



**ALBUQUERQUE  
PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**Supplemental Education  
Services:  
The Impact on Student  
Achievement  
2006-2007**

Ranjana Damle, Ph.D  
November 2008



# ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## BOARD OF EDUCATION

MARY LEE MARTIN  
President

BERNA FACIO  
Vice President

DOLORES GRIEGO  
Secretary

JON BARELA  
Instructional Policy Chair

PAULA MAES  
District Relations Chair

ROBERT D. LUCERO  
Finance/Audit Chair

MARTIN R. ESQUIVEL  
Capital Outlay Chair

## SUPERINTENDENT WINSTON BROOKS

LINDA SINK  
Chief Academic Officer

BRAD WINTER  
Chief Operations Officer

RUBY ETHRIDGE  
Associate Superintendent

DIANE KERSCHEN  
Associate Superintendent

RAQUEL REEDY  
Associate Superintendent

EDUARDO SOTO  
Associate Superintendent

## INSTRUCTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Rose-Ann McKernan, Executive Director

### **Research, Deployment & Accountability**

Thomas Genné, Director

6400 Uptown Blvd. NE (400 EAST)

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110

(505) 872-6870

[www.rda.aps.edu](http://www.rda.aps.edu)

# **Supplemental Education Services: The Impact on Student Achievement 2006-2007**

## **Executive Summary**

The Title I Supplemental Education Services (SES) program signifies the expanded parental choice and greater school accountability under NCLB, the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. All low-income students in Title I schools that have not met AYP goals in three consecutive years are eligible for free tutoring in reading and math. The local educational agency (LEA) is authorized to prioritize services to the lowest achieving eligible students to counter the funding limitation.

APS Title I budgeted \$4,407,490 for the SES 2006-2007 program, although incurred \$2,031,133 in actual costs. There were 24 schools in the program and 10 SES providers that served about 1760 students with after-school tutoring in reading and/or math.

This report focused on two questions: Did the SES tutoring improve student achievement? And, did the SES providers significantly differ in their impact on student achievement? This study compared the achievement of students receiving SES tutoring with their peers in the same schools. The student achievement was measured by the outcomes on the New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (SBA) and Assess2Learn (A2L).

### ***Findings***

- The information from the 2006-2007 school year incorporated in this study indicated that despite a substantial budget and infrastructure, the SES program had a very limited impact on student achievement.
- There was little evidence of difference across providers in terms of student outcomes.
- The school-level analysis showed that the SES students fared about the same as their school counterparts and that there was a very modest variability in student achievement across schools, suggesting that the SES tutoring had little or no effect over and above the effect of the school instructional programs.
- APS students' participation rate was slightly lower than the national SES participation rate.

### ***Recommendations for Program Improvement***

The NCLB directive dictates a sizable budget and accompanying bureaucracy for SES. However, this study revealed that the SES program at APS contributed very little to student achievement and, hence, did not improve the schools' odds of meeting the AYP targets. If more schools fail to meet AYP and a larger number of eligible students participate in the SES program, a lower per pupil allocation will result in fewer hours of tutoring. To accrue benefits commensurate with the total cost, NMPED and APS may consider intensifying the SES program perhaps with better oversight of the providers.

- APS may lobby NMPED to provide and enforce guidelines regarding teacher-vendor-parent collaboration to set goals and accomplish a greater focus for student progress.
- APS might work with individual SES providers to ensure collaboration among the teachers, SES tutors, and parents to make the services aligned and focused for enhanced benefits to the

students. A new grant within Curriculum and Assessment and School and Community Partnerships is designed to build and support their collaboration.

- This report recommends that NMPED and APS collaboratively ensure that the SES program aligns with the State standards and APS instructional programs.
- APS may also lobby for rigorous standards for the approval of vendors and their elimination if they do not measure up to the promise and expectation.
- Since only a fraction of the eligible students participate, it may be in APS' interest to survey parents about the reasons they elected not to participate in the SES program.
- As a large urban school district, APS has opportunities to communicate with organizations such as the Council of Great City Schools about NCLB re-authorization. Taking the position of improving accountability and more effective use of the funding would be justified because of the significant portion of Title I funds dedicated to the SES program and the minimum impact of the services.

