slightly in 2003-04, but the increases were more modest than increases reported by some states in the sample or all states nationwide. In five of the nine case study sites that were included in the study sample in both years of data collection, the number of providers offering services increased in four of the five districts (see Exhibit 7).

In eight of the nine case study districts, the number of supplemental service providers ranged from 5 to 14; on average, parents were able to select from a total of nine providers in these districts. One very large urban district (one of the largest in the country) had a total of 27 providers offering services.

All of the districts in the study sample had just a fraction of the supplemental service providers approved by the state operating in their districts (see Exhibit 7). Brooktown, located in the largest city in the state, had the largest proportion of state-approved providers available to parents and children in the district (14 of 31). Other case study districts had relatively few state-approved providers available to provide services—for example, just 5 of 27 state-approved providers in the Plainfield School District and 6 of 164 providers in the Redding School District. This pattern was true for mid-sized suburban districts as well as for very large districts in urban centers. Within each of the case study states, most approved providers worked only in selected local areas. Alternatively, some providers could have received approval to work statewide but were not operational in local areas immediately.

In general, school and district staff reported that available providers were able to accommodate the needs of students in the sampled districts. School and district staff believed that providers offered services that were likely to benefit their students, and that few students would have had difficulty finding a provider whose services would help them. In the sampled districts, there were fewer providers serving high school students, and thus more limited choices for parents and their children.

Exhibit 7
Number of Providers in Sampled Districts and States

District Name	Number of Providers in the District 2002-03	Number of Providers in the District 2003-04	Number of Providers in the State 2003-04
Brooktown School District	13	14	31
Plainfield School District	4	5	27
Redding School District	3	6	164
Sunnydale School District	6	10	27
Trainville School District	12	5	181
Springvale School District	N/A	12	74
Oakwood School District	N/A	6	74
Emory Public Schools	N/A	12	65
Longwood Public Schools	N/A	27	181

In the three sampled districts with significant proportions of English language learners, district and school staff reported that those students had been able to find tutoring. At least one provider serving English language learners reported an increased emphasis on vocabulary and comprehension skills to address the needs of non-English speaking students. Teachers felt that this provider's approach was helpful to students but did not necessarily help English language learners as much as native English speakers. A teacher explained, "I think [the program] really helps native English speakers, but [it] is harder for Spanish speakers, although I believe all of my kids are getting something out of it." Spanish-speaking parents in two focus groups conducted for the study, however, expressed satisfaction with the services their children had received. In none of the sampled sites did district or school staff report problems with special education students' access to services. None of the districts included in the case study sample this year was small, or located in a rural area where state administrators had expressed concern about the limited supply of providers, so this year of the study does not provide data on whether rural students' needs were being met.

Online and faith-based providers served only a handful of students in districts sampled for the study. Only three of the nine districts included in the study had any online providers offering services (see Exhibit 8). Online providers served 28 students in one of those districts, five students in another and none in the third.

Exhibit 8
Types of Supplemental Service Providers
Operating in Case Study Districts, Spring 2004

District	Number of Providers, by Provider Type						
	Other Private*	Faith-Based (private)	Online (private)	School Districts	Colleges	Other/ Unknown	TOTAL
Brooktown School District	13	1					14
Plainfield School District	4			1			5
Redding School District	6						6
Sunnydale School District	9			1			10
Trainville School District	5						5
Springvale School District	8	1	3				12
Oakwood School District	5		1				6
Emory Public Schools	9		3				12
Longwood Public Schools	25	1		1			27
Sample Total	**84**	**3**	**7**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**97**
Sample Percent	**87**	**3**	**7**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**100**
Nationwide Total	**1,033**	**109**	**172**	**464**	**45**	**67**	**1,890**
Nationwide Percent	**55**	**6**	**9**	**25**	**2**	**4**	**100**

* "Other private" providers were private providers that were not faith-based or online.

Source: District brochures and U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service. "Supplemental Service Providers on State Web Sites," (May 3-5, 2004), unpublished database.

Faith-based providers were also relatively rare; these providers served 60 students total in two districts. In a third very large district, the faith-based provider served fewer than 5 percent of the total number of students receiving supplemental services. The low incidence of both online and faith-based providers in the study sample is consistent with the small numbers of online and faith-based providers operating nationwide.

In the case study sample, school districts made up a small proportion of all providers available to students, in contrast to the distribution of types of providers nationwide. Nationwide, IEAs, school districts and public schools make up 25 percent of all supplemental service providers (see Exhibit 2). Three of the nine case study districts—Plainfield, Sunnydale,

and Longwood—had been approved by their states to offer supplemental services to students. These three school districts represented just 3 percent of the providers offering services in the nine sites. Other case study districts reported that they had decided not to apply to become supplemental service providers because they anticipated that they would be identified for improvement under NCLB in one or two years, and at that point would become ineligible to provide supplemental services. District administrators saw little point in gearing up to offer services, only to have to stop providing them later on.

However, school districts enrolled the lion's share of students in two of the three districts where they were offering services. The district-sponsored tutoring programs in Plainfield and Longwood enrolled 49 and 76 percent of all the students participating in supplemental services, respectively (see Exhibit A-1 in the appendix for enrollments of all providers in all districts). District administrators in these districts explained that because these programs employed district and school staff that parents already knew and trusted, they had been quite successful in recruiting students. However, it is also possible that these districts recruited for their own program more aggressively, or created barriers to participation for the other providers. In the third district, Sunnydale, 10 providers each enrolled relatively large numbers of students (between 51 and 922), with the district's program enrolling just 5 percent of the total (155 students). Sunnydale assigned each provider operating in the district, including the district-sponsored program, space in just one school. Parents typically chose to send their children to the provider operating in their child's school, although they had the option to send their child to other providers in other schools as well. As a result, in part, of the district's policy for assigning space in schools, there were five providers in the district with enrollments higher than the district's own program.

Organizing and Delivering Services

Providers interviewed for the case studies required a minimum number of students to enroll at each site in order to make a program viable, although this minimum varied widely across providers. In most districts, providers did not offer services if demand was too low. As was the case in 2002-03, providers explained that they required a minimum number of students to enroll at each program site in order to cover their costs. For some providers the minimum number was 10 students per site; for others, the minimum was as high as 80. Competition for students could be intense in some schools. In one district, providers raffled off video game players and other prizes to students who signed up for their services.

In almost every one of the nine districts, at least one provider withdrew from a school or closed operations because the number of students interested in services was too low. In these cases, the district asked parents to select another provider. In a few cases, providers announced that they would no longer offer services in all the subjects originally promised. One principal explained that when a provider withdraws, it can have a negative effect on recruitment and attendance for other programs:

Kids were really interested, but [the provider] didn't have their numbers. We lost a bunch of kids that might have signed up for a better program. When they didn't come in, that shocked a bunch of kids.

Providers in the nine case study districts found it challenging in 2003-04 to hire and retain the appropriate number of qualified tutors to meet fluctuating demand. One provider in the study sample was serving 60 fewer students than had requested services because the company did not have enough teachers on hand to serve those students. Another provider was forced to let staff go when he experienced a steep drop in the number of students enrolled for supplemental services (from 100 in 2002-03 to 12 in 2003-04) as a result of actions taken by the district. (The district had closed a school where students were eligible for supplemental services the year before. Once enrolled in other non-identified schools, these students were no longer eligible for tutoring.) Yet another provider had suspended tutoring at one school in the study because the site coordinator and several staff members quit and students were no longer coming to tutoring.

