



HOW DID STATES IN THE CENTRAL REGION EVALUATE SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROVIDERS IN 2007?

February 2009

Prepared by:

Zoe A. Barley, Ph.D
Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning

Sandra K. Wegner, Ed.D
Wegner Consulting



February 2009

©McREL

This project was conducted for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-06-CO-0023 by Regional Education Laboratory Central administered by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement of the U.S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND/REGIONAL IMPORTANCE.....	1
Regional Importance.....	3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	3
Data Collection.....	4
Data Processing and Analysis.....	4
FINDINGS.....	5
What criteria do states have for provider performance, how do they assess provider performance, and do they have a policy for terminating a provider?.....	6
What system for gathering information do Central Region states use to evaluate providers?.....	7
What do state contacts report about their experience with the state’s evaluation of providers?.....	9
LIMITATIONS.....	10
DISCUSSION.....	11
REFERENCES.....	12
APPENDIX A: PROTOCOL FOR STATE CONTACT INTERVIEWS.....	13

SUMMARY

In state needs assessment meetings held in late June 2008, the leadership of two Central Region state departments of education, South Dakota and Missouri, asked REL Central to determine how the states in the region evaluate their supplemental educational service (SES) providers. Specifically, these SEA staff requested more information about Central Region states' data collection processes, examples of instruments in use, and information on state SES contacts' perceptions of their evaluation processes, including issues that have emerged and/or problems that have been solved.

In response to this regional request, REL Central reviewed the federal guidance provided to states on monitoring SES providers and developed the following research questions:

1. What criteria do states have for provider performance; how do they assess provider performance; and what policies do they have for terminating a provider?
2. What systems do Central Region states use to gather information with which to evaluate their providers?
3. What do state contacts report about their experience with the state's evaluation of providers?

States are required to develop standards for monitoring and evaluating providers. Only one state, South Dakota, has standards in place. The others rely on criteria that are found in the provider application, which defines the role and expectations of the provider. Typically, adherence to the provider contract becomes a substitute for criteria in evaluating provider performance. South Dakota is the only state with a provider termination policy.

The study found that the seven Central Region states include varying numbers of approved providers, eligible schools, and eligible students, which influences the scope and scale of their provider evaluations. State contacts were primarily concerned that their states did not have sufficient staffing to adequately monitor and evaluate the providers, but suggested specific aspects of evaluation and monitoring that they believed worked well in their states.

Six of the states (all but Nebraska, which has an evaluation process in place but did not identify any schools qualified to receive SES in 2007) have made or are making changes to better evaluate the performance and impact of their SES providers.

BACKGROUND

Among the primary accountability measures of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) is the requirement for schools to make "adequate yearly progress" (AYP) toward bringing all of their students, categorized by subgroup, to proficiency in mathematics and reading by the end of the 2013–2014 school year. Schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years are identi-

fied as being “in need of improvement,” or in School Improvement I status. Once identified as being in need of improvement, schools are required to offer low-income students the option of transferring to a school that has *not* been identified as being in need of improvement. Schools that fail to make AYP for three consecutive years are categorized as being in “School Improvement II” status. Title I¹ schools that fall into School Improvement II status are required to offer supplemental educational services (SES), in addition to the transfer option, to their low-income students (GAO August, 2006).

These supplemental educational services, tutoring and other supplemental and academic enrichment, are provided free of charge to eligible students outside of the regular school day. According to non-regulatory guidance issued by the U.S. Department of Education, such services must be “designed to increase the academic achievement of students in schools in need of improvement” (U.S. Department of Education, 2005, p.1). These services

...may include academic assistance such as tutoring, remediation and other educational interventions, provided such approaches are consistent with the content and instruction used by the local education agency (LEA) and are aligned with the state’s academic content standards. Supplemental educational services must be of high quality; research-based, and specifically designed to increase student academic achievement. (U.S. Department of Education, 2005. p.1).

Supplemental educational services can be provided by a variety of entities, including non-profit groups, for-profit companies, local community programs, private schools, charter schools, national organizations, faith-based groups, public schools and districts, and colleges or universities. However, providers must be approved by the state before they can begin offering services.

