ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES IN URBAN FLORIDA SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

MYRNA L. ALLEN

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2008
To my children Terry, Christine, and Roger whose love, motivation, and encouragement enabled me to make this milestone possible and to my grandson, Braeden, whose birth has been a blessing to our family
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank my children, Terry, Christine, and Roger for their love, patience, and support while I pursued this degree. I could never have accomplished this milestone without their love and support. By far the most important accomplishment in my life has been raising my children to be loving, responsible, caring adults.

I would like to also express my gratitude to all of the people who helped me achieve my goal of obtaining a Ph.D. This group includes Dr. Jim Doud, who made this program possible by establishing the Jacksonville Cohort, as well as Dr. David Quinn for the support and patience he provided as chair of my committee. I also give my deepest appreciation to Dr. Jean Crockett for her positive attitude and editing skills, as well as Dr. Kathy Gratto for the words of encouragement she shared with me on more than one occasion. I would also like to acknowledge the help and dedication of Angela Rowe.

I thank the Title I Office for their motivation and enthusiasm as I pursued this goal, especially Latosha Norman, Brenda Smith, Jennifer Militello, and Libby Marsh for their encouragement and support that allowed me to leave the office in Jacksonville to attend classes in Gainesville. My deepest gratitude to Frank Herrington whose support and confidence in me never wavered, Lynette Weber whose friendship and editing skills were much appreciated, Dr. Kathy Divine for her expert advice on data analysis, Pat Cascone for her editing advice, and to my Associate Pastor, Bob Gauger, whose encouragement was invaluable. I am grateful to Tim Allen for his steadfast confidence in my abilities and his words of encouragement for the last three and a half years.

My final acknowledgement is extended to my friends in the Jacksonville/St. Augustine cohort. The support and friendship of the cohort was instrumental in my success. I will always have fond memories of the Fridays and Saturdays we spent in class. Special thanks to Lissa
Dunn whose friendship and gentle nature was much appreciated and to Ed Pratt-Dannals whose research and perseverance brought the University of Florida to Jacksonville and made the cohort possible.

I thank God for his blessings and guidance while pursuing this degree, as well as throughout my life. He truly blessed me in making this degree possible.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | .................................................................................................................. 4 |
| LIST OF TABLES | .......................................................................................................................... 8 |
| LIST OF TERMS | ............................................................................................................................. 9 |
| ABSTRACT | ................................................................................................................................. 11 |
| CHAPTER | ................................................................................................................................. 13 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | Supplemental Educational Services (SES) ....................................................................... 18 |
| | Statement of the Problem ................................................................................................. 22 |
| | Purpose of the Study ........................................................................................................ 24 |
| | Significance of the Study ................................................................................................. 25 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW | History of Tutoring .................................................................................................................. 27 |
| | Quality Indicators of Effective Tutoring ................................................................................ 29 |
| | The Effectiveness of Other After-school Tutoring Programs .................................................. 31 |
| | Current Status of Evaluating SES ........................................................................................ 34 |
| | Lack of Funding .................................................................................................................. 36 |
| | The Increasing Number of SES Providers ............................................................................. 37 |
| | Implementation in Rural Districts and Districts with Low Enrollment ..................................... 38 |
| | Highly Qualified Teachers .................................................................................................... 39 |
| | Increasing Enrollment .......................................................................................................... 39 |
| | SES Coordination with Classroom Curriculum ....................................................................... 40 |
| | SES Student-Teacher Ratio .................................................................................................... 42 |
| | Existing Research on SES .................................................................................................... 42 |
| | Minneapolis Public Schools’ SES Effectiveness .................................................................. 44 |
| | Chicago Public Schools’ SES Effectiveness ......................................................................... 45 |
| | Los Angeles Unified School District’s SES Effectiveness ......................................................... 47 |
| | Tennessee’s SES Effectiveness Study .................................................................................... 47 |
| | Large Urban Districts’ SES Effectiveness ............................................................................. 48 |
| | SES Evaluation Progress ....................................................................................................... 49 |
| | Challenges in Evaluating SES .............................................................................................. 51 |
| | Recommendations to Strengthen and Evaluate SES ............................................................... 53 |
| | Summary ................................................................................................................................ 55 |
| 3 STUDY OVERVIEW | ................................................................................................................................. 57 |
Purpose of the Study ................................................................................................. 58
Research Hypotheses ............................................................................................... 59
Overview of the Method ............................................................................................ 60
2006-07 Participating District Statistics .................................................................... 60
Procedures .................................................................................................................. 64
Summary ...................................................................................................................... 65

4 RESEARCH FINDINGS ............................................................................................. 67
Research Questions ..................................................................................................... 68
Research Hypotheses ................................................................................................. 68
Analysis and Quantitative Results .............................................................................. 69
Summary ...................................................................................................................... 76

5 DISCUSSION ............................................................................................................ 83
Discussion of the Findings .......................................................................................... 84
Conclusions and Recommendations ........................................................................... 86
Implications ................................................................................................................ 93
Future Research ......................................................................................................... 95
Summary ...................................................................................................................... 96

APPENDIX
A UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ......................... 100
B REQUEST FOR DISTRICT FCAT DATA .............................................................. 101
C DISTRICT ONE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ............................................ 103
D DISTRICT TWO INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ............................................ 105
E DISTRICT THREE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ......................................... 106
F DISTRICT FOUR INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ........................................... 108
G DISTRICT FIVE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ............................................ 110
H DISTRICT SIX INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD ............................................. 111
LIST OF REFERENCES ............................................................................................... 112
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH ......................................................................................... 118
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Quality Indicators of Effective Tutoring</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Participating District Statistics</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>SES Students by Grade Level</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>SES Students by District</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Active SES Providers by District</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>Total Students: Math Only Group by District and Grade</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Total Students: Reading Only Group by District and Grade</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Total Students: Reading and Math Group by District and Grade</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for Math Only Group</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for Reading Only Group</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for Reading and Math Tutoring Group</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for District 1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for District 2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for District 3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for District 4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for District 5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance for District 6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Summary of Findings for Hypotheses 1 through 3</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Summary of Findings for Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TERMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is the measure of the extent to which students in a school taken as a whole, and certain groups within the school, demonstrate proficiency in at least reading/language arts and mathematics. It also measures the progress of schools under other academic indicators, such as the graduation or school attendance rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was first enacted in 1965, is the principal federal law funding K-12 education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Students Students eligible for Supplemental Educational Services are those students from low-income families who attend Title I schools that are in their third year or more of not making AYP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible School An eligible school is a Title I school that has students eligible for Supplemental Educational Services. The school must be a Title I school that has not made adequate yearly progress for three years or more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Child Left Behind The federal No Child Left Behind Act, the most recent authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), is the primary federal law funding K-12 education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider A provider of Supplemental Educational Services may be any public or private (non-profit or for-profit) entity that meets the State’s criteria for approval. Potential providers include public schools, including charter schools, private schools, school districts, educational service agencies, institutions of higher education, faith- and community-based organizations, and private businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Choice Students who attend a Title I school in their second year of not making AYP are eligible to transfer to another public school in the district, including a public charter school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assessments Under the No Child Left Behind Act, state assessments are aligned with academic standards. Beginning in the 2002-03 school year, schools were required to administer assessments in each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of three grade spans: grades 3-5, grades 6-9, and grades 10-12 in all schools. Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, assessments were required to be administered every year in grades 3 through 8 in math and reading. Beginning in the 2007-08 school year, science achievement was also assessed.

Subgroup
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Supplemental Educational Services are additional academic instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students from low-income families who attend Title I schools in their third year or more of not making AYP.

Title I

Title I provides federal funding under NCLB for schools to ensure that all students have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high quality education.
Nationally, millions of federal dollars are given to private tutoring companies to provide tutoring to low income students who participate in the Supplemental Educational Services (SES) program in Title I schools. There is little or no research to prove the effectiveness of this program in improving the academic growth of these students. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the SES program in six large urban Florida school districts by utilizing existing scores from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT).

A quasi-experimental design was used to analyze the FCAT developmental scale scores wherein the scores were divided into two groups of Title I students. Group One was composed of students who received SES in the 2006-07 school year and completed the FCAT in math and reading in both 2006 and 2007. Group Two was a control group composed of students who were enrolled in Title I schools, completed the FCAT in reading and math in 2006 and 2007, and were eligible for SES but did not participate in the program. The developmental scale scores from the 2006 and 2007 FCAT administration were used as pre- and post-tests. A one-way analysis of variance design was used to analyze the FCAT data. The analysis was completed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences with a .05 level of significance.
Results of this study found increased developmental scale scores for Title I students who received tutoring in math, but there were no statistically significant findings on increased academic achievement for students who received tutoring in reading only or in reading and math. This study also assessed the effectiveness of individual SES providers by analyzing the three largest SES providers in each of the six districts that participated in this study. Of those 18 providers, only 3 provided results that confirmed increased academic achievement.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

_The Elementary and Secondary Education Act_ (ESEA) of 1965 was signed into law by
President Lyndon B. Johnson as part of the War on Poverty and is still the principal federal law
funding K-12 education (Kennedy, 2005). ESEA created the Chapter I program, subsequently
renamed the Title I program, to ensure that students living in poverty have an equal opportunity
to obtain a high quality education and achieve the required academic growth to meet state
standards and assessments. Title I provides federal funding to help students who are either
behind academically or are at risk of falling behind academically. Funding is based on the
number of low-income children in a school, generally including those eligible for free or reduced
price lunch, and was intended to supplement, not replace, state and district funds. Schools
receiving Title I monies have been required to involve parents in deciding and evaluating how
these funds are spent and in the review process (Peterson & West, 2003). Title I sought to
strengthen America’s schools by allocating substantial federal resources “to turn the door of the
schoolhouse into a true door to opportunity for all students” (Kennedy, 2005, p. 16). The goal
was to afford all students, even the most vulnerable, the opportunity to succeed by establishing
public school classrooms as a place of learning.

ESEA was most recently reauthorized on January 8, 2002 when President George W. Bush
signed the _No Child Left Behind Act_ (NCLB) into law. NCLB is referred to as the most
comprehensive piece of federal legislation in 35 years (Peterson & West, 2003). This law
represents an extensive renovation of federal support for elementary and secondary education in
the United States and affects every federal program initially authorized under ESEA. As the
largest federal program supporting elementary and secondary education, NCLB focuses
resources where students have the greatest need (U. S. Department of Education, 2002).
NCLB was signed into law in response to demands for public education to meet the challenges of America’s workforce and changes occurring in America’s industry. The economic expansion of the 1990s gave birth to a new global economy, which increased the pressure on America’s public education system to set high standards, create stronger schools, and produce better teachers. In response to this pressure, President Clinton proposed education reform in the Goals 2000 Educate America Act, that became law on March 14, 1994. Goals 2000 was designed to increase academic standards, measure student progress, and provide adequate support to enable students to meet the increased academic standards. Although Federal funding for education was increased from 1994 to 2000, Goals 2000 still fell short of meeting America’s educational needs (Kennedy, 2005).

Poverty and inequality in America’s education system continued to be a roadblock to opportunity and progress and became visible in achievement gaps between student groups. African-American and Latino students continued to lag behind in academic achievement compared to other students. For example, the math and reading skills of ethnic minority students graduating from high school were equal to those of 13 year-old white students. Kennedy (2005) reported that the high school dropout rate increased for African-American students at the rate of 1 dropout for every 20 black students, compared to 1 for every 30 white students. Achievement gaps became especially obvious in high poverty schools, where in 2001 these students were 77% more likely to be taught by a teacher who was teaching out-of-field as compared to students in low poverty schools. Kennedy also contends that while the dropout rate increased for African-American students, the number of students learning English as a second language also increased by 1 million students, a 50% increase. America’s schools were not equipped to meet the educational needs of these students. The hope of Brown vs. the Board of Education (1954) to
provide an equal, quality education for all minority students was still not a reality in 2001. America’s ethnic minority and low-income students were not receiving a quality education from qualified teachers (Kennedy, 2005). Furthermore, international educational comparisons revealed that other countries’ education systems were producing students who were academically superior to students in the United States (Hess & Finn, 2004b).

Education remained foremost on the minds of the American people. During the 2000 presidential campaign both candidates pledged to improve the education system. George W. Bush, the GOP candidate and governor of Texas, promoted the accountability system of Texas as a national model. Upon taking office, President Bush made good on his campaign promise and immediately sent to Congress legislation that created strong accountability for districts and states, as well as a school choice option modeled after the system in place in Texas public schools (Hess & Finn, 2004b).

Negotiations over this legislation lasted a year, as the White House and Congressional leaders forged a bipartisan compromise that came to be known as the No Child Left Behind Act. NCLB enjoyed strong support from Republicans and prominent Democrats such as Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy and California Representative George Miller. However, winning bipartisan support created many changes in the original Bush education plan. For example, the White House compromised on its proposal of choice-based reforms, such as school vouchers, and agreed to more restrictive options for students in low-performing schools. These negotiations added to the complexity of the NCLB legislation and, as a result, the federal government was challenged to work with and through states to make implementation meaningful with the end result providing a quality education for all American students (Hess & Finn, 2004b).
For the first time the federal government tied federal dollars to consequences for schools that failed to make adequate yearly progress. It gave parents and students in low-performing schools the option to obtain additional educational assistance or move to another school. From the time NCLB was signed into law it became evident that this complex law required extensive monitoring and evaluation. The academic performance of students, individual schools, and school districts would necessitate the use of best practices to turn NCLB into policy and subsequently into practice in every school district in America (Hess & Finn, 2004b).

NCLB was charged with the reformation of the American education system which included meeting the educational needs of low-income children, children with disabilities, minority children, and English language learners. These students became the top priority of school reform. NCLB called for improvement in America’s schools and demanded accountability for results in decreasing the achievement gap. The law required each state to create content standards that specified what students should know and performance standards that specified mastery levels for students. State tests were to be rigorous and aligned with the standards, and teachers were to be of high quality for all students. The law created opportunities for students to transfer to other schools, participate in after-school programs, and obtain free tutoring and extra academic support. The law also required that parents be informed of the academic performance of their child’s school and be encouraged to become more involved in their child’s education. According to Kennedy (2005), the No Child Left Behind Act is “more than a slogan,” (p. 18). It is a commitment and a promise to offer each child a quality education by improving public education.

The commitment to strengthen public education by improving the academic achievement of all students was apparent in NCLB by its very specific requirements for accountability: annual
state assessment of the academic performance of students in grades 3 through 8 in math and reading, with one additional test to be administered in high school. The state assessments must be based on rigorous state standards and at least 95% of enrolled students in each school must participate in the assessment. The results are reported by student subgroups which include poverty levels, race, ethnicities, disabilities, and limited English proficiencies. These data are converted into an annual school report card required by NCLB, and provide comparative information on the quality of schools (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). School report cards detail the performance of each subgroup and are required to be reported to the public. These annual report cards must show adequate yearly progress (AYP) of the school toward the goal of 100% student proficiency by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. The AYP is defined by each individual state and is evaluated most commonly in terms of benchmarks that increase on predetermined intervals until the goal of 100% proficiency is reached in the 2013-14 school year. If a school does not demonstrate AYP, a sanction process, described below, is initiated and increases every year until the school makes AYP for two consecutive years (Peterson & West, 2003).

As well as addressing the academic performance of students, NCLB built upon and expanded the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by creating ground breaking educational mandates such as parental choice, high teacher quality, and Supplemental Educational Services (SES). These programs were created to increase the quality and effectiveness of the Title I program in raising the achievement of all students, especially those students achieving at the lowest levels (Stullich, Eisner, McCrary, & Roney, 2006).

Promoting parental choice and increased involvement in their child’s education is one of the cornerstones of NCLB (Hess & Finn, 2004b). Under this legislation, local school districts
must set aside 20% of their Title I, Part A allocation. Title I is a federally funded formula grant
given to school districts to supplement the education of students who attend high poverty
schools. The 20% setaside is to be used to fund the first two sanctions under NCLB, public
school choice and SES. The first sanction, public school choice, must be offered to students who
attend schools that have failed to make AYP for two years. Part of the 20% is required to fund
the transportation of students from their home school to the school of their choice (U. S.
Department of Education, 2002).

