

Supplemental Educational Services (SES)

2013-2014 Program Evaluation Findings and Evaluation of Providers

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 outside of the school day (i.e., tutoring) to students in low performing schools. Under the Colorado ESEA Flexibility Waiver, Colorado opted to maintain the SES program with some modifications based on the State's evaluations of the program across the years¹. Under the Waiver, any Title I school assigned a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan type must offer SES to the students within that school the year after being assigned that plan type². Districts were given more flexibility to plan and implement an SES program designed to better meet the needs of their students, including providing services to students at/or below grade or proficiency level as defined by the district³.

In 2013-2014, 120 schools within 48 districts were required to offer SES. During that year, students from 88 schools (within 28 districts) received SES tutoring. The 2013-2014 school year was the last year in which CDE maintained a list of approved SES providers⁴. In that year, 48 providers, including districts approved to serve as their own provider, were approved by CDE to provide SES to eligible⁵ students in reading, math, writing, and/or English language development (ELD). Families of eligible students selected 30 out of the 48 approved providers. Approximately 80% of participating students received services in reading, 54% in math, 23% in writing, and 17% in ELD (Students may receive services in more than one content area as needed).

This evaluation report compares the academic achievement and growth of students served to their academic peers to determine the impact of the SES

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>.

³ Prior to Waiver, SES had to be offered to students of low socioeconomic status regardless of the students' performance.

⁴ As part of the Waiver application, SES was modified to allow districts to select providers they felt would be most qualified to meet their students' needs based on a demonstrated record of effectiveness, which include but was not limited to the state's evaluation of providers.

⁵ Under the Waiver, the criteria for eligibility were changed from any student of low socioeconomic status regardless of performance to any student performing below grade or proficient levels as determined by the district.

SES Highlights

Reading

- Overall, students receiving reading SES services were more likely to improve at least one proficiency level and had a higher MGP than students in the comparison group
- 6 out of 10 providers had a higher percentage of students that moved to at or above grade-level target on DRA-2 than the comparison group
- 9 out of 16 providers had a larger percentage of students that increased at least one proficiency level on reading TCAP than the comparison group
- Students served by 15 of the 16 providers evaluated had a higher reading MGP than the comparison group

Math

- Students receiving math SES services were also more likely to improve at least one proficiency level and had a higher MGP than students in the comparison group
- 9 out of 12 providers had a larger percentage of students that increased at least one proficiency level on math TCAP than the comparison group
- Students served by 8 of the 11 providers evaluated (one did not have enough students to be included) had a higher math MGP than the comparison group

Writing

- Overall, there was no difference between the students receiving writing SES services and the comparison group on the percent of students improving at least one proficiency level
- Students receiving writing services, however, did demonstrate higher writing growth than students in the comparison group
- 5 out of 6 providers had a larger percentage of students that increased at least one proficiency level on writing TCAP than the comparison group
- Students served by 2 of the 6 providers evaluated had a higher writing MGP than the comparison group



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 offer 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 (for example, the segment pertaining to reading achievement for 3rd through 10th graders relied upon the assessment window for the reading TCAP). 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. The same exclusion rules were applied to both SES and comparison groups to create comparable groups and control for any confounding factors that might skew the results for one group or the other.

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. Because of the large number of English learners receiving services, however, it should be noted that the resulting comparison groups had smaller percentages of NEP/LEP students: for DRA-2, 75.8% of students served compared to 57.1% of the comparison group; for reading TCAP, 59.9% compared to 45.8%; for math TCAP, 53.6% compared to 46.0%; and for writing TCAP, 67.9% compared to 53.6% in the comparison group. Therefore, the following results should be considered within the context of the students represented in each group.

For each component of this evaluation, the academic achievement of students the year prior to implementation (2013) was compared to the academic achievement of those students the year after implementation (2014). The percent of students that moved up at least one proficiency level (for analyses involving TCAP or ACCESS) or the percent of students that started below grade-level and moved to at/or above grade-level (for analyses involving DRA-2) were calculated and compared for each group (i.e., the SES served students compared to eligible but not served students). Median growth percentiles for each group were also compared to determine which groups of students had the highest growth in each content area.