## **Supplemental Education Services: The Impact on Student Achievement 2006-2007**

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 mandates that when schools receiving Title I Part A funds fail to make AYP for three or more years, the LEA must arrange to provide supplemental educational services (SES) to low-income students attending those schools.<sup>1</sup> These services must be high quality, research-based, and to be provided outside the school day. These services may include tutoring or other academic enrichment activities that are designed to help students meet the proficiency standards of their State. The LEA is authorized to prioritize services to the lowest-achieving eligible students. The SES provision is an example of expanded parental choice under the NCLB, the 2001 authorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The SES also exemplifies a greater focus on disadvantaged students, NCLB's intended constituents.

The SES service providers may consist of a wide range of for-profit and non-profit organizations and the local educational agencies (LEAs) themselves. The providers must offer programs that are consistent with the LEA's instructional programs and measure up to the academic standards of the State. The State educational agencies (SEAs) are required to use objective criteria to select the SES providers and to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the programs. The SEAs are required to withdraw their approval of the providers that fail to contribute to the achievement of the students for two consecutive years.

The SES provision of NCLB places responsibility on LEAs to notify parents of their rights to supplemental education and to monitor the programs. Once parents choose an SES provider from the list provided to them by the LEA, the LEA creates a contractual agreement between the parent and the tutoring company to academically support the student to meet the academic standards set by the State.

Evaluations reveal that the report card is mixed for SES programs. The frequent findings in many States and school districts included the following:<sup>2</sup>

- Only a small percentage of eligible families are taking advantage of the free tutoring.
- Quality of tutoring programs or companies is varied.
- Results are mixed regarding student outcomes.

The June 2007 report from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) found that students served by SES scored better on math and reading in the "first year and even better in the second and subsequent years."<sup>3</sup> This study was based on nine large, urban school districts. However, other studies found that student outcomes were at best very modest. Chicago Public Schools SES evaluation revealed that students farthest behind gained most and students who completed the program made more gains on standardized math and reading tests than the eligible students who did not receive SES. New Mexico Public Education Department (2005) reported gains in SBA

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 1116 (e) – Supplementary Education Services in Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency and School Improvement of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Press Reports regarding the SES programs in Michigan (February 2007), South Carolina (September 2008), Los Angeles, Pittsburg, and Milwaukee (March 2008), and New Mexico (January 2006).

<sup>3</sup> The Rand Report 2007

scores for students in SES program, although these gains cannot be attributed to tutoring without a comparison group. On the other hand, Los Angeles Unified School District (2007) reported statistically significant, “yet substantively negligible” performance gain on ITBS for their students in SES tutoring over those who applied but did not receive services.<sup>4</sup> Minneapolis Public Schools (2007) reported no difference in test scores between the SES-served students and those eligible students who did not receive SES services. Finally, a statewide evaluation of SES in Indiana (2006) revealed little difference between the SES and non-SES students’ test scores in math and English/language arts.

### **Title I SES Program in Albuquerque Public Schools**

The SES administrators sent letters at the beginning of the school year to all eligible students’ families informing them of their eligibility to receive free additional academic support for their students. Students from low-income families in 24 schools in APS received SES tutoring in 2006-2007 from the vendors chosen by their families.<sup>5</sup> The Title I SES program included 11 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, and 2 high schools. A total of 10 NMPED-approved SES providers<sup>6</sup> offered tutoring to students in grades K-12. About 1,764 students stayed in the program and received services. APS Title I SES program was able to offer services to all those who applied without prioritizing. The SES program incurred the actual cost of \$2,031,133<sup>7</sup> although \$4,407,490 was budgeted for SES/NCLB compliance.<sup>8</sup>

Approximately 14,600 students were eligible and offered SES service in 2006-2007.<sup>9</sup> However, 1764 students actually received SES services for a participation rate of 12.1%. National average for the year 2005-2006 was 14%. Approximately 1,596 students received services in both reading and math, 138 received tutoring in reading only, and 26 students received tutoring only in math. The information on the type of service was not available for four students.