**Supplemental Educational Services (SES)**

If schools fail to make AYP for three years, they are required to offer SES, the second
sanction under NCLB. SES is designed to increase the academic achievement of students from
low income families who attend Title I schools. NCLB defines SES as additional academic
assistance (e.g., tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions) provided that these
approaches are consistent with the content and instruction used by the school district and are
aligned with the state’s academic content standards. In addition to the NCLB sanctions of public
school choice and SES, additional sanctions are added in each subsequent year a school does not
make AYP. These additional sanctions include corrective action, planning for restructuring, and
The SES program must be aligned with the state’s academic standards and is required by federal
guidelines to be provided before school, after school, or on Saturday. Additionally, the SES
program must be of high quality, research based, and designed to increase student achievement.
This program is structured to create partnerships between public schools and a wide variety of

The Supplemental Education Services program evolved from President Bush’s initial
proposal, when drafting NCLB, that a student in a school that did not make AYP for three years
would be offered a $1,500 exit voucher to be used toward a private school education. The exit voucher was not well received by the Democrats, and Senator Kennedy adamantly refused to support it. However, he did counter with a proposal to use these funds as “supplemental services.” The White House accepted this proposal feeling that it would be a sufficient incentive to improve failing schools because the districts would have to pay for the tutoring out of their Title I funds, thus decreasing the amount available for district use. Furthermore, President Bush felt that private tutoring would give struggling students an educational opportunity that would otherwise be unavailable to them (Hess & Finn, 2004b).

In Florida for the 2007-08 school year, the 20% setaside ranges from a low of $46,724 for Liberty County Public Schools to a high of $25,308,760 for Miami-Dade County Public Schools, with 22 Florida school districts encumbering over $1 million for this setaside. The total 20% setaside encumbered to fund public school choice and SES in Florida is $115,140,533 for 67 school districts (Florida Department of Education, 2007a). Full implementation of SES nationwide could total more than $2.5 billion of the annual Title I grant funds (Ascher, 2006; Cohen, 2006).

The state, local school district, parents, and SES providers are all charged with implementation responsibilities via the Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance (2005), developed by the United States Department of Education. Implementation of SES begins with the state and includes a number of responsibilities in providing services to eligible students. These responsibilities begin with the identification of providers, as well as maintaining a list of approved providers, and monitoring the implementation and success of the program. States start the SES process by developing and advertising the procedure by which a tutoring company becomes state-approved to serve students. Once a provider is approved, the
The school district also has many responsibilities in implementing SES in Title I schools that have not made AYP for three years. Districts must notify parents of eligible students annually and must offer assistance, if requested, in helping parents choose a provider that will meet their child’s educational needs. Federal guidance mandates that the notification sent to parents must include a comprehensive description of the SES program and a timeline that explains the enrollment process. Districts are urged to reach the eligible population by notices mailed to homes, as well as by newspaper, radio and TV ads, Internet sites, and notices at movie theaters, shopping malls, beauty salons, and churches. To ensure the privacy of students, districts are reminded that individual student identities must not be released to the public. Districts also must draft and enter into a contract with the state-approved SES providers. If the demand for services exceeds the available funding, districts must implement a prioritization plan (U. S. Department of Education, 2005).

After the enrollment process is completed and contracts with SES providers are executed, the district is responsible for implementation of the program. This includes supervising the program in each school where services are provided, paying the SES providers, monitoring student attendance, verifying that the tutors have clear background checks and meet education requirements, as well as approving each enrolled student’s academic plan (Florida Department of Education, 2006b)
Parent responsibilities include choosing a provider from the state-approved list. Parents are permitted to request assistance from the district in making this choice. They also are required to be active participants in the SES program, which includes working with the district and provider to create an academic plan appropriate for their child’s needs and making sure that their child attends the tutoring sessions on a consistent basis.

The SES provider responsibilities include providing the appropriate curriculum to enable each child to succeed academically in the program. This includes monitoring student attendance, measuring student progress, reporting student progress to the parents and district, following the timeline set forth by the district, and ensuring that student privacy is maintained. Provider responsibilities also include providing services that are secular, neutral, and non-religious (U. S. Department of Education, 2005).

To fund the SES program each student is allotted a per pupil allocation for tutoring. During the 2007-08 school year in Florida, per pupil allocations ranged from a low of $883 for Nassau County Public Schools to a high of $1,467 for Miami-Dade Public Schools; the average allocation was $1,124 per student (Florida Department of Education, 2007d). When the allocation is depleted, services automatically end for each student. Providers set their hourly rates within the parameters established by each state; in Florida, the hourly rate has ranged from $5 to $80 per hour. The hourly rate in Florida for the 2007-08 school year ranges from a low of $20 per hour to a high of $80 per hour, with an average of $60 an hour for the 201 state-approved providers. SES providers also choose the student-to-teacher ratio they will utilize. The Florida Department of Education allows providers to choose from small group instruction with a 5:1 student: tutor ratio, large group instruction that cannot exceed 10 students per tutor, or individual tutoring. Providers are paid the hourly rate multiplied by the number of students being
tutored. For example, if a provider is tutoring 10 students at $80 an hour, their total hourly income would be $800. It is also important to note that, in Florida, SES providers are only paid for students who attend the tutoring sessions (Florida Department of Education, n.d.). The federal guidance allows states to determine if payment for tutoring will be based on attendance. The Florida policy requires that the student be present. Otherwise, the provider cannot charge the district for services to the student on that day (Florida Department of Education, 2006a).

**Statement of the Problem**

Nationwide, each Title I school that has not made AYP for three years is required to provide SES to its students from low-income families. In the 2004-05 school year, 19% of eligible funded students participated nationwide in SES, which was a 7% increase over 2003-04, when only 12% participated in this free tutoring program (Fusarelli, 2007). Locally, the Florida Department of Education reported that in the 2006-07 school year 70,908 students participated in SES. This is more than triple the enrollment of the 2005-06 school year when 23,187 students received services (Florida Department of Education, 2007c).

The main goal of the Supplemental Educational Services program is to provide tutoring or other supplemental academic enrichment services in reading, language arts, and mathematics to increase the academic performance of students. These tutoring sessions must be offered before or after school, and they must be research based (Florida Department of Education, 2006b). To fund this program, districts are required to set aside 20% of their Title I, Part A funds and they have been doing so since the 2002-03 school year (Cohen, 2006). School districts currently spend billions of federal dollars on this program nationwide with funds that would have been allocated to schools to supplement the curriculum before NCLB was signed into law (Cohen, 2006; Sunderman, 2006).
Florida implemented the SES program in 2004-05 in 11 urban districts that had Title I schools in their third year of non-adequate yearly progress. The number of districts required to offer SES has increased every year until the 2006-07 school year, when SES was required in every school district in Florida. In the 2007-08 school year, 201 Florida providers were approved to tutor students (Florida Department of Education, n.d.).

Now that SES has been fully implemented in Florida, the focus now should turn from implementation and move towards quality control of the services provided. This may be the most challenging aspect of NCLB, and many states and districts are struggling with SES evaluation. The entire concept of successful tutoring must be clarified. Evaluation must address what specifically increases a student’s academic performance, especially in schools where many different programs and new curricula are being implemented to help low performing students to achieve. If a student progresses to higher academic levels on the state assessment, it must be determined if the increase is due to a few hours of tutoring per week or to a new curriculum implemented school wide (Hess & Finn, 2004b).

Per the following excerpt from the NCLB Statute, Section 1116(e) 4, evaluating the effectiveness of SES is clearly defined as a state responsibility:

4) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES—A State educational agency shall—

(D) develop, implement, and publicly report on standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of the services offered by approved providers under this subsection, and for withdrawing approval from providers that fail, for two consecutive years, to contribute to increasing the academic proficiency of students served.

States are beginning to focus on SES effectiveness, but there has been no definitive answer from the federal government on what defines effectiveness (Hess & Finn, 2004b). Monitoring the quality and effectiveness is a major challenge in many states. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (2004) sums up the importance of quality control by stating that the main
concern it is not the lack of evaluation, but rather the importance of knowing whether low achieving Title I students are receiving high quality services that can actually improve their academic performance. Although SES has been implemented for over four years and billions of dollars have been spent, there is still little known about the effects of tutoring on improving student achievement, the fundamental goal of SES (Ascher, 2006).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this analysis was to assess the effectiveness of the SES program in Florida Title I urban district schools that were required to offer this program during the 2006-2007 school year.

To assess the effectiveness of SES, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in math for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

2. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

3. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services in both math and reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

4. Do students tutored by the three major SES providers in each district (i.e., those that provided tutoring for the largest number of students) for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

**Null Hypothesis 1.** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math.
Null Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in reading.

Null Hypothesis 3. There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math and reading.

Null Hypothesis 4. There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring from the three SES providers who tutored the largest number of students in each district.

Significance of the Study

The highest priority of the No Child Left Behind Act is to give low achieving students the opportunity and ability to meet high academic standards and reach proficiency on demanding state assessments. The fact that only 29% of all fourth grade students performed at or above the proficient level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress in reading in 2000 clearly indicated a need for nationwide education reformation (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). The federal government chose the reauthorization of ESEA to implement education reform, which funded Title I in 2007 in the amount of $12.7 billion nationwide. This reformation requires accountability from states that received this federal aid (U. S. Department of Education, 2006).

Currently, Florida has no evaluation of the effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services which consume federal funds that have been diverted from Title I schools. While
Florida is required to prohibit providers from offering services to students if they fail to increase student achievement for two years, the state has neglected to enforce this section of the law.

NCLB has been described as the accountability law, but this cornerstone program has not been held accountable for results. SES cannot be improved if the weaknesses and deficiencies are not identified. Evaluating SES effectiveness will allow states, districts, and lawmakers to strengthen and improve these services.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services, most often offered as a tutoring program, designed by NCLB to increase the academic achievement of Title I students in urban Florida school districts. The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature pertaining to the history and best practices of tutoring, as well as the effectiveness of other after-school tutoring programs. The current status of SES evaluation efforts nationwide will then be reviewed, followed by existing research on the effectiveness of SES. Finally, the literature relevant to SES evaluation challenges and recommendations to strengthen and evaluate SES will be presented.

History of Tutoring

Tutoring is a form of education with a long, rich history that has been used to educate children for centuries (Gordon, Morgan, Ponticell, & O'Malley, 2004). Tutoring is as old as civilization itself, and its beginnings can be traced back to as early as 7000 B. C. when the family was responsible for the education of its children, as parents tutored their children in life skills and passed on their culture’s folklore. History’s most favored and honored teachers were tutors. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle taught their students one at a time by using the principal of imitation, lectures, and posing problems to their students. Tutoring was the only form of education in ancient Rome and Greece and can be traced through and beyond the medieval transition in 500-440. During the medieval period the Church controlled education; thus tutoring focused on theological principles, and secular training was abandoned. During this time Britain tutored girls in the nunneries and, at the same time, boys in Ireland were tutored by receiving instruction in monasteries. As the century progressed, tutoring again returned to the home, but it
was only available for the children of royalty or noble descendants. Centuries passed, but the primary subject of tutoring remained theology (Gordon & Gordon, 1990).

Tutoring persisted in Europe as the primary style of education, and when the colonists came to America they brought tutoring with them. In America, education soon gave birth to the public school, but tutoring was often the only form of education available in isolated, rural, frontier settings. Education was valued in colonial America. Often when a child grew up in a home of non-readers it was not unusual for neighbors to offer to tutor the child. New England Puritans’ concern for education centered on strong religious beliefs, and tutoring centered on reading the Bible. Tutoring persisted throughout the frontier era, but the number of children tutored at home declined as America was settled and more states passed compulsory school attendance laws (Gordon & Gordon, 1990). As the 19th century transitioned to the early 20th century, educators ignored tutoring as a part of education. They contended that due to student socialization issues, a public school education for all children was superior to tutoring small groups of isolated students (Gordon et al., 2004).

Interest in tutoring was revived in the 1960s when the public started to question the quality of public education due to the poor academic achievement of many children. Peer tutoring was introduced in Detroit Public Schools and with the Mobilization for Youth Program in New York City. Peer tutors were soon joined by adult tutors and paid tutors. By 1973, the National School Volunteer Program estimated that 2,000,000 tutors were tutoring 3,000,000 students in over 3,000 programs. Tutoring was commonly used to educate students with disabilities, as well as gifted students. The academic benefits of tutoring children were seen in classrooms across America in the 1960s and 1970s (Gordon & Gordon, 1990). Since the 1960s, each passing decade has increased the demand for tutoring in each socioeconomic group (Gordon, 2003).
Presently, tutoring has become a permanent tool in educating students in the United States. Gordon & Gordon (1990) predicted that the “future use of tutors across society will likely increase as educators continue to focus on individual differences and the means to increase productivity in all modes of learning” (p. 320).

**Quality Indicators of Effective Tutoring**

Tutoring has made a significant contribution to the education of children throughout history. Tutoring adjusts for a child’s individual differences and creates a more meaningful education for students (Gordon & Gordon, 1990). There were several common themes identified in the literature as quality indicators of effective tutoring. Small student-teacher ratio, collaboration with classroom teachers, tutor qualifications, and tutor training were identified repeatedly as quality indicators of tutoring.

One-to-one tutoring is considered as the most effective form of tutoring (Baker, Rieg, & Clendaniel, 2006; Elbaum, Vaughn, Hughes, & Moody, 2000; Juel, 1996; Lauer et al., 2004; Lauer, 2006; Wasik, 1998). Tutoring programs that provide one-to-one tutoring for at-risk students were proven to increase the academic achievement of students in reading. Tutoring programs that target reading as their primary goal should strive to provide one-to-one tutoring (Elbaum et al., 2000; Lauer et al., 2004). Elbaum, et al. (2000) conducted a meta-analysis to assess the effectiveness of one-to-one reading interventions for at-risk elementary students with low reading skills. In this meta-analysis of 29 studies, the reading outcomes for 42 samples of students (n = 1,539) were examined. It was discovered that students who received one-to-one tutoring performed at a level that was two fifths of a standard deviation higher than the average level of the control group. An important program component of any tutoring program is to keep the student-teacher ratio low so students can obtain the best possible benefits (Sanderson, 2003).
Baker et al. (2006) suggested maintaining a 2:1 student teacher ratio or smaller for a successful tutoring program.

Collaboration between the child’s classroom teacher and the tutor also has been identified as an important aspect of effective tutoring (Baker et al., 2006; Gordon, 2003; Gordon et al., 2004; Wasik, 1998). Tutoring needs to be coordinated with classroom instruction to present the student with supplementary tutoring on what is being taught in the classroom with the same materials and taught in the same manner. This enables the student to have multiple opportunities to work on challenging materials. As students master the material during tutoring, they are more likely to perform better in class. This can be an effective motivator for future tutoring sessions (Wasik, 1998). The tutor is able to provide individual, intense instruction that a classroom teacher is unable to provide in a group setting and, in most cases, the classroom teacher is more than willing to collaborate with the tutor (Gordon, 2003). Close tutor-teacher collaboration will help make the most of each tutoring session (Gordon et al., 2004).

Tutoring best practices addresses the qualifications of tutors. Experienced, certified teachers make the best tutors (Elbaum et al., 2000; Gordon, 2003; Gordon et al., 2004; Wasik, 1998). Teachers make effective tutors because they are specifically educated to teach, and tutoring enables them to reach out and individualize instruction, which they are unable to do in a classroom setting. Due to their education and prior professional experience, teachers can make a major difference in a tutoring situation (Gordon et al., 2004).

Research also reveals that training tutors is important in effective tutoring (Baker et al., 2006; Elbaum et al., 2000; Gordon et al., 2004; U. S. Department of Education, 1997; Vadas, Jenkins, Antil, Wayne, & O'Connor, 1997; Wasik, 1998). Extensive training stands out among the features of tutoring programs that produce the most positive effects (U. S. Department of
Education, 1997). Training must be ongoing and include observing tutors and students during tutoring sessions, followed by immediate feedback. Volunteer tutors also need to be trained to have an understanding of the reading process and the complex cognitive interactions that facilitate reading (Wasik, 1998). Specialized training as a tutor consistently produces higher levels of student achievement than tutors with little or no special training (Gordon et al., 2004).