A large majority of providers sampled for the study offered their services at the school sites. In theory, providers serve students either off-site or at schools required to offer services in the district. Of the 24 providers included in the study sample, 18 provided tutoring in schools; four provided services off-site in their own facilities, at churches, or in a Boys & Girls Club site; and two ran home-based programs (see Exhibit A-2 in the appendix). Within districts, some providers offered services at several different school sites. Other districts had assigned one provider to each school required to offer services.

Just under half of the supplemental service providers included in the study sample provided students with transportation to and from tutoring, or transportation home from school sites (see Exhibit A-2 in the appendix). One district in the study sample decided to offer transportation to and from tutoring to all students in March 2003 in an effort to boost student enrollment in supplemental services. In two districts, all providers offered transportation as part of their services. In two other districts, parents could choose between providers who offered transportation and providers who did not. In these two districts, transportation did not seem to be a strong incentive for enrollment: providers in the study sample who offered transportation tended to have lower enrollments than providers who did not.

Across the providers interviewed for the case studies, the total number of hours each student spent in tutoring over the course of a school year varied greatly from provider to provider, depending primarily on provider costs. Supplemental services were typically offered after school for one to two hours a day, two to three times a week. Providers in the study sample offered tutoring anywhere from one to four days a week, with most offering services on two or three days each week. Nearly all tutoring sessions lasted an hour and none extended beyond two hours in one day.

Although the frequency of services was relatively constant across providers, the total number of contact hours varied as a function of provider costs (see Table A-2 in the appendix). Districts paid providers a maximum amount equal to their per-pupil Title I allocation. Because the amount paid by districts to providers is limited in this way, low-cost providers were able to offer many more contact hours than high-cost providers in the same district. For example, in one

large urban district, a provider whose per-pupil costs were $14 per hour offered a total of 100 hours of tutoring for each student. Another provider in that same district whose per-pupil costs were $50 per hour offered a total of only 28 hours of tutoring per student. Across the 24 providers interviewed for the case studies, total contact hours per student ranged from a low of 18 to a high of 120. The average number of contact hours was 60, although the number varied so widely across providers that few could be considered "average." At the rate of two to six hours a week, students tended to "cycle out" of supplemental services after 10-20 weeks. For example, if a student received one hour of tutoring three days a week (a total of three hours per week), he or she would accumulate 60 contact hours after 20 weeks. A student who received two hours of tutoring two days a week (four hours per week) would reach 60 contact hours after 15 weeks. Once providers had billed the maximum amount allowed per student, services ended.

Provider costs and the total number of contact hours varied for a number of reasons, some within the control of providers, some not. Staff costs varied, depending on student-to-tutor ratios, tutor qualifications (e.g., whether tutors were certified teachers or not), and local salary scales. Some districts allowed providers to use school buildings free of change, and others charged rent at various rates. Providers offering services off-site also paid rent at various rates. Providers who offered transportation home from tutoring incurred additional costs. District policies for reimbursing providers based on student attendance also affected the income generated by each "slot" for supplemental services, and thus the number of hours of tutoring that could be provided to each student.

In the case study sites, students often received supplemental services for one marking period or one semester, but typically they did not stay enrolled beyond that. As a result, providers who began services early served two cohorts of students in one academic year.

A few providers had more unusual service arrangements, or offered their services in tandem with other after-school programming. In one large urban district where kindergarten is only offered for a half-day, a community-based provider was running a complementary afternoon kindergarten program for 15 students at one school with funding from supplemental services. The supplemental services allocation for these 15 students covered the salary of the tutor who ran the afternoon kindergarten class for the entire school year. (The tutor was paid outside the district's salary scale, and overhead at this community-based organization was low.)

Some providers organized their programs so that they could be attended in combination with other activities. One faith-based provider offered after-school programming from 3-7 p.m. Tutoring supported by supplemental services took place for one to two hours. In the time remaining, students could participate in character education, leadership development and drug prevention programs, music education, recreation, service learning, and field trips. Another provider offered tutoring services in tandem with several GEAR UP sites in one district. Children attending these programs enjoyed snack and free time immediately after school, received tutoring from supplemental service providers for an hour, and spent another hour on GEAR UP activities, all at the same site. Still another provider partnered with the local YWCA to offer recreational activities along with tutoring. Finally, a faith-based provider offered a half-hour non-denominational religious talk after tutoring for students whose parents had agreed to allow them to participate (no Title I or other federal funds were used to support this activity, however).

In 2003-04, tutoring was most often provided to students in small groups, and tutor-to-student ratios ranged from 1:3 to 1:15. One-on-one tutoring was rare among the providers included in this study. More than half the providers tutored children in small groups of 5 to 10 (see Table A-2). In a few cases, tutor-student ratios were as high as 1:15, and in others, two adults worked with groups as large as 24. In these cases, according to teachers interviewed for the study, class sizes in tutoring programs supported by supplemental services approached or exceeded class sizes during the regular school day. With groups this large, teachers used both whole-group instruction and individual seatwork to keep students engaged for the entire tutoring session.

Student Attendance

In 2003-04, student attendance continued to be a challenge, especially among middle and high school students. Supplemental services providers were responsible for tracking attendance and had negotiated different agreements with districts about how and whether they would be paid for no-shows. For example, some districts paid providers per session, and only paid for the days that students actually attended the program. Other districts paid providers per slot, and considered that slot filled as long as students attended at least one of every three days. Because providers tracked attendance in different ways across the nine case study sites (according to the terms of their agreements with districts), it was difficult to collect comparable information about attendance rates across sites.

Providers in several districts reported that as programs became established, attendance was higher and more predictable in 2003-04. However, most respondents observed that lack of attendance was still a problem. In one large urban district, one of the largest providers estimated that attendance on any given day ranged from 60 to 95 percent of students officially enrolled in services. In several middle schools visited for the study, teachers and principals reported that half or less of the students signed up for services attended on any given day. Both school staff and providers reported that many students who signed up for services never attended.

Teachers reported that attendance at after-school tutoring was a problem even among students who had attended school during the day. They observed that student attendance was often better when services were provided in the school building. One teacher explained that the few minutes at the end of the school day could be crucial:

> *It's a problem if supplemental services are not school-based, because there is lots in the neighborhood to deflect kids' attention. But when it takes place here and the bell rings at the end of the regular day, kids know where to go. If tutoring is outside the building, even if they provide transportation, if the bus isn't* ***right there*** *at the right minute, the kids are gone.*

Several supplemental service providers offered incentives for students to attend regularly, and others were considering the use of incentives. For example, one middle school program offered students who completed 80 hours of tutoring a $75 retail gift card. Another

provider awarded students tokens for daily attendance that they could then spend at the school store.

Provider Curricula and Instructional Approaches

The content and structure of tutoring services varied across providers within the same district, and across districts. According to the U.S. Department of Education's non-regulatory guidance, supplemental services must consist of academic assistance such as "tutoring, remediation and other educational interventions, provided that such approaches are consistent with the content and instruction used by the local education agency and are aligned with the state's academic content standards" (ED, Aug. 22, 2003, p. 1).

