



Center for Research in Educational Policy

The University of Memphis
325 Browning Hall
Memphis, Tennessee 38152
Toll Free: 1-866-670-6147

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007 – 2008





Center for Research in Educational Policy

The University of Memphis
325 Browning Hall
Memphis, Tennessee 38152
Toll Free: 1-866-670-6147

Supplemental Educational Services
in the State of Tennessee:
2007 – 2008

December 2008

Laura L. Neergaard
Lynn W. Harrison
James Ford
Jangmi Paek
Steven M. Ross
Alaina Mount
Center for Research in Educational Policy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Results	iii
Evaluation Report	1
Rationale and Questions for the Evaluation.....	2
Methodology	2
Procedure	2
Instrumentation	3
Results	4
Rubric Summaries of Perceived Provider Effectiveness	15
Conclusions and Discussion	48
General Discussion	51
References.....	53

Index of Tables

Table 1: Comparison Summary of Provider Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	5
Table 2: Tennessee 2007-2008 SES Survey Return Overview.....	6
Table 3: Comparison Summary of District Coordinator Responses, Aggregated for All Providers	7
Table 4: Comparison Summary of Principal/Site Coordinator Responses, Aggregated for All Providers...	8
Table 5: Comparison Summary of Teacher Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	9
Table 6: Comparison Summary of Parent Responses, Aggregated for All Providers	11
Table 7: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, All Providers	12
Table 8: Summary of Overall Satisfaction by Respondent Group for Provider	14
Table 9: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC</i>	16
Table 10: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>AlphaBEST</i>	17
Table 11: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Applied Scholastics</i>	18
Table 12: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>ATS Educational Consulting Services- Project Success</i>	19
Table 13: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Babbage Net School, Inc.</i>	20
Table 14: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Back on Track Tutoring Association</i> ...	21
Table 15: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Bethlehem Literacy Academy - After School and Summer Program</i>	22
Table 16: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Boys and Girls Clubs in Tennessee</i>	23
Table 17: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Bright Sky Learning</i>	24
Table 18: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Catapult Online</i>	25
Table 19: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Club Z! In-Home Tutoring</i>	26
Table 20: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Cool Kids Learn, Inc.</i>	27
Table 21: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Education 2020 Virtual Tutor</i>	28
Table 22: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Education Station</i>	29
Table 23: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Educational Enhancement Services, Inc.</i>	30
Table 24: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Educational Enterprises</i>	31
Table 25: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Exceptional Parent Connection</i>	32
Table 26: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Failure Free Reading</i>	33
Table 27: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.</i>	34
Table 28: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Kastle Instruction Recovery, LLC</i>	35
Table 29: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Kastle Summer Reading Academy</i>	36
Table 30: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Knowledge Points of Middle Tennessee</i>	37
Table 31: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Learning 4 Today “I Can Do This”</i>	38
Table 32: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Martha O’Bryan Center for Reading Achievement Program (RAP)</i>	39
Table 33: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Project Achieve: Intervention Assistance for Students</i>	40
Table 34: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Success Educational Services</i>	41
Table 35: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center-Knoxville</i>	42
Table 36: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>The Learning Zone</i>	43
Table 37: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>The Street Academy</i>	44
Table 38: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Total Learning Center</i>	45
Table 39: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>University of Memphis Reading</i>	46
Table 40: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>X-CEL Operating Foundation</i>	47

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the study of the 2007-2008 implementation progress of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in Tennessee. The study was conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to examine SES provider effectiveness through analyzing SES student achievement outcomes and the perceptions of key stakeholders in specified school districts in Tennessee. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process to assist the Tennessee State Department of Education (TN DOE) meet federal monitoring requirements. A rubric, or summary of provider progress and outcomes, was completed for the TN DOE to help evaluate individual providers and make decisions regarding approval status.

During the 2007-2008 school year, five local educational agencies (LEAs) in Tennessee were required to offer supplemental educational services. Within these districts, 54 Title I schools were designated SES-eligible, based on the fact that they were in their second year of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress or “AYP” for three or more years), in corrective action, or in restructuring status. Parents of students in these schools were informed by the school of their child’s eligibility for additional academic assistance provided through SES, and were provided a list of the authorized service providers from which they could choose. Statewide, 42 individual provider companies were authorized by the TN DOE.