Other quality indicators of effective tutoring include a long term commitment sustained over the entire school year with the same tutor working with the same student, intensive and consistent tutoring, as well as using tutors that can motivate and encourage (Baker et al., 2006; Gordon, 2003; Juel, 1996; Wasik, 1998).

**The Effectiveness of Other After-school Tutoring Programs**

There is existing research that assesses the effectiveness of other academic tutoring programs provided to students outside their regular school day. One such research study completed in 2002 evaluates the 21st Century Learning Community Centers, a nationally known after-school program for children in urban and rural communities that includes academic activities. The results of this evaluation have shown that the program had limited influence on student achievement. At the elementary and middle school levels, test scores in reading and grades in most subjects were not higher for 21st Century students than for similar students in a control group. This after-school program had no impact on whether students completed their homework or finished assignments to their teacher’s expectations (U. S. Department of Education, 2003).

A meta-analysis of 65 studies on school based tutoring programs confirmed that tutoring has some positive effects on raising student academic achievement. Cohen, Kulik & Kulik (1982) conducted this meta-analysis and reported on the academic achievement of tutored students. Of the 65 studies, 45 reported that the tutored students made achievement gains, but
only 20 of the comparisons reported statistically significant effects for students receiving the tutoring. Further analysis of the studies showed that students in more structured programs had larger tutoring effects, as did students in tutoring programs of shorter duration. Effects were also larger when lower level skills were taught and tested. Tutoring in math produced larger effects than tutoring in reading. Students exhibited larger academic effects when tested on locally developed tests rather than nationally standardized tests.

In 2001, the Corporation for National Service commissioned a report on the outcomes of tutoring conducted by AmeriCorps. AmeriCorps is a network of local, state, and national service programs that connects more than 70,000 Americans each year in intensive service to meet the critical needs of our country in education, public safety, health, and the environment. The AmeriCorps study conducted a meta-analysis of their tutoring programs that used adult volunteers. The study sample included 869 students in 68 tutoring programs and assessed their reading gains using the Woodcock Johnson Reading Test as the pre-test and post-test measure. The 869 students were nearly evenly dispersed across grade levels with 294 in first grade, 292 in second grade, and 283 in third grade. The number of boys and girls was almost evenly split in grades two and three, however the first grade student sample was 59% female and 41% male. Ethnically the sample was composed of 51% white students, 23% African-American, 20% Hispanic, and 7% Native American, Pacific Islander, Asian, or mixed ethnicity. Findings indicated that tutored students at all grade levels that began the program with below grade-level academic achievement closed the gap and were reading at or near their grade-level by the end of the school year as measured by the Woodcock Johnson Reading Test. These gains were large enough to be statistically significant and represented meaningful changes in the students reading performance. The reading gains were the same for students of different ethnic/racial
backgrounds. Surveyed teachers also agreed that tutored students improved their reading to some degree (Moss, Swartz, Obeidallah, Stewar, & Green, 2001).

AmeriCorps program directors reported that more than a third of the tutoring programs were conducted in one-to-one tutoring sessions and an additional 30% of the programs reported small group tutoring consisting of two to four students. The length of the tutoring sessions lasted from 30-60 minutes and totaled more than 1.5 hours a week. The report also stated that tutor training was critical to a successful tutoring program. Moss et al. (2001) identified several effective practices that, when implemented, were essential in showing significant reading gains in the AmeriCorps program. These effective practices include:

1. Tutors receive training both prior to and during the course of tutoring;
2. Tutoring sessions occur at least three times a week;
3. Tutoring activities are monitored and evaluated. (p. 36)

In 2004, Lauer et al. conducted a research synthesis on the effectiveness of out-of-school-time strategies for improving the academic performance of low-achieving students. The meta-analysis included 53 studies conducted after 1984 that concentrated on the effectiveness of a program that was delivered outside the regular school day. Program indicators included the timeframe in which the program was offered (after school or summer), grade level of students, focus of the program (academic or academic and social), duration of the program, and student teacher ratio. Results from this research synthesis led to the following conclusions:

1. Out-of-school-time strategies can increase the achievement level of low-achieving students in reading and math.
2. The times that out-of-school strategies are offered (after school or summer school) do not impact the effectiveness.
3. Student in early grades had the greatest gains in reading. Students in secondary school had the greatest benefit from math strategies.
4. These strategies have positive effects when the focus of the program is academic or academic and social.
5. Administrators should closely monitor the implementation and ongoing student learning to determine the appropriate duration for particular strategies and activities.

6. Out-of-school-time strategies that provide one-to-one tutoring for low-achieving or at-risk students have strong positive effects on reading achievement.

**Current Status of Evaluating SES**

One of the key provisions of NCLB is the implementation of SES, which is designed to provide tutoring or other academic activities to students from low-income families who attend Title I schools that have been identified as not making AYP for three years. As a result of not making AYP, these schools are required to participate in NCLB sanctions which include SES. The SES program is to be implemented in Title I schools in their second year of school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (Smole, 2004). SES is defined as additional academic instruction designed to increase the academic achievement of students in low-performing schools. These services are most commonly provided in the form of tutoring and must be provided outside the regular school day by companies known as SES providers that are approved by each state’s Department of Education (Sunderman & Kim, 2004). Parents of eligible Title I students select an SES provider from a state-approved list, and the local school district contracts and implements the tutoring program with the selected provider. SES providers are required to demonstrate that the tutoring provided increases student academic achievement in order to retain their status as approved and remain on the state-approved list. Therefore, states are required to evaluate SES providers to determine their effect on increasing student achievement (Smole, 2004). This topic is addressed in the SES Non-Regulatory Guidance under state responsibilities and monitoring requirements:

**B. OVERVIEW OF STATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

B-1. What is the responsibility of a State Educational Agency (SEA) in providing Supplemental Educational Services?
The SEA has a number of responsibilities in ensuring that eligible students receive additional academic assistance. The SEA must identify providers, maintain a list of providers, and monitor services [Section 1116(e) (4)]. Specifically, the SEA must:

5. Develop, implement, and publicly report on standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services offered by approved Supplemental Educational Service providers, and for withdrawing approval from providers that fail, for two consecutive years, to contribute to increasing the academic proficiency of students served by the providers (see Section D for additional information) (U. S. Department of Education, 2005, p. 4).

D. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

D-4. How may an SEA terminate approval of a provider that is not meeting the statutory requirement to increase students’ academic achievement?

An SEA must use a consistent policy for withdrawing Supplemental Educational Service providers from the State-approved list. The statute requires an SEA to remove from the approved list any provider that fails, for two consecutive years, to contribute to increased student proficiency relative to State academic content and achievement standards [Section 1116(e)(4)(D)]. In addition, a provider must be removed from the list if, at any time, it fails to provide Supplemental Educational Services consistent with applicable health, safety, and civil rights requirements (U. S. Department of Education, 2005, p. 19).

The review of literature on the evaluation of SES programs reveals there have been research studies and evaluations that have produced conflicting results of the effectiveness of SES on increasing student academic growth. Additionally, in a report delivered to Congress in August 2006, the Government Accountability Office concluded that no definitive evaluation had been done to measure the effects of SES on student academic achievement (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006). Although states are required by NCLB to evaluate SES providers annually, surveys indicate that few states have developed and implemented evaluations (Reid, 2004). Critics contend that there are no thorough evaluations of SES programs in place in any state and that the evaluations that do exist rely on the most basic evaluation methods (Sunderman & Kim, 2004). Due to the absence of evaluation procedures, SES providers have no evaluation data to show student academic growth on state assessments as is required of states and districts by NCLB. Current state monitoring of SES providers consists of relying on questionnaires,
surveys, and data submitted by the providers themselves. Some states depend on SES providers to evaluate their own effectiveness by using their pre- and post-test assessments to measure increased academic growth of students (Reid, 2004).

**Lack of Funding**

One of the reasons cited for the lack of evaluation is that states lack the capacity and funds to develop a monitoring system for tutoring (Reid, 2004). NCLB requires states to ensure that Supplemental Educational Services are of high quality, research based, and designed to help eligible children attain proficiency in meeting the state’s academic achievement standards. States and districts have been overwhelmed with designing an implementation plan for providing SES in schools and communities nationwide (Cohen, 2006). Due to the increasing enrollment and mandatory NCLB requirements, the SES program has created administrative and management challenges at both state and district level. States and districts are forced to assume these additional responsibilities with no additional funds to cover them (Ascher, 2006).

NCLB places a financial burden on local and state administrators with no additional administrative funds designated to cover the costs of implementing and evaluating SES (Ascher, 2006; Burch, 2007). District administrative costs for implementing the SES program are significant considering that 40% of all urban districts are required to offer SES (Ascher, 2006). For example, the SES administrative budget of the Chicago School District was more than $2 million in the 2004-05 school year (Sunderman, 2006). Further evidence of escalating SES administrative costs are demonstrated in Duval County Public Schools in Jacksonville, Florida, where these costs have increased from $700,000 in 2006-07 to a projected amount of $1.1 million for the 2007-08 school year. This is in addition to the mandatory 20% setaside and amounts to 3.5% of the total Title I allocation that must be used to administer SES that, in past years, would have been allocated to Title I schools (Duval County Public Schools, 2007).
An example of the administrative challenges presented by SES can be found in Oakland, California, where 500 parents failed to select an SES provider on their free tutoring application. Per federal SES guidance, the SES coordinator was required to contact these parents to select one of the 25 providers on the district’s state-approved list. Duplicate applications also presented a problem in Oakland where parents submitted one application at the district’s SES Provider Fair and then submitted a duplicate application with another provider who visited the student’s home. Again, the SES coordinator had to contact these parents to determine their provider choice.

Monitoring attendance, verifying student eligibility, and tracking which students are enrolled in which programs are some of the administrative burdens experienced by districts nationwide (Rentner et al., 2006).

**The Increasing Number of SES Providers**

The ever increasing number of approved SES providers nationwide heightens concern over the lack of evaluation and inadequate monitoring (Cohen, 2006). As of February 2007, states reported approving at total of 3,223 SES providers (U. S. Department of Education, 2007). Stullich et al., (2006) reported this was over three times as many SES providers than had been approved just two years earlier, when the approved list consisted of 997 providers. Many of the approved providers are leaders in providing educational services, but others have little or no track record of effectiveness in tutoring low-income, low-achieving students (Cohen, 2006). In 2004, the number of approved providers varied per state with a high of 216 in New York to a low of 3 in Hawaii (Reid, 2004). The Bush Administration remains an enthusiastic supporter of the program and has pushed states to increase the number of approved SES providers, even though there is little evidence of their effectiveness (Sunderman, 2006).

SES providers can include nonprofit, for-profit, and faith-based organizations, as well as school districts, charter schools, and private schools (Kasmin & Farmer, 2006). An annual
review conducted in 2005-06 by the Center on Education Policy, a national, independent advocate for public education, reported 54% of all state-approved providers were for-profit, 21% were nonprofit not affiliated with a religious group, 9% were districts, with the remaining 16% made up of public entities, private faith-based organizations, and other types of organizations (Ascher, 2006). A typical tutoring program provides 30 hours of free tutoring (Hess & Finn, 2004a). The mode of instruction can vary, including one-to-one tutoring, small group instruction and online tutoring. The frequency or intensity of service can also vary because NCLB has no set requirements except that help with homework is prohibited (Kasmin & Farmer, 2006).

**Implementation in Rural Districts and Districts with Low Enrollment**

Rural districts and districts with low enrollment face a different problem in attracting a sufficient number of SES providers to serve their eligible students, thereby creating a lack of services in their districts (Burch, 2007; Fusarelli, 2007). These districts disclosed that they failed to implement SES due to a lack of state-approved SES providers, and in one case, there was no approved provider within 200 miles of the school district (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006). In the Grant Union School district in California, only 26 of the hundreds of state-approved providers were interested in serving students in this rural district and only 11 attended the SES Provider Fair for parents. SES providers require a minimum number of students to make SES a profitable venture. A similar problem occurred in Kansas City, Missouri. Although Kansas City Schools are considered an urban school district, half of the SES providers on the state-approved list removed themselves from providing services in this school district due to low enrollment because they would not be profitable. The only solution at this time for rural districts or districts with low enrollment is to contract with online SES providers. This presents additional barriers to serving students such as unreliable connectivity and limited access to computers (Schwartzbeck, 2005).
Highly Qualified Teachers

Although NCLB mandates highly qualified teachers in every classroom taught during regular school hours, the law does not specify any education or certification requirements for SES tutors (Ascher, 2006; Burch, 2007; Kasmin & Farmer, 2006). Districts have expressed concerns about programs that use tutors who lack teaching credentials (Sunderman, 2006). Critics say that this is in conflict with the intention of NCLB, which strives to match the most qualified teachers with students who have the most academic need (Kasmin & Farmer, 2006). Ascher (2006) found that although most SES tutors are certified teachers employed by the district, some were college students with no teaching experience, and 7% were high school students. The American Institutes for Research and the Education Industry Association found that a majority of SES tutors are certified teachers, while others are high school students and college graduates without prior tutoring experience (Burch, 2007). The U. S. Department of Education reported that 15 of 24 the providers interviewed for this case study of supplemental services stated that they require their tutors to be certified teachers, the remaining 9 did not require certification. For example, Huntington Learning Center does not require teacher certification, while Princeton Review hires certified teachers employed in non-SES schools (Anderson & Laguarda, 2005). Although training programs, typically 4 to 20 hours, are provided by some SES providers, not all providers train their tutors. It should also be noted that some, but not all, providers evaluate their tutors.

Increasing Enrollment

Due to the increasing number of schools being required to offer SES programs, the number of Title I students participating in this free tutoring program increases dramatically each school year. To fund this rapidly increasing program, local school districts are required to set aside 20% of their annual Title I allocation (Cohen, 2006).
The lack of evaluation has created boon times for SES providers. The number of students receiving SES in 2004-05 amounted to over 400,000 students. This number more than tripled from the previous two years and student participation is still increasing rapidly ("Beyond the pale: SES provisions emerge as 'loose cannon' reform," 2006). In the 2005-06 school year, the number of students receiving this free tutoring program again increased to almost 500,000 students (U. S. Department of Education, 2007).

A substantial amount of money is at stake in funding this program. Per NCLB, a portion of the 20% setaside of Title I funding is to provide SES in school districts (Borja, 2006). Chicago’s SES program served 60,000 students in 2004-05 and cost the district almost $50 million (Chicago Public Schools, 2005). In 2005, SES providers nationwide received $400 million in federal money for tutoring services (Borja, 2006). Under full implementation nationwide, SES could amount to more than $2.5 billion of the almost $13 billion annual Title I grant funds (Ascher, 2006; Cohen, 2006). SES providers contend that they are eager to have their programs evaluated (Reid, 2004), but critics state that they operate as “loose cannons” in school districts across the country with no accountability ("Beyond the pale: SES provisions emerge as 'loose cannon' reform," 2006).

**SES Coordination with Classroom Curriculum**

Concerns over the lack of accountability also center on the lack of requirements to coordinate SES with classroom curriculum or for providers to communicate with school personnel. SES provides no procedure for providers to receive academic information from teachers or vice versa. Critics contend that this lack of coordination between the school and SES providers reverses a district’s approach to a coordinated and comprehensive reform of Title I schools. Some district officials have expressed concern that the curriculum of SES providers was at odds with their efforts to create a complete academic program for students in these schools.
They feel that SES provisions weaken the ability of their schools to develop a consistent instructional program by requiring tutoring to be offered outside the school day, further discouraging coordination of the SES provider and classroom teacher ("Beyond the pale: SES provisions emerge as 'loose cannon' reform," 2006; Sunderman, 2006). In Tennessee, many teachers reported that they were not even aware that their students were being tutored by SES providers, which meant that there was no collaboration regarding student academic needs. Teachers also expressed frustration at the lack of collaboration with providers in developing student learning plans (Potter, Ross, Paek, & McKay, 2006). Experts stated that academic gains would be stronger if providers would collaborate with the students’ teachers. They also contend that SES will not meet its potential as long as the SES curriculum is disconnected from what is being taught in the classroom (Viadero, 2007). Although there is no research that supports the methodology behind SES, there is research that suggests that students benefit in schools that support a comprehensive approach to educating students. This includes Title I curriculum that is aligned with the regular curriculum and provides services that support the core instruction (Sunderman & Kim, 2004).