### **Research Questions**

The purpose of the study was to gauge the impact of SES tutoring on student achievement. The study focused on the following research questions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Rickles and Barnhart (2007; p.4) quoted in the Education Industry Association Report (2007; p.9).

<sup>5</sup> The SES service information provided by the Title I Office at APS.

<sup>6</sup> NCLB 1116 (e) (4-D) NCLB mandates that the SES providers are approved by the State agency based on rigorous criteria. The Law also requires that the providers be removed from the list if the students they tutor do not make progress in two consecutive years.

<sup>7</sup> LEAs are required to spend 20% of their Title I Part A allocation for school choice and SES combined, of which at least 5% should be spent on SES. LEAs may spend other federal, state or local school improvement funds for SES in addition to the Title I Part A allocation. See *No Child Left Behind, Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, June 13, 2005).

<sup>8</sup> In school year 2006-2007, Title I of NCLB-A—the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)—provided \$12.7 billion in federal funds to more than 50,000 public schools nationwide in order to improve the education of low-income students (GAO-07-738T 2007).

<sup>9</sup> This is the total number of students receiving free or reduced priced meals in 24 APS schools that have not met AYP in three or more years. Under the NCLB legislation, the LEA is required to offer SES services to income-eligible students in these schools.

1. Did the students receiving SES after-school tutoring exhibit higher academic achievement compared to their peers in the same schools?
2. Did the SES providers differ in their impact on the achievement of the students they served?

While this study was designed to address these specific questions, other comparisons deemed important were included in the analysis. A comparison of SES and non-SES students' gains within each program school and of the average SES student gains across program schools provided a preliminary look at the effect of school instructional programs along with SES tutoring on student outcomes. The study also explored the impact of SES across grade levels.

### **Methods**

The SES program impact on student achievement is tricky to measure because we cannot with certainty ascribe the change in achievement to SES tutoring without an experimental design which allows controlling for other known or unknown factors. The study used two strategies to improve validity in measuring the impact of SES on student achievement.

- A. The analytical framework was based on two comparison groups: students receiving SES tutoring (the treatment group) and their peers that did not receive SES (the comparison group). This design can be considered a non-experimental, ex post facto control group design.
- B. Since the students whose families chose SES tutoring were likely to be systematically different from those who did not opt for SES, the study minimized the difference between the two groups by comparing gains rather than static scores for the year of service (the post-test). This method essentially compared students to themselves where the initial scores worked as a pretest that controlled for extraneous effects or unknown factors that might account for student performance.

Student achievement was measured by the gains on New Mexico standards based assessment (SBA) and APS short-cycle assessment Assess2Learn (A2L). The two comparison groups, students receiving SES tutoring (the treatment group) and their peers (the comparison group), and student achievement were defined as follows:

1. The treatment group consisted of students in 24 schools in the SES program that opted to receive SES tutoring.
2. The comparison group came from the 24 schools in the SES program and consisted of students not receiving SES services.
3. Student achievement was defined as gains on SBA and A2L:
  - a. The gains on SBA were the differences between the students' scale scores and performance levels in reading and math as measured by the New Mexico SBA 2007 and SBA 2006.
  - b. The gains on A2L were the difference between the students' performance on reading and math in the Fall and Spring 2007 administrations.

4. To make the two groups slightly more comparable, much of the analysis included only those students in both the treatment and comparison groups who were not proficient in the 2006 administration of SBA or not proficient on the Fall administration of A2L.
5. Since students in SES received tutoring in math, reading, or both, only students who received math instruction were selected for analysis of math gains, and ones who received reading instruction were selected for the analysis of reading gains.

There were a total of 760 SES students and 7,908 non-SES students with the gain scores in the SBA file for the 24 SES program schools. These were the students who had scores in math, reading, or both, for the 2006 and 2007 SBA. These students attended 11 elementary, 11 middle, and 2 high schools in the program.