A district with students who are eligible to participate in SES is responsible for informing parents of their children’s eligibility, of the providers available to them, and how to enroll their children in services. Some services are arranged and offered at the school after school hours; some are offered on Saturdays either at the school or at a provider site; some in the summer; and some are offered online, either at the school or through online courses taken at home.

According to the Department of Education Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance,

SEAs² have a responsibility, through the approval and monitoring processes, to ensure that high-quality services are delivered. In general, SEAs must identify the approved providers and determine whether providers improve student academic achievement...Specifically, an SEA must develop and implement standards and techniques for monitoring the quality, performance, and effectiveness of the services offered by approved supplemental educational service providers. Such standards and techniques, as well as any findings resulting from such monitoring, must be publicly reported. These quality control standards and techniques should be consistent with the initial criteria de-

¹ Title I schools are schools that operate programs funded under Title I of the elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Title I, Part A includes the parental choice option of supplemental educational services.

² State Education Agencies

veloped for identifying potential providers [Section 1116(e) (4) (D)]. SEAs may also want to collect and report information about parent or student satisfaction with services (U.S. Department of Education, 2005, p. 18).

A prior REL Central study (Barley & Wegner, 2007) identified eligible students' participation in SES in Central Region³ states at 11 percent, below the national average of 17 percent. The present study describes how the seven states in the Central Region⁴ are monitoring and evaluating the providers of supplemental educational services in their states. These seven states, are currently developing their evaluation systems, and like many other states (U.S. Department of Education, 2008) do not yet have a fully developed monitoring and evaluation program in place. The request for descriptions of what neighboring states were doing was intended to assist states in putting their systems in place. We expected the 'work in progress' nature of the evaluations to be reflected in this review.

The non-regulatory guidance (U.S. Department of Education, 2005) suggests that parent and school support of the supplemental educational services program are elements that can potentially enhance student participation. In the guidance, SEAs are encouraged "to consider ways that [they] can help parents understand and access supplemental educational services for their children." (p.4); further, "SEA[s] should encourage LEAs⁵ to provide teachers and principals in their district with information about supplemental educational services and local providers, so that these educators can act as a resource for parents" (p.5). The guidance also suggests that states may want to monitor parent or student satisfaction with services.

Regional Importance

In state needs assessment meetings held in late June 2008, McREL was asked by the leadership of two Central Region state departments of education, South Dakota and Missouri, to determine how the states in the region evaluate their SES providers: to describe their data collection and provide examples of instruments in use, and to describe the state SES contacts' perceptions of their evaluation processes, including issues that have emerged and/or problems that have been solved.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In response to the regional request, McREL reviewed the federal guidance provided to states on monitoring SES providers and developed the following three research questions:

1. What criteria do states have for provider performance; how do they assess provider performance; and what policies do they have for terminating a provider?

³ The Central Region includes the states of Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming.

⁴ The Central Region includes the states of Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming.

⁵ Local Educational Agencies

2. What system for gathering information do Central Region states use to evaluate providers?
3. What do state contacts report about their experience with the state's evaluation of providers?

Data Collection

To address the research questions, McREL collected data from SEAs on four monitoring requirements imposed by the U.S. Department of Education: 1) standards and techniques for monitoring quality; 2) the system for gathering information; 3) how providers are to assess academic progress; and 4) how an SEA terminates approval of providers (U.S. Department of Education, 2005; D-1 through D-4, pp 18-19). Additionally, in response to the direct request from SEAs for the study, we asked SEAs about their experience with monitoring and evaluating the program. These data were used to prepare state-level data compilations which were used in creating the current report.

Each SEA in the Central Region has designated a single state contact for their SES program. To address the original request for the study and obtain information on how each state in the Central Region monitors and evaluates SES providers, McREL conducted telephone interviews with each state agency SES contact person. State contacts were identified through the Center on Innovation & Improvement database (<http://www.centerii.org/centerIIPublic/criteria.aspx>). All interviewees were informed that this cross-state report would use state names, but that they would have an opportunity to review their state's information for accuracy. Only one state asked that specific data not be reported..

The interview protocol (Appendix A) was organized around the four federal monitoring requirements and SEAs' experiences in evaluating their programs. Each of the interviews was conducted by the same researcher. Given the emphasis on parent and school support, we asked about the *provider communications* with parents and schools, the provider's efforts to work with them (*provider collaboration*), and what data states collected on parent, school, and district *satisfaction with the provider services*.