The curriculum used during tutoring is up to the discretion of the SES provider and to-date almost nothing is known about what students are actually being taught during tutoring sessions beyond what is listed in their state application, on their website, or in their marketing materials. Providers most commonly describe their curriculum as “literacy skills” and “problem solving skills.” While NCLB encourages SES providers to align their curriculum with state standards, it clearly forbids states and districts from attempting to influence a provider to implement a certain curriculum (Burch, 2007).
There is also speculation that SES decreases accountability by focusing on short term individual student achievement rather than focusing on a broad range of school level outcomes based on state standards. The focus is narrowed further by not only serving individual students, but serving only students who request the free tutoring services (Sunderman, 2006).

**SES Student-Teacher Ratio**

The student-teacher ratio is established by SES providers and can vary significantly by provider, district, and location (Burch, 2007). Although research strongly suggests that the greatest academic gains can be obtained from one-to-one tutoring, current state and district evaluations have found that most SES programs are significantly larger (Baker et al., 2006; Burch, 2007; Elbaum et al., 2000; Juel, 1996; Lauer et al., 2004; Lauer, 2006; Wasik, 1998). The Education Industry Association reports that SES is most commonly offered in small groups of less than 10 students, but studies have shown that some providers have ratios of 1:10 or 1:12. Providers with higher enrollment rates tend to have larger groups sizes of 1:8 to 1:10, while providers with a smaller enrollment tend to tutor in groups of 1:1 to 1:3 (Burch, 2007).

Another noteworthy problem is that by funding SES with the 20% setaside of Title I funds to pay providers, the allocations to schools have been drastically reduced. Rather than use these funds to focus on school wide improvement tied to state standards, SES uses these funds to focus on individual student academic gains for the students whose parents elect this free tutoring program (Sunderman, 2006).

**Existing Research on SES**

In 2004, The Center for Education Policy conducted a study of the implementation of SES. Six states and nine districts with SES implementation experience were selected. The study consisted of telephone surveys to state administrators in charge of implementing SES statewide and site visits to the nine districts to interview district staff, visit schools, conduct teacher and
parent focus groups, and hold personal interviews. This study reported that although parents had been satisfied with the services delivered to their children, they wanted the services to start sooner. Parents were concerned that their children were not receiving the maximum benefit of the tutoring due to the amount of time it took to actually start tutoring after they had chosen a provider. In some districts several weeks passed before students started receiving tutoring. The study also stated that it was too early to assess the effectiveness of SES on student academic achievement and that states needed guidance on how to assess SES effectiveness (Anderson & Weiner, 2004).

In 2005, the U. S. Department of Education commissioned a follow-up study to the 2004 Center for Education Policy study. Once again, six states and nine districts were included in this case study of SES. However, four of the nine districts included in the original study were no longer providing SES because they no longer had schools in their second or higher year of school improvement. To compensate for these four districts, four new districts in two additional states were added. This study, conducted by Anderson & Laguarda (2005), noted a lack of coordination between the SES provider and the teacher. Many teachers in the study reported that they did not know which of their students were participating in the SES program and felt that collaboration with the tutors would help their students. Teachers and parents also reported that they did not receive progress reports on their students, although providers of these same students reported that they sent regular progress reports to them. Parents also objected to the instructional approach that providers took in teaching their children. Additionally, these parents stated that they were disappointed with the quality of the tutoring provided and felt their children had made no academic gain in reading and math. They also questioned whether just a few hours of tutoring could actually make a difference for their children. This U. S. Department of Education case
study concluded that, as a result of the lack of evaluation of SES, very few providers have been removed from state lists. In a few instances, providers were removed for financial irregularities or because they did not offer the specified tutoring services to their students, but there were no providers removed from state-approved lists because the state had determined that the quality of their tutoring program was not adequate. Burch (2007) reported that 15 of the 30 states (50%) who responded to a survey conducted through The Education Public Interest Center stated that their state actually removed a provider from the state list because of a contract infraction or a lack of effectiveness in the SES services provided.

**Minneapolis Public Schools’ SES Effectiveness**

In 2005, Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) conducted an internal SES study on the effectiveness of the program in their district. Dr. David Heistad of the MPS Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Office conducted this evaluation because he felt the state was ill-equipped to conduct a controlled study. He stated that it may be incumbent upon large urban districts to conduct their own evaluations of the SES program in an effort to provide feedback to its stakeholders, including schools, parents, SES providers, and the Minnesota Department of Education. Dr. Heistad conducted two different studies.

The first compared reading achievement gains for students in each SES program on the Northwest Achievement Levels Tests (NALT). The second study matched students on the NALT pre-tests and student demographic characteristics and calculated achievement on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA) for the largest SES provider with a control group of students who received no tutoring. Results of the first study found no statistical significant difference among SES providers on NALT annual reading gains. No provider with at least 10 students receiving tutoring came close to averaging 100% of expected scale score growth based on the NALT norms. For example, Education Station tutored 561 students who averaged 71% of
a year’s growth, while 92 students tutored by Newton Learning Services averaged 67% of a year’s growth. Students in grades 3 and 7 who did not receive SES achieved at a higher level than students they were paired with who received SES from Catapult Learning, outscoring them by 19 points and 6 points, respectively. On the other hand, Catapult’s 5th grade students outscored their matched sample by 4 points. The achievement differences in both instances were not statistically significant. Overall, the average growth for students in SES programs was 66% of the national norm growth for all students (Burch, 2007; Heistad, 2006).

Results from the second study found no statistically significant difference in MCA reading achievement for students who received tutoring from their largest SES provider compared to the control group who received no tutoring. Dr. Heistad stated that the results of the second study were disappointing when given the fact that 564 students who received tutoring from their largest SES provider spent an additional 37 hours of instruction in the SES program. The report concluded by saying that the SES program must be redesigned to better serve the needs of Minneapolis students.

**Chicago Public Schools’ SES Effectiveness**

Another evaluation of SES tutoring programs was completed in 2005 by the Chicago Public Schools. This evaluation was done to determine if students who received SES had made sufficient academic gains. Test score data from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills from 2003-04 and 2004-05 were analyzed and it was determined that students who received at least 40 hours of tutoring in grades 4 – 8 achieved higher gain scores than students who did not receive SES. It was also determined that students who received 40 total hours of tutoring achieved higher math and reading scores than students who received less than 40 hours (Chicago Public Schools, 2005).
SES was again evaluated in the Chicago Public Schools in 2006. The results showed that tutored elementary students made only slightly higher gains in reading than students who were eligible for tutoring, but did not receive SES. In the 2005-06 school year, SES was offered in 324 schools by 41 private firms who were approved to provide SES by the Illinois Department of Education. Chicago Public Schools spent $50 million for 56,000 students who received SES and officials questioned whether the tutoring services were worth the money. Officials stated they wanted to see higher achievement gains for the investment that was made (Grossman, 2007).

A policy brief from the Education Public Interest Center (EPIC) at Arizona State University stated that although the studies from Minneapolis and Chicago made important contributions to the evaluation of SES, they both contained methodological limitations that left many aspects of the program unevaluated. In the Chicago study, the evaluation failed to consider differences among student populations. It was also stated that the higher gain scores may have resulted from an academic program other than SES tutoring. Selection bias could also account for the higher gain scores. For example, parents who enroll their students in SES programs tend to be better educated parents and take a more active role in their child’s education. EPIC contends that since these possibilities are not considered, the evaluation results are open to question (Burch, 2007).

EPIC cited similar limitations in the design of the Minneapolis study. Minneapolis compared their students with a nationally normed population, when in fact the Minneapolis students were disproportionately low income, with 73% of the students classified as minority students, with 76% being black, Hispanic, American-Indian or Asian. Therefore, while the study compared its results to a national norm, significant differences in the two populations make the findings questionable (Burch, 2007).
Los Angeles Unified School District’s SES Effectiveness

In February of 2007, Los Angeles Unified School District released a study wherein they duplicated a January 2006 study of the effectiveness of the 2004-05 SES program on increasing the academic achievement of participating students. The January 2006 study found that SES had no significant impact on student achievement on the California Standards Test in language arts and math. The 2007 study analyzed the academic achievement of the 14,759 students who participated in SES in the 2005-06 school year. The results of the study showed that students who attended SES had a statistically higher, yet non-significant increase in their academic achievement than did students who qualified for SES but did not participate. The SES program was more effective for elementary students than secondary students and some providers had a greater effect on increasing student academic achievement, while others had no effect (Rickles & Barnhart, 2007).

Tennessee’s SES Effectiveness Study

The effectiveness of SES was assessed statewide in Tennessee in a study completed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) in March 2007. The goal of this study was to evaluate the academic achievement of students in grades 4 through 8 who received SES in the six school districts during the 2005-06 school year that were required to offer these services. The results of the study by CREP yielded no statistically reliable effects for increased student achievement from the 33 SES providers included in the study. The results show no statistically significant differences between students who received tutoring and those who did not. The evaluation of two SES providers in this study resulted in negative effects on academic achievement for students who enrolled in their programs (Potter et al., 2006).
Large Urban Districts’ SES Effectiveness

The U. S. Department of Education released a report in June 2007, where data from the 2004-05 school year were analyzed from nine large urban school districts that had a large number of students participating in the two choice options. The nine districts were Baltimore, Chicago, Denver, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Palm Beach, Philadelphia, San Diego, and Washington, DC. The first of the two choice options allowed parents to transfer their children to another school in the district that had not been identified for school improvement and the second choice option gives parents the opportunity to enroll their children in SES. Of the nine districts included in this study, two districts were eliminated in the SES academic achievement portion because they had less than 100 students participating in the tutoring program. Across the remaining seven districts, students who participated in SES scored better in reading and math in the first year and the higher academic achievement was deemed statistically significant. Students also scored even higher in the subsequent year of SES (Zimmer, Gill, Razquin, Booker, & Lockwood, 2007). Zimmerman et al. (2007) stated that these findings were based on a small number of school districts that are not nationally representative, and the results should not be viewed as representative of the effectiveness of SES nationally. The results are important because this study is one of the first to analyze the effectiveness of SES in multiple districts.

Contradictory evidence was presented in a study for the Los Angeles Unified School District. Rickles & Barnhart (2007) stated that, in the 2004-05 school year, they found no significant impact on the achievement of Los Angeles Unified School District SES students on the California state test. Rickles & Barnhart’s report contradicts the Zimmerman et al. (2007) report where it was stated that, as one of the nine districts that was included in their study, Los Angeles Unified School District students who participated in SES made statistically significant academic gains in reading and math in the 2004-05 school year.
SES Evaluation Progress

Although states report that systems have been developed and implemented to evaluate and monitor SES providers, as of 2005, 15 states had not established any monitoring process, 25 states had not established any standards for evaluating provider effectiveness, and none had finalized their evaluation process. Seventeen (17) states plan to use student achievement on state assessments as their evaluation tool for SES providers, although only one state planned to use a control group. The most common evaluation method proposed by 25 states was to survey districts about provider effectiveness, while 18 states plan on using providers’ reports on student academic progress (Stullich et al., 2006). In a policy brief from EPIC at Arizona State University, 15 of the 30 states that responded to a survey stated that they did not use any form of test data to evaluate SES provider quality, but instead relied on annual site visits (Burch, 2007).

Several states are making progress on evaluating SES providers. Louisiana has made progress on its SES evaluation by using test scores from state assessments to monitor the effectiveness of individual SES providers on student achievement. To accomplish this task Louisiana developed a data system for all of its programs that take place outside the regular school day. This data system communicates with the district’s entire student data system and compares the state test scores of students in after-school programs with the scores of those who are not (Gewertz, 2005). Illinois, Ohio and Florida also were scheduled to implement their SES evaluation program in the summer of 2006 (Pines, 2006). Illinois and New Jersey reported to the United States Government Accountability Office that they were in the process of improving their data collection system to effectively capture and examine needed data to determine SES provider effectiveness. Several states said that while they have collected needed data to evaluate providers, they have not completed the evaluations. Other states reported that additional federal guidance on implementing effective evaluation models was needed because developing and
implementing effective evaluation models was time-consuming and costly (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).

Although state monitoring of SES implementation has been limited, states reported making gains in monitoring both districts and providers in 2005-06. Districts have also increased monitoring efforts of SES providers serving their students. New Mexico and Tennessee were the only two states that had final or draft SES evaluation reports that attempt to assess the effectiveness of SES providers on student academic achievement, but these evaluations did not provide conclusive results. Although states are required to remove providers from approved lists if they fail to increase student achievement for two years, most states have failed to implement this section of NCLB (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).

The Center on Education Policy (CEP) published a report in 2007 on the status of state implementation of SES. In their annual survey regarding NCLB implementation, CEP included several questions regarding the state’s role in overseeing SES. Two key findings center on a state’s ability to monitor SES providers effectively. It was found that 38 states were unable to comprehensively monitor the quality and effectiveness of providers and only 10 states reported that they adequately monitor SES. States reported that the biggest barriers to effective monitoring were a lack of staff and inadequate funding at the district level to administer the program (Minnici & Bartley, 2007).

The Education Industry Association (2005) has attempted to make SES providers themselves responsible for monitoring their tutoring programs by creating high ethical standards that its over 500 members have adopted as a code of professional conduct. The Supplemental Educational Services Code of Conduct (2005) states that the importance of SES activities and the complicated interactions of SES make it vital that members adhere to the highest standards of
professional conduct and ethics. This voluntary Code of Conduct describes key organizational behaviors and policies that are to direct SES providers. It includes: (a) guidelines on how providers should conduct business and fulfill responsibilities, (b) directives to consistently implement the NCLB Supplemental Educational Services provisions and promote full access to SES services, and (c) describes best practices for implementing SES. The Supplemental Educational Services Code of Conduct is now a part of the state application process in several states including Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Illinois, Ohio, Florida, Georgia, and New Mexico (“Code of Professional Conduct,” 2006).

**Challenges in Evaluating SES**

Many challenges are presented in the SES literature, but there are few suggestions to guide states and districts on evaluating the benefits of SES, particularly in improving the education of low-income and minority students who are to benefit from this program (Sunderman, 2006). Three-fourths of states reported that they are experiencing challenges evaluating SES, including designing evaluations to determine the academic gain of students, having the personnel and funds to analyze data, and developing data systems to monitor SES information (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).

Due to the fact that states do not have the capacity or funding to monitor and evaluate SES providers, many students end up in sub-standard programs (Rees, 2006). In March of 2006, CEP published their fourth annual report, *From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Their findings were based on a survey of all 50 states, a nationally representative survey of 299 school districts, case studies of 38 geographically diverse districts and 42 schools, three national forums, and six special analyses of critical issues in implementing NCLB. According to survey results, states consider the greatest challenge to implementing SES is monitoring and evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the tutoring services provided.
Forty-one (41) states and 51% of school districts called this a moderate to serious challenge. Current federal regulations restrict the ability of school districts to establish rules for SES providers, but districts ultimately are responsible for allocating federal funds to providers and increasing the academic performance of SES students. In response to these expectations, CEP has made recommendations to help NCLB work better. One of these recommendations calls for states and school districts to be given sufficient resources and authority to evaluate and monitor SES providers’ effectiveness in raising student achievement (Rentner et al., 2006).