The purpose of this report is to summarize the overall effectiveness of the program within each content area, as well as the effectiveness of the providers that provided services in the 2013-2014 school year.

Impact of Reading, Math, and Writing Services

Reading Grades K-3

In reading, 19.1% of the students receiving SES services who started below grade-level target on DRA-2 (grades K-3) in 2013 improved to at or above grade-level target in 2014. The comparison group (eligible students who did not receive



services) was less likely to improve, with 15.2% of students increasing to at/or above grade-level target on DRA-2, although the difference was not statistically significant.

Reading Grades 4-10

For those starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient, the percent of students receiving services who increased at least one proficiency level on TCAP (grades 4-10) was 24.0%, compared to 22.8% of the students in the comparison group. The median growth of students receiving SES services ($MGP = 49$) was higher than the comparison group ($MGP = 44$), which was a statistically significant difference ($U = 967173.5, p < .01$).

Math Grades 4-10

Students who received math SES services were also more likely to demonstrate improved proficiency and higher growth than the respective comparison group (in prior years' evaluations, math trends have been similar to trends identified in this year's evaluation, presenting a consistent finding on math across years). For those starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient, 22.7% of students receiving SES services improved at least one proficiency level, compared to 19.0% of students in the comparison group, but this difference was not statistically significant. The median growth of students receiving SES services ($MGP = 54$) was higher than the comparison group ($MGP = 46$), which is a statistically significant difference ($U = 903892, p < .01$).

Writing Grades 4-10

In writing, there was not a significant difference in the percent of students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient who improved at least one proficiency level, with 20.2% of students receiving services and 20.9% of students in the comparison group demonstrating improvement. However, the median growth of students who received writing SES services ($MGP = 53.5$) was higher than the comparison group ($MGP = 48$), which is a statistically significant difference ($U = 79280, p < .05$).

Considering the higher percentages of English learners in the SES group compared to the comparison group, these positive trends are noteworthy. In addition, although the students receiving writing services were not more likely to improve proficiency than the comparison group students, the similar rates of improvement (within 0.7%) are still striking considering the SES group consisted of nearly 15% more NEP and LEP students.

Improvement Based on Starting Proficiency

Reading

In addition to the overall trends in reading, there were a few other noteworthy differences in performance when looking at students separately based on starting reading TCAP proficiency (see Table 1). Students who started unsatisfactory in 2013 demonstrated similar improvement regardless of whether they received services (25.3% improved) or were in the comparison group (25.2% improved), but those students receiving services demonstrated higher growth ($MGP = 49$) than the comparison group ($MGP = 45$). Students who started unsatisfactory and received SES services were also more likely to meet step-up (40.6%) and catch-up (15.6%) targets⁶ than students in the comparison group (39.9% and 11.9%, respectively).

Students who started partially proficient in 2013 were more likely to improve to proficient or advanced in 2014 if they received SES services (22.7%) than students in the comparison group (20.1%). In addition, the SES students also demonstrated higher median growth ($MGP = 54$) than students in the comparison group ($MGP = 43$), which was a statistically significant difference ($U = 135388.5, p < .01$). Students receiving services who started partially proficient were

⁶ For explanations of the Colorado Growth Model, including definitions of step-up and catch-up, please visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/generalgrowthmodelfaq>.



also more likely to meet catch-up targets (43.3%) than students in the comparison group (32.3%), which was a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2(1) = 13.26, p < .01$).

Students who started proficient and advanced and received services, however, were more likely to decrease at least one proficiency level (33.3%) than students in the comparison group (17.6%), and also demonstrated lower growth ($MGP = 40.5$, compared to $MGP = 44$ for the comparison group). The SES students were also less likely to meet keep-up targets (51.9%) than students in the comparison group (66.0%), which was a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2(1) = 9.81, p < .01$).