Data Processing and Analysis

The interviewer recorded each state contact's responses to the interview questions. McREL then compiled a list of the evaluation instruments the state uses and noted, based on the original request, whether copies could be obtained and shared with the other states in the region. Next, both researchers reviewed and edited the recorded responses for completeness and accuracy for each state on a clean copy of the protocol. These documents became the seven individual state data compilations, which were organized in the same format as the interview protocol: the system for gathering data, data collected from the provider, other data used to evaluate/monitor providers, termination of approved provider, and overall perceptions of the state contact about the evaluation process used by the state. The primary purpose of the state-level data compilation was to confirm the information obtained in the phone interviews; however, in addition to a description of how the state evaluates providers, (the original impetus for this study), each includes a list of materials (i.e., evaluation instruments and sample letters) that the state has developed, along with

information on how to download copies of the materials from the state’s website. These state compilations were sent to each SEA contact to confirm the accuracy of the information presented. Revisions were made if the state contact indicated that they were necessary. These seven state-level data compilations were then used by the researchers to synthesize findings across the seven states.

FINDINGS⁶

The seven Central Region states have varying numbers of approved providers, eligible schools, and eligible students. Table 1 displays 2007 data for the number of state-approved providers, the number of qualified Title I schools, and the number of eligible students in those schools.

Table 1. Number of SES providers and eligible schools and students in the Central Region in 2007

	CO	KS	MO	NE	ND	SD	WY
#Approved providers	54	17	66	5	14	17	3
# Qualified schools	91	35	104	0	14	30	6
# Eligible students	35,435	6,344	32,181	0	554	5,500	1,116

Note. Data obtained from phone interviews with state SES contacts

To evaluate their providers, the seven states collect data from a variety of sources and on a range of topics. In some cases, states collect the data directly from the source (providers, parents, etc.); in others, states rely on reports from districts. Each SEA is required to monitor providers to determine whether they are increasing the academic achievement of students. The non-regulatory guidance suggests collecting provider data about parent and student satisfaction, student enrollment and attendance, frequency of progress reports to parents, and student achievement, either from their own assessments or from state achievement tests (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

Table 2 summarizes findings from the first research question, “what criteria do states have for provider performance; how do they assess provider performance; and what policies do they have for terminating a provider?” In order to examine the second research question, “what system for gathering information do Central Region states use to evaluate providers?,” the researchers noted the nature of each state’s system and, for cross-state analysis, determined whether or not each data point collected by any one state was also collected by the other states (see Tables 3 and 4). To answer the third research question, “what insights and issues do state contacts have regarding the state’s evaluation of providers?” researchers reviewed state contacts’ responses to six questions about their experience with SES provider monitoring and evaluation for similarities and differences.

⁶ All of the information in the Findings section is derived from the state contact interview data.

What criteria do states have for provider performance, how do they assess provider performance, and do they have a policy for terminating a provider?

In 2008, the U.S. Department of Education produced an interim report on state implementation of NCLB, which included Volume IV on SES. That report states that

As of 2004-2005, most states were working to develop and implement standards for the monitoring and evaluation of supplemental service providers; only a small number of states had statewide databases incorporating participation and achievement information that would permit rigorous evaluations of providers' effects. (p.xvi)

Although all seven states in the Central Region collect data to evaluate their providers, the criteria used to interpret the data are not always clear, nor are they consistent across states. All state contacts were asked about provider performance standards and their policies for terminating providers. Their responses are summarized in Table 2. Of the seven Central Region states, only South Dakota reported that they had established standards for providers and potential providers and posted them on their website.

In using the data from district reports or data collected directly by states, states assess provider performance in a variety of ways. For example, North Dakota has developed a Self Monitoring Guide for Providers that must be completed annually and is then reviewed by the SEA. If the Department of Public Instruction determines that it is necessary, SEA staff will make a site visit to the provider. South Dakota has hired a monitor to make loosely structured site visits to schools to monitor supplemental services programs. In the absence of performance standards, the remaining five states rely on assurances in the provider application and/or the contract to establish their expectations of the providers (criteria for performance). Reviewing provider compliance with these criteria varies; two states, Kansas and Wyoming, require providers to reapply every two years, and South Dakota holds a mandatory summer meeting of providers with districts to ensure that both understand and adhere to the program requirements.