Forty-nine (49) states reported that they used the criteria required by NCLB and federal guidance to review and approve SES providers. These criteria include the assurances that providers are financially sound, have a record of effectiveness, utilize research-based strategies, provide services that are consistent with district instruction, and adhere to health, safety, and civil rights laws (Minnici & Bartley, 2007). States also reported that the effectiveness of SES is jeopardized because the federal government pushes states to increase the pool of providers with little evidence of program effectiveness. Districts have raised additional concerns about what they consider to be unethical practices some providers have used to attract students to their tutoring program (Sunderman, 2006). Providers have used recruiting practices to entice parents to enroll students in their program that are unrelated to the quality of their services. In Chicago, parents were given over 40 SES providers from which to choose from; some of these providers attempted to influence parents by offering cash payments, video game consoles, or other enticements for enrolling their children in the provider’s program (Rees, 2006). The use of incentives by SES providers had become such a problem in Florida that the practice was specifically addressed in a state statute that was approved by the Florida legislators in 2006.
Florida State Statute 1008.331 Supplemental Education Services in Title I schools states the following:

(1) INCENTIVES. — A provider or school district may not provide incentives to entice a student or a student's parent to choose a provider. After a provider has been chosen, the student may be awarded incentives for performance or attendance, the total value of which may not exceed $50 per student per year (The 2006 Florida State Statutes, 2006).

**Recommendations to Strengthen and Evaluate SES**

Nothing is gained by avoiding the question of the effectiveness of NCLB or naively assuming that well-intentioned efforts will be sufficient. As noted by Michael Kirst (2004), a veteran policy analyst, it took more than 10 years and many legislative and administrative adjustments before the initial Title I program in the 1965 *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* met the legal intent of Title I. This is typical of aggressive new federal programs. These new programs rarely work well at first; instead they bring a plethora of unforeseen problems, consequences, loopholes, and impractical features. In fact, NCLB is immensely more ambitious than the original ESEA because its goals, methods, and reforms do not conform to current educational practices in America’s public schools. NCLB requires states and districts to participate in unfamiliar, untried activities, such as SES. The important question is whether SES, in its current form, has a realistic chance of being effective given time and practice or whether the law is impractical and unrealistic. If the latter is true, then NCLB needs rethinking and revision, not just persistence and adjustments (Hess & Finn, 2004a).

A wealth of recommendations to strengthen and evaluate SES are presented in existing literature. Recommendations from Steven Pines, Executive Director of the Education Industry Association (2006) include the following:

1. States should directly involve SES providers and the local education agency in the development of evaluation policies and specific methodologies.
2. States should ensure the fairness of the system particularly when the local education agency is an approved provider.

3. States should separate the effects of SES from other variables that might affect a student’s achievement.

4. States should use extreme care or avoid using standardized tests for purposes other than for which they were originally deemed reliable and valid.

5. States should include data from providers’ pre-and post-testing of SES students in their overall evaluation of provider effectiveness.

Hess & Finn (2004) made recommendations to strengthen and improve the existing SES program. These recommendations include the following:

1. Guidance must be provided to states to ensure sound and rigorous evaluations including careful planning, time, and adequate funding.

2. Better federal data must be provided on how SES is being utilized and how it is working. For example, data might include tracking the number of students receiving services, or which providers are serving how many students. This information is vital and could be tracked by the National Center for Education.

3. Districts must be given additional money to support the administration and evaluation of SES programs.

4. School districts need to function as either administrators of SES or SES providers, not both.

Sunderman & Kim (2004) recommend that the federal government terminate the SES program as a mandated sanction of NCLB for poorly performing Title I schools, while suggestions made by the United States Government Accountability Office (2006) call for states to be provided with needed assistance regarding methods for the evaluation of SES, including additional and clearer guidance. States also have requested a forum to share SES best practices with peers, such as meetings and conferences that could be facilitated by the federal government. There is also a request for data collection on the amount of Title I funds spent on SES by districts (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).
Summary

NCLB legislation requires states to ensure that Supplemental Educational Services are of high quality, research based, and designed to help eligible children attain proficiency in meeting the state’s academic achievement standards, yet the federal government has not partnered with states to develop an adequate evaluation process.

Presently, $2.5 billion is being diverted from Title I funds annually to pay for this free tutoring program with virtually no accountability. While states are required to remove providers from their approved lists if they fail to increase student achievement for two years, states have failed to implement this section of NCLB. The few states that are evaluating SES providers have not yet produced reports that provide a decisive evaluation of their effect on student academic gains. States also have expressed concern that additional federal guidance on implementing effective evaluation models is needed because developing and implementing evaluation models is time consuming and costly. In fact, 75% of states reported that they are experiencing challenges evaluating SES, including designing evaluations to determine the academic gains of students, having the personnel and funds to analyze data, and developing data systems to monitor SES information (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).

Current literature provides evidence that the Supplemental Educational Services provision of NCLB has been in effect nationwide for several years with minimal and conflicting evaluations of its effectiveness on increasing student achievement despite the NCLB requirement for evaluation. The literature echoes a resounding demand to evaluate the effectiveness of SES to determine the level of academic gain of Title I students, if any, that this program facilitates. With billions of dollars set aside annually to fund the SES program, it is critical that it be evaluated and adjusted, if necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student-teacher ratio should be kept low. A 1:1 or 2:1 ratio is suggested for a successful tutoring program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaboration between the child’s classroom teacher and the tutor has been identified as an important aspect of effective tutoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experienced, certified teachers make the best tutors. Teachers make effective tutors because they are specifically educated to teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extensive training of tutors produces the most positive effects. Training must be ongoing and includes observing tutors and students during tutoring sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A long term commitment sustained over the entire school year with the same tutor working with the same student produces positive results. Tutoring should be intensive and consistent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
STUDY OVERVIEW

With the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 initiated unprecedented educational reform to ensure that all children have the opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach proficiency on state standards and assessments by increasing the accountability of states and districts (Stullich et al., 2006). Supplemental Educational Services is one of the elements of this historic educational legislation and is defined as academic activities provided outside normal school hours and typically offered as an after-school tutoring program. The legislated goal of the SES program is to increase the academic performance of low-income students who attend Title I schools that have not made adequate yearly progress for three or more years. An SES program typically includes tutoring in math, reading, and/or language arts, but specifically prohibits homework help (Smole, 2004). NCLB requires states to ensure that Supplemental Educational Services are of high quality, research based, and designed to help eligible children increase their academic achievement to attain proficiency in meeting the state’s academic achievement standards.

This free tutoring program is offered by SES providers who include nonprofit, for-profit, and faith-based organizations, as well as school districts, charter schools, and private schools that have been approved by state educational agencies (Kasmin & Farmer, 2006). SES is a parent-driven program wherein providers are selected by parents from a state-approved list. SES providers remain on this approved list unless they fail to demonstrate student academic gains for two consecutive years. In order to demonstrate academic gain, providers are required to be evaluated annually by the state educational agency. This evaluation is the specific responsibility of the state, but currently no definitive evaluation has been completed on the effectiveness of SES on raising student academic achievement in any state (Smole, 2004).
Annually as much as $2.5 billion is set aside nationwide to provide SES in Title I schools for a program that has little or no research to prove its effectiveness in increasing academic growth for enrolled students (Ascher, 2006; Cohen, 2006). While states are required to remove providers from their approved lists if they fail to increase student achievement for two years, states have failed to implement this section of NCLB. According to the U. S. Government Accountability Office (2006) the few states that are evaluating SES providers have not generated reports that provide a thorough evaluation of their effect on increasing academic achievement for Title I students.

States have expressed concern that additional guidance is needed from the United States Department of Education to construct and implement adequate evaluation models (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006). At this time the federal government has not partnered with states to develop an adequate evaluation process to ensure that these requirements are being met (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006). Furthermore, states contend that development and implementation of evaluation models is time consuming and costly. In fact, 75% of states reported that they are experiencing challenges evaluating SES, including designing evaluations to determine the academic gains of students, having the expertise and funds to analyze data, and developing data systems to examine SES information (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this analysis was to assess the effectiveness of the SES program in Florida Title I urban district schools that were required to offer this program during the 2006-2007 school year.
To assess the effectiveness of SES, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in math for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

2. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

3. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services in both math and reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

4. Do students tutored by the three major SES providers in each district (i.e., those that provided tutoring for the largest number of students) for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

**Research Hypotheses**

The study was guided by the following research hypotheses:

**Null Hypothesis 1.** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math.

**Null Hypothesis 2.** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in reading.

**Null Hypothesis 3.** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math and reading.

**Null Hypothesis 4.** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the
post-test for students receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring from the three SES providers who tutored the largest number of students in each district.

**Overview of the Method**

This study utilized existing FCAT scores to assess the effectiveness of SES in grades 4 - 10 for six large urban Florida school districts in an effort to align this study with the anticipated evaluation of SES by the State of Florida. A memo dated December 21, 2007, stated that the Florida Department of Education will use FCAT scores in the 2006-07 evaluation of companies providing SES to students in grades 4-10 (L. Dukes, personal communication, December 21, 2007).

Included in this study are six of the largest urban Florida school districts. The six districts have been randomly assigned numbers one through six for identification purposes. This study was limited to these large urban Florida school districts due to the unavailability of statewide data.

**2006-07 Participating District Statistics**

District One has a total student enrollment of 362,050. The number of students who receive free or reduced price lunch is 221,229 or 61% of the student population. Title I funds are provided to schools with a 63% or higher rate of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. Of the 438 schools in the district, 47% (n = 204) are Title I schools that are required to offer SES. The ethnic makeup of the student population district wide is comprised of 61% Hispanic, 27% Black, 9% White, and 3% Other, which includes American Indian, Asian, and Multiracial categories. In grades 9-12, there are a total of 8,526 dropouts which represents a 6.7% annual dropout rate. The four-year graduation rate in this district is 59.2%. The district employs 39,603 full time employees, including administrators, teachers, and support staff.
There are a total of 193,681 students enrolled in District Two. Free or reduced price lunch is provided for 49% (n = 95,726) of the student population. In District Two, Title I funding is provided to schools with a 57% or higher rate of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. This district is comprised of 279 schools of which 123 are Title I schools offering SES. The district ethnic breakdown of the student population consists of 44% White, 22% Black, 26% Hispanic, and 8% Other, which includes American Indian, Asian, and Multiracial categories. The annual dropout rate in grades 9-12 is 2.1% (n = 1,330), with a four year graduation rate of 77.3%. A total of 17,272 full time employees are employed by this district, including administrators, teachers, and support staff.

District Three has a total enrollment of 175,593 students. Students receiving free or reduced price lunch total 81,245 students or 46% of the student population. Title I funds are provided to schools with a 75% or higher rate of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. This district is composed of 222 schools of which 39 schools or 18% are Title I schools offering SES. The district wide ethnic distribution of students in District Three is 36% White, 28% Black, 29% Hispanic, and 7% Other, which includes American Indian, Asian, and Multiracial categories. The annual dropout rate is 1.9% (n = 1,165) students in grades 9-12. The four year graduation rate is 72.2%. There is a total of 22,361 full time staff members employed in the district, including administrators, teachers, and support staff.

Student enrollment totals 174,861 students in District Four. Of the total enrollment, 72,947 or 42% of the district’s students receive free or reduced price lunch. District Four provides Title I funding to schools with a 44% or higher rate of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. There are 265 schools in this district with 24% (n = 64) being Title I Schools offering SES. The ethnic breakdown of the district enrollment is 42% White, 29% Black, 22% Hispanic, and 7%
Other, which includes American Indian, Asian, and Multiracial categories. The annual dropout rate of students in District Four, grades 9-12, is 3% (n = 1,715). The four year graduation rate in this district is 69.3%. There are 19,696 full time staff members employed by the district, including administrators, teachers, and support staff.

District Five has a total enrollment of 126,648 students. Free and reduced price lunch is received by 52,709 students or 42% of the student enrollment in the district. This district provides Title I funding to schools with a 62% or higher rate of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. Of the 182 schools in the district, 41 or 23% are Title I schools that are required to offer SES. The ethnic composition of the student population district-wide is comprised of 44% White, 43% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 7% Other, which includes American Indian, Asian, and Multiracial categories. The annual dropout rate of students in grades 9-12 in District Five is 6.6% (n = 2,780) with a four year graduation rate of 60.5%. A total of 12,958 full time staff members are employed by the district, including administrators, teachers, and support staff.

The final school district included in this evaluation, District Six, has a total student enrollment is 112,150 with 40% (n = 45,217) receiving free or reduced price lunch. In District Six, Title I funding is provided to schools with a 43% or higher rate of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch This district is comprised of 279 schools of which 32 are Title I schools offering SES. The ethnic distribution of students in this district is 64% White, 19% Black, 9% Hispanic, and 8% Other, which includes American Indian, Asian, and Multiracial categories. In grades 9-12, there are a total of 1,304 dropouts, which represents a 3% annual dropout rate. The four-year graduation rate is 67%. A total of 14,409 full time staff members are employed by District Six, including administrators, teachers, and support staff.
FCAT data requested from the six Florida school districts was used in a quasi-experimental design in this study. In each district, the data was divided into two groups of Title I students receiving free or reduced price lunch in grades 4 - 10. Both groups of students had FCAT scores for 2006 and 2007 for math and reading and attended schools that offered SES. Group One, the experimental group, was composed of students who received at least 10 hours of tutoring in the SES program during the 2006-07 school year. Group Two, the control group, was composed of students who were eligible for SES, but not enrolled in the program.

When submitting the requested data, districts were asked to include FCAT developmental scale scores, as well as FCAT achievement levels. In addition, demographic information was requested including gender, ethnicity, student ESE codes, SES provider codes, as well as the total hours of tutoring in math and/or reading.

Prior to submitting the Institutional Review Board application to each of the six urban Florida school districts included in this study, permission to conduct research was obtained from the University of Florida Institutional Review Board. The study did not involve direct student contact, but evaluated existing FCAT scores and student identification numbers were deleted. Therefore, individual students were not identifiable and informed consent was not required.

The methodology included using developmental scale scores from the 2006 and 2007 FCAT administrations. Developmental scale scores were selected as the unit of measure because they are an effective tool in tracking student performance across grade levels. As a student moves from grade to grade, his/her performance can be tracked and compared to the performance of other students. Developmental scale scores enable the yearly progress of individual students to be reported by the change in their scores (Florida Department of Education, 2007b).
Procedures

The developmental scale score from the 2006 and 2007 FCAT administrations were used as pre- and post-tests. A quasi-experimental design was utilized wherein the experimental group participated in the SES program and students in the control group did not participate in the tutoring program.

Students who did not participate in both the 2006 and 2007 administration of the FCAT were eliminated from the study. In addition, the data file was scrubbed by eliminating students who did not receive a minimum of 10 hours of tutoring. A minimum of 10 hours of tutoring was consistent with criteria set by the Florida Department of Education’s evaluation proposal that only students who receive a minimum of 10 hours of tutoring be included. Students who had received SES were placed in the experimental group. The control group was randomly selected utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software and was re-sampled for each analysis. In addition, the control group was matched by grade with students in the experimental group. The control group was qualified to receive SES, but the parents of these students chose not to enroll them.

Next, the experimental group was divided into three categories: students who received tutoring in math only, students who received tutoring in reading only, and students who received tutoring in both math and reading. The control group was subsequently divided into three matching groups.

The null hypotheses in this study were tested using the ANOVA test of means to determine if there was a statistically significant increase in FCAT developmental scale scores from the 2006 to 2007 administration. Computations were performed using SPSS software and tested at a .05 level of significance. The effectiveness of SES was reported in three areas: reading only,
math only, and reading and math. SES effectiveness was also reported by individual SES provider within each district.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the study by discussing the need to evaluate SES to determine its success on improving the academic achievement of students receiving tutoring. An overview of the method discussed the criteria used to select the six Florida urban school districts included in this study, as well as the selection protocol used to form the control and experimental groups. Finally, a discussion of the procedures was presented wherein scrubbing the data and the formation of categories in the experimental and control group was explained as a preface to the reporting of data in Chapter 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
<th>District Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>362,050</td>
<td>193,681</td>
<td>175,593</td>
<td>174,861</td>
<td>126,648</td>
<td>112,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>221,229</td>
<td>95,726</td>
<td>81,245</td>
<td>72,947</td>
<td>52,709</td>
<td>45,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate for Title I funding</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Schools</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Staff</td>
<td>39,603</td>
<td>17,272</td>
<td>22,361</td>
<td>19,696</td>
<td>12,958</td>
<td>14,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this analysis was to assess the effectiveness of the SES program in Florida urban school districts that were required to offer this tutoring program during the 2006-07 school year. To determine effectiveness, FCAT data was obtained from six of the largest Florida urban school districts. Initially the study was designed to include the seven largest urban Florida school districts, but was revised to six school districts when obstacles in obtaining the needed data arose from the seventh district. In reporting the results of this study, participating school districts are not identified by district name. Districts were randomly numbered one through six for identification purposes in this study.

