

Supplemental Educational Services (SES)

2013-2014 Program Evaluation Findings by District

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 schools outside of the school day (i.e., tutoring) to students in low performing. 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 school². 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. Six of the districts were considered small rural and 8 were considered rural, while the remaining 15 districts were in urban-suburban or Denver metro areas. The majority of the students served were from schools within DPS (1,417 students), APS (695 students), and Adams 12 (280 students), comprising more than half (60.3%) of the total students receiving services.

This evaluation report compares the academic achievement and growth of students served within each district to their peers to determine the impact of the SES program by district.

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

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.

SES District Highlights

Math

- Students receiving math services were more likely to improve proficiency (22.7%) and demonstrated higher growth ($MGP = 54$) than non-SES students within the same districts (13.7% and $MGP = 45$)
- In 5 out of 9 districts, a higher percentage of SES students increased proficiency on math TCAP than the non-SES students
- In 4 out of 8 districts, the SES students had a higher MGP than the non-SES students

Reading

- In 1 of 3 districts, a higher percentage of SES served students (grades K-3) improved to at/or above grade-level on the DRA2 than the non-SES students
- Students receiving reading services were more likely to improve proficiency (24.0%) and demonstrated higher growth ($MGP = 49$) than non-SES students (21.9% and $MGP = 44$)
- In 4 out of 9 districts, a higher percentage of SES students increased proficiency on reading TCAP than the non-SES students
- In 7 out of 9 districts, the SES students had a higher MGP than the non-SES students

Writing

- Students receiving writing services were more likely to improve proficiency (20.2%) and demonstrated high growth ($MGP = 53.5$) than non-SES students (19.0% and $MGP = 49$)
- In 2 of 3 districts, a higher percentage of SES students increased proficiency on reading TCAP than the non-SES students
- In 2 of 3 districts, the SES students also had a higher MGP than the non-SES students

ELD

- Students receiving ELD services were more likely to improve proficiency (64.8%) and demonstrated high growth ($MGP = 48$) than non-SES students (50.6% and $MGP = 40$)



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.

For these analyses, the performance of students served with SES was compared to the performance of two different groups. First, comparison groups were created by randomly selecting students, who did not receive services, from schools implementing SES (i.e., at least one student served) for each content area. These comparison groups were selected using 2013 performance, stratified by grade, to ensure the comparison group 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.

Second, the performance of students receiving services within each district was also compared to the non-SES students in the schools implementing SES within that same district (comparison to other students in the district). For each district, for reading, writing, and math, the non-SES students were students who either started unsatisfactory or partially proficient on TCAP or below grade-level target on DRA-2, but did not participate in SES. For English language development (ELD) services, the non-SES students were students who started levels 1 through 4 on the ACCESS for ELLs assessment, but did not participate in SES.

In each of the evaluation segments, 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 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.

Impact of Math Services

Using the methodology described above, the math performance of students in SES-implementing schools was analyzed. The performance of students served with SES was compared to students that had also performed unsatisfactory or partially proficient on the prior year's math assessment, but did not participate in SES.



Improved Proficiency

Overall, of the students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient on TCAP in 2013, 22.7% of the students receiving services improved at least one proficiency level in 2014. In comparison, only 13.7% of the non-SES students in the same schools within those districts improved (see Table 1; overall performance of all districts combined is represented in the dark purple highlighted line). Nine districts met the minimum student count to be included in the achievement portion of this evaluation (at least 16 students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient). Six of those districts were above the comparison group, with more than 19.0% of students improving at least one proficiency level (light purple highlighted line). Five of those districts also had a larger percentage of SES students improve proficiency than non-SES students (green highlighted cells).

Table 1. SES and Non-SES Students' Performance on Math TCAP, By District

District	Served for Math (N)	SES Students				Non-SES Students		
		Valid TCAP Data (N)	Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient	Improved		Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient	Improved	
				N	%		N	%
Lamar Re-2	22	19	18	N<16	%>22.7	61	26	42.6
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	230	178	108	37	34.3	339	67	19.8
Widefield 3	53	40	37	N<16	%>22.7	28	N<16	%<13.7
Denver County 1	466	215	168	39	23.2	1,927	266	13.8
Performance of SES Districts	1,137	674	516	117	22.7	5,985	821	13.7
Huerfano Re-1	24	19	18	N<16	%>19	62	N<16	---
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	67	22	21	N<16	%>19	689	90	13.1
SES Comparison Group	N/A	2,986	2,286	435	19.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mapleton 1	66	43	35	N<16	%<19	149	21	14.1
Jefferson County R-1	72	40	35	N<16	%<19	336	22	6.5
Las Animas Re-1	21	20	20	N<16	%<19	n<16	--	--

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district 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.