Only one of the states in the Central Region, South Dakota, has a policy for terminating providers, although another state is working with their attorney to develop such a policy. No state has terminated a provider, and to date, in only one instance did a state permit a dissatisfied school to discontinue their relationship with a provider.

Table 2. State policies for monitoring SES providers

	CO	KS	MO	NE	ND	SD	WY
Performance Standards	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Termination Policy	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N

Note. Data obtained from phone interviews with state SES contacts

What system for gathering information do Central Region states use to evaluate providers?

Central Region states vary considerably in how they collect and use data to evaluate providers (see Tables 3 and 4). A detailed listing by state of instruments used, data sources, administering agencies, and the frequency with which data are used, is included in Appendix B.

The variables states collect vary. *Provider communication* includes letters, emails, telephone calls, and face-to-face encounters with both parents and schools. The frequency and content of communications are thought to influence student participation (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). *Provider collaboration*, working with parents and schools to determine aspects of the program, also has the potential to influence parent satisfaction. Perceptions of *satisfaction with provider services* and how often a provider reports students' progress are examples of data that the non-regulatory guidance suggests states could collect to assess *provider effectiveness* (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). For some states, these variables serve in the evaluation as leading indicators toward the intended outcome of improved student academic achievement. States operationalize these variables by asking a variety of questions, such as Are you happy with ____ Or are you satisfied with ____?, or simply by asking respondents to rate the variable on a five-point scale.

States in the Central Region, directly or through districts, collect data from parents, school principals, and site coordinators. They also collect student data from providers. As illustrated in Tables 3 and 4, not every state collects data from each group. For example, to date Colorado has relied entirely on student data to evaluate providers' performance. Missouri and Wyoming, on the other hand, have not included student results in their evaluations. Instead, Missouri has evaluated the effectiveness of the providers' communications and collaboration through a review of materials solicited from the provider. These materials include surveys of providers, parents, teachers, principals, and district coordinators. Missouri's Provider Questionnaire asks providers to describe the program, including the tutoring sessions and attendance, as well as the provider's communications with parents and schools. Missouri also asks providers to evaluate parent and school participation and to evaluate their own performance. The state then hires an outside evaluator to review the materials and prepare a report based on these data. Wyoming has distributed surveys to schools for parents and teachers to complete, but has had little success in getting responses; only one of the six Wyoming schools contacted in 2007 responded to the survey.

Table 3. Data sources and variables collected by Central Region states directly or from districts to evaluate SES providers

	CO	KS	MO	NE ⁷	ND	SD	WY
Data Collected from Parents							
Provider Collaboration	No parent	No par-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

⁷ Nebraska has had only one school eligible for SES and it has not yet provided services. Therefore, their system has not yet been used.

	CO	KS	MO	NE ⁷	ND	SD	WY
Provider Communication	survey	ent survey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Provider Effectiveness			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Data Collected from Parents							
Satisfaction with provider			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Data Collected from School Principal or Site Coordinator (for Wyoming - Teacher)							
Provider Collaboration	No school level survey	Y	Y	No school level survey	Y	N	Y
Provider Communication		Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Satisfaction with provider		Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Data Collected from Districts							
Provider Collaboration	No district survey	No district survey	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Provider Communication			Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Provider Effectiveness			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Satisfaction with provider			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Note. Data obtained from phone interviews with state SES contacts

Under NCLB, SEAs must “determine whether the services that providers offer to students are contributing to increasing the academic achievement of students.” (U.S. Department of Education, 2005, p. 18) As shown in Table 4, there is considerable variation in the SES-related student data collected from providers by states in the Central Region. Providers may administer pre- and post-tests to measure student achievement; report attendance in tutoring sessions; indicate the number of students who have completed the program (based on the provider definition); and/or indicate the number of students that have achieved individual goals set within the program. North and South Dakota collect data on all four of these categories; Colorado requires providers to enter data online on pre-post test results and attendance. Missouri and Wyoming, on the other hand, have not included student data in their evaluations in 2007. Kansas and Nebraska (in its evaluation plan) only collect data pertaining to students’ achievement of their goals.