This study utilized FCAT data from these districts in a quasi-experimental design. FCAT developmental scale scores for 2006 and 2007 were used as pre- and post-tests. In each district, the FCAT data from the Title I SES schools was divided into two groups receiving free or reduced price lunch in grades 4 - 10. Both groups were required to have FCAT scores from the 2006 and 2007 administration for reading and math. Group one, the experimental group, was composed of students who received at least 10 hours of tutoring in the 2006-07 school year. Group two, the randomly selected control group, was composed of students who were eligible to receive SES, but were not enrolled in the program.

Next, the experimental group was divided into three categories: students who received tutoring in math only, students who received tutoring in reading only, and students who received tutoring in math and reading. The control group was subsequently divided into three matching groups. In the experimental group and the control group, each student’s 2006 FCAT developmental scale score was subtracted from their 2007 score and the net result was used in the analysis.
The null hypotheses in this study were tested using a one-way analysis of variance design to determine if there was an increase in FCAT developmental scale scores from the 2006 to 2007 administration for students who participated in SES. Computations were performed using SPSS software testing at a .05 level of significance. The results reported in three areas: reading only, math only, and reading and math. SES effectiveness was also reported by individual SES providers in each district who served the largest number of students who received at least 10 hours of tutoring in math and/or reading.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in math for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

2. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

3. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services in both math and reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

4. Do students tutored by the three major SES providers in each district (i.e., those that provided tutoring for the largest number of students) for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

**Research Hypotheses**

The study was guided by the following research hypotheses:

**Null Hypothesis 1.** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math.
Null Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in reading.

Null Hypothesis 3. There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math and reading.

Null Hypothesis 4. There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring from the three SES providers who tutored the largest number of students in each district.

Analysis and Quantitative Results

FCAT data from the six districts participating in this study were combined to assess the effectiveness of the SES program in raising student achievement. This FCAT data file contained complete data by grade level for the 9,026 students who received SES during 2006-07 school year. Table 4-1 reports the number of students represented at each grade level. Table 4-2 reports the combined breakdown of students by grade level and school district. When assessing academic gains for students, grade levels with less than 50 students were eliminated because it was determined they did not adequately represent the student population. Grades 11 and 12 were eliminated because of the small number of students represented in these grades (n= 17). As a result, the experimental group used in this study contained 9,009 students each of whom received at least 10 hours of tutoring in math and/or reading. Table 4-3 documents the number of state approved SES providers who provided tutoring services within each district during the 2006-07
school year. Some providers served multiple districts; elimination of duplication resulted in a total of 86 different providers assessed in this study.

The control group was comprised of students with similar demographic information as represented in the experimental group. The control group population included 21,784 students who attended Title I SES schools but did not participate in the SES tutoring program. Using the SPSS software program, a random selection process was utilized to compile control groups that matched the experimental groups. The control group was re-sampled for each analysis completed in this study.

**Research Question 1**: Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in math for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

The math only group included 1,565 students in the experimental group and 1,565 students in the corresponding control group. Table 4-4 illustrates the number of students in each grade level per district that received tutoring in math. This group received a total of 24,590 hours of math tutoring from 57 SES providers. The number of math tutoring hours provided per student ranged from a minimum of 10 hours to a maximum of 56 hours. The developmental scale score gain mean for the experimental group was 144.16 and 122.60 for the control group. Therefore, a mean score difference of 21.56 was determined with the tutored group having the higher mean score. Developmental scale scores gains ranged from a low of -828 to a high of 1046 for the experimental group. In the control group, developmental scale scores gains ranged from a low of -816 to a high of 1120.

**Null Hypothesis 1**: There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math.
Results of the ANOVA test of the means for Null Hypothesis 1 (Table 4-7) found a statistically significant difference between the math experimental group and the math control group on the FCAT developmental scale score gains ($f = 11.161; p = .001$). Thus, Null Hypothesis 1 stating that SES tutoring in math would have no statistically significant effect in FCAT developmental scale scores was rejected.

**Research Question 2:** Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

The reading only experimental group was comprised of 6,630 students who participated in the reading tutoring program. The control group mirrored the grade levels and number of students in the experimental group. Table 4-5 details the number of students per grade level and district for the reading group. Students received 106,600 hours of tutoring in reading provided by 73 SES providers. The minimum number of per student tutoring hours in reading was 10 with the maximum tutoring hours of 53. The developmental scale score gain mean for the experimental group was 126.60 and the mean for the control group was 120.21 a mean score difference of 6.39 favoring the experimental group. Developmental scale score gains ranged from a low of -1250 to a high of 1498 for the experimental group. The control group developmental scale scores gains ranged from a low of -891 to a high of 1163.

**Null Hypothesis 2:** There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in reading.

Results of the ANOVA test of means (Table 4 – 8) for Null Hypothesis 2 found no statistically significant difference between the FCAT developmental scale score gains of the reading experimental group and the reading control group ($f = 2.453; p = .117$). As a result Null
Hypothesis 2, stating that there is no statistically significant difference between the 2006 and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores for students tutoring in reading was accepted.

**Research Question 3**: Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services in both math and reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

The reading and math experimental group was comprised of 1,084 students who received tutoring in both subjects. The control group for this analysis also contained 1,084 students at the same grade levels. Table 4-6 summarizes the number of students and the grade levels per district for this group. These students received 6,488 hours of reading tutoring and 6,505 hours of math tutoring from 38 SES providers. Individual students received a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 36 hours of tutoring in reading. The same group of students received a minimum of 10 hours and a maximum of 30 hours in math tutoring. The developmental scale score mean for the experimental reading group was 126.95 and the control reading group was 122.29, a mean scale score difference of 4.66 favoring the experimental reading group. The mean developmental scale score gain for the experimental math group was 137.69 while the mean score gain for the control math group was 128.44. The experimental math group produced a higher mean score gain difference of 9.25. Developmental scale score gains ranged from a low in the reading experimental group of -956 to a high of 1369. The math experimental group had developmental scale score gains that varied from a low of -792 to a high of 1036. The control group developmental scale scores in reading ranged from -823 to a high of 1231 and in math ranged from a low of -816 to a high of 1120.

**Null Hypothesis 3**: There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students in Title I schools receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring in math and reading.
The ANOVA for Null Hypothesis 3 (Table 4 – 9) resulted in a finding of no statistically significant difference in mean scores between the experimental and control groups receiving tutoring in reading and math (reading: f = .212; p = .646; math: f = 1.347; p = .246). The finding of no statistically significant difference between the 2006 and 2007 FCAT developmental scale score gains between the experimental and control groups resulted in acceptance of Null Hypothesis 3.

**Research Question 4**: Do students tutored by the three major SES providers in each district (i.e., those that provided tutoring for the largest number of students) for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

An ANOVA was used to assess the effectiveness of individual SES providers that provided tutoring in the six districts included in this study. The three SES providers that served the largest number of students in each district were included in the analysis for a total of 18 SES providers. Results are reported by district in Tables 4-10 through 4-15.

Of the 18 providers analyzed, three were found to have statistically significant results as tested by the ANOVA. These SES providers were (a) Advanced Learning, (b) Rocket Learning, and (c) Studentnest, Inc.

In District 2 (Table 4-11), Advanced Learning tutored 88 students in math and 97 students in reading. Students received 1,857 hours of tutoring in reading and 1,782 in math. Reading students received a minimum of 10 hours of tutoring and a maximum of 29. A minimum of 10 hours and a maximum of 34 hours was provided to students in math tutoring. The mean developmental scale score for the math experimental group was 157.34 and the math control group developmental scale score mean was 84.64. A mean score difference of 72.70 resulted with the math experimental group having the higher mean score. The reading experimental group in the analysis of Advanced Learning had a mean developmental scale score of 158.94 and the
control group had a mean score of 79.40 resulting in a 79.54 difference. Developmental scale score gains in the experimental group ranged from a low in reading of -320 to a high of 483. In math the scores ranged from a low of -547 to a high of 1433. The control group developmental scale score gains ranged from a low in reading of -523 to a high of 445. In math the scores ranged from a low of -681 to a high of 588.

In District 3 (Table 4-12), Rocket Learning provided tutoring for 47 students in reading. This SES provider tutored students for a total of 1,120 hours. Students received a minimum of 10 hours of tutoring and a maximum of 34 hours. The mean developmental scale score for the experimental group was 189.02 and the control group was 71.49, resulting in a difference in the mean developmental scale scores of 117.53. In the experimental group developmental scale score gains for Rocket Learning students ranged from a low -342 to a high of 818. Developmental scale score gains for the control group ranged from a low -334 to a high of 357.

The final SES provider that had statistically significant ANOVA results was Studentnest in District 4 (Table 4-13) who tutored 155 students in Math for a total of 3,151 hours. A minimum of 10 hours of tutoring was provided to students with a maximum of 27 hours offered per student. The control group had a mean developmental scale score of 96.14, and a mean of 151.13 was determined in the experimental group. Thus, a difference of 54.99 was found between the experimental group and the control group. The analysis of Studentnest developmental scale score gains in the experimental group resulted in a low of -543 to a high of 778. The control group developmental scale score gains ranged from a low of -427 to a high of 696.

**Null Hypothesis 4**: There is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring from the three SES providers who tutored the largest number of students in each district.
The ANOVA resulted in a finding of statistically significant difference for three of the SES providers analyzed, but the remaining 15 SES providers resulted in a finding of no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores. Tables 4-10 through 4-15 detail the statistical findings for the 18 SES providers analyzed. Null Hypothesis 4, which states that tutoring provided by the three largest providers in each district would have no statistically significant results, was rejected for the three providers who demonstrated statistically significant results: Advanced Learning, Rocket Learning, and Studentnest, Inc. The ANOVA results for the remaining 15 SES providers was retained for Null Hypothesis 4.

The ANOVA analysis for Advanced Learning resulted in a finding of a statistically significant difference between the experimental group receiving tutoring in reading and math and the matching control group on the developmental scale score gains on the FCAT reading ($f = 4.688; p = .032$) and math ($f = 5.344; p = .022$). This finding of a statistically significant difference between the 2006 and 2007 FCAT developmental scale score gains in reading and math resulted in rejection of Null Hypothesis 4 for Advanced Learning in District 2 (Table 4-11).

Results of the ANOVA (Table 4-12) for Rocket Learning in District 3 found a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the reading experimental group and control group on FCAT developmental scale score gains ($f = 7.193; p = .009$). This finding resulted in rejection of Null Hypothesis 4 for Rocket Learning in District 3.

The outcome of the ANOVA test of means (Table 4-13) for Studentnest in District 4 found a statistically significant difference between the math experimental group and the math control group on the FCAT developmental scale score gains ($f = 8.237; p = .004$). This finding resulted in rejection of Null Hypothesis 4 for Studentnest in District 4.
Summary

The purpose of these analyses was to examine the effectiveness of the SES program in Florida urban school districts’ Title I schools that were required to offer the SES program in the 2006-07 school year. The ANOVA test of means was used to analyze groups of tutored students that included students who were tutored in math only, reading only, and reading and math. Also analyzed were the three SES providers who tutored the largest number of students in each district. Of the 21 groups evaluated, 4 groups resulted in a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group. The analysis concluded that students tutored in math only, as well as students tutored by Advanced Learning, Rocket Learning, and Studentnest, Inc., significantly increased their academic achievement per the developmental scale scores on the 2007 FCAT.

In Chapter 4 quantitative results of the study were presented. Chapter 5 will present a discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as implications, future research and summary.
Table 4-1. SES Students by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. SES Students by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
<th>District Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,247</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 9,026
### Table 4-3. Active SES Providers by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
<th>District Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-4. Total Students: Math Only Group by District and Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
<th>District Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1,565
Table 4-5. Total Students: Reading Only Group by District and Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
<th>District Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3501</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 6,360

Table 4-6. Total Students: Reading and Math Group by District and Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>District One</th>
<th>District Two</th>
<th>District Three</th>
<th>District Four</th>
<th>District Five</th>
<th>District Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 1,084
Table 4-7. Analysis of Variance for Math Only Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>11.1161</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant

Table 4-8. Analysis of Variance for Reading Only Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,718</td>
<td>2.453</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-9. Analysis of Variance for Reading and Math Tutoring Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-10. Analysis of Variance for District 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cool Kids</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocket Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocket Learning</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Station</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-11. Analysis of Variance for District 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Success</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Success</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4.688</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Learning</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5.344</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically Significant

Table 4-12. Analysis of Variance for District 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club Z!</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.305</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Z!</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocket Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.193</td>
<td>.009*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically Significant

Table 4-13. Analysis of Variance for District 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AlphaBEST</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlphaBEST</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studentnest</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>8.237</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically Significant

Table 4-14. Analysis of Variance for District 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A” Wise Choice</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxtable Education</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-15. Analysis of Variance for District 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>df 1</th>
<th>df 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievia</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTA</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTA</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Poverty and inequality in America’s education system are barriers to opportunity and progress. This is apparent in the achievement gaps between student groups with African-American and Latino students continually lagging behind in academic achievement compared to other students (Kennedy, 2005). The fact that only 29% of all fourth grade students performed at or above the proficient level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress in reading in 2000 clearly indicated a need for nationwide education reformation and the federal government enacted NCLB to implement this reform (U. S. Department of Education, 2002; U. S. Department of Education, 2006).

The highest priority of NCLB is to give low achieving students the opportunity and ability to meet high academic standards and reach proficiency on demanding state assessments. The Title I program, one of the largest programs funded by NCLB, was designed to ensure that students living in poverty have an equal opportunity to obtain a high quality education and achieve the required academic growth to meet state standards and assessments. Title I provides federal funding to help students who are either behind academically or are at risk of falling behind academically.

NCLB introduced the SES program to Title I schools to provide additional academic assistance (e.g., tutoring, remediation, and other educational interventions). The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the SES program in Florida urban school districts’ Title I schools that were required to offer the program in the 2006-07 school year. Nationwide, each Title I school that has not made AYP for three years is required to provide SES to students from low-income families. This program is designed to increase the academic achievement of students in eligible Title I schools. NCLB defines SES as additional academic assistance such as tutoring,
remediation, and other educational interventions, provided that these approaches are consistent with the content and instruction used by the school district and are aligned with the state’s academic content standards (Kennedy, 2005). SES providers are required to demonstrate that the tutoring provided increases student academic achievement in order to maintain their status as approved and remain on the state-approved list (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). Therefore, states are required to evaluate SES providers to determine their effect on increasing student achievement (Smole, 2004).

While federal guidance places the responsibility of evaluating the effectiveness of the SES program on the state, Florida has not evaluated this program since it began in the 2004-05 school year. States are required to prohibit providers from offering services to students if they fail to increase student achievement for two years, but Florida, as well as all other states, has neglected to enact this section of the law.

Discussion of the Findings

This study included 9,009 students from 6 large urban Florida school districts in grades 4 through 10 who were tutored by 86 state-approved SES providers. These SES students received a total of 113,148 hours of tutoring in reading and 31,128 hours of tutoring in math for a total of 144,276 hours of tutoring during the 2006-07 school year. Findings from this study demonstrated that, although there was some increase in the academic achievement of students participating in this program, the increase was limited to a relatively small number of students. Of the 21 tutoring groups analyzed, only 4 groups demonstrated statistically significant academic gains on FCAT developmental scale scores. These 4 groups include the math only tutoring group and 3 individual SES providers. Those providers are Advanced Learning, Rocket Learning, and Studentnest, Inc. The results of the study are summarized in Tables 5-1 and 5–2.
The following research questions were addressed in the study.

1. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in math for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

From an experimental group of 1,565 students, an ANOVA test of means evaluated the developmental scale scores from the 2006 and 2007 FCAT to assess the academic gains of students tutored in math. The results from the ANOVA were statistically significant with a significance level of .001. Of the three subject assessments (tutoring in math only, tutoring in reading only, and tutoring in reading and math) this was the only analysis that resulted in a statistically significant difference in mean scores. Of the 9,009 students evaluated in this study, only 1,565 students received benefits from the math only tutoring. Null Hypothesis 1 was rejected for the math only tutoring group.

2. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services exclusively in reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

The number of students tutored in reading was considerably higher than the number tutored in math. This analysis contained 6,360 students who were tutored in reading only. The ANOVA test of mean scores was not statistically significant for the reading group with a significance level of \( p = .117 \). Therefore, Null Hypothesis 2 was retained. The 106,600 hours of tutoring this group received, was not effective in increasing their academic achievement in reading.

3. Do students who participated in Supplemental Educational Services in both math and reading for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control group?

This group of 1,084 students received tutoring in both math and reading. Reading tutoring totaled 6,488 hours and math tutoring totaled 6,505. The ANOVA test of mean scores resulted in
a finding of no statistical difference between the tutored experimental group and the control
group with a significance level of $p = .246$ in math and $.646$ in reading. This group also failed to
increase their academic achievement. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 3 was retained.

4. Do students tutored by the three major SES providers in each district (i.e., those that
provided tutoring for the largest number of students) for 10 or more hours demonstrate higher
developmental scale score gains, as determined by the FCAT, compared to students in a control
group?

Each district was represented by three SES providers who provided tutoring for the
largest number of students in that district. Of the 18 providers analyzed, 3 were found to have
produced statistically significant results per the ANOVA. As a result, the null hypothesis was
rejected for these 3 providers. The ANOVA results from the remaining 15 providers resulted in a
finding of no statistically significant difference in the mean scores between the tutored
experimental group and the control group. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 4 was retained for these
15 SES providers.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Sunderman & Kim (2004) defined the goal of SES as a program that was designed to
increase the academic achievement of students in low-performing schools. The results of this
study found minimal evidence to indicate that the SES tutoring program was producing
significant academic growth for Title I students. In fact, the study’s statistical evidence clearly
demonstrates that the SES program had only a minimal impact on Title I students. More
extensive results should be expected for a program that consumes 20% of district’s Title I
allocation.

This analysis indicated that despite 9,009 students in grades 4-10 received a total of
144,276 hours of tutoring, major academic growth accrued for a relatively small number of
students. Of the 6 districts assessed, only 3 of the 18 major SES providers had statistically
significant results on increasing the academic achievement of students as measured by FCAT Developmental Scale Scores. The number of students tutored by the three providers was small (n = 413) when compared to the total number of students (n = 9,009) who received tutoring in the 2006-07 school year. The only student group that was positively affected by the tutoring in math totaled 1,565 students. The students who demonstrated increased academic achievement in at least one subject totaled 1,978 (22%), leaving 7,051 (78%) students who received tutoring, but did not demonstrate increased academic achievement.

Isolating the impact of the SES program on students who did make academic gains is difficult. Rickles & Barnhart (2007) stated that positive outcomes of students who participated in the SES program might be due to students who are more motivated and persistent in nature or who have parents who are more involved in their children’s education than those who did not participate. Burch (2007) noted that selection bias could also account for higher gain scores. For example, parents who enroll their children in SES tend to be better educated and take a more active role in their children’s education. He also stated that academic gains may have resulted from an academic program other than SES. Such selection bias was not apparent from the results of this study.

The cost of the SES program also must be considered when assessing the effectiveness of the program. SES is funded by a 20% setaside that is deducted from the school district’s Title I funds. This setaside is taken from grant funds that in past years were distributed to Title I schools. Therefore, with the implementation of SES, school funding for Florida’s Title I schools was decreased by 20%. The setaside encumbered to fund SES and school choice in the 67 Florida school districts for 2007-08 amounted to $115,140,533. The 20% setaside for Miami Dade County Public Schools alone amounted to $25,308,760, with an additional 21 Florida
school districts encumbering at least $1 million each to fund the SES program (Florida Department of Education, 2007a). Full implementation of SES nationwide could total more than $2.5 billion of the annual Title I grant funds (Ascher, 2006; Cohen, 2006). Given the minimal number of Florida students in large urban school districts who benefit from SES, it must be determined whether this is the most effective way to spend these funds.

Students in Title I schools that have not made AYP can be challenging learners. In past years many research based, innovative programs have been utilized with these students to increase their academic achievement. Despite these programs the achievement of these students has not significantly increased. The question must be asked whether it is feasible for after-school tutoring programs presented a few hours a week to increase the academic performance of these students. SES is expected to enable significant academic strides in students who have continued to be unsuccessful. Perhaps the expectations of the SES program are inappropriate.

The task of this analysis was to assess the effectiveness of the SES program in Florida urban district schools that were required to offer this program in the 2006-2007 school year. Through the literature review, data collection, and findings reported in this analysis, the following conclusions were developed:

**Conclusion 1:**

According to SES federal guidance, the state is charged with the responsibility to develop, implement, and publicly report the effectiveness of SES providers and is required to withdraw approval from providers that fail to increase the academic performance of students for two consecutive years (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). Hess & Finn (2004b) suggested that guidance be provided to states to help develop sound and rigorous evaluations, including planning and funding. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (2004) summarized the
importance of evaluating SES programs by stating that it is not the lack of evaluation that is of 
the utmost concern; it is the importance of knowing if SES students are actually receiving 
services that increase their academic achievement.

Florida implemented the SES program in 2004-05 in 11 urban districts that had Title I 
schools in their third year of non-adequate yearly progress. The number of SES districts 
increased every year until 2006-07, when SES was required in every school district in Florida. 
During the 2007-08 school year Florida approved 201 providers to provide SES (Florida 
Department of Education, n.d.). SES has been fully implemented in Florida, but there has been 
no evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in the state. This study confirmed that 
relatively few providers were effective in raising the academic performance of students in large 
urban Florida school districts. Effective providers need to be retained, but ineffective providers 
need to be eliminated from the state-approved list. To meet the mandate of NCLB a 
comprehensive evaluation is necessary so that ineffective providers can be removed from the list 
of state-approved providers.

Conclusion 2:

Reid (2004) indicated that one of the reasons for the lack of evaluation is that states lack 
the capacity and funding to develop an effective monitoring system and evaluation method. By 
the very nature of the NCLB sanction process, SES enrollment continues to increase yearly. With 
increased enrollment, additional administrative and management burdens are created. Districts 
are forced to assume these responsibilities with no additional funding (Ascher, 2006). The Center 
on Education Policy released a 2006 study based on survey results from 50 states, concluding 
that NCLB created greater administrative burdens with inadequate funding. Rentner, et al. (2006) 
concluded that districts and states lack funding and staff to manage the many demands of NCLB.
These financial burdens are not part of the 20% setaside, but are additional funds taken from the Title I budget that would have been allocated to schools before NCLB was enacted. A portion of the required setaside should be used to ease the administrative burden on districts created by SES. Using 4% of the 20% setaside would cover administrative costs such as printing, postage, parent outreach, monitoring, and personnel needs. Using this portion of the setaside for SES administrative costs would ultimately increase the financial support of all Title I schools and students if such costs were not taken from their allocation.

Conclusion 3:

Although there is research that identifies quality indicators (Table 2-1, p. 57) of effective tutoring (i.e., student-teacher ratio, collaboration with the classroom teacher, tutor qualifications, tutor training, and length of tutoring), NCLB does not require that they are used in SES tutoring programs. The law vaguely states that SES programs must be of high quality, research based, and designed to increase student achievement (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). For SES to be effective in raising the academic achievement of students, established quality indicators of effective tutoring must be required of SES providers and be part of the evaluation of effectiveness.

The literature review conducted for this analysis indicated that low student-teacher ratio is an important factor in effective tutoring. A 1:1 or 2:1 ratio is suggested for a successful tutoring program. Research indicated that 1:1 tutoring is considered as the most effective form of tutoring (Baker et al., 2006; Elbaum et al., 2000; Juel, 1996; Lauer, 2006; Wasik, 1998). Programs that provide 1:1 tutoring for at-risk students were proven to increase the academic achievement of students in reading. Currently, Florida allows SES providers to choose their student group size. These choices include small group (not to exceed 5 students), large group (not to exceed 10
students), and individual tutoring. The allowed student grouping size for SES must be revised to provide 1:1 tutoring to individualize instruction.

Another important aspect of successful tutoring is collaboration between the child’s classroom teacher and the tutor. Tutoring needs to be coordinated with classroom instruction to provide the student with additional instruction that parallels what is being taught in the classroom and that uses comparable materials. This enables the student to have multiple opportunities to work on difficult materials. As students master the material during tutoring, they are more likely to perform better in class (Wasik, 1998). Currently, the curriculum used during tutoring is left to the discretion of the SES provider. Little is known about what students are actually being taught during tutoring sessions beyond what is listed in the SES provider’s state application, on the provider’s website, or in marketing materials. Although NCLB encourages SES providers to align their curriculum with state standards, it clearly prohibits states and districts from trying to influence a provider’s curriculum (Burch, 2007). A study conducted by Anderson & Laguarda (2005) noted a lack of coordination between the SES provider and the teacher. Many teachers in the study reported that they did not know which of their students were participating in the SES program and felt that collaboration with the tutors would help their students. Collaboration between teachers and SES providers must be required so that tutoring will be meaningful to students.

The next quality indicator that should be required is that of tutor qualifications. Experienced, certified teachers are the best tutors (Elbaum et al., 2000; Gordon, 2003; Gordon et al., 2004; Wasik, 1998). Teachers make effective tutors because they are specifically educated to teach. Tutoring enables them to individualize instruction, which they are often unable to do in a classroom setting. Their education and professional experience make teachers key in providing
effective tutoring (Gordon et al., 2004). Currently, the Florida Department of Education requires that SES tutors meet the minimum standards for Title I paraprofessionals. These minimum standards include a high school diploma and two years of college, an associate’s (or higher) degree, or a passing score on a test required of paraprofessionals who are employed in Title I schools. The qualifications of tutors ought to be revised to prohibit anyone from tutoring who is not a certified teacher. Teachers are specifically trained in differentiated instruction and can individualize instruction based on a student’s needs. Title I students have special academic needs that are most likely to respond to the experience and expertise of certified teachers.

Tutors are most effective when they receive extensive training. Tutors with specialized training consistently produce higher levels of student achievement than tutors with little or no training (Gordon et al., 2004). Training must continue throughout the duration of the tutoring services and must include monitoring of tutors and students during tutoring sessions, followed by immediate feedback (Wasik, 1998). Although training programs which typically consist from 4 to 20 hours are provided by some SES providers, not all providers train their tutors (Ascher, 2006). Tutoring training is not required by NCLB and the Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance does not address it (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). Curriculum implementation, behavior management, and individualized instruction are just a few of many important tools necessary to deliver effective instruction in a tutoring environment. SES tutors would benefit from specific, ongoing training to tutor SES students effectively.

Tutoring delivered over the entire school year with the same tutor working with the same student was found to be most effective. Effective tutoring should be long term, intensive, and consistent (Baker et al., 2006; Gordon, 2003; Juel, 1996; Wasik, 1998). The SES program is designed to provide each student with a specific allocation to fund tutoring. When the allocation
is depleted, services automatically end for each student (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). A typical tutoring program provides 30 hours of free tutoring (Hess & Finn, 2004a). It should also be noted that the frequency or intensity of service can vary because NCLB has no set requirements (Kasmin & Farmer, 2006). If tutoring is provided by a certificated teacher using research based curriculum in a low student to teacher ratio, it may not be effective because of the short length of time SES is offered. The U.S. Department of Education currently allows SES providers to set their own hourly rate within the parameters established by each state. The hourly rate in Florida for the 2007-08 school year ranges from a low of $20 per hour to a high of $80 per hour, with an average being $60 an hour (Florida Department of Education, n.d.). The average student allocation for the 2006-07 school year was $1,124 (Florida Department of Education, 2007d). Therefore, based on the parameters set for SES provider’s hourly rates, a student could be tutored for 56 hours at $20 per hour or 14 hours at $80 per hour. Hourly rates need to be established by the Florida Department of Education to allow students to receive consistent, long term tutoring services. In addition, to enable tutoring to be long term, the student allocation must be increased. If hourly rates are established by the Florida Department of Education and the student allocation is increased, more tutoring hours would be provided to each student.

**Implications**

Per SES federal guidelines, it is the state’s responsibility to evaluate SES providers to ascertain whether they are effective in raising the academic achievement of students who receive tutoring. Although billions of federal education dollars are pumped into this program yearly, no state has completed a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of SES. Research has shown that states are struggling with evaluation design and funding for a comprehensive assessment of SES effectiveness (Minnici & Bartley, 2007; U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006).
SES evaluation is complicated and costly, and the U. S. Department of Education must take the lead in designing, as well as funding, an effective SES evaluation process.

Current evaluations are typically conducted by large, urban school districts concerned about the amount of money invested in a program with no proven results. There is considerable research to confirm the effectiveness of tutoring, but most evaluations completed on SES do not show positive results on increasing the academic achievement of students (Lauer et al., 2004; Moss et. al., 2001). Although SES has been implemented in Florida since the 2004-2005 school year, there has been no statewide evaluation of SES.

The only avenue to remove ineffective SES providers from the state-approved list is by state evaluation (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). Lack of state evaluation forces school districts to enter into contracts year after year with SES providers whose effectiveness is not documented, and per the results of this study, are questionable, thereby wasting millions of federal dollars. More importantly, students who participate in SES are not provided the help they need to increase their academic skills. States must begin evaluating SES providers; those who are effective should remain on the approved list and ineffective providers must be removed. If the overall evaluation results indicate that there are no effective SES providers, then the focus must shift to defining a program design that will increase student academic performance. A plethora of research exists that addresses the effectiveness of tutoring, and this information must be used to increase the effectiveness of this multibillion dollar program.

To facilitate additional planning, future researchers should be aware of the data collection problems experienced in this study. This study was designed to be a statewide assessment of SES, but the statewide data could not be obtained from the Florida Department of Education in a timely manner. The Florida Department of Education puts data requests in a queue and the wait
time is 18 months to have a data request reviewed. Thus, the most current data is not available for use in such a study. Although Florida is considered by many to have the most advanced data system in the nation, essential data were not made available for this study. This roadblock required redesign of this study to include the seven largest urban school districts in Florida. One of the districts initially included in the study required payment of a substantial fee for processing the needed data. After much thought and conversation, that district was excluded and the study was again redesigned to include six urban Florida school districts. Timely receipt of data still produced complications in that it took eight months to receive data from two of the districts. Therefore, creating a timeline that allows ample time for redesign and data collection is essential.

**Future Research**

The goal of the SES program to increase the academic achievement of Title I students is an important goal in today’s education system. There are many problems facing educators in schools today, and new ways to educate students effectively must be found. Decreasing the dropout rate, eliminating the achievement gap, and educating students to succeed in a global economy are worthy goals, and NCLB was implemented in response to these needs. NCLB provisions are a starting point, but school districts, regardless of their level of effectiveness, are currently unable to follow them. This study opens conversation on the effectiveness of SES, but future research is needed. The following recommendations address needs for future research regarding SES effectiveness.

1. A longitudinal study that follows SES students from year to year is needed to assess the cumulative effect of long term tutoring. Consistency of results across multiple years would strengthen conclusions regarding program effectiveness.

2. FCAT developmental scale scores are designed to track a student’s progress from year to year. Analyses that show statistically significant results should be compared to the expected increase in scale scores from grade level to grade level to assess the actual academic achievement.
3. In this study FCAT developmental scale scores were used as the measurement tool. From an assessment perspective, this is a rather blunt instrument to use for this purpose. In future research to better understand and interpret the results, additional measures are needed to assess the effectiveness of SES tutoring.

4. Future evaluations should include systematic sampling to form a control group that groups students by pre-test FCAT developmental scale scores, in addition to grade levels, that are aligned with the experimental group.

5. Consideration must be given to the confounders in this study. For example, SES is a parent-driven program in which a child can only receive tutoring if a parent completes and returns the tutoring application. Analysis should be completed on the differences between parents who request services and parents who do not. This would help in determining if the differences in parental support are a contributing factor to the success or lack of success in advancing the academic achievement of SES students.