The content and structure of tutoring services varied widely, depending on the provider and in some cases, on the individual tutor. Most providers in the study sample offered services that focused on reading instruction; however, the instructional approach in reading ranged from detailed diagnosis and scripted lessons to more general help with homework. Providers represented a range of philosophies and approaches to the teaching of reading and math. Many students took diagnostic assessments developed by the provider or built from state assessment items. The results of those assessments then dictated the instructional objectives to be covered in tutoring. Whole-group reading instruction could include guided reading of authentic literature, group discussions, and extension activities to help students develop oral fluency, build vocabulary, and improve comprehension. Other providers focused on developing phonics and decoding skills. Some providers offered self-paced worksheet programs designed to strengthen mastery of basic skills. Other providers did not use a prescribed curriculum, choosing instead to work with students on class work or home work, organizational strategies, taking notes in class, critical thinking skills, and test preparation.

The following descriptions illustrate the range of approaches adopted by supplemental service providers in the case study sample. The providers highlighted below were chosen to represent the widest possible range of approaches. Descriptions were excerpted from provider brochures.

- **A national chain** focuses on time and accuracy in mathematics instruction. Students take a placement test to determine a baseline level and build skills from there. The instructional approach aims to build confidence, establish a daily study routine, strengthen mastery of basic skills, and develop students' ability to concentrate. To accomplish this, students complete worksheets to "learn by doing." Students see an example illustrating a concept. This is followed by a simple exercise closely modeled on the example so that students quickly gain confidence as they work with the new concept. Students work at their own pace, and if they make too many errors or take too long to complete a worksheet, they must repeat it until they have mastered the concepts.

- **An in-home tutoring service** offers K-12 tutoring in almost all subject areas, although reading and math predominate with a focus on critical thinking skills. The provider does not use a prescribed curriculum; tutors work with students on the district curriculum and

on their class work or homework. Because testing makes many students anxious, the provider also offers a test preparation program to provide students with practice on multiple-choice and reading comprehension questions. Tutors are trained to work with students to develop their skills in writing, reading comprehension, information retention, and note-taking. In addition, tutors are trained to help students learn about the various types of tests they may encounter, as well as how to use reference materials, the library, or the Internet to obtain information. Tutors also learned to use Scholastic texts to teach students critical thinking skills, which is a district priority.

- **A large multistate provider** offers reading and math instruction to students in grades K-8. Instructors organize classrooms by grade level. Reading instruction includes a sequence of teacher readings of award-winning literature, group discussions, and creative extension activities to help students develop oral fluency, build vocabulary, develop comprehension, and maintain confidence. Students study math through sports, music, history, and personal experiences and hands-on activities to develop number sense, estimation techniques, and spatial sense. In addition, students learn how to collect and organize data and problem solve. A typical tutoring session might begin with what the provider refers to as "focus skills." Students tackle a practice test question modeled after a statewide test question. The instructor then identifies the correct answer and explains why this is the correct answer. Following "focus skills," students spend one hour on reading and language arts or mathematics. The last 30 minutes of each tutoring session consists of individualized instruction that focuses on each student's strengths and weaknesses, as defined by their pre-test assessment.

- **A small local provider offers** students in grades K-8 one-on-one tutoring after school. Instruction focuses on reading, phonemic awareness, reading comprehension, written and oral expression, and spelling or mathematics. Although participants are not necessarily dyslexic, the provider uses strategies designed for dyslexic students. Licensed instructors receive training in a research-based, clinically proven approach called Orton-Gillingham. Staff design sessions to match the individual student's academic needs and learning style.

The extent to which providers aligned their curriculum with state standards was unclear. According to the law, provider services must be aligned with state academic content standards. The providers interviewed for the case studies maintained that their curriculum was aligned with state standards; for their part, districts assumed that the state's approval process ensured that tutoring services would be aligned with state standards. When asked what types of evidence providers had to demonstrate this alignment, some providers were unable to describe any. Others reported that they had conducted alignment studies and had purchased instructional materials to ensure that all state standards were covered. Other providers explained that they used state assessment results, or a diagnostic test based on the state assessment, to develop tutoring plans for individual students.

Providers in at least three of the case study sites were using diagnostic assessments based on the state tests to determine the content of tutoring. In one district, for example, a state assessment score report and a district progress report was placed in each child's file as a source of tracking objectives for tutoring sessions. As one tutor explained, "The [district] report is the basis of instruction." (Providers in at least one other district complained that they could not get

access to state assessment scores for their students.) Another provider used computer software with a built-in assessment to prescribe tutoring for individual students and to track progress. The provider explained, "If they don't score an 80 [on the diagnostic assessment], they can't move on to the next lesson." Tutors reviewed the skills students had missed and re-tested to see if the score has improved.

This focus on preparation for the state assessment is one way to draw clear links between tutoring services and regular classroom instruction. In one district, for example, a provider used state assessment program practice booklets in math and reading as instructional materials during tutoring. One middle school teacher who works as a tutor for this provider saw a clear connection between supplemental services and her own classroom teaching:

> *I am able to tie what the students are doing in tutoring right back into what I am doing in the classroom. For example, the key words we use in the [tutoring] book line up with the words we use in the classroom. The [tutoring] book covers the same type of instruction [as I use in my class]. It will help my students with the [state assessment], especially my students that have test anxiety. They can say to themselves, 'There is no reason to be nervous, I have done this already.'*

When asked about the alignment of provider curricula with state or district standards, district administrators reported that they deferred to the state's assessment of provider qualifications related to this issue. That is, district administrators assumed that states assessed the alignment of provider curricula with state standards as part of their provider selection criteria.

With some exceptions, providers typically did not attempt to coordinate their instructional approaches with those being promoted by the districts where they were offering services. In one district, one provider had worked with district staff to build components of the district's new literacy program into its tutoring services. This kind of collaboration between districts and providers was rare, however. District administrators in most of the sites we visited reported that providers did not explicitly align their services with district instructional approaches and improvement efforts. As one district administrator explained, "They are doing the best they can to align to state standards, but that is as far as most of the providers go." For their part, district administrators had done little to assist providers to coordinate their services. In general, teachers and principals reported that they knew little about what tutors were doing after school, and that they had had little opportunity to coordinate instruction.

In one district, the superintendent argued that supplemental service providers offered a valuable service by providing students with a different approach to instruction: "We're obviously not getting the job done in the schools. We should be doing everything we can to make sure students have a chance to get something different in tutoring." In several other districts, teachers and providers agreed that explicit coordination is less important than whether tutoring provides students with the requisite skills to help them succeed during the regular school day. In one district, school staff explained that although there was no direct connection between what students do in their regular curriculum and tutoring services, the services support much of the work students do at school. Teachers also agreed that the phonics work students were doing with one provider overlapped with what they were doing in their classroom. One teacher said,

"There is definitely a link, and it provides struggling readers a chance to catch up." A principal in another district explained:

> *What I see providers doing and what I know is going on in classrooms is not a match. I do think it helps fill in some of the foundational gaps—yes, it does do that. I'm not sure it's keeping abreast of where they're trying to go. Maybe it has value in terms of shoring up the foundation—maybe it will help students move forward more rapidly.*

One provider took issue with the notion that supplemental services needed either to be fully aligned with district curriculum or to replicate what was happening in classrooms:

> *The district gives us standards and it's an unfair expectation that that in 30 to 50 hours [we will] teach the kids so that they [meet these standards.] That's not our job. Our job is to fill the gaps and find the weak areas and hone in on those skills. We work [with the kids] so that the kids can work harder during the school day. We're not a magic fix but just one piece of the puzzle.*

In at least two case study sites, the district's approach to teaching reading differed from the approach used by providers in significant ways. One district, for example, was using the Open Court reading series, and school staff reported that providers' approach to literacy instruction did not mesh well with the Open Court approach. An assistant principal in this district reported:

> *[The providers'] thing is literacy and our teachers aren't too happy about that because we have Open Court and the district works hard to be sure we are implementing Open Court correctly and it doesn't match our [curriculum]*.