As states move toward establishing systems that assign unique student identification numbers, it may be possible to more easily track the impact of SES providers on student achievement. Once student identification numbers are in place, for example, states and providers can gauge the impact of their services, for the students who receive services, by provider organization and by the nature and amount of service. Assessment data for participating students can be compared to assessment data for students who do not participate in SES, to rule out increases from growth in achievement over time rather than increases associated with provider services. Currently, the student data available are from pre- and post-tests administered by providers. These vary from provider to provider, and are not necessarily aligned with either classroom instruction or state standards.

Table 4. Student Data collected by provider and reported for individual students

	CO	KS	MO	NE	ND	SD	WY
--	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Pre/post tests	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Attendance	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
	CO	KS	MO	NE	ND	SD	WY
Completion of Program	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Achievement of Goals	N	Y*	N	Y	Y	Y*	N

Note. Data obtained from phone interviews with state SES contacts *Group percents only are collected.

The nature and size of states' evaluations are determined by the number of eligible schools and providers that states are required to monitor (See Table 1), but also by the state's ability and/or willingness to expend non-SES related resources toward the evaluation. Colorado and Missouri, which have more than 50 approved providers and about 100 schools participating in the SES program, have used an outside evaluator to assist with the program evaluation. In 2007, Colorado hired an outside evaluator to analyze student achievement data from the state test to evaluate providers. As previously noted, Missouri hired an outside evaluator to review their evaluation data. The South Dakota Department of Education, with fewer providers and schools, has hired a monitor to make on-site visits, and plans to hire a second monitor, in order to visit all 30 of their implementing schools. North Dakota, with 14 schools and 14 providers, administers a comprehensive evaluation system in which they collect all of the data and documents used in the delivery of services, which they then use to assess each provider's performance.

What do state contacts report about their experience with the state's evaluation of providers?

This research question addresses the regional interest in what issues other states are encountering and how they are addressing them. In order to provide some structure to state contacts' responses to this particular research question, we asked six specific questions, as follows:

In your perception of your state's SES program,

1. Are students gaining?;
2. What has worked well?;
3. What has *not* worked well?;
4. What should the state have done differently?;
5. What would you wish the state to have done?
6. What would you not do again?

In addition, we asked a final, open-ended question: "Is there anything else I should know?"

Because Nebraska has not yet implemented their evaluation, their state contact was not able to respond to these questions.

No state had a data report in 2007 to indicate whether or not students made achievement gains by participating in the SES program. Two of the six state contacts for this question indicated that it

was difficult to know whether or not students were making gains. Of the remaining four contacts, the South Dakota contact relayed anecdotal reports from schools and parents that indicated that students were making gains. The Wyoming contact indicated that students were not completing the program, which in the opinion of that contact would make progress unlikely. The North Dakota contact believed that students should make gains if they participate in services; and the Kansas contact indicated that the extra assistance with academics should help students increase their achievement. This contact also felt that a locally based provider from within the district was more successful than a provider from out of the district's area.

Regarding what worked well, Kansas and Missouri both reported that it is too early to say. The remaining four states shared specific examples of processes or actions that had worked well in conducting their evaluations: attaching the reporting requirement to a regularly received report; requiring providers to reapply every two years; using an online data entry system to improve data retrieval; holding an SES conference for districts and providers annually and allowing the two groups to meet; using a monitor to conduct on-site visits; and using resources such as PIRC (Parent Information Research Center) to help develop parent materials.

When asked what did *not* go well, three of the six contacts noted a lack of adequate staffing and resources at the state level. Two contacts indicated that there was not enough staff time allocated to monitor the program effectively; the third indicated that staffing was shared such that five different persons worked on the program, with no consistency from one to the next. The North Dakota contact mentioned the difficulty in starting from scratch to develop the evaluation aspect of the program, and the South Dakota contact expressed disappointment that districts had not submitted parent materials for review, which in the contact's view would have made them more effective. The Colorado state contact pointed out that the lack of state assessment data for students in the lower grades meant that there were no data available for 50% of the participating students.

Things to do differently in the future include getting key materials out earlier; developing policies to guide decision making; better on-site monitoring at the school level; and having resources to allocate more staff time to the program. Other suggestions included holding a required provider meeting to clarify program rules and to create an online reporting system.