6. Another confounder to address in future research is the individual attributes of each SES school. Schools that have not made AYP for several years receive intense remediation with several new programs and strategies every year. Adjustments in staff, curriculum, and instruction are ongoing in an attempt to provide an educational program that is effective in raising students’ academic achievement. If an SES school increases the academic achievement of its students, can this increase be entirely attributed to a tutoring program that lasts a few weeks? If not, thought must be given to methods for isolating increased achievement as a result of SES or other educational programs and strategies.

7. Tutoring is an effective tool in raising the academic performance of students (Moss et al., 2001; Lauer et al., 2004). Future research should focus on the implementation and fidelity of the SES program. Several quality indicators of successful tutoring (Table 2-1) have been identified and future research should focus on the implementation of these indicators in the SES program.

Summary

The No Child Left Behind Act was implemented in 2002 in an effort to decrease the achievement gap between student groups by providing additional academic opportunities for America’s Title I students in low achieving schools. Supplemental Educational Services was included as one of these academic opportunities and was designed to provide students with tutoring. Although SES is specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of participating students through tutoring, there has been no evaluation of the success of this program (U. S. Government Accountability Office, 2006). Federal guidance places the
responsibility of evaluating SES on the state, but there have been no evaluations completed by the Florida Department of Education. Therefore, the goal of this study was to assess the effectiveness of SES in increasing academic achievement for students.

This study focused on assessing the increased academic performance of students on the FCAT as measured by developmental scale scores. The results found increased developmental scale scores for students who received tutoring in math, but there were no statistically significant findings on increased achievement for students who received tutoring in reading or in reading and math. This study also assessed 3 of the largest SES providers in each of the 6 districts that participated in this study. Of those 18 providers assessed, only 3 provided results that confirmed increased academic achievement.

Although there was some increased academic achievement found in this study, the number of students benefiting from SES must be significantly increased to justify the time and money spent on implementing this tutoring program in America’s schools. At the time of this study, the reauthorization of NCLB is only months away. Therefore, this is the optimal time to make needed adjustments and revisions. Michael Kirst (2004), a veteran policy analyst, found that it took more than 10 years and many legislative and administrative modifications before the initial Title I program in the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act achieved its intent. Kirst stated that this is typical of aggressive new federal programs.

The overall goal of Title I is to increase the academic achievement of students who live in poverty, and all programs funded through Title I must meet this goal. Therefore, SES must be evaluated and subsequent action must be taken to ensure its success, or the program needs to be abandoned and the funds returned to Title I schools where they can be used to meet the academic needs of students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Status of Null Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>There is a relationship between SES tutoring and increased FCAT developmental scale scores in math (p=.001)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>There is no relationship between SES tutoring and increased FCAT developmental scale scores in reading (p=.117)</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>There is no relationship between SES tutoring and increased FCAT developmental scale scores in math and reading (Math p=.246; Reading p=.646)</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5–2. Summary of Findings for Hypothesis 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>SES Provider</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Status of Null Hypothesis 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cool Kids</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocket Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocket Learning</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Station</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Academy of Success</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of Success</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.032**</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Learning</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.022**</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Club Z!</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Club Z!</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocket Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.009**</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AlphaBEST</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AlphaBEST</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntington Learning</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studentnest</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.004**</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“A” Wise Choice</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huxtable Education</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A+ Tutor U</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACES</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievia</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCTA</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCTA</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hypothesis 4 states that there is no statistically significant difference between 2006 FCAT developmental scale scores as the pre-test and 2007 FCAT developmental scale scores as the post-test for students receiving at least 10 hours of tutoring from the three SES providers who tutored the largest number of students in each district.

** Statistically Significant
APPENDIX A
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

UF
Institutional Review Board
UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

DATE: May 29, 2007
TO: Myrna Allen
    1898 Village Glen Drive
    Jacksonville, FL 32259
FROM: Ira S. Fischler, Chair
      University of Florida
      Institutional Review Board
SUBJECT: Renewal of Protocol #2007-U-0530
TITLE: The Effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services in Florida Urban School Districts
SPONSOR: PI'S OWN FUNDS

Because only existing data will be used in this protocol, it is exempt from further review by the Board in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101b(4), as no human participants are involved in this research. It is understood that information will be recorded by the investigator in such a manner that individuals cannot be identified, directly or through identifying links.

Should the nature of your study change or if you need to revise this protocol in any manner, please contact this office before implementing the changes.

IF:cl
APPENDIX B
REQUEST FOR DISTRICT FCAT DATA

July 20, 2007

XXXXX County Public Schools
Mr. XXX XXXX
Manager
Information Services
XXX XXXXXXXX
XXXX, Florida XXXXX

Dear Mr. XXXXXX:

Please find enclosed the required documents to gain permission from the XXXXXX School District to obtain FCAT data for Title I students receiving Supplemental Educational Services (SES). I am currently pursuing a doctoral degree at the University of Florida and request permission from your district to analyze the requested data to determine the effectiveness of NCLB’s SES program for Florida students. As well as being a UF doctoral student, I am an administrator for Duval County Public Schools in the Title I Office where my job responsibilities include coordinating the SES Program for our district. My dissertation will analyze FCAT scores for Title I students in the seven largest urban Florida school districts, which includes:

- XXXXX
- XXXXX
- XXXXX
- XXXXX
- XXXXX
- XXXXX
- XXXXX

This evaluation will be done by using FCAT test scores for two consecutive years (2006 and 2007) for students in urban Florida districts who have received SES services. FCAT developmental scale score gains will be used to determine academic growth. I am required by the University of Florida to submit my request to the University Institutional Review Board. I have enclosed a copy of this form and subsequent approval letter for your review. I anticipate needing this data in September 2007, as I would then officially be a Ph.D. candidate at the university and would begin the data analysis of the requested FCAT scores. Dr. David Quinn is my dissertation committee chair and will supervise the dissertation process for the University of Florida. I am submitting my request early in an effort to meet your requests and requirements in a timely manner.

I have discussed this study with Mr. XXX XXXXX, Director of Federal Programs of XXXXXXX County Public Schools and will be happy to share my results with his office, as well as any other department in your school district. The results of this study will be useful in
enhancing and improving the SES Program in your district, as well as other districts in Florida. I will also be submitting this study to the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Public School Options, which implements SES for the entire state.

This request was also submitted to Ms. Teresa Miller, Director of Educational Policy, at Integrated Education Data Systems at FDOE in an effort to obtain all needed FCAT scores from her department, but was told that it would be at least an 18 month wait for this data. Due to my dissertation timeline and requirements, I cannot wait that length of time to begin the data analysis needed, so I am contacting each school district to gain permission to use this data.

Enclosed you will find your districts required research form, a proposal narrative, a literature review, an example Excel spread sheet that lists the FCAT data needed, and the IRB form submitted to the University of Florida, as well as the subsequent approval letter. Please consider my request to use this student data in my research. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached at XXX-XXX-XXXX or on my district cell at XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Myrna Allen
Supervisor of Supplemental Instruction
Title I Office
Duval County Public Schools
1701 Prudential Drive
Jacksonville, Fl 32207
Office: 904-390-2123 Fax: 904-390-2634
allenm2@educationcentral.org

cc: Dr. David Quinn
    Mr. XXXXXX
    Mr. XXXXXX
July 30, 2007

Ms. Myrna Allen
XXXXXXX
Jacksonville, FL XXXX

Dear Ms. Allen:

I am pleased to inform you that the Research Review Committee of the XXXXXXX County Public Schools has approved your request to conduct the study, "The Effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services in Urban Florida School Districts." The approval is granted with the following conditions:

1. The anonymity and confidentiality of all subjects must be assured.

2. The computer-generated data which are provided by the XXXXXXX will be either aggregated or coded to ensure the subjects' anonymity.

3. The study is based on anonymous student records, so parent permission forms are not required.

4. The study will involve approximately 34,000 XXXXXXX students.

It should be emphasized that the approval of the Research Review Committee does not constitute an endorsement of the study. It is simply a permission to request the voluntary cooperation in the study of individuals associated with the XXXXXXX. It is your responsibility to ensure that appropriate procedures are followed in requesting an individual's cooperation, and that all aspects of the study are conducted in a professional manner. With regard to the latter, make certain that all documents and instruments distributed within the XXXXXXX as a part of the study are carefully edited.

The approval number for your study is 1382. This number should be used in all communications to clearly identify the study as approved by the Research Review Committee. The approval expires on June 30, 2008. During the approval period, the study must adhere to the design, procedures and instruments which were submitted.

The computer-generated data for the study will be provided by Mr. XXXXXXX of the Office of Program Evaluation of the XXXXXXX. Contact him at XXX-XXX-XXXX to make the necessary arrangements.
If there are any changes in the study as it relates to the MDCPS, it may be necessary to resubmit your request to the committee. Failure to notify me of such a change may result in the cancellation of the approval.

If you have any questions, please call me at XXX-XXX-XXXX. Finally, remember to forward an abstract of the study when it is complete. On behalf of the Research Review Committee, I want to wish you every success with your study.

Sincerely,

Chairperson
Research Review Committee

XXX:XX

cc: Mr. XXXXXXXX
July 25, 2007

Mrs. Myrna L. Allen
Duval County Public Schools
Title I Office
1701 Prudential Drive, Room 406
Jacksonville, Florida 32207

Dear Mrs. Allen:

The Duval County Public School district has agreed to participate in your research proposal, *The Effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services in Urban Florida School Districts*. A copy of this letter **MUST** be presented to the principal and participating principals in order to assure them your research has been approved by the district. Approval is given, however, under the following conditions:

1) Participation by the school, its teachers, students, or parents is to be on a voluntary basis. That is, participation is **NOT MANDATORY** and you must advise all participants that they are not obligated to participate in your study.

2) If the principal agrees the school will participate, it is **up to you** to find out what rules the school has for allowing people on campus and you must abide by the school’s “check in” policy. You will **NOT BE ALLOWED** on any school campus without first following the school’s rules for entering campus grounds.

3) Confidentiality must be assured for all. That is, **ALL DATA MUST BE AGGREGATED SUCH THAT THE PARTICIPANTS CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED**. Participants include the district, parents, students, and administrators.

4) **PARENT PERMISSION MUST BE OBTAINED FOR ALL STUDENTS INVOLVED IN YOUR RESEARCH.** This includes both the sample group **AND** if you have one, the control group. **You must indicate in your letter to the parent all the types of data you will be collecting (i.e., race, gender, FGAT scores, etc.).** It is appropriate to ask parents of participating students to respond only if they do not want their child to participate.

5) Student data **MUST be DESTROYED** when the project has been completed.
August 7, 2007

Your research project is approved but please be aware that SES data are not readily accessible in the district. It would require substantial work on your part to retrieve the SES data. FCAT and demographic data could be provided.

The contact person for Title 1 SES Services is XXX (XXX) XXX-XXX.

Senior Director
Accountability, Research, and Assessment
Telephone: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Fax: XXX-XXX-XXXX
Submit this form and a copy of your proposal to: [Redacted]

**RESEARCH REQUEST FORM**

Your research proposal should include: Project Title; Purpose and Research Problem; Instruments; Procedures and Proposed Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requester's Name</th>
<th>Myrna L. Allen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address</td>
<td>1701 Prudential Drive, Fl 406, Jacksonville, FL 32207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director or Advisor</td>
<td>Dr. David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Please see attached UIM form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Sought</th>
<th>(check one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Title | The Effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services in Urban Florida School Districts |

**ESTIMATED INVOLVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL/CENTERS</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF TIME (DAYS, HOURS, ETC.)</th>
<th>SPECIFY/DESCRIBE GRADES, SCHOOLS, SPECIAL NEEDS, ETC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>All Title I Students</td>
<td>Students Existing PLAN scores from 2006 &amp; 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/Centers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify possible benefits to students/school system: The results of this research study could be used as a tool for Public Schools to improve and enhance their Supplemental Educational Services Program. This completed study will also be submitted to the PDOK Department of Public School Options. which is the office responsible for the statewide implementation of GES.

**ASSURANCE**

Using the proposed procedures and instrument, I hereby agree to conduct research in accordance with the policies of the Orange County Public Schools. Deviations from the approved procedures shall be cleared through the Senior Director of Accountability, Research, and Assessment. Resources and materials shall be supplied as specified.

Requester's Signature: [Redacted]

Approval Granted: [ ] Yes [ ] No Date: 8-7-07

Signature of the Senior Director for Accountability, Research, and Assessment: [Redacted]

NOTE TO REQUESTER: When seeking approval at the school level, a copy of this form, signed by the Senior Director, Accountability, Research, and Assessment, shall be retained by the local principal.

Reference School Board Policy GCS, p. 249
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November 9, 2007

Ms. Myra Allen  
Duval County Public Schools  
Title I Office  
1701 Prudential Drive, Room 406  
Jacksonville, FL 32207

Dear Ms. Allen:

The Superintendent's Research Review Committee approved your request to conduct research concerning The Effectiveness of Supplemental Education Services (SES) in Urban Florida School Districts, in the School District of XXXXXXX County.

The purpose of this study is to analyze FCAT scores for Title I students receiving Supplemental Educational Services (SES) and a comparison group that did not receive services, but have the same demographics. This report will assess whether the additional academic instruction given by SES providers increases the academic achievement of students in low-performing schools in the seven largest urban Florida school districts.

To conduct the survey, you will:

· Contact the Department of Supplemental Educational Services to identify a contact person;
· Request the contact person to provide 2006 and 2007 FCAT scores in Math/Reading, as well as, other needed data for all students who have received SES services and for a control group of students who were not enrolled in SES;
· Engage in no direct student contact;
· Receive only student data with the identity of all students deleted.

As you conduct your research, please use the following guidelines:

· Submit to this office, a signed Affidavit of Good Moral Character for each researcher before they begin (A blank affidavit form is enclosed);
· Obtain permission from the principal or department administrator before beginning;
· In the case of student subjects, obtain written permission from the parent or guardian before proceeding;
· Provide a copy of all completed and signed parental/guardian consent forms to the principal or principal's designee;
All collection activities involving students must occur in the presence of school staff members;

If your research requires the use of additional resources in the future, you must first submit a written request to this office and then wait for a response before proceeding;

One copy of the study results with an executive summary must be submitted to the Department of Research and Evaluation no later than one month after completion of the research;

Your research activities at the school must not occur during the testing window of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The FCAT testing window includes pre-test, administration, and post-test activities from February 1, 2008 through March 28, 2008.

According to our District's procedures, participation is voluntary. Thank you for your interest in our school district.

XX:XX
Enclosure
c: XXXX
XXXX

XXXXXXXXX, Director
Research and Evaluation
September 11, 2007

Dear Ms. Allen:

Your request to conduct research in XXXX County Public Schools has been approved. This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to this office for review. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol must be cleared with this office prior to implementing such changes.

Due to the fact that you are actively employed by XXXX County Public Schools, the data upon which your study is based has not been disguised in any way. However, no child or group of children is to be mentioned directly or made personally identifiable in the final product of your research.

Upon completion of the study, it is customary to forward a copy of the finished report to the Office of Instructional Research and Accountability, XXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXX, Florida XXXXX. This office also shall be notified, in advance, of the publication of any reports/articles in which XXXX County is mentioned by name.

If you have questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to call me at XXX-XXXX.

General Director
Instructional Research and Accountability
August 13, 2007

Ms. Myrna Allen
Duval County Public Schools Title 1 Office
1701 Prudential Drive, Room 406
Jacksonville, Florida 32207

Dear Ms. Allen:

I received your request to conduct research in XXXXXXX County. Your study, “The Effectiveness of Supplemental Educational Services in Urban Florida School Districts” proposal number 070708-04 has been reviewed and the research has been approved.

Your research request does not require school; teacher or student's participation; therefore please contact our office to make arrangements to receive data you have requested.

If there are any questions or if additional information is needed, please contact our Research & Accountability Department at (XXX) XXX-XXXX.

Once the research is completed please forward a copy of the results to my office.

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXX, Ph. D.
Director, Program Evaluation

XX:x
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