In the other district, providers' focus on phonics and decoding skills contrasted with the districts' emphasis on guided reading as the centerpiece of its new literacy program.

Teachers in several other districts noted that some providers' reliance on worksheets and traditional drills in both reading and mathematics bore little resemblance to their own beliefs and teaching practices. For example, one teacher commented:

> *We are moving toward being cutting edge instructionally.... These teachers would teach algebra and trig using manipulatives because they know that is how kids learn best, especially these kids. The teachers are just appalled by [the provider].... If worksheets were the way to go, then these kids would have been scholars by now*.

Provider Staff

The majority of providers interviewed for this study hire only certified teachers to staff their programs, typically from the districts where the provider was offering services. Fifteen of the 24 providers included in the study reported that a teaching certificate was a requirement for

employment. A handful of providers had far less stringent staff requirements. For example, one provider had hired college students who were finishing teacher certification programs.

About half of the providers interviewed for this study sought to hire tutors and site coordinators directly from the staffs of the schools where they provided services. Many providers went out of their way to recruit these teachers as tutors. Providers, teachers, and parents pointed out that teachers can be on-site immediately after the school day ends (rather than traveling across town to a tutoring job); they know the students and their parents; and they can strengthen the links between supplemental services and the teaching that takes place during the regular school day. Others had more mixed feelings, arguing, in the words of one provider, that the use of teachers from the same school was a "double-edged sword":

> *They know the ins and outs of the school. But I don't think the children receive a fair shake because teachers can't separate their biases and attitudes from the school day. One school used new, outside teachers, and we have seen a tremendous difference.*

Training and supervision of tutors in 2003-04 was not intensive. Most of the providers interviewed reported that tutors received between 4 and 20 hours of training at the beginning of the school year, prior to any students enrolling in the service. Tutors typically did not receive follow-up support during the school year. Many tutors interviewed for the study reported that some tutors skipped the initial tutor training. One problem was that most tutoring jobs were part-time, amounting to just a few hours a week. For that level of commitment, some tutors were not willing to invest large numbers of unpaid (or even paid) hours in training.

Two well-established, national providers reported that they check on tutors regularly and conduct formal evaluations of their performance. Other providers had no formal systems for supervising tutors.

Communicating with Parents and Teachers on Student Progress

Many teachers in the case study sites reported that they did not know which of their students were receiving supplemental services or from whom. Providers negotiated agreements to serve students with districts, but district administrators did not always pass on information about which students were receiving services to schools. As a result, many teachers only knew if their students were in tutoring if those students received services in the school building. In addition, few of the teachers interviewed for this study knew much, if anything, about what their students were doing in after-school tutoring. Teachers saw this lack of communication as a missed opportunity. They expressed the desire to collaborate with tutors on addressing the needs of particular students; some teachers also pointed out that they could help to make sure that students attended after-school tutoring sessions.

Provider communication with parents and teachers was sporadic or informal and was seldom very effective. The supplemental service providers in the study sample said that they sent regular progress reports on students to districts as required under the terms of their contracts, but most of the teachers and parents interviewed for this study reported that they had not received

any information about students' progress. None of the teachers interviewed for this study reported getting formal student progress reports from providers. In cases where school staff also worked as tutors for supplemental service providers, they kept classroom teachers informed through informal conversations.

A handful of providers had more formal mechanisms for communicating with regular classroom teachers. For example, one provider sent a three-page checklist to each child's classroom teacher, asking the teacher to identify students' strengths and weaknesses. In one school, supplemental service providers attended school faculty meetings. Some of the teachers and principals interviewed for the study said that they would have appreciated more feedback from providers. One principal commented:

> *I have not gotten feedback from anyone; I thought I would get a report…. I would like to see what the baseline is—where did the kids start out based on their criteria for where students should be at any given point…. I'll ask the tutor how those kids are doing…. but I would like it a bit more formal.*

Some providers in the study sample reported that they sent information on student progress home to parents monthly or every six weeks. Few of the parents interviewed for this study, however, recalled receiving these reports. Instead, they relied on their face-to-face contact with teachers at the school to stay abreast of their children's progress in tutoring. Other providers reported that they preferred to communicate informally with parents.

Parents' Role in Supplemental Services

Most parents of children receiving supplemental services were pleased that this resource was available to their children and expected that the additional help and personal attention promised by tutors would benefit their children. Of the parents interviewed who had not signed their children up for services, most had not done so because they did not know about the option. Parents relied heavily on their children's teachers and other school staff to choose among providers. Parents' assessments of the effectiveness of services were mixed.

Context for Choosing Supplemental Services

Parents weighed their options regarding supplemental services in the context of their judgments about their children's educational needs and the option to transfer their child to another school under Title I.

Most of the parents interviewed for the case studies expressed confidence in their children's schools and teachers, despite schools' continued Title I school improvement status. Parents expressed satisfaction with schools and teachers that they felt were caring and responsive to their children's needs. Parents praised their children's teachers for the extra support and attention they said that they provided to their children (for example, after-school tutoring), for calling frequently to discuss their children's progress in school, and for demonstrating care and concern. They also valued schools whose office staff were calm, respectful, and welcoming to parents. Two comments reflected the sentiments of parents across nearly all of the schools visited for this study:

> *This is the best school my child has even been in. The staff supervise the kids. If I have a complaint, the teachers are right on it. Both of my children are doing well here.*

> *Every teacher he's had has been awesome. They've always been there to help, we've always been involved. All he has to do [now] is get his education. The teachers are always there to get questions answered. They are always there to help.*

In the small number of cases where parents were not happy with their child's school, this sense of responsiveness and connection was missing.

Where parents were aware of the Title I school improvement status in their children's school, they explained that this designation had little impact on their assessment of the school. One group of parents pointed out that school scores had been improving every year (just not enough to make AYP). Another parent explained that she had little interest in reviewing the school's report card:

> *My thing is, [the staff who put together report cards] have more than one student to deal with. I just go by my one. As long as he's getting what he needs, I don't care what whoever says about my school.*

Most parents were aware of the public school choice options available to them under Title I of NCLB, but few parents had seriously considered transferring their child to another school. With prompting, most parents interviewed for this study remembered a letter sent to them at home at the beginning of the school year, informing them of the opportunity to transfer their child to another school in the district. Some parents did not know about their choice options, and parents in one district thought that they would have had to drive their children to school if they transferred.