Table 1. SES and Comparison Students' Performance and Growth on Reading TCAP

Group	2013 Reading Proficiency Category	2014 Reading Proficiency Category						2014 Reading MGP	Adequate Growth Targets					
		Unsatisfactory		Partially Proficient		Proficient / Advanced			Step Up Target Met		Catch Up Target Met		Keep Up Target Met	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory														
SES	352	263	74.7	N<100	---	N<10	---	49.0	143	40.6	55	15.6		
Comparison	1,054	788	74.8	N<275	---	N<15	---	45.0	421	39.9	125	11.9		
Partially Proficient														
SES	330	46	13.9	209	63.3	75	22.7	54.0*			143	43.3*		
Comparison	988	196	19.8	593	60.0	199	20.1	43.0			319	32.3		
Proficient / Advanced														
SES	156	N<10	---	N<50	---	104	66.7	40.5					81	51.9
Comparison	467	N<10	---	N<100	---	385	82.4	44.0					308	66.0*

*Statistically Significant

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.

Math

As evidenced in Table 2, students who started unsatisfactory in 2013 and received SES services were more likely to improve at least one proficiency level in 2014 (34.8%) than students in the comparison group (21.1%), and also demonstrated a significantly higher median growth percentile (MGP of 60) than students in the comparison group (MGP of 47), $U = 61595.5, p < .01$. These students were significantly more likely to meet step-up targets (38.7%) than students in the comparison group (23.1%), $\chi^2(1) = 18.72, p < .01$. They were also more likely to meet catch-up targets (Suppressed due to small N size) than students in the comparison group (4.1%), although the results were not significant.

Students who started partially proficient in 2013 were less likely to improve to proficient or advanced (16.1%), but were also less likely to decrease to unsatisfactory (21.2%) than students in the comparison group (17.9% and 23.7%, respectively). Those students receiving services demonstrated significantly higher growth (MGP of 52) than the comparison group (MGP of 46), $U = 225421, p < .01$, and were also more likely to meet catch-up targets (23.9%) than students in the comparison group (21.4%).

Similar to reading, students who started proficient and advanced and received services were more likely to decrease at least one proficiency level (19.6%) than students in the comparison group (19.1%). Those students receiving services, however, demonstrated higher growth (MGP of 53 compared to MGP of 47 for comparison group) and were more likely to meet keep-up targets (50.6%) than students in the comparison group (48.7%).



Table 2. SES and Comparison Students' Performance and Growth on Math TCAP

Group	2013 Math Proficiency Category	2014 Math Proficiency Category						2014 Math MGP	Adequate Growth Targets					
		Unsatisfactory		Partially Proficient		Proficient / Advanced			Step Up Target Met		Catch Up Target Met		Keep Up Target Met	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory														
SES	181	118	65.2	N<75	---	N<10	---	60*	70	38.7*	N<16	%>4		
Comparison	802	633	78.9	N<175	---	N<15	---	47.0	185	23.1	33	4.1		
Partially Proficient														
SES	335	71	21.2	210	62.7	54	16.1	52*			80	23.9		
Comparison	1,484	352	23.7	866	58.4	266	17.9	46.0			317	21.4		
Proficient / Advanced														
SES	158	N<10	---	N<50	---	127	80.4	53.0					80	50.6
Comparison	700	N<10	---	N<150	---	566	80.9	47.0					341	48.7

*Statistically Significant

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.

Writing

Students starting unsatisfactory in 2013 demonstrated similar improvement regardless of whether they received services (41.9% improved) or were in the comparison group (42.0% improved), but those students receiving services demonstrated higher growth ($MGP = 66$) than the comparison group ($MGP = 50$), as indicated in Table 3. Students who started unsatisfactory and received SES services were less likely to meet step-up targets (62.8% compared to 64.0% for the comparison group), but were more likely to meet catch-up targets (Cells suppressed due to small sizes).

Similar to the trends in math, students who started partially proficient in 2013 were less likely to improve to proficient or advanced (15.3%), but were also less likely to decrease to unsatisfactory (Suppressed due to small N size) than students in the comparison group (16.1% and 9.5%, respectively). Those students receiving services, however, demonstrated higher growth ($MGP = 52$) than the comparison group ($MGP = 49.5$), and were also more likely to meet catch-up targets (33.2% compared to 27.0% for the comparison group).

Students who started proficient and advanced and received SES services were more likely to decrease at least one proficiency level (34.1%) than students in the comparison group (31.2%), but demonstrated higher growth ($MGP = 56$) compared to the comparison group ($MGP = 46$). Those students were also more likely to meet keep-up targets (61.0%) than students in the comparison group (58.1%).