Growth

The overall median growth of all students receiving math services ($MGP = 54$) was higher than the growth of non-SES students ($MGP = 45$) starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient (see Table 2; overall growth for all districts combined is represented in the dark purple highlighted line). The median adequate growth percentile⁴ (AGP) for the students receiving services was 83, however, indicating that those students overall did not demonstrate enough growth to reach or maintain proficiency within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. More than 25% of students receiving services did meet their adequate growth target, though, compared to only 9.7% of non-SES students.

Eight districts met the minimum student count to be included in the growth portion of this evaluation (at least 20 students with valid growth data). Of those districts, four had median growth percentiles higher than students in the comparison group (see Table 2, districts listed above the light purple highlighted line, representing the performance of the SES comparison group). Those same districts also had a higher MGP for students receiving services than for the non-SES students in the district (green highlighted cells).

⁴ For explanations of the Colorado Growth Model, including description of adequate growth percentile, please visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/generalgrowthmodelfaq>.



Table 2. SES and Non-SES Students' Growth on Math TCAP, By District

District	Served for Math (N)	SES Students			Non-SES Students Starting U or PP		
		Valid TCAP Data (N)	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Valid TCAP Data (N)	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	67	22	62.5	88.5	689	42.0	92.0
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	230	178	62.0	74.0	339	52.0	90.0
Denver County 1	466	215	55.0	81.0	1,927	48.0	96.0
Performance of SES Districts	1,137	674	54.0	83.0	5,985	45.0	94.0
Widefield 3	53	40	48.0	82.0	28	41.5	82.5
SES Comparison Group	N/A	2,986	46.0	81.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mapleton 1	66	43	41.0	84.0	149	43.0	92.0
Greeley 6	34	24	39.5	62.0	283	47.0	87.0
Jefferson County R-1	72	40	38.0	96.0	336	39.0	98.0
Las Animas Re-1	21	20	25.5	94.0	n < 20	--	--

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district 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.

Four districts (APS, Adams 12, Denver, and Widefield 3) were above the comparison group for both proficiency improvement and growth. The students served in these districts also demonstrated higher improvement and growth than the non-SES students within the district.

Impact of Reading Services

Following the same methodology, the reading performance of students in SES-implementing schools was also analyzed. Comparisons were conducted in the same manner as for the math evaluation.

Improved Proficiency

For those students (grades K-3) starting below grade-level on DRA-2, 19.1% of students receiving services improved to at or above grade-level, compared to 18.7% of the non-SES students within those districts (see Table 3, dark blue highlighted line represents the performance of all SES districts). Three districts met the minimum student count necessary to be included in the evaluation (at least 16 students starting below grade-level). One district (Denver) had a higher percent of students served improve (24.9%) than the comparison group (15.2%; blue highlighted line). This district also had a larger percentage of SES students improve to at or above grade-level than the non-SES students within the district (19.9%; green-highlighted cell).

Table 3. SES and Non-SES Students' Performance on DRA-2, By District

District	Served for Reading (N)	SES Students				Non-SES Students		
		Valid DRA2 Data (N)	Below Grade-Level Target (N)	Improved		Below Grade-Level Target (N)	Improved	
				N	%		N	%
Denver County 1	594	309	233	58	24.9	657	131	19.9
Performance of SES Districts	1,796	649	434	83	19.1	1,029	192	18.7
SES Comparison Group	N/A	865	578	88	15.2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	387	304	180	23	12.8	350	56	16.0
Thompson R2-J	59	36	21	N<16	%<15	22	N<16	%>18.7

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district 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.



Similarly, of the students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient on TCAP in 2013, 24.0% of students who received services improved at least one proficiency level in 2014, compared to 21.9% of the non-SES students within those districts (see Table 4; overall performance of all districts combined is represented in the dark blue highlighted line). Five of the 9 district meeting minimum student counts (at least 16 students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient) were above the comparison group, with more than 22.8% of students improving at least one proficiency level (blue highlighted line). Four of those districts also had a larger percentage of SES students improve proficiency than non-SES students in the district (green highlighted cells).