Two complementary studies were conducted to address the research questions. The first study examined how students served by SES providers performed, compared to other students in their schools and grade levels, in terms of Reading and Mathematics. Results of this first study are reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 student achievement analyses*¹. Results from the first study were also used to inform the second study.

The second study investigated stakeholder perceptions of provider implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents of students receiving SES services. The current report addresses those research questions statewide across all providers, and includes provider-specific data summaries from each respondent group.

Results

Results are presented in the context of the guiding questions for the second study. In addition, a statewide Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness across all providers as well as by individual provider was scored using both the summary perceptual data together with the achievement findings from the achievement study report.

¹SAS EVASS. (2008). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Results*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, The Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?

- Responding providers (95.7%; n=22/23) overwhelmingly indicated satisfaction with district cooperation and involvement.
- Responding principals/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) largely noted that they were satisfied with the way the school district helped their school implement services.
- The vast majority of responding parents (95.6%; n=330/345) noted that they were pleased with the way their school district helped them obtain SES for their child. Most also indicated that they were given information about their child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law (88.1%; n=304/345) and that they were given enough time to decide which tutoring company they wanted for their child (88.4%; n=305/345).

2. Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents of students eligible for SES?

- Almost all providers who responded to the survey (95.7%; n=22/23) indicated that their tutors communicated student progress frequently or occasionally with parents, and most responding providers (82.6%; n=19/23) indicated their tutors communicated this information to teachers as well.
- Most district coordinators (75.0%; n=45/60) reported that communication by providers occurred frequently or occasionally.
- The majority of responding principal/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) reported that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year.
- Over half of the responding teachers (56.7%; n=76/134) reported that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year, but a large percentage (43.3%; n=58/134) said providers did not communicate with them at all.
- Of the 345 parent respondents, 82.9% (n=286/345) reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year either frequently or occasionally, and 76.3% (n=263/345) said they received frequent or occasional written communication from providers.

3. Are providers working with districts, principals, and teachers to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?

- Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) indicated that tutors integrated their services with classroom learning activities either frequently or occasionally.
- Just one-fourth of the district coordinators (25.0%; n=15/60) said providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Of the 60 district coordinator survey respondents, 25 reported that the provider adapted tutoring services to each school's curriculum and integrated the services with classroom learning activities (41.7%). About

the same percentage (43.3%; n=26/60) said they did not know whether this was occurring.

- The majority of principal/site coordinator respondents (67.2%; n=41/61) stated that providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Most also agreed that providers adapted the tutoring services to the school's curriculum (65.6%; n=40/61) and integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities (65.6%; n=40/61).
- Less than half of the responding teachers (47.0%; n=63/134) said that service providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Nearly half of the teacher respondents agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to the school's curriculum (49.3%; n=66/134), while fewer said that the tutoring services were aligned with classroom learning activities (41.1%; n=55/134). Many reported being unaware of whether integration with the school's curriculum (43.3%; n=58/134) and classroom activities (40.3%; n=54/134) was occurring. Just over half of the teachers who completed the survey (53.0%; n=71/134) agreed that tutors adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students. Again, many (37.3%; n=50/134) responded "Don't Know."

4. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state standards?*

- All responding providers (100%; n=23/23) agreed that services were aligned with state academic content and achievement standards.
- Fewer than half of the district coordinator respondents (46.6%; n=28/60) agreed that providers aligned their services with state and local standards.

5. *Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?*

- Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) indicated that services were offered to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.
- A slight majority of responding district coordinators (51.6%; n=31/60) noted that providers made efforts to service special education and ELL students; many (38.3%; n=23/60) responded "Don't Know."
- Most responding principals/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) agreed that the providers offered services to special education and ELL students.

6. *What are the stakeholders' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?*

- Fifty percent of the district coordinator respondents (n=30/60) agreed that providers met the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions; however, 20% (n=12/60) disagreed. Slightly less than half the district coordinators (48.4%; n=29/60) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement.
- Of the 61 principal/site coordinator respondents, 50 (82.0%) agreed that providers met the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions, and just four respondents (6.6%) disagreed. While most survey participants (63.9%; n=39/61) agreed that the provider started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete, 29.5% (n=18/61)

disagreed. Responding principal/site coordinators (67.2%; n=41/61) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement.