There were 22 schools in the A2L file, 11 elementary and 11 middle schools. There were a total of 1003 SES students and 8,185 non-SES students with the gain scores in math and/or reading. These students had scores on the Fall as well as Spring administrations of A2L testing in 2006-2007 school year.

***Demographics and other Descriptive Information***

As Tables 1 and 2 show, a greater percentage of students in the SES program was Hispanic and low-income than their comparison group counterparts in the in the 24 schools. Almost half the students received between 21 and 30 hours of service. While the mean was 20.5 hours, the range was from one hour to 48 hours of service.

**Table 1 Ethnicity 2006-2007**

	<b>Percentage of Students in SES Program*</b>	<b>Percentage of Peers in 24 SES Schools</b>	<b>District Percentage</b>
African American	1.5	3.1	4.0
Asian	0.1	0.9	2.5
Caucasian	6.6	10.4	33.0
Hispanic	89.8	81.0	55.4
Native American	2.1	4.7	5.1

\* Information about ethnicity was missing for 11.8% of the SES students.

**Table 2 Free of Reduced priced Meal Eligibility (FRPM) Rates 2006-2007**

	<b>Percentage of Students in SES Program</b>	<b>Percentage of Peers in 24 SES Schools</b>	<b>District Percentage</b>
Free or Reduced	89.0	77.0	50.9
No	11.0	23.0	49.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 3 Hours of Services Received**

<b>Total Hours of Service</b>	<b>Number of Students Served</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Served</b>
1 – 10	330	18.7
11 - 20	357	20.2
21 - 30	813	46.1
30 - 48	264	15.1
	1764	100

A total number of 10 State-approved vendors provided SES services. Each school was served by multiple SES providers. Students in grades K through 12 received SES services.

**Table 4 SES providers and number of students in their tutoring programs\***

<b>SES Providers</b>	<b>Number of Students Served</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Served</b>
A+ Tutoring - La Promesa Early Learning Center	189	10.7
Advantage Tutoring Services	106	6.1
Apex Learning (Parent Co.: Apex Education)	6	0.3
ATF Teacher Tutoring Services	252	14.3
Club Z! New Mexico	279	15.8
CompatibleLand Inc.	63	3.6
Education Station	91	5.2
eProgress Academy	26	1.5
RGEC Inc Rio Grande Educational Collaborative	490	27.8
YDI (Youth Development Inc.)	262	14.8
Total	1764	100.0

\*This information came from the SES/Title I Office at APS.

**Table 5 SES Providers and Student Grades**

<b>SES Providers by Grade 2006-2007</b>														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
A+Tutoring - La Promesa Early Learning Center	9	22	17	25	20	15	37	18	15	8	3	0		189
Advantage Tutoring Services	8	8	7	17	8	11	12	9	11	14	1	0		107
Apex Learning (Parent Co.: Apex Education)	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0		0		6
ATF Teacher Tutoring Services	24	39	44	44	45	56	0	0	0	0		0		252
Club Z! New Mexico	19	15	36	45	43	39	23	25	23	9		1	1	279
CompatibleLand Inc.			4	7	7	13	12	12	5	2		0	1	63
Education Station	7	7	7	5	7	6	15	4	18	12	3	0		91
eProgress Academy	1	2	1	5	1	6	5	2	0	3		0		26
RGEC Inc Rio Grande Educational Collaborative	15	54	50	56	59	59	73	56	57	2	2	4	3	490
YDI (Youth Development Inc.)	10	13	11	28	32	18	42	54	51	1	2	0		262
	95	161	178	234	222	223	219	180	180	51	11	5	5	1764

## Results

### *The Analysis of Student Achievement on New Mexico SBA*

#### *Comparison of Gains for All SES-served Students and their Peers*

The analysis of gains on SBA scale scores from 2006 to 2007 showed mixed results. When all students in SES programs were compared to their peers in the 24 schools, there was a statistically significant but modest gain for SES students in reading and math. However, the strength of the relationship or the effect size was small as the difference in the scale scores was about 5 point in reading and less than 2 points in math. In other words, the impact of the program was negligible (Table 6).

