Unit of Federal Programs
Office of Data, Program Evaluation and Reporting (DPER)

www.cde.state.co.us

COLORADO
Department of Education

BRIEF REPORT

Supplemental Educational Services (SES)

2013-2014 Summary of the English Language Development (ELD) Services

Introduction

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) is a subpart of Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which authorizes districts to utilize a portion of the district's Title I funds to provide direct instruction (i.e., tutoring) to students in low performing schools outside of the school day. Under the Colorado ESEA Flexibility Waiver, Colorado preserved the SES program with some modifications based on the State's evaluations of the program across the years[1]. Under the Waiver, any Title I school assigned a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan type must offer SES to the students within that school[2].

Under the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, CDE offered districts the opportunity to provide English language development (ELD) tutoring services using SES funds. Starting in 2012-2013, districts added ELD to services offered to students and families. Of the 4,822 students who participated in SES in that first year, 114 students (2.4%) received supplemental ELD tutoring services. In 2013-2014, participation in ELD services increased to 16.7 percent, with students receiving services through 9 different providers. On average, these students completed 25.5 hours of supplemental ELD tutoring services (a minimum of 20 hours of services is required).

This evaluation report compares the linguistic performance and growth of students served to their linguistic peers to determine the impact of the SES ELD program. Students served by each provider are compared to the comparison group as well as to students served by other providers to ascertain which providers have had the greatest success with increasing student performance.

Evaluation Methods

Colorado's updated Title I SES Guidance required that providers deliver a minimum of 20 hours to each student receiving services. Therefore, in order to be included in the effectiveness analyses, a student must have completed at least 75 percent of the 20 hours minimum *and* at least 50 percent of their contracted hours prior to a designated cut-point date. Cut-point dates were determined by using the mid-point of the state assessment window for the assessment used in each segment of the evaluation , in this case, ACCESS for

SES ELD Highlights

- Students participating in supplemental ELD services, who started Levels 1 through 4 on ACCESS, were more likely to improve at least one proficiency level (64.8%) than students in the comparison group (59.2%)
- Students receiving SES ELD services also demonstrated higher growth on ACCESS (MGP of 48) than students in the comparison group (MGP of 40), although these students were still below the state MGP of 50
- Students who participated in SES were also more likely to meet adequate growth percentile (AGP) targets (69.0%) than students in the comparison group (66.1%)

---

[1] For prior evaluations of the SES program, please visit the DPER website at http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/evalrpts.asp.
[2] For additional information about the SES program, please visit the SES website at http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/ti/ses.

ELLs. Students must have two years of assessment data, as well as a 2013-2014 student growth percentile, to be included in the evaluation. Students with more than one test score for that assessment in the same year (i.e., students testing twice) were excluded. Students also must have progressed one grade from 2013 to 2014 to be included; students held back or students who skipped a grade were excluded to make the SES and comparison groups comparable.

Comparison groups were created by randomly selecting students, who did not receive services, from schools implementing SES (i.e., at least one student served). The comparison groups were selected using 2013 performance, stratified by grade, to ensure the comparison groups had the same proportions of students scoring within each proficiency level in each grade as the students served. Demographics of the students served were compared to the randomly selected samples to ensure the groups were demographically similar (within a few percentages) on key variables such as the percent of students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP), or the percent of Non-English Proficient (NEP) or Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in each group.

In each of the following sections, the English language proficiency of students the year prior to implementation (2013) was compared to the English language proficiency of those students the year after implementation (2014). The percent of students that moved up at least one proficiency level were calculated and compared for each group (i.e., the SES served students compared to eligible but not served students). Median growth percentiles (MGP) for each group were also compared to determine which groups of students had the highest growth.

Based on the Redesignation and Exit Guidance provided by the Office of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education, English learners (ELs) who score at or above proficiency level 5 overall and literacy level 5 on ACCESS may be redesignated if there is additional evidence to support fluent English proficiency and grade-level proficiency in reading and writing. Therefore, in determining the percent of students who moved up at least one proficiency level, only students who started Levels 1 through 4 on the 2013 ACCESS assessment were included so that an increase in proficiency level could be ascertained. All students with ACCESS student growth percentiles were included in the calculations for median growth percentiles.