- The majority of responding teachers (61.2%; n=82/134) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement.
- Parents were generally satisfied with the number of hours of free tutoring given to their child (87.5%; n=302/345) and with the provider's ability to start and end tutoring sessions on time (87.3%; n=301/345). Parent respondents (88.7%; n=306/345) largely indicated their belief that tutoring services helped their child's achievement.

7. *What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?*

- Half of the district coordinator respondents (50.0%; n=30/60) agreed with the statement: "Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider."
- Most responding principals/site coordinators (65.6%; n=40/61) expressed overall satisfaction with the provider services.
- The majority of responding teachers (56.7%; n=76/134) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating.
- Parents were the most satisfied group among the surveyed stakeholders, with 90.7% (n=313/345) indicating they were pleased with the services their children received.

8. *What are providers' experiences with and assessments of SES interventions?*

- Responding providers indicated satisfaction with state SES coordinator cooperation and involvement (87.0%; n=20/23) and principal/site coordinator cooperation and involvement (73.9%; n=17/23). Fewer providers (56.5%; n=13/23) indicated satisfaction with parent and teacher cooperation and involvement
- About half of the providers (52.2%; n=12/23) reported being satisfied with student attendance, though the majority (91.3%; n=21/23) said they were satisfied with student attitudes.
- Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) noted satisfaction with success at raising student achievement to desired levels.

EVALUATION REPORT

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE: 2007 – 2008

Introduction

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in Tennessee, conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis. SES is a component of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), and is designed to provide extra academic assistance for eligible children. Specifically, students are eligible to receive SES if they are from low-income families and attend Title I schools in their second year of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress or “AYP” for three or more years), in corrective action, or in restructuring status.

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to examine SES provider effectiveness through the analysis of SES student achievement outcomes and perceptions from key stakeholders in the Tennessee school districts where these services were offered during the 2007-08 school year. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process that allows the Tennessee Department of Education (TN DOE) to meet federal monitoring requirements.

During the 2007-2008 school year, five local educational agencies (LEAs) in Tennessee were required to offer supplemental educational services. Within these districts, 54 Title I schools were designated SES-eligible, based on the fact that they were in their second year of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress or “AYP” for three or more years), in corrective action, or in restructuring status. Parents of students in these schools were informed by the school of their child’s eligibility for additional academic assistance provided through SES, and were provided a list of the authorized service providers from which they could choose. Statewide, 42 individual provider companies were authorized by the TN DOE. Providers were authorized in one or more districts and could thus offer services to students from multiple schools.

Rationale and Questions for the Evaluation

Two complementary studies were conducted to address the research questions. The first study examined how students served by SES providers performed, compared to other students in their schools and grade levels, in terms of Reading and Mathematics. Results of this first study are reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Analysis*².

The second study investigated stakeholder perceptions of provider implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents of students receiving SES services. The primary research questions for the second study were:

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?
2. Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents of students eligible for SES?
3. Are providers working with districts, principals, teachers to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
4. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic standards?
5. Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?
6. What are the stakeholders' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?
7. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?
8. What are provider's experiences with and assessments of SES interventions?

Methodology

Procedure

The research design consisted of a descriptive study investigating the implementation of SES in districts and schools and an evaluation of individual SES providers' compliance and effectiveness.

Descriptive study of SES implementation. The descriptive portion of the study consisted of surveying the following groups of respondents: (a) SES providers, (b) district coordinators in participating SES districts/counties, (c) principals or SES coordinators in participating SES schools (d) teachers of students receiving SES and (e) parents of students receiving SES. The first four groups were surveyed using an online survey.

²SAS EVASS. (2008). *Supplemental Education Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Results*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, The Center for Research in Educational Policy.