**Table 6 All Students - Analysis of Mean Scale Score Gains**

	<b>All SES Students</b>	<b>All Peers</b>	<b>ANOVA</b>	<b>Strength or substantiveness of the program impact</b>
Reading	14.52 (N=740)	9.47 (N=7832)	F=30.042 P<.000	Negligible
Math	18.31 (N=757)	16.53 (N=7887)	F=5.121 P<.024	Negligible

#### *Comparison of Gains for the Students Non-Proficient in 2006*

When gains for only the non-proficient students were examined, there was a statistically significant difference in gains for SES students in math and reading when compared to their peers (Table 7). However, the difference in the gains was extremely modest. The SES students scored on average 3.88 points in reading and 2.73 points in math more than their peers. A scale score difference of 3-4 points is a negligible gain.

**Table 7 Students Not Proficient on SBA 2006 - Analysis of Mean Scale Score Gains**

	<b>Non-proficient SES</b>	<b>Non-proficient peers</b>	<b>ANOVA</b>	<b>Strength or substantiveness of the program impact</b>
Reading	17.32 (537)	13.44 (N=4869)	F=13.156 P<.000	Negligible
Math	20.91 (N=636)	18.18 (N=6322)	F=10.688 P<.001	Negligible

***Comparison of Gains in Proficiency***

The study also explored if the non-proficient students in SES programs became proficient in reading or math in 2007 at a greater rate than their peers who were not tutored. As Table 8 shows, there was no difference on SBA for math, and the gain in reading proficiency in fact favored the students who did not receive SES tutoring.

**Table 8 Gains in the Proportion of Proficient Students**

Non-Proficient in 2006	Percent Achieved Proficiency in 2007	
	SES	Non-SES
Reading	14.5	18.6
Math	7.4	7.4

***Other Significant Findings***

- Hours of service and achievement: There was no correlation between the hours of service and the gains on math or reading on SBA.
- Student outcomes by provider: There were no statistically significant differences in SES students’ gains in reading or math across providers. The average scores for providers clustered around the group average while one or two providers showed very low or no gains.

While the gains were not statistically or educationally significant, non-proficient students appeared to make slightly more scale score points on average than did the ‘all-students’ category which included proficient students who participated in tutoring.

**Table 9 Average Student Gains Across Providers**

Tutored in		Greatest Change	Least Change	Average Gain
Reading	All Students	17.89	-1.10	14.52
	No-Proficient Students	20.02	-4.50	17.32
Math	All Students	22.05	5	18.31
	No-Proficient Students	27.30	14.25	20.91

- School impact: A comparison of SES and non-SES students within their schools showed no statistically significant differences in achievement on SBA for most schools. Moreover, there was a finding of a very modest, statistically significant relationship between schools and average gains suggesting that student achievement varied across schools. These findings indicate that the impact of SES tutoring on student achievement over and above that of the school programs was insignificant.

*Comparison within schools - Reading*

- Ten (10) schools showed similar results for the non-proficient SES and non-SES Students for SBA reading.
- The SES students performed slightly better (5 to 12 points) than their peers in a total of 7 schools - 4 out of 11 elementary schools, 2 out of 11 middle schools, 1 out of 2 high schools. The positive relationship was statistically significant for two schools.
- The non-SES students indicated slightly better reading gains when compared to the SES students in 7 schools.

*Comparison within schools - Math*

- SES students in elementary schools tended to show more gains in math than their peer groups when compared to the middle schools.
- In 6 elementary schools, non-proficient SES students performed slightly better in math than their peers while in 5 others, the two groups performed about the same.
- In math, the SES and non-SES students performed about the same in 7 out of 11 middle schools while the non-SES students made better math gains than their SES counterparts in 2 middle schools.
- In 2 middle schools, non-proficient SES students performed better than their peers and the differences were small but statistically significant.

*Comparison across schools*

- There was a weak but statistically significant relationship between the mean reading and math gains and the schools the students attended. In other words, student gains modestly varied by school suggesting a small school effect on student gains. The mean reading gains for the non-proficient students ranged from -10 to 34 points and math gains ranged from 7 to 33 points across schools.