No state contact reported full confidence in the evaluation data and process currently in place, but all reported that they are considering ways to improve their evaluation processes. Three states reported expanding the use of an outside evaluator to obtain more reliable evaluation data. No state has yet developed a report on the supplemental services program that includes the information needed to make decisions about how to improve the program. Nonetheless, most are seeking ways to improve how they evaluate their providers, and all have been willing to make their instruments available to other states.

LIMITATIONS

A limitation of this study is that interviews were conducted with a single contact person in each of the seven states. The report does not include the opinions of other state-level staff, district ad-

ministrators, providers, school personnel, parents or students. Further, given that none of the state contacts are devoted full-time to the program, the contacts surveyed for this study may have been limited in their ability to know all dimensions of the program. Although every effort has been made to cross-check the information received from the state contacts, this report is primarily a descriptive study of the opinions and perceptions of state SES contacts.

DISCUSSION

The seven states in the Central Region vary in the scale and scope of their SES programs. The number of approved providers and eligible schools ranges from a low of three providers and six qualified schools in Wyoming⁸ to a high of 66 providers and 104 qualified schools in Missouri. This influences the scope of the evaluations that they need and are able to conduct.

States are required to develop standards for monitoring and evaluating providers. Only one state, South Dakota, has standards in place. The others rely on criteria that are found in the provider application, which defines the role and expectations of the provider. Typically, adherence to the provider contract becomes a substitute for criteria in evaluating provider performance. South Dakota is the only state with a provider termination policy.

There are commonalities across the region in the systems states use for gathering evaluation data about SES providers. Basing their evaluations on the non-regulatory guidance has generally resulted in states collecting variables that are similar in name, although they often use different sources for the data. Providers are required to report student progress to the state; three states, Colorado and North and South Dakota received progress data from providers on provider administered tests as well as student attendance at services. Kansas only received data on student achievement of goals, and two states, Missouri and Wyoming, had not yet received student data from providers in 2007.

State contacts were primarily concerned that their states did not have sufficient staffing to adequately monitor and evaluate the providers, but suggested specific aspects of evaluation and monitoring that they believed worked well in their states.

Six of the states (all but Nebraska, which has an evaluation process in place but did not identify any schools qualified to receive SES in 2007) have made or are making changes to better evaluate the performance and impact of their SES providers.

⁸ There are five providers, but no eligible schools, in Nebraska.

REFERENCES

- Barley, Z.A. & Wegner, S. K. (2007) *Access to supplemental educational services in the Central Region states* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No.007). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of education Sciences, national Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central.
- Government Accountability Office (2006, August). No Child Left Behind Act: Education Actions Needed to Improve Local Implementation and State Evaluation of Supplemental Education Services, Report # GA-06-758, Retrieved August 23, 2006 from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06758.pdf#search=%22GAO%20report%20Supplemental%20educational%20services%22>
- U.S. Department of Education (2005) Supplemental Educational Services: Non-Regulatory guidance, Washington, DC Available on the Department of Education Web site: www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/suppsucsguid.doc
- U.S. Department of Education (2008) Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, policy and Program Studies Service, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume IV – Title I School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services: Interim Report*, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX A: PROTOCOL FOR STATE CONTACT INTERVIEWS

Hello. My name is _____ and I am calling on behalf on McREL. Two neighboring states have asked if we could learn from each of the seven states in the region how they are handling the evaluation of SES providers required in the guidance related to Supplemental Educational Services. Would you be willing to give me 20 to 30 minutes of your time to answer questions about your state’s evaluation process? I will share the results of these interviews with you and any examples or useful tips I learn in the process so that you may verify that our discussions were accurate. Due to an imposed deadline for the completion of this report, I will get the interview notes back to you within one day of the interview so that you can have two days to review and get the get back to me with your approval of the notes which I took during our conversation.

The questions are in the four areas of the federal guidance that relate to Monitoring providers: 1) the system for gathering information, 2) standards and techniques for monitoring quality, performance, and effectiveness of the services, 3) how providers are required to demonstrate student progress, and 4) how approval of a provider could be terminated. I am also interested in your experience with evaluation/monitoring and what you have learned as a state contact.

I reviewed the national database maintained at the Center for Innovation and Improvement for information you have submitted in the past about Provider Evaluation. I have retrieved the materials from those links so we can refer to them as needed.