SES provider representatives received individual email notifications containing their unique login information and instructions for completing the provider surveys. The evaluators provided district coordinators with their online survey login information. Likewise, login information and instructions for the online surveys were sent to the schools for the principal/SES coordinator and the teacher surveys. All personnel were instructed to complete a separate online survey for each provider currently providing services to students in their districts (district coordinators), schools (principal/site coordinators) or classes (teachers). At the school level, either the principal or the site coordinator completed the survey, depending on which had the most contact with the SES tutoring program. Each district coordinator, principal/site coordinator or teacher, provider-specific survey was counted as a separate response.

Parents received a paper survey presented in both English and Spanish, sent home to them by their child's school. These surveys were shipped to each district having schools expected to offer SES services, together with distribution and return instructions. Districts then dispersed parent surveys to their schools with students receiving SES services. Each parent envelope contained the survey, an introductory letter, and a master list of all the SES providers authorized by the state. Parents were asked to identify the provider which had tutored his/her child, and mark the provider's number on the survey. Parents were asked to return the completed survey to the school sealed in the provided envelope. Each school bundled the returned parent surveys and mailed them to CREP using postage-paid return envelopes. Comments on parent surveys were transcribed verbatim, and identifying names were removed. Spanish comments were translated into English as they were transcribed. All respondent groups were given several weeks to complete the surveys near the end of the academic year.

Evaluation study of provider effectiveness. Provider effectiveness for this preliminary study was assessed using a rubric evaluation tool. To obtain overall outcome ratings for each provider, independent examiners analyzed survey and achievement results and assigned a rating for each category, based on the percentage of agreement/disagreement on individual items. The "Provider Overall" rubric outcome was determined by using respondent agreement/disagreement for the survey questions addressing overall satisfaction and communication. To ensure reliability of findings, each evaluation was reviewed by at least two independent raters. Where there was disagreement, consensus was derived through discussion.

Instrumentation

Surveys. Five survey instruments were used, one for each stakeholder group: (1) SES providers, (2) district coordinators in participating SES districts/counties, (3) principals or SES coordinators in participating SES schools, (4) teachers of students receiving SES, and (5) parents of students receiving SES. The surveys contained a common core set of questions for all groups (e.g., experiences with SES and providers) to facilitate triangulation of findings. In addition, surveys included some questions geared to specific groups (e.g., reactions to particular providers, the respondent's role as a teacher, principal). For

each survey item, the respondent chose from a range of three, four or five point Likert-style responses (e.g., 3-point: Frequently, Occasionally, Not at all; 4-point: Frequently, Occasionally, Not at all, Don't Know; 5-point: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, Don't Know), with higher scores indicating a more positive perception of the provided services.

The provider survey collected data about the provider's activities, services, and stakeholder participation, together with multiple opportunities for targeted comments. For the district coordinator, principal/SES coordinator, and teacher instruments, close-ended questions were used to collect data about provider services and an overall assessment of the program. All of these surveys asked whether the respondent was employed by the provider being rated. The parent survey was composed of 10 Likert-style response questions addressing the provider's service and the information provided to parents by their district. Each instrument included an optional Additional Comments section.

Provider Rubric. The rubric evaluation tool used five outcome categories established by CREP researchers, following the NCLB SES guidelines: (a) Communication, (b) Instructional Plans, (c) Local and State Standards, (d) Special Ed/ELL Students, and (e) Provider Overall. Accompanying each category was a scale consisting of four levels of attainment (e.g., Above Standards, Acceptable, Marginal Quality, Below Standards) and one level of "Insufficient Information." Full descriptors accompanied each attainment level for each category in the rubric.

Results

The results section details the statewide aggregated data for each of the survey respondent groups: providers, district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents, with findings are discussed by respondent group for the 2007-2008 school year. When available, cross-year comparisons are made with two prior years of data³. The results section also includes: a discussion of survey responses rates, overall approval ratings for each provider by respondent group, and a statewide provider rubric of stakeholder perceptions. The section concludes with individual provider rubrics of stakeholder perceptions.