Table 4. SES and Non-SES Students' Performance on Reading TCAP, By District

District	Served for Reading (N)	SES Students				Non-SES Students		
		Valid TCAP Data (N)	Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient (N)	Improved		Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient (N)	Improved	
				N	%		N	%
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	76	20	20	N<16	%>24	701	161	23.0
Mapleton 1	58	45	33	N<16	%>24	153	33	21.6
Denver County 1	508	247	215	58	27.0	1,886	386	20.5
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	260	205	153	41	26.8	376	88	23.4
Performance of SES Districts	1,336	838	682	164	24.0	5,967	1,307	21.9
Adams County 14	60	46	34	N<16	%<24	426	120	28.2
SES Comparison Group	N/A	2,509	2,042	465	22.8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Westminster 50	81	61	58	N<16	%<22	635	150	23.6
Greeley 6	64	48	35	N<16	%<22	289	63	21.8
Trinidad 1	23	21	18	N<16	%<22	30	N<16	---
Alamosa RE-11J	43	35	20	N<16	%<22	46	N<16	---

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district 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.

Growth

Overall, students receiving reading services (MGP = 49) had higher growth than non-SES students (MGP = 44) starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient (see Table 5; overall growth for all districts combined is represented in the dark blue highlighted line). Similar to the evaluation findings for math, the median AGP of 71 was well above the MGP for those students receiving services, indicating they did not demonstrate enough growth to reach or maintain proficiency. Approximately 33% of students receiving services did meet their adequate growth targets, though, compared to only 23.1% of non-SES students.

Nine districts met the minimum student count to be included in the growth portion of this evaluation (at least 20 students with valid growth data). Of those districts, five demonstrated higher median growth percentiles for students receiving services than for students in the comparison group (see Table 5, districts listed above the blue highlighted line, representing the performance of the SES comparison group). Those five districts, as well as two additional districts (Trinidad and Alamosa), also had a higher MGP for students receiving services than for the non-SES students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient in the district (green highlighted cells).

Three districts (APS, Adams 12, and Denver) were above the comparison group for both proficiency improvement and growth, and the students served in these districts also demonstrated higher improvement and growth than the non-SES students within the district. These three districts were also identified as successful based on the math evaluation above.



Table 5. SES and Non-SES Students' Growth on Reading TCAP, By District

District	Served for Reading (N)	SES Students			Non-SES Students Starting U or PP		
		Valid TCAP Data (N)	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Valid TCAP Data (N)	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile
Adams 12 Five Star Schools	76	20	65.0	74.5	701	46.0	75.0
Greeley 6	64	48	55.5	70.0	289	47.0	72.0
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	260	205	55.0	72.0	376	49.0	78.0
Denver County 1	508	247	54.0	71.0	1,886	44.0	77.0
Westminster 50	81	61	49.0	81.0	635	48.0	73.0
Performance of SES Districts	1,336	838	49.0	71.0	5,967	44.0	74.0
SES Comparison Group	N/A	2,509	44.0	70.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Trinidad 1	23	21	43.0	69.0	30	27.0	61.5
Alamosa RE-11J	43	35	39.0	52.0	46	31.5	69.0
Mapleton 1	58	45	39.0	62.0	153	42.0	73.0
Adams County 14	60	46	37.5	73.0	426	51.0	74.0

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district on that metric.

Impact of Writing Services

The writing performance of students in SES-implementing schools was also analyzed, with comparisons conducted in the same manner as described above for the math and reading evaluations.

Improved Proficiency

Of the students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient on TCAP in 2013, 20.2% of students who received services improved at least one proficiency level in 2014, compared to 19.0% of the non-SES students within those districts (see Table 6; overall performance of all districts combined is represented in the dark teal highlighted line). Three districts met minimum student counts to be included in the achievement portion of this evaluation (at least 16 students starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient), although none of the districts were above the comparison group, with less than 20.9% of students improving at least one proficiency level (light teal highlighted line). Two of the districts did, however, have a larger percentage of SES students improve proficiency than non-SES students in the district (green highlighted cells).

Table 6. SES and Non-SES Students' Performance on Writing TCAP, By District

District	Served for Writing (N)	SES Students				Non-SES Students		
		Valid TCAP Data (N)	Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient	Improved		Started Unsatisfactory OR Partially Proficient	Improved	
				N	%		N	%
SES Comparison Group	N/A	633	540	113	20.9	N/A	N/A	N/A
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	198	149	126	26	20.6	430	89	20.7
Denver County 1	181	97	88	18	20.5	1,786	335	18.8
Performance of SES Districts	409	274	233	47	20.2	2,242	427	19.0
Mapleton 1	30	28	19	N<16	%<20	26	N<16	---

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district 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.