The purpose of this report is to summarize any trends noted for students who participated in the supplemental English language development services.

Impact of English Language Development Services

Of the students who started Levels 1 through 4 on the 2013 ACCESS assessment, the percent of students receiving ELD SES services who increased at least one proficiency level on ACCESS in 2014 was 64.8%, compared to 59.2% of students in the comparison group (see Table 1). The median growth percentile (MGP) of students receiving SES services (MGP of 48) was also higher than the comparison group (MGP of 40), although both groups were still below the state MGP of 50. In addition, 69.0% of students receiving supplemental ELD services met adequate growth percentile (AGP) targets[3], compared to 66.1% of students in the comparison group.

---

[3] Adequate growth percentiles denote whether the observed level of growth was sufficient for those students to be, on average, on track to reach or maintain proficiency.

Table 1. SES and Comparison Students' Performance and Growth on ACCESS

Group	Valid ACCESS Data (N)	Started ACCESS Levels 1-4	Improved		Median Growth Percentile
			N	%	
SES Students	145	128	83	64.8	48.00
Comparison Group	189	169	100	59.2	40.00

Green highlight represents a score higher than the comparison group on that metric.

Table 2 below identifies the percentages of students within each ACCESS proficiency level, separately by starting proficiency. Proficiency levels were combined according to the designations of the state's proficiency continuum. Data is provided for students receiving supplemental ELD services, as well as students in the comparison group. Students receiving SES ELD services, regardless of starting proficiency level, demonstrated higher growth (MGP of 49 for students starting in Levels 1 or 2; MGP of 48 for students starting in Levels 3 or 4) than students in the comparison group (MGPs of 39.5 and 36, respectively). Students who started in Levels 3 or 4 were also more likely to improve to Level 5 or above in 2014 if they received SES services (30.4%) than students in the comparison group (22.0%).

Table 2. Distribution of Students' ACCESS Proficiency, Based on Starting Proficiency Level

Group	2013 ACCESS Proficiency Level	2014 ACCESS Proficiency Level						2014 ACCESS Median Growth Percentile
		Levels 1-2 (*NEP*)		Levels 3-4 (*LEP*)		Levels 5-6 (*FEP*)		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
Levels 1-2 (*NEP*)								
SES	59	31	52.5	N<30	---	N<10	---	49.0
Comparison	78	36	46.2	N<45	---	N<10	---	39.5
Levels 3-4 (*LEP*)								
SES	69	N<10	---	N<50	---	21	30.4	48.0
Comparison	91	N<10	---	N<75	---	20	22.0	36.0

Green highlight represents a score higher than the comparison group on that metric.
Students starting at level 5 are not included in the proficiency level change analyses and their growth data is not included due to the small number of students (n<20)
Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.

Providers

Club Z! and Advanced Brain Gym Plus were the only providers which served enough students to be included in the evaluation (at least 16 students starting Levels 1 through 4 on 2013 ACCESS and/or at least 20 students with valid growth data). Students served in these programs were more likely to improve at least one proficiency level and demonstrated higher growth than students in the comparison group (see Table 3).

Table 3. ACCESS Performance and Growth of Students Receiving SES Services, By Provider

Provider	Served for ELD (N)	Valid ACCESS Data (N)	Started ACCESS Levels 1-4	Improved		Median Growth Percentile
				N	%	
Club Z	347	82	71	47	66.2	49.5
Advanced Brain Gym Plus	89	61	55	35	63.6	47.0
Comparison Group	**N/A**	**189**	**169**	**100**	**59.2**	**40.0**

Green highlight represents a score higher than the comparison group on that metric.

Next Steps for the Supplemental ELD Service Evaluation

Although a larger percentage of students participated in supplemental ELD services offered through SES in the 2013-2014 school year, the small number of students completing services prior to the ACCESS cut-point date limited the evaluation analyses that could be conducted. As the prior year's evaluation was limited by the transition from CELA to ACCESS for ELLs assessments, it will be important to determine whether trends discovered in this evaluation remain consistent in future years.

Report Authors

- Tina Negley
- Barb Vassis
- Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson

Where can I learn more?