Aggregate Provider Perceptions, Statewide. Representatives from 23 companies offering SES services in Tennessee in 2007-2008 completed the online provider survey. Providers overwhelmingly indicated satisfaction with district coordinator cooperation and involvement (95.7%; n=22/23) and state SES coordinator cooperation and involvement (87.0%; n=20/23). Providers (73.9%; n=17/23) were generally satisfied with principal/site coordinator cooperation. Fewer providers (56.5%; n=13/23) indicated satisfaction with parent and teacher cooperation and involvement. About half of the providers

³ Prior years for which data are available are 2005-2006 and 2006-2007.

(52.2%; n=12/23) reported being satisfied with student attendance, and the majority (91.3%; n=21/23) said they were satisfied with student attitudes. Most (87.0%; n=20/23) noted satisfaction with success at raising student achievement to desired levels.

All but one of the providers who responded to the survey (95.7%; n=22/23) indicated that their tutors communicated student progress frequently or occasionally with parents; fewer responding providers (82.6%; n=19/23) indicated their tutors communicated this information to teachers. Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) indicated that tutors integrated their services with classroom learning activities either frequently or occasionally. However, just 52.2% of providers (n=12/23) reported that the tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom or subject teachers of the children they tutored. All responding providers (100%; n=23/23) agreed that services were aligned with state academic and achievement standards. Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) indicated that services were offered to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

Providers' responses in 2007-2008 were more positive than in 2006-2007 (Paek, McKay, Harrison, Ross, & Fedde, 2008) and in 2005-2006 (Potter, Ross, Paek, & McKay, 2007). The only percentages that did not increase were in adapting the services to each school's curriculum and provider satisfaction with student attendance and parent and teacher cooperation/involvement. (See Table 1; the complete data summary table for the aggregated 2007-2008 provider survey responses is presented in the Technical Appendix.)

Table 1: Comparison Summary of Provider Responses, Aggregated for All Providers

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Providers	N=18	N=35	N=23*
Provider Perceptions and Activities	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally		
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	61.1%	80.0%	82.6%
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	88.9%	91.5%	95.7%
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	33.3%	40.0%	52.2%
The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	88.9%	88.6%	100%
The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	55.6%	74.3%	87.0%
The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	66.7%	85.7%	82.6%
The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	NA	NA	87.0%
Provider satisfaction with:	Percentage Satisfied or Highly Satisfied		
Student attendance	77.2%	54.3%	52.2%
Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	66.7%	85.7%	91.3%
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	72.2%	80.0%	87.0%
Parent cooperation/involvement	72.2%	62.8%	56.5%
Teacher cooperation/involvement	44.4%	57.1%	56.5%
Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	NA	NA	73.9%
District Coordinator cooperation/involvement	72.2%	71.4%	95.7%
State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	NA	NA	87.0%
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	72.2%	85.7%	87.0%

*29 providers submitted survey. However, four providers indicated on their surveys that they did not provide services in Tennessee in the 2007-2008 school year, and two providers that submitted surveys did not offer services to the school districts offering Supplemental Educational Services in Tennessee in 2007-2008 school year. Therefore, these six surveys were not included in the aggregate provider report. NA: Some questions on the 2007-2008 provider survey were not on the 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 surveys.

Non-Provider Response Rates. District coordinators from all five districts that offered SES services completed surveys. Of the 54 schools where students were eligible for SES services, 20.0% (n=11/54) of them had both a principal/site coordinator and a teacher respond to the online survey about one or more SES providers. An additional 13 schools (24%) had either a principal/site coordinator or teacher who responded. In total, 44% of the SES eligible schools (n=24/54) were represented by either a principal/site coordinator or teacher survey. A slightly higher percentage of the 54 schools (56%; n=30/56) had parents who responded to the paper survey.

Table 2: Tennessee 2007-2008 SES Survey Return Overview

District	Numbers of SES Eligible Schools Submitting							Types of Surveys		
	School Total: SES eligible	District surveys (Y/N)	School Personnel				Percent EITHER type (principal/SC or teacher)	Parent		Schools w/ parent surveys, but NO school personnel
			BOTH principal/SC & teacher surveys	ONLY principal/SC surveys	ONLY teacher surveys	EITHER principal/SC or teacher surveys		Schools with parent surveys	Percent schools with parent surveys	
Davidson County	19	Y	2	5	1	8	42%	9	47%	4
Hamilton County	4	Y	0	1	0	1	25%	4	100%	3
Jackson-Madison Co.	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Knox County	2	Y	2	0	0	2	100%	2	100%	0
Memphis City	28	Y	6	5	1	12	43%	14	50%	4
TOTAL	54	5	11	11	2	24		30		11
Statewide Percentage		100%	20%	20%	4%	44%		56%		20%

Aggregate District Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide. In 2007-2008, district coordinators were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the school district. A total of 60 district coordinator surveys were received from all five districts required to offer SES. District coordinator surveys represented 31 individual providers.