When asked about moving, however, most parents expressed allegiance to their current school and explained that they would not want their children to transfer. Some parents wanted their children to attend school nearby and in the community, and saw little benefit in sending their children to another school farther away. Other parents were reluctant to send their children to a school staffed by teachers they didn't know. As one parent explained, "I like the teachers here. They communicate with me, they wave. My kids are shy, they would shut down in a new environment." Still others decided to stay in their current school and try supplemental services. One parent explained:

> *I started calling because I knew they were supposed to offer transfer options when a school didn't make AYP. I couldn't get any answers from the superintendent. It took days for the district to call back. . . . However, with the new program, I thought I may as well give the new program a try.*

Several parents reported that they had investigated alternative schools and had decided against them because they were too far away, in run-down or poorly equipped buildings, or because they had a bad reputation among parents.

Parents' Criteria for Selecting Providers

In 2003-04, many parents reported that they had received enough information to choose good providers for their children; nearly as many, however, reported that they knew little or were confused about the services available to them. By carefully studying the provider brochures sent out by districts, some parents were well-informed about the services offered by various providers. For these parents, choosing a provider was fairly straightforward. As one parent described it:

> *The packet came home at the beginning of the year, and we had to choose two of them. I read over the package and picked a program. It had all the subjects he was having trouble in. It seemed to be a great program, and I wanted to try it out.*

Other parents reported that they had attended open houses where providers had made presentations, or that they had spoken with providers at their child's school. In several schools, providers had become a regular and visible presence, attending back-to-school nights, PTA meetings, and other school events, making presentations in classrooms, and talking with parents. These face-to-face contacts were crucial sources of information for some parents.

In at least four districts, however, many parents were confused about the services available to them. Some parents interviewed had no memory of receiving the district's letter and provider brochures, even when they lived in districts that had sent out multiple mailings. Some parents were not clear about the range of choices available; they did not realize that they could have selected a provider other than the one operating at the school, or they assumed that the two or three providers most visible in the school were the only choices available. As one parent commented, "You didn't know that there were 16 providers…. I assumed that [the largest provider at the school] was the only provider." Other parents didn't know how to proceed when the provider they wanted for their child ended up not offering services, or there was no transportation available. Finally, some parents were surprised to discover that supplemental services were only available to students from low-income families. Because some districts had sent letters to all parents in schools required to offer services and advertised in the local media, parents expected that supplemental services would be available to every child who wanted them.

Some English language learners' parents did not fully understand how to select supplemental services for their children. In one large district with a majority of Latino parents, parents relied almost exclusively on word-of-mouth and advice from teachers and other parents in making decisions concerning the education of their children. While the Title I site coordinator had interviewed and spoken with parents about supplemental services, none of the teachers had.

Parents paid careful attention to teacher and principal recommendations in deciding to sign their child up for services and in choosing a provider; teachers employed by supplemental service providers played a key role in recruiting parents at their schools. In at least two districts, schools where teachers and the principal were actively involved in recruiting parents to sign up for services had much higher participation rates than schools where teachers and the principal were less active. In many schools, teachers who also worked for supplemental service providers were a key point of contact for supplemental services in those schools. Many parents reported that they had signed their children up for a particular provider because a teacher who worked for that provider had encouraged them to do so. For these parents, a major draw was the fact that a teacher they knew and trusted was involved providing services. One parent explained her reasoning as follows:

> *There were two or three different [programs to choose from], and this one seems like the better one. Ms. Smith [a teacher who is also site coordinator for one supplemental services provider] was one reason. [My son] has had her off and on since sixth grade. I could talk to her, ask questions. I liked the idea of her being there, as opposed to someone else.*

In other schools the principal or the Title I parent coordinator acted as a gatekeeper, directing parents to one or two providers based on their knowledge of the providers and of student needs. As one parent explained: "[My son] has speech problems… [the principal] told me where to put him…. I told her that was fine."

In addition to teacher recommendations, the parents interviewed for the case studies considered location, hours of operation, and availability of transportation in selecting providers. Parents tended to consider those providers offering services in their child's school first; among the parents interviewed, almost none sent their children off-site when given the

choice to have their children attend tutoring at the school. In at least one district, providers moved on-site because they believed this would make their program more attractive to parents. In a couple of districts, providers that offer services in students' homes were also an attractive option for some parents. Parents reported that the availability of transportation to and from the school was critical in selecting a provider. Still other parents selected providers that would keep their children until 6 p.m., when they could pick them up after leaving work.

Parents looked for providers who would keep their children productively engaged after school, give them individualized attention, and help them with their homework. In explaining why they had signed their children up for services, parents said that they sought to keep their children occupied and safe in the afternoon. These parents explained that any "extra learning" would benefit their children. Finally, parents explained that they hoped tutoring would give their children the structure and extra attention lacking during the regular school day and at home. Parents' comments on these themes included:

> *Tutoring is good for any kid because they get more attention. [My daughter] says teachers don't have time for her…. She needs extra help.*
>
> *Teachers are doing a yeoman's job, but this generation of kids is hard to work with. There's a lack of discipline, a lack of love, a lack of attention. Kids want that attention. They are not getting education from their parents, or getting someone to listen to them, getting attention. We need to encourage parents to put their children in the [supplemental services] program.*
>
> *They discipline the kids. Little boys need that extra discipline. They make him sit down, before he gets involved with other things…. They make him do homework, they stay on top of kids to get homework done. They know what we have to deal with.*

Parents across districts also explained that the help children received with their homework in after-school tutoring was an important feature of these services. In one district, several of the providers added some time for homework help to their daily routine in response to parent demand. In another district, parents complained that some providers focused only on helping students develop their academic skills, while others also helped students with their homework.

Some parents selected providers based on the number of hours of service they offered, the subjects they taught, and student-to-tutor ratios. These parents typically had studied the brochure and provider information mailed out by districts. Among the parents interviewed they tended to be the exception, however.

Parents who elected not to enroll their children in supplemental services did so for many reasons. In many cases, parents found other after-school options more accessible, more convenient, or more appropriate for their child. Many parents thought that their children were already getting enough extra help from the regular after-school program or informal tutoring offered by classroom teachers. Several parents had considered supplemental services but opted for other programs instead. For example, one parent chose the after-school math program at her daughter's school because it was already underway and would last longer than supplemental

services. Other parents opted for their children to participate in sports, other recreational activities, or church-based activities after school. Finally, one parent doubted that supplemental service providers would address her son's special needs:

> *My son is special education, other kids [from the school] are in the magnet program. How can they teach him the same as the magnet kids? It wouldn't make a difference, he would just start getting frustrated…. Another reason I didn't get back into it, they didn't say anything about his needs, they just said it was an after-school program.*

Several parents expressed concern about having their children stay in the school building after hours or travel home late in the afternoon; due to issues of safety, these parents had elected not to sign their children up for services.

In still other cases, parents simply did not know enough about supplemental services to enroll their child. These parents remembered receiving a letter and a brochure but were unsure how to sign their children up. A parent coordinator at one school, who had been calling parents and urging them to sign up their children if they qualified for supplemental services, reported that parents were confused by the application and said that they didn't know enough about the providers to choose among them. Other district and school staff noted that parents facing a choice among many providers, like most consumers, were sometimes overwhelmed by too many options.