While all students received instruction during a regular school day, the students in the SES accessed additional instruction in the after-school SES tutoring. If SES students fared better than their non-SES peers, one reason could be their SES participation. If the SES students and their peers fared about the same, or if the non-SES students performed better, then one could argue that the school impact is stronger than the impact of SES. The findings presented above suggest there is little or no impact of SES over and above the efficacy of the school programs in schools.

- Student achievement across grades: The study explored if the tutoring services had diverse impact at different grade levels.

- When non-proficient SES students receiving math tutoring were compared to their peers in grades 4<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup>, there was a small but statistically significant relationship for grades 4<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>. In other words, in grades 4<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, the students in SES math tutoring scored on average over 7 points more than their same-grade peers.
- There was no difference across grades in reading gains for students who received tutoring in reading when compared to their peers.

***The Analysis of Student Achievement on A2L***

The study compared students in the SES reading and math tutoring to their peers to track gains made between the Fall and Spring administrations of A2L. The analysis of reading and math gains showed that there was no difference between the two groups. In fact, when only the non-proficient students were selected, the comparison group showed slightly better gains than the SES students suggesting that the school programs played a stronger role in student gains than the SES tutoring.

***Comparison of Gains for All SES-served Students and their Peers***

When students with all proficiency levels were included in the comparison, there was no difference in the students’ gains in A2L reading scores between the SES participants and their counterparts. In math, the results showed that the SES students gained a point more than their counterparts in the Spring A2L, a statistically significant but weak relationship.

**Table 10 All Students - Analysis of Mean Score Gains**

	<b>All SES Students</b>	<b>All Peers</b>	<b>ANOVA</b>	<b>Is the difference statistically significant?</b>
Reading	4.47 (N=897)	4.72 (N=7242)	F=0.198 P<.656	No
Math	8.76 (N=950)	7.75 (N=7710)	F=5.220 P<.022	Yes, but it is a weak relationship.

***Comparison of Gains for the Students Non-Proficient in 2006***

When only the students non-proficient in the Fall were included in the analysis, the results showed that the non-participant peer group on average gained 2 more points than the SES participants. The relationship was weak but statistically significant. The results in math similarly showed that there was no difference between the SES participants and their counterparts in math gains in A2L Spring administration.

**Table 11 Students Non Proficient on A2L Fall 2006-2007 - Analysis of Mean Score Gains**

	<b>Non-proficient SES students</b>	<b>Non-proficient peers</b>	<b>ANOVA</b>	<b>Is the difference statistically significant?</b>
Reading	5.82 (N=778)	7.58 (N=4978)	F=9.148 P<.003	Yes, but it is a weak <b>negative</b> relationship
Math	9.17 (N=895)	8.38 (N=6730)	F=2.976 P<.085	No

***Comparison of Gains in Proficiency***

An analysis of the relationship between SES tutoring and proficiency rates revealed that a smaller percentage of non-proficient students in the SES group achieved proficiency on the Spring test compared to the students in the peer group. Thus, from among the non-proficient, 17% of the SES students and 20% of their peers achieved proficiency in math, and 12% of the SES students as opposed to 23% of their peers became proficient in reading according to the Spring A2L testing.

**Table 12 Gains in the Proportion of Proficient Students**

	<b>Percent Achieved Proficiency in Spring 2007</b>	
	SES	Non-SES
Reading	12.0	23.5
Math	17.4	20.2

***Other Significant Findings***

- Hours of service and achievement: There was no correlation between the hours of service and the gains on math or reading on A2L.
- Student outcomes by provider: When exploring the provider impact on student outcomes, the study found that average gains were comparable across providers in reading as well as math, and that the relationship between the provider and student outcome was statistically not significant.

**Table 13 Average Student Gains on A2L Across Providers**

<b>Tutored in</b>		<b>Greatest Change</b>	<b>Least Change</b>	<b>Average Gain</b>
Reading	All Students	7.64	-3.37	4.47
	No-Proficient Students	8.82	0.50	5.82
Math	All Students	12.75	6.92	8.76
	No-Proficient Students	12.94	7.04	9.17

- **School Impact:** The school-level analysis explored the differences in reading and math gains for non-proficient SES and non-SES students. The expectation was that the SES students' participation in after-school SES tutoring adds value and a corresponding gain on A2L. However, in most schools, tutoring in reading and math seemed to add little benefit over and above the schools' own instructional programs.