Table 3. SES and Comparison Students' Performance and Growth on Writing TCAP

Group	2013 Writing Proficiency Category	2014 Writing Proficiency Category						2014 Writing MGP	Adequate Growth Targets					
		Unsatisfactory		Partially Proficient		Proficient / Advanced			Step Up Target Met		Catch Up Target Met		Keep Up Target Met	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory														
SES	43	25	58.1	N<20	---	N<10	---	66.0	27	62.8	N<10	---		
Comparison	100	58	58.0	N<45	---	N<10	---	50.0	64	64.0	N<20	---		
Partially Proficient														
SES	190	N<16	---	N<150	%>75	29	15.3	52.0			63	33.2		
Comparison	440	42	9.5	327	74.3	71	16.1	49.5			119	27.0		
Proficient / Advanced														
SES	41	N<10	---	N<16	---	27	65.9	56.0					25	61.0
Comparison	93	N<10	---	N<30	---	64	68.8	46.0					54	58.1

*Statistically Significant

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.



Effective Reading Providers

Providers whose students outperformed that comparison group on any given metric were considered to be effective. Ten providers were included in the reading evaluation for grades K-3, having served at least 16 students who started below grade-level on DRA-2. More than half (six) of those providers demonstrated a higher percent of students improving to at or above grade-level target than the comparison group (see Table 4).

Table 4. DRA-2 Performance of Students Receiving SES Services in Reading, By Provider

Provider	Served for Reading K-3 (N)	Valid DRA2 Data (N)	Below Grade-Level Target (N)	Improved	
				N	%
Learn It Systems	94	48	40	N<16	%>15.2
Club Z!	272	143	96	23	24.0
eXL Learning, LLC	38	30	23	N<16	%>15.2
Orion's Mind	93	60	33	N<16	%>15.2
Imagine Learning	102	59	46	N<16	%>15.2
Above & Beyond Learning	104	61	32	N<16	%>15.2
Comparison Group	N/A	865	578	88	15.2
Step to Success Community Learning Center	123	70	50	N<16	%<15.2
Advanced Brain Gym Plus	59	52	29	N<16	%<15.2
Aurora Public Schools RWaM	49	33	17	N<16	%<15.2
Results Learning LLC.	98	24	22	N<16	%<15.2

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.

Sixteen providers were evaluated based on reading TCAP data (at least 20 students with valid growth data and/or at least 16 students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient), with nearly all (14 providers) demonstrating higher growth than the comparison group, and over half (9 providers) demonstrating higher percent improved than the comparison group. Eight providers were above the comparison group for both growth and improvement (see Table 5). The six providers considered effective based on DRA-2 data were also above the comparison group based on TCAP data.

Table 5. Reading TCAP Performance and Growth of Students Receiving SES Services, By Provider

Provider	Served for Reading 4-10 (N)	Valid TCAP Data (N)	Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient (N)	Improved		Median Growth Percentile
				N	%	
Sylvan Learning Center	29	21	21	N<16	%>22.8	65.0
Learn It Systems	45	28	27	N<16	%>22.8	64.5
eXL Learning, LLC	26	20	18	N<16	%>22.8	64.5
Aurora Public Schools RWaM	41	33	25	N<16	%>22.8	64.0
Orion's Mind	118	55	44	N<16	%>22.8	59.0
Imagine Learning	38	29	29	N<16	%<22.8	54.0
Inspired Solutions	25	23	20	N<16	%<22.8	54.0
Advanced Brain Gym Plus	30	26	22	N<16	%<22.8	53.5
Results Learning LLC.	98	65	62	N<16	%<22.8	51.0
Step to Success Community Learning Center	73	67	50	N<16	%>22.8	51.0
Club Z!	264	162	123	36	29.3	50.0
Above & Beyond Learning	84	69	44	N<16	%<22.8	48.0
EDUSS Learning	76	42	33	N<16	%<22.8	46.0
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc	95	41	34	N<16	%>22.8	44.0
Mapleton Public Schools	49	42	30	N<16	%>22.8	37.5
Comparison Group	N/A	2,509	2,042	465	22.8	44.0
The Marian School, LLC	85	57	47	N<16	%<22.8	41.0

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.