Finally, some parents wanted to enroll their children in supplemental services but had been told that their children were not eligible, either because they were not eligible for free or reduced-price lunches or because their children were too high-achieving (although all children eligible for free or reduced-price lunches should have been offered services).[9] A group of parents whose children were not receiving supplemental services at one high school complained about the lack of support structures in place in the school for students who weren't performing poorly but who still needed some extra assistance.

For most parents, supplemental services were just one option among many possible, and equally attractive, after-school activities. As they had in 2002-03, the five districts included in the study sample in both years of data collection continued to offer other local, state, and federally funded after-school programs that operated in tandem with supplemental services. In 2003, the study reported that many parents saw no difference between supplemental services and other after-school programs offered by their child's school. But in 2003-04, most parents knew the names of the most active supplemental service providers and most understood that their services were distinct from other after-school programs operating at the school. In two districts, parents could describe the differences between supplemental services and other programs (e.g., differences in goals, daily routines, activities).

However, parents interviewed for this study still tended to regard supplemental services as one possible option among many. Some parents reported that they had signed their children up for supplemental services as well as for other after-school and extracurricular programs. Parents spoke highly of arrangements where students could receive tutoring through

[9] U.S. Department of Education Non-Regulatory Guidance on supplemental services (Aug. 22, 2003, Item F-1).

supplemental services and participate in more recreational after-school activities on the same day. For example, one parent explained that her son each day had an hour of tutoring with a supplemental services provider followed by an hour of track practice. Other parents had children attending both GEAR UP and tutoring from supplemental service providers on the same day. Still other parents were eager to have their children participate in all kinds of programs. The following comment was typical:

> *I have two kids in seventh and eighth grade. They are getting after-school services, but I don't remember what. I think I'm signed up for three or four things, I don't know. I think Tools of Empowerment is one of them.*

In several districts, parents reported that they did not receive their first choice of provider. In two districts, parents reported that their children had been assigned to providers that they had not requested. The reasons why children were switched were not clear to parents. One parent explained:

> *I signed up for [one provider]. I never heard back from [that provider]. The choice was made for me; [another provider] was selected. It didn't matter to me. . . . I just wanted the tutoring.*

Administrators in these two districts explained that providers either didn't show up to provide the services or did not have a high enough demand to justify offering the services. In two other districts, providers closed down or withdrew from a school, and parents were asked by the district to select other providers.

Parent Satisfaction with Provider Services

Parents whose children had been receiving services for some time had somewhat mixed reactions. Some were satisfied with the services and credited them for improvements in their children's performance; others reported that the services had provided little benefit.

The parents interviewed reported that they had received little information from providers about their children's activities or progress in supplemental services. With few exceptions, the parents interviewed reported that they had received no written reports and no other information back from providers about work completed during tutoring sessions or student progress. Several parents reported that they relied on their child's teachers to keep them informed. Others said they had no idea what their child was doing after school.

Nevertheless, many of the parents interviewed reported that they were satisfied with the services their children had received and believed that after-school tutoring had helped their children. Across districts, parents provided numerous examples of the ways that their children had benefited from supplemental services. Some parents noted that their children's grades had improved. Others pointed to improved math or reading skills. Still other parents credited tutors with improving their children's attitudes toward school. Typical comments included the following, from five satisfied parents in five different interviews:

My son came to this school at the end of last year and he was behind. His teacher always tells me what he needs help with. So going to tutoring helped him. He doesn't count with his fingers anymore. He slows down and pays attention more. I can tell when I see his work.

In math he's made great progress now that he's coming home and doing homework. He's doing much better and is eager to do math worksheets.

Before, when he started he didn't know how to read. Right now he is reading better. Even in the one month. Between this and working with him at home he is improving.

I don't always have time for attention about homework. He gets his homework done, it tires him out. I don't have to worry about a lot of different things. He's keeping his grades up, it helps him open up more.

I don't have to drag my kids to school anymore.

Several high school parents in one district appreciated the fact that their children had earned high school credit for participation that would allow their children to graduate on time.

Other parents reported that they observed little benefit from the services. Some parents reported that they were disappointed with the services and saw no improvement in their children's reading and math skills. Others questioned whether a few extra hours of tutoring each week could really be expected to make a difference for their children. A few parents objected to the instructional approach of the providers they had selected. Comments from these parents included:

Two hours per week is not enough for these kids. They need more attention. [It] is too soon to make a decision [about whether the program] is good or if I like it or don't like it for our kids.

I don't see any improvement—she still counts on her fingers in the fifth grade…. Her reading is still not what it should be. . . . There's no way she could read a Harry Potter book.

To me, it's like he's working on his own when he's there. He goes in and does his worksheet and times himself. Then they want me to check his work—but sometimes I don't have time to do all that and fill out the form. Why do I have to go over his work and record his grades—what are they being paid for?

I thought kids would get help in tutoring with homework. But they are doing something completely different and have to come home and then do homework.

As in 2002-03, parents in some districts complained about the length of time between making a selection and receiving services. In the 2002-03 study sample, some parents reported that the amount of time that elapsed between the services being offered to them and services being provided was too long. A year later, a number of parents interviewed in the study sample had the same complaint. In several districts, parents returned their initial interest form in

September or early October, but services for children did not start until November or December. Several parents complained about the time lag, noting that it was easy to lose track of what providers they had signed up for and when they were supposed to be meeting. In one district, services did not start until March.[10] By contrast, parents in another district were pleased that services were up and running so much earlier in 2003-04. One parent noted with satisfaction, "As soon as we got the form [from the provider we selected], we sent it back and the tutoring started right away."

[10] This district was offering services for the first time in 2003-04. The state did not finalize the list of schools where students would be eligible for supplemental services until September. The district did not complete negotiations on provider contracts until late January, and providers needed approximately six weeks to enroll students and organize services.

Conclusions

After nearly two full years, there were signs that the case study states, districts, schools, and providers had overcome some of the initial trials associated with getting a new set of services up and running. There was ample evidence that the states, districts, and providers had learned from their experience: some of the challenges faced with respect to identifying providers, identifying eligible students, and notifying parents were not as serious for districts included in the study sample in 2003-04, compared with the set of districts in the sample in 2002-03. Nevertheless, challenges remained. The following highlights the progress states, districts, schools, and providers made in implementing supplemental services in 2003-04 as well as some of the challenges they confronted.

Implementation Progress

By 2003-04, the states in the case study sample had established routines for reviewing applications and had succeeded in getting lists of providers out to districts sooner in the school year. With each round of applications, new entities expressed interest in becoming providers, and the list of choices continued to expand, both statewide and within districts. States continued to work on developing systems for monitoring provider performance, although efforts were still limited.

District responsibilities for implementing the supplemental services provisions of NCLB continued to challenge district administrators in the case study sites, but many had developed systems and methods for streamlining operations and procedures so as to simplify their work and to provide supplemental services to families sooner. Among the more significant developments for these districts was the deliberate and ordered inclusion of schools in the work of implementing, coordinating, and monitoring supplemental services.

Sampled providers learned that there were significant advantages to offering supplemental services in schools, and to using, where possible, teachers from the same school building as tutors. Providers in some districts were beginning to make connections with parents and earn the recognition and respect of local communities. Better-established providers were beginning to explore strategies for improving attendance rates.