***Comparisons within schools***

- The SES-tutored students and their non-SES counterparts made comparable average gains in reading. The difference in reading gains between the SES and non-students was not statistically significant for any schools.
- The differences in math gains of the SES and non-SES students were not statistically significant for any schools.

***Comparison across schools***

- The mean gains for SES students ranged from -14 to 12 points for reading and from 2 through 12 points for math across schools. There was an extremely weak but statistically significant relationship between mean math and reading gains and school membership suggesting a small school program effect on student gains.

These findings indicated that the SES tutoring provided little added value over and above the impact of the instructional programs at the schools.

- **Student achievement across grades:** APS students take the short-cycle assessment A2L in grades 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>. The study explored if there was a difference in the gains between the SES and comparison groups for any grades.
  - There was no difference in gains between non-proficient SES students receiving tutoring and their peers in reading in any of the grades 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>.
  - Similarly, the non-proficient students receiving math tutoring and their grade-level peers made equivalent gains in math in all grades.

## Discussion and Recommendations

This report examined two questions: Did the SES tutoring improve student achievement? And, did the SES providers significantly differ in their impact on student achievement? The study compared students in SES tutoring with their peers in the same schools in terms of their SBA and A2L outcomes. The information from the school year 2006-2007 incorporated in this study indicated that despite a substantial budget and infrastructure the SES programs had little or no impact on student achievement. Another finding was that APS students' SES participation rate was lower than the national trend.

The analysis of gains on SBA from 2006 to 2007 showed that the SES students who were not proficient on SBA 2006 made modest gains in reading and math compared to their peer groups who were also non-proficient and attending the same 24 schools. However, the difference in gains was less than 4 points on average. Moreover, students in the SES and non-SES groups achieved proficiency at the same rate in math while a slightly greater proportion of non-SES students achieved proficiency on SBA 2007.

The analysis of gains on A2L revealed that the SES students did not fare better, and sometimes did worse, than their counterparts in improving their scores in reading and math and in accomplishing proficiency by the A2L Spring administration.

There was no evidence of difference across providers in terms of student outcomes. The student gains were modest and stable across the providers with the exception of one or two. The school-level analysis suggested that the SES students exhibited no advantage over their school counterparts and that there was a small variability in student achievement across schools suggesting that programs in some school were effective in improving student achievement. The SES tutoring contributed very little to improving student achievement over and above the school program impact.

The SES mandate dictates a sizable budget and accompanying bureaucracy. However, this study revealed that the SES programs contributed very little to student achievement and did not improve the schools' odds of meeting the AYP targets. To accrue benefit commensurate with the cost, APS may strengthen the SES program perhaps with better oversight of the providers and their services to derive more benefits for the schools and students.

The SES Non-Regulatory Guidance stipulates parent-tutor and teacher-tutor communication and APS could create an expectation of meaningful collaboration among these three groups to focus the services to meet the needs of individual students. Also, there is no significant effort from the NMPED to align tutoring programs to the State standards. NMPED may revisit vendor accountability about student achievement as NMPED's statewide evaluation showed that there was a huge discrepancy between the SES vendors' own assessments and State testing outcomes. While the vendor data indicated a high success rate with 4/5<sup>th</sup> of the student making progress, only 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the same students showed progress on SBA. A cost-benefit analysis and a review of these weaknesses in the SES programs need to be considered for program improvement.