Effective Math Providers

Similar to reading, the majority of providers evaluated based on math TCAP also demonstrated higher growth and/or higher percent improved (see Table 6). Eight of the 12 providers evaluated were above the comparison group on both growth and percent improved, and one provider was above on percent improved only (this provider did not meet the minimum student count of 20 to be included in the growth calculations). Eight of these providers were also considered effective in reading: Aurora Public Schools RWaM, Above & Beyond Learning, Advanced Brain Gym Plus, Alternatives Unlimited, Inc., Club Z!, Imagine Learning, Orion’s Mind, and Sylvan Learning Center.

Table 6. Math TCAP Performance and Growth of Students Receiving SES Services, By Provider

Provider	Served for Math 4-10 (N)	Valid TCAP Data (N)	Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient	Improved		Median Growth Percentile
				N	%	
Aurora Public Schools RWaM	41	34	20	N<16	%>19	67.0
Above & Beyond Learning	50	39	24	N<16	%>19	67.0
Sylvan Learning Center	30	22	21	N<16	%>19	62.5
Alternatives Unlimited, Inc	95	39	32	N<16	%>19	60.0
Club Z!	235	155	110	30	27.3	59.0
Orion's Mind	118	61	43	N<16	%>19	51.0
Advanced Brain Gym Plus	30	26	18	N<16	%>19	51.0
The Marian School, LLC	93	61	57	N<16	%>19	48.0
Imagine Learning	28	19	17	N<16	%>19	n < 20
Comparison Group	N/A	2,986	2,286	435	19.0	46.0
Mapleton Public Schools	58	40	33	N<16	%<19	41.5
Learn It Systems	45	32	20	N<16	%<19	39.0
EDUSS Learning	89	56	52	N<16	%<19	37.5

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.

Effective Writing Providers

Six providers were evaluated based on writing TCAP data and, similar to trends in reading and math, nearly all (5 providers) demonstrated higher growth than the comparison group (see Table 7). Aurora Public Schools RWaM and Club Z! also demonstrated a higher percent improved than the comparison group. Four of the effective writing providers were also considered effective in both reading and math: Aurora Public Schools RWaM, Above & Beyond Learning, Advanced Brain Gym Plus, and Club Z!. One provider, Mapleton Public Schools, was considered effective in reading only.

Table 7. Writing TCAP Performance and Growth of Students Receiving SES Services, By Provider

Provider	Served for Writing 4-10 (N)	Valid TCAP Data (N)	Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient	Improved		Median Growth Percentile
				N	%	
Aurora Public Schools RWaM	41	33	28	N<16	%>20.9	64.0
Club Z!	182	119	106	23	21.7	55.0
Mapleton Public Schools	30	28	19	N<16	%<20.9	53.0
Above & Beyond Learning	50	39	31	N<16	%<20.9	51.0
Advanced Brain Gym Plus	30	26	22	N<16	%<20.9	49.0
Comparison Group	N/A	633	540	113	20.9	48.0
Learn It Systems	45	29	27	N<16	%<20.9	46.0

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

Due to data privacy concerns, smaller N sizes are suppressed. In some instances it was necessary to also suppress complementary cells to protect privacy.



Conclusions Regarding the Content of SES

While the effectiveness of the SES program varies based on the providers, analyses indicate overall successes for reading and math services. Students served with reading and math tutoring attained higher achievement and growth than students in the comparison groups. Although students served with writing services did not demonstrate higher improved achievement than students in the comparison group, the growth of these students still exceeded that of the comparison group. The 2013-2014 school year was the first year in which the writing tutoring was made available as a supplemental service; therefore, it is imperative that additional years of data are analyzed to further evaluate the impact of writing services.

CDE recommends using these evaluation findings in shaping local SES programs and identifying providers with which to contract for services to students in low performing schools. Some providers have greater success in one content area than the other. Therefore, it is important to select providers by the specific content area(s) being offered.

Report Authors

- Tina Negley
- Barb Vassis
- Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson

Where can I learn more?

For additional information regarding the evaluation of the Supplemental Educational Services program, including analyses from prior years, visit the Program Evaluations webpage of the Office of Data, Program Evaluation and Reporting: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/evalrpts#tiases>