Supplemental services provided in the nine case study sites suggest a basic format that applied in most cases, although there were exceptions. Tutors generally worked with students in small groups. Providers offered tutoring immediately after school, two to three times a week, for sessions lasting one to two hours. The total number of hours each student received ranged widely, from a low of 18 to a high of 120. However, most students tended to "cycle out" of supplemental services after 10-20 weeks.

In 2003-04, many of the parents interviewed for the study reported that they had received helpful information about the services available to them, especially from teachers and face-to-face contacts with providers. Many of the parents interviewed reported that they were pleased

with the services their children had received, and believed that their children had benefited from the tutoring provided.

Implementation Challenges

Despite incremental progress, significant challenges remain to the successful implementation of the supplemental services provisions of NCLB in the case study sites. As states, districts, schools, and providers move forward, the following issues remain, and suggest areas in which support and guidance are needed:

- **Increasing participation rates:** Some districts had undertaken extensive and imaginative efforts to enroll students in supplemental services, with only moderate increases in participation rates to show for it. Districts likely will need to step up their outreach efforts as well as develop more effective ways to communicate with parents about services if they are to reach higher participation rates. Outreach should become easier for districts as providers become established in the communities they are trying to serve and as they develop a positive reputation with parents. Allowing providers to use school facilities appears to help to boost participation, as many parents prefer their children to attend tutoring at their schools.

- **Evaluating provider performance:** Monitoring and evaluation of providers continued to be a challenge. State administrators wondered what criteria they should use to evaluate provider performance, and were searching for some useful benchmarks for assessing provider quality and impact. Both states and districts reported that they would appreciate guidance or examples of key indicators of quality.

- **Improving communication with parents:** Districts had clearly improved the quality of their communications with parents in 2003-04, with letters home that were much more family-friendly, as well as the quantity and variety of their efforts to communicate with parents. Even so, many parents in focus group interviews had only a vague idea about what might be available to them. Communicating effectively with parents is an art, and districts need to continue to refine their outreach efforts. This is an area where districts pay close attention to ideas and examples from other districts and where identification and circulation of good models could be beneficial.

- **Managing administrative costs:** Most district administrators continued to express concern about the costs of implementing supplemental services. Significant costs were associated with the mailings to schools and parents, working with the providers, and writing provider contracts.

- **Payment to providers when student attendance is uneven:** Attendance in after-school programs is always uneven. Both districts and providers struggled with determining who should bear the risk when students do not attend tutoring regularly. Both districts and providers noted the need for district payment policies that ensure providers are paid fairly and predictably, while at the same time ensuring that

providers are not paid for students who do not receive tutoring. Districts in the case study sample had developed a variety of policies for dealing with attendance in payment to providers; this is an area where they could benefit from some guidance from the states and the U.S. Department of Education.

Appendix

Exhibit A-1
Characteristics of All District Supplemental Service Providers, 2003-04

Type of Provider	Cost of Services per Contact Hour	Number of Contact Hours Per Student	Number of Students Served	Tutoring Format (small group, individualized, etc.)	Service Capacity (How many students can provider serve?)
District: Brooktown School District					
Other private (national)	$22	43-45	14	Small group	17
Other private (national)	$32	30	1	Individualized	1
Other private (national)	$12	100	295	Small group	289
Other private (national)	$20	30-40	14	Small group	18
Other private (national)	$30	34	841	Small group	1,016
Other private (multistate)	$40	24-25	85	Individualized	101
Other private (local)	$15	48-60	3	Small group	10
Other private (local)	$40	25	21	Small group	21
Other private (local)	$250/mo.	24-60	28	Individualized	32
Other private (local)	$11	57	123	Small group	140
Other private (local)	$ 5	150	9	Small group	16
Other private (foundation)	$22	45	30	Small group	30
School district	$15	32 or 64	290	Small group	398
Faith-based	$26	18	23	Individualized	28
District: Plainfield School District					
Other private (national)	$31	38.6	41	Small group	300
Other private (multistate)	$20	59	12	Small group	100
Other private (local)	$ 5	256	26	Small group	100
Other private (local)	$10	120	26	Small group	100
School district	$ 7	162	100	Small group	n/a
District: Oakwood School District					
Other private (national)	$20	96	5	Online, Web-based	2,000
Other private (national)	$35	56	386	Individualized; small group	Limitless
Other private (multistate)	$25	80 (recently added 40 hours of instruction)	250	Large group	Limitless
Other private (local)	$27	72	20	All	500
Other private (local)	$16	120	285	Individualized	Limitless
Other private (local)	$ 9	204	53	Individualized; small group	¼ of eligible students

District: Sunnydale School District					
Other private (national)	$15	68	291	Small group	500
Other private (national)	$35	30	91	Small group	200+
Other private (national)	$30	40	110	Small group	300
Other private (national)	$30	40	922	Small group	1,026
Other private (local)	$31	39	51	Small group	103
Other private (local)	$18	66	479	Small group	500
Other private (local)	$20	60	79	Small group	80
Other private (local)	$40	30	186	Small group	220
School district (local)	$12	86	155	Small group	415
Other private (local)	$17	70	436	Small group	600
District: Springvale School District					
Other private (national)	$35	30	0		150
Other private (multistate)	$14	100	149	Large group	145
Other private (multistate)	$14	100	149	Large group	145
Other private (multisite within state)	$41	40	124	Small group	400
Other private (multisite within state)	$15	88	0	Online	150
Other private (local)	$48	30	5	Individualized	50
Other private (local)	$50	28	0	Virtual tutoring	75
Other private (local)	$20	70	0	Online	150
Other private (local)	$40	35	0		150
Other private (local)	$11	557	0	Kindergarten	50
Other private (local)	$28	38	20	Small group	75
Other private (local)	$33	42	0		150
Faith-based	$50	28	37	Small group	250

District: Emory Public Schools					
Other private (national)	$35	30 hours	60	Small group	Unknown
Other private (national)	Charge $1,520/ student/year		0	Small group	Unknown
Other private (national)	$1,520/student/year	36	18	Individualized instruction, max 3:1	Unknown
Other private (national)	$10-$13 per session, $20-$25 per week	Up to 69 hours	6	Individualized	Unknown
Other private (multisite within state)	$50	30 hours	11	Online	Unknown
Other private (multistate)	1 to 1 ($40/hr.) 4 to 1 ($25/hr.)	Average of 30-35 hours	25	Individualized /small group	Unknown
Other private (multistate)	$20	Up to 76 hours	0	Online	Unknown
Other private (local)	$25	53 hours	8	Small group	Unknown
Other private (local)	$30	Up to 51 hours	0	Primarily individualized—maximum of 3 for group activities	Unknown
Other private (local)	$22	Up to 65 hours	17	Online	Unknown
Other private (local)	$60	Up to 25 hours	1	Individualized	Unknown
Other private (local)	$14	Up to 109 hours	7	Individualized, workshops and small groups of 3:1	Unknown
District: Redding School District					
Other private (national)	$48	25	155	Individualized	300+
Other private (multisite within state)	$57	24-34	45	Small group	250
Other private (local)	$40	34	66	Small group and independent work	Unknown
Other private (local)	$34	40	70	Small group	Unknown
Other private (local)	$47	28	74	Individualized	Unknown
District: Trainville School District					
Other private (national)	$44	30	210	Small group	Unknown
Other private (national)	$44	30	55	Small group	100
Other private (multisite within state)	$44	30	80	Small group	Up to 1000
Other private (local)	$12	115	150	Small group and individualized	150
Other private (local)	$44	30	80	Small group	1,000