### ***Recommendations for Program Improvement***

- This report recommends that, along with monitoring the logistics of SES service delivery, NMPED and APS rigorously monitor the quality of instruction and content of the tutoring services.
- APS may lobby NMPED to provide and enforce guidelines regarding teacher-vendor-parent collaboration to set goals and accomplish a greater focus for student progress. A new grant within Curriculum and Assessment and School and Community Partnerships is designed to build and support their collaboration.
- The SES Non-Regulatory Guidance places the responsibility on the SEA to align the SES program with the State standards. NMPED and APS may work collaboratively to align the tutoring programs to the standards and curriculum and monitor their implementation. There should be a stricter oversight at all levels to ensure that the SES program truly supplements the schools' plan to enhance student learning and achievement when providing additional academic help to the eligible students.
- APS may also lobby for rigorous standards for the approval of vendors and their elimination if they do not measure up to the expectation.
- The study found that a fraction of the eligible students enrolled in the SES program in 2006-2007. The schools as well as the Title I Office may expand their methods of dissemination of the information regarding the parental right to seek tutoring for their student. Since only a fraction of the eligible students participate, it may be in APS' interest to survey parents about the reasons they elected not to participate in the SES program.
- APS may suggest to the SES providers that before-school programs could be more effective especially for the younger students as the after-school time slot when much tutoring occurs may not be the most productive time for student learning.
- As a large urban school district, APS has opportunities to communicate with organizations such as the Council of Great City Schools about NCLB re-authorization. Taking the position of improving accountability and more effective use of the funding would be justified because of the significant portion of Title I funds dedicated to the SES program and the minimum impact of the services.

This report addressed the narrow questions of the impact of SES services and of service providers on student gains. However, there are many important questions that will need to be addressed through future research to fully evaluate the Title I SES program or the SES providers such as provider quality and program details; alignment of the SES curriculum and instruction with the district goals, curriculum, and instruction; SES program's intangible benefits to the students in terms of motivation and confidence and long-term impact of SES on drop-out rates, grades, and achievement in subsequent years; and, customer satisfaction.

## Bibliography

Indiana Department of education. (2006). *Statewide Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services in Indiana. 2005-2006*

Mrozowski, Jennifer. (2005). *Michigan Overhauls Tutoring Program*. The Detroit News. February 14, 2007. New Mexico Public Education Department. *Supplemental Education Services Evaluation Report 2004-2005*, prepared by the Center for the Education and Study of Diverse Populations.

New Mexico Public Education Department. (2006). *Supplemental Education Services Evaluation Report 2005-2006*, prepared by the Center for the Education and Study of Diverse Populations. 2006.

Rickles, Jordan and Melissa Barnhart. (2007). *The Impact of Supplemental Educational Services Participation on Student Achievement: 2005-06*. Los Angeles Unified School District, Program Evaluation and Research Branch, Planning, Assessment and Research Division Publication No. 352.

Ross, Steven M., Potter, Allison and Jennifer Harmon. (2006). *Evaluating Supplemental Educational Service providers: Suggested Strategies for States (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Center for Research in Education Policy, American Institutes for Research, Academic Development Institute.

Tan, Chee-Soon, Chan, Chi-Keung and David Heistad. (2007). *Evaluation of the Supplemental Educational Services in Minneapolis Public Schools - Third Year Study*. December 2007.

The Associated Press. (September 22, 2008). *Few South Carolina Parents Sign up for Free Tutoring*. Greenvilleonline.com.

The Education Industry Association. (2007). *The Performance and Promise of Supplemental Educational Services Under "No Child Left Behind."* A Compilation of Research and Perspective.

Toppo, Greg. (March 25, 2008). *Free Tutoring Failing to Help Needy Kids*. USA Today.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, *State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume I - Title I School choice, Supplemental Educational Services, and Student Achievement*, Washington D.C., 2007.

U. S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind. Public Law 107-110 107th Congress. Section 1116 (e) – Supplementary Education Services in Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency and School Improvement*.

U. S. Department of Education. (2003). *No Child Left Behind: Supplemental Educational Services, non-regulatory guidance*. Washington D.C.

U. S. Department of Education. (2005). *No Child Left Behind: Supplemental Educational Services, non-regulatory guidance*. Washington D.C.

U. S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. (2004). *Creating Strong Supplemental Educational Services Programs*. Washington D.C.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2008). *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.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service. (2008). *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.

U. S. Government Accountability Office. (2007). *Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives*. (GAO-07-738T).