Growth

Students receiving writing services had higher growth ($MGP = 53.5$) than non-SES students ($MGP = 49$) starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient (see Table 7; overall growth for all districts combined is represented in the



dark teal highlighted line). Similar to the evaluation findings for both math and reading, the median growth percentile was well below the median AGP of 72 for those students receiving services, indicating they did not demonstrate enough growth to reach or maintain proficiency. Approximately 33% of students receiving services did meet adequate growth targets, though, compared to only 19.8% of non-SES students in those districts.

The three districts above also met the minimum student count to be included in the growth portion of this evaluation (at least 20 students with valid growth data). Of those districts, one (APS) demonstrated higher median growth percentiles for students receiving services than for students in the comparison group (see Table 7, districts listed above the blue highlighted line, representing the performance of the SES comparison group). That district, as well as Mapleton, also had a higher MGP for students receiving services than for the non-SES students in the district starting unsatisfactory or partially proficient (green highlighted cells). Although APS was not above the comparison group for proficiency improvement in writing, the district was identified as successful based on both the math and reading evaluations above.

Table 7. SES and Non-SES Students' Growth on Writing TCAP, By District

District	Served for Writing (N)	SES Students			Non-SES Students Starting U or PP		
		Valid TCAP Data (N)	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Valid TCAP Data (N)	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	198	149	61.0	75.0	430	44.0	78.0
Performance of SES Districts	409	274	53.5	72.0	2,242	49.0	82.0
Mapleton 1	30	28	53.0	59.0	26	27.0	77.5
SES Comparison Group	N/A	633	48.0	70.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Denver County 1	181	97	46.0	71.0	1,786	50.0	83.0

Green highlight represents a score higher than the non-SES students in the district on that metric.

Impact of ELD Services

Of the five districts providing English language development supplemental services to students, only one district (APS) met the minimum student counts (at least 16 students starting levels 1 through 4, and at least 20 students with valid growth data) to have their data publicly reported. Comparisons similar to those outlined in the content area evaluations above were conducted, and the overall results are briefly summarized below.

Proficiency improvement for ELD services was based on the number of students starting in levels 1, 2, 3, or 4 in 2013 who improved at least one proficiency level on the ACCESS for ELLs assessment in 2014. Overall, 64.8% of students receiving services (across all districts) improved at least one proficiency level in 2014, compared to 50.6% of the non-SES students in those districts. Students receiving services were also more likely to improve than students in the comparison group (59.2%).

Students receiving ELD services had higher growth ($MGP = 48$) than non-SES students ($MGP = 40$) starting levels 1 through 4 and higher than the comparison group students ($MGP = 40$). In contrast to the evaluations results for math, reading, and writing, however, the median growth percentile for students who received services was above the median AGP of 27. It should be noted, however, that non-SES students in those districts were also slightly above the median AGP of 39, as were the students in comparison group (median AGP of 26). Approximately 68% of students receiving services met adequate growth targets, compared to 55.4% of non-SES students in those districts.



Conclusions Based on District by District Analyses

This evaluation was conducted to determine if some districts have more successful SES programs than others. Because not all districts had sufficient data to be included in the evaluation, the evaluation questions could not be adequately addressed. Nonetheless, promising trends have been noted across the districts that could be included.

By comparing the performance of the SES-served students to the comparison group **and** the non-SES students from each district, we can begin to isolate the impact of the SES program on served students. Although only a few districts had enough students to be included in the evaluation, the trends support positive outcomes for the students served in those districts. In all but two of the analyses, the overall performance of served students from all SES districts was higher than the non-SES students from those same districts. For all content areas, in most of the districts in the analyses, the SES-served students had higher median growth percentiles than students from the same districts who started unsatisfactory or partially proficient (TCAP) or levels 1 through 4 (ACCESS), but did not receive SES services. Although this trend is not consistent for all districts, it is noteworthy that the majority of districts included in the evaluation for each content area had data that demonstrated this trend. Furthermore, within several of the districts, the performance of the SES-served students was higher than the comparison group.

For math and reading services, in many districts, the SES-served students were also more likely to improve at least one proficiency level than students from the same districts who did not receive SES services. Again, this trend was not consistent for all districts, but many of districts included in the evaluation had trends similar to the overall findings. Similarly, within several of the districts, the percentage of SES-served students improving proficiency was higher than the comparison group.

Please visit our website for evaluations of the effectiveness of the SES program across the state by content area.

Report Authors

- Tina Negley
- 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>