District: Longwood Public Schools					
Other private (national)	$40	30	104	Individualized tutoring	100
Other private (local)	$40	30	1,300	Small group and individualized tutoring	Unlimited
Other private (local)	$40	30	528	Individualized tutoring	1,500
School district	$40	30	9,000	Small group	Unlimited
Faith-based	$40	30	900	Small group and individualized tutoring	3,000

Exhibit A-2
Characteristics of Sampled Supplemental Service Providers, 2003-04

Provider	Location	Transportation	Total Number of Contact Hours Per Student	Frequency of Services	Tutoring Format	Student: Tutor Ratio	Content and Grades Served	Staffing
District: Brooktown School District								
Provider A (school district)	Multiple schools	No	32 or 64	1 hour 30 minutes; 2 times a week	Small group	12:1	Math, reading	State certified teachers only, recruited from non-identified schools
Provider B (national)	Multiple schools	No	34	1 hour; 2 times per week	Small group	6:1	Reading	State certified teachers only, recruited from schools where providers operate
Provider C (faith-based)	Off-site	Yes	18	1 hour; 1 time per week	Individual	1:1	Homework help	No requirements
District: Plainfield School District								
Provider A (national)	One school	No	38.6	1 hour; 2 times per week	Small group	Up to 10:1	Math, K-4	Certified teachers from other schools in the district
Provider B (multi-state)	In home or location in community (e.g. library)	No	59		Small group	4:1	Guided reading, K-5	Certified teachers from other schools in the district
Provider C (school district)	One school	No	162	1.5 hours; 3 times per week	Small group	5-10:1	Guided reading, K-4	

Provider	Location	Transportation	Total Number of Contact Hours Per Student	Frequency of Services	Tutoring Format	Student: Tutor Ratio	Content and Grades Served	Staffing
District: Oakwood School District								
Provider A (national)	Multiple schools	Yes	120	2 hours; 4 times per week	Large group	15:1	Test preparation, reading/ language arts, homework help; K-8	State certified teachers only
Provider B (local)	Off-site	Yes	120	2 hours; 3 times per week	Individual tutoring, computer software	3:1	Mathematics, reading; grades K-12	State certified teachers only
Provider C (national)	Off-site	Yes	56	1-2 hours; 4 times per week	Individual tutoring, small group	8:1	Mathematics, reading, recreational activities; grades K-12	State certified teachers only, recruited from the school where the provider operates
District: Sunnydale School District								
Provider A (local)	One school, serving students from other schools as well	No	66	1.5 hours; 2 times per week	Small group	10:1	Reading, math in grades 1-12	Certified teachers from the school where provider operates
Provider B (national)	One school, serving students from other schools as well	No	68	2 hours; 3 times per week	Small group	15:1	Reading, math in grades 2-6	Certified teachers from the school where provider operates
Provider C (local)	One school, serving students from other schools as well	No	86	1.5 hours; 2 times per week	Small group	6:1	Reading, math in grades 1-6	Certified teachers from the school where provider operates

Provider	Location	Transportation	Total Number of Contact Hours Per Student	Frequency of Services	Tutoring Format	Student: Tutor Ratio	Content and Grades Served	Staffing
District: Springvale School District								
Provider A (local)	Off-site	Yes	28	1-2 hours; 4 times per week	Small group	10:2	English, reading, math, K-8	Current or former teachers from the school system
Provider B (national)	Multiple schools	Yes	100	1 hour 45 minutes; 4 times per week	Large group	15:1	Reading and math, K-8	State certified teachers only, recruited from the schools where the provider operates
Provider C (multisite within state)	Multiple schools	No	40	1 hour 30 minutes; 3 times per week	Small group	8-10:1	Reading, writing, math, study skills K-8	Typically certified teachers, recruited from the schools where the provider operates
District: Emory Public Schools								
Provider A (multi-state)	In-home or community location (e.g., library)	Yes, beginning 3/04	Varies per student; up to 59 hours, on average, 30-35 hours	1-3 hours per week	Individual/small group	4:1	Homework help, math, reading—individualized based on student's needs, grades 1-8	Certified teachers only
Provider B (national)	Multiple schools	Yes, beginning 3/04	30 hours	2 hours; 1 time per week	Small groups	4:1	Reading and Math, grades 1-8	College graduates
Provider C (national)	Off-site	Yes, beginning 3/04	Up to 69 hours	½ hour; 2 times per week	Independent work	Tutors available if students need assistance	Math and reading comprehension, grades 1-8	Middle/high schools students and college graduates; certified Kumon instructors

Provider	Location	Transportation	Total Number of Contact Hours Per Student	Frequency of Services	Tutoring Format	Student: Tutor Ratio	Content and Grades Served	Staffing
District: Trainville School District								
Provider A (national)	Multiple schools	No	30	1.5 hours; 2 times a week	Small group	6:1 (but twice that in one school)	Math for grades 1-6	Certified teachers only
Provider B (national)	Middle school	No	30	1.5 hours twice/week	Small group	10:1	Math and language arts for grade 6-12	Certified teacher and college grads.
Provider C (local)	Elementary school	No	115	3 hours a week	Small group	10:1	Reading, math, and homework help for grades 1-6	All but one with BA degree and finishing up credentialing program
District: Longwood Public Schools								
Provider A (school district)	Multiple schools	No	Approx. 32 hours	3 ½ hours; 1 Saturday a week	Small group	5:1	Reading, ESL, Math for grades 1-12	Certified teachers only, recruited from non-identified schools
Provider B (national)	Multiple schools	No	Approx. 30 hours	2 hours per week	Individual	1:1	Math and lang. Arts for grades 1-12	Certified teacher or teachers in training
Provider C (faith-based)	Multiple schools	No	30 hours	2 hours per week	Individual	1:1	Math and lang. Arts for grades K-12	Certified teachers or professionals with degrees
Provider D (national)	Multiple schools	No	28 hours	4 hours per week	Individual or small group	1:1 to 4: 1	Math and lang. Arts for grades K-12	College graduates and certified teachers
Provider E (local)	Multiple schools	No	40 hours	3-4 hour per week	One on one	1:1	Math and lang. Arts for grades K-12	Certified teachers or college graduates

Provider	Location	Transportation	Total Number of Contact Hours Per Student	Frequency of Services	Tutoring Format	Student: Tutor Ratio	Content and Grades Served	Staffing
District: Redding School District								
Provider A (local)	Multiple schools	Yes, to home	34 one hour sessions	2 hours; 2 times a week	Small group and independent work	5:1	Math and lang. Arts for grades K-8	Certified teachers, grad student, counselors, retired teachers
Provider B (local)	Multiple schools	Yes, to home	About 40	2 hours; 2 times a week	Tutoring in groups of 5	5:1	Math and lang. Art skill and homework help for K-8	Retirees, graduate students, certified teachers, and parents
Provider D (local)	Multiple schools	Yes, to home	28	2 hours; 2 times a week	Individual	5:1	Math and lang. Art skill and study skills K-8	Certified teachers w/ background checks

Our mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.

www.ed.gov