They are listed below:

Materials on State Monitoring and Evaluation of SES from the Center on Innovation & Improvement Database: State’s Response Retrieved July 20, 2008 from:

<http://www.centerii.org/centerIIPublic/criteria.aspx>

I. System for gathering information:

- First, I would like to know if your state has established a set of standards which were developed for monitoring and evaluating the SES provider. Are you willing to share this document?
- Please briefly describe how your state monitors/evaluates the providers. Probe for all kinds of data collection – from whom about what. Ask for copies of instruments if willing. (McREL will not share them if state prefers – but we need them to categorize variables covered and sources)
- If an outside consultant is utilized to gather data, please ask permission to discuss this survey with them if needed.

Name of Outside Consultant _____ Phone Number: _____
Contact Person _____

Data Collection Event:	Purpose:	Source of data	Who collects:	Timing/frequency	Instrumentation/Method	How is it used in reports
<i>Example:</i> Parent satisfaction survey	Obtain parent evaluation of provider	Parents of enrolled students	School	Annually	12 item survey using 5 point likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree	Sole source of data for parent evaluation section.
#1						
#2						
Etc.						

Note: When the purpose (for a particular data collection event) is to evaluate student progress and the provider is the collector, go to III, otherwise continue with II.

Let's use the Data Collection Events from above and begin to clarify the specific types of data that are obtained in each collection event. (Review and get clarification on all of the data they have to use in evaluating and ask for the topics covered in those data Underneath each data collection column, probe for types of data that are obtained and in what format (i.e. how are respondents selected (entire population or sample), perception data based on likert scales (etc)).

Assessing the variables in each data collection event?	Data Collection #1____	Data Collection #2____	Data Collection #3____	Data Collection #4____	Data Collection #5_
Student Achievement					
Student Achievement pre/post as a group (grade level)					
Achievement pre/post for individual students					
Student Attendance					
% students who achieved goals					
% students who made progress					
% students who showed no improvement					
No. who complete program					

Special Ed/LEP Students					
# SpEd students served					
#LEP /ELL students served					
Provides services to LEP/ELL students					
Provides services to Spec Ed students					
Local and State Standards					
Ensures the curriculum and instruction was consistent with classroom instructional program					
Ensures the curriculum and instruction was consistent with district's instructional program					
Ensures the curriculum and instruction was consistent with state standards					
Quality of Instruction/Instructors Provided					
Provider works collaboratively with school and parent					
Overall Quality of Instruction in the Program					
Overall Quality of Instructors utilized by Providers					
Ensures safety measures were built into the program					
Communication					
Provider utilizes Effective Communication skills					
Provider communicates frequently regarding student achievement					
Provider Overall					
Utilizes research based programming					

Provider Overall					
Overall Effectiveness of Program					
Provider Fulfills Contractual obligations					
Overall Satisfaction with Program					

II. Standards and techniques for monitoring quality, performance, and effectiveness of the services.

...

	How are respondents selected?	What methods are utilized to obtain responses from this group	What is your average response rate from this group	How are the data recorded?	How are the data filed?	Do you combine data from another source? Which?	How then do you weight these data relative to other sources?
Sample: Parent Satisfaction Survey	All parents of enrolled students	Survey mailed to homes, follow up telephone call	75%	Summed by hand	Summary kept in provider file	NA	NA
#1							
#2							
#3							

III. How providers are required to demonstrate student progress:

- Ask these questions directly

Specific Questions	Specific Answers	General Comments
Do you require providers to report to you or to the district?		
What do you require Providers to demonstrate?		
*What testing instruments do they use or are they required to use?		
What are the schedules for data collection from the provider?		
Do you require them to only report a sample of the population or the entire population?		
What are your response rates like from the providers?		

Specific Questions	Specific Answers	General Comments
Do you make a report to the districts, etc regarding the evaluation of the providers?		

*Examples: Provider-made tests, nationally normed tests, school developed tests, state-developed tests

IV. Termination of Approved Provider.

Question	Answer
Have you terminated a provider for non-performance?	
On what basis did you determine termination? Are there policies in place for such an action? Could I obtain a copy of them?	
If you have not terminated a provider yet, how would you make such a determination? Are there policies in place for such an action? Could I obtain a copy of them?	

V. I am also interested in your overall experience with evaluation/monitoring and what you have learned as a state contact.

Open ended.

Potential Probes:	Answers
1. Do you feel that Students have gained in knowledge after exposure to the SES tutoring program?	
2. What can you report that has worked very well in the process of monitoring and evaluation of SES providers?	
3. What can you report that has not worked well in the process of monitoring and evaluation of SES Providers?	
4. Things that you feel the state should have done with the SES tutoring program.	
5. Things you wish the state would have done with the SES tutoring program.	
6. Things that you don't think you will do again related to the SES tutoring program.	
7. Anything else that you would like to discuss that I have not asked?	

VI. Conclusion Thank you for the interview today. I will be sending you a copy of my notes (by email) for you to confirm our conversation in the next 48 hours. I would like to request that you return the document with your approval within 48 hours of receiving the notes. I apologize for the short turnaround, but it is necessary to meet the deadlines for this report, which will be made available to all states in the McREL region: Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming.

Copies of documents that the state has agreed to share

Name of Document	Willing to share with States and McREL	Willing to share with McREL only	Available on the Website	State contact will email

APPENDIX B

Summary of Data Collected in Central Region States during the 2007-2008 School Year

	Colorado		Missouri		North Dakota		South Dakota		Wyoming		Kansas	
	Who Collects?	Frequency	Who Collects?	Frequency	Who Collects?	Frequency	Who Collects?	Frequency	Who Collects?	Frequency	Who Collects?	Frequency
District Survey	Not Collected	NA	Consultant sends to District Coordinators—completed online	A	State collects information from district/school on Annual Program Improvement Report	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state.	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state. Note: No district had responded to this in 07-08	A	State sends surveys to district	A
School Survey	Not Collected	NA	Consultant sends to School principals or site coordinators—survey completed online	A	State collects information from district/school on Annual Program Improvement Report	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state	A	Not Collected	NA	Not Collected	NA
Classroom Teacher Survey	Not Collected	NA	Consultant sends to classroom teacher and they complete the survey online for each provider	A	Not Collected	NA	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state.	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state.	A	Not Collected	NA
Parent Survey	Not Collected	NA	Consultant sends paper copies to the District Coordinator who then gives them to school principals who are to distribute them to the students to take home. School collects them and sends back via US mail.	A	State sends forms to district-district collects and sends back to the state	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state..	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state.	A	Not Collected	NA

	Colorado		Missouri		North Dakota		South Dakota		Wyoming		Kansas	
Provider Survey	Provider inputs data on a state developed online database	M	Consultant sends to Providers who complete the survey online	A	State sends Provider Annual Report to district-district collects and sends back to state State sends Self – Monitoring Guide directly to Provider and collects annually	A	State gives to the district to administer. District is returns to the state. The state also has a survey that is collected from the tutors for the Providers	A	<i>State Plans to collect information directly from Provider—had not completed this task as of 07-08</i>	A	State sends surveys to Provider	A
State Coordinator	Not Collected	NA	Consultant sends State Coordinator the survey to be completed online	A	Not Collected	NA	Not Collected	NA	Not Collected	NA	Not Collected	NA
Pre/Post Test Results	Provider	M	Not Collected	NA	Provider	A	State gives to district-district collects from Provider and then districts return to state	A	<i>State Plans to collect information directly from Provider—had not completed this task as of 07-08</i>	A	Not Collected	NA
Student Attendance	Provider	M	Not Collected	NA	Provider	A	State gives to district-district collects from Provider and then districts return to state	A	<i>State Plans to collect information directly from Provider—had not completed this task as of 07-08</i>	A	Not Collected	NA
% / No. of students who achieve goals	Provider	M	Not Collected	NA	Provider	A	State gives to district-district collects from Provider and then districts return to state	A	<i>State Plans to collect information directly from Provider—had not completed this task as of 07-08</i>	A	Provider	A
Who Analyzes Data?	Outside Consultant: OMNI Evaluation in Denver CO		CREP (Center for Research and Educational Policy) University of Memphis		State		Institute for Educational leadership and Evaluation in Rapid City, SD.		State		State	

Note: Frequency: M = Monthly, A=Annually. Source: Phone Interviews with State Contacts during the fall of 2008-state contacts based all answers on the 2007-2008 school year