Two-thirds of responding district coordinators (75.0%; n=45/60) noted that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year; in contrast, just one-fourth said the providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth (25.0%; n=15/60). About one-third of responding district coordinators (36.7%; n=22/60) reported that providers communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers and parents; however, most reported being unaware of whether communication among tutors and teachers and parents occurred. Half of the respondents (50.0%; n=30/60) agreed that providers met the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions, though 20% (n=12/60) disagreed.

Of the 60 district coordinator survey respondents, 41.7% (n=25/60) reported that the provider adapted tutoring services to each school's curriculum and integrated the services with classroom learning activities. About the same percentage (43.3%; n=26/60) said they did not know whether this was occurring. Less than half of the respondents agreed that providers aligned their services with state and local standards (46.6%; n=28/60). However, a large percentage of district coordinators (38.3%; n=23/60)

responded “Don’t Know.” A slight majority of responding district coordinators (51.6%; n=31/60) noted that providers made efforts to service special education and ELL students; again, many (38.3%; n=23/60) said they did not know if this was the case. Half of the responding district coordinators (50.0%; n=30/60) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating. Slightly less than half (48.4%; n=29/60) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement. Respondents’ positive comments indicated consistent communication; negative comments noted poor communication, delayed start, and problems following district protocol.

District coordinator responses were notably less positive in 2007-2008 compared to previous years (Potter et al, 2007; Paek et al, 2008). For example, just 25% (n=15/60) of respondents noted providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth in 2007-2008, compared to 57% (n=35/63) in 2006-2007. The percentage of district coordinator respondents who indicated satisfaction with provider services was also much lower in 2007-2008 than in the prior years. (See Table 3; the complete data summary table for the aggregate 2007-2008 district coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix.)

Table 3: Comparison Summary of District Coordinator Responses, Aggregated for All Providers

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
District Coordinators	N=40	N=63	N=60
How often did the provider...	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally		
Communicate with you during the year?	95.0%	93.6%	75.0%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	NA	54.0%	25.0%
Communicate with teachers during the year?	NA	57.1%	36.6%
Communicate with parents during the year?	NA	69.2%	36.7%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	90.0%	90.5%	50.0%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
Adapted the tutoring services to each school's curriculum.	47.5%	63.5%	41.7%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	45.0%	76.2%	41.7%
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	90.0%	76.2%	46.6%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	55.0%	55.5%	51.6%
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	NA	85.7%	63.3%
Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	92.5%	85.7%	45.0%
Overall Provider Assessment	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	72.5%	60.3%	48.4%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	72.5%	84.2%	50.0%

NA: Some questions on the 2007-2008 district coordinator survey were not on the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 surveys.

Aggregate Principal/Site Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide. Principals/Site coordinators were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students at their school. A total of 61 principal/site coordinator surveys were received from 22 of the 54 schools (40.7%) required to offer SES. Principal/site coordinator surveys represented 17 individual providers. Responding principals/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) largely noted that they were satisfied with the way the school district helped their school implement services.

Most responding principals/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) reported that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year. The majority (67.2%; n=41/61) stated that providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Of the 61 principal/site coordinator respondents, 50 agreed that providers met the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions, and just four respondents (6.6%) disagreed. While most survey participants (63.9%; n=39/61) agreed that the provider started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete, 29.5% (n=18/60) disagreed.

Most respondents (65.6%; n=40/61) agreed that providers adapted the tutoring services to the school's curriculum and integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities. Responding principals/site coordinators agreed that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (82.0%; n=50/61). Finally, responding principals/site coordinators (65.6%; n=40/61) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating and agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement (67.2%; n=41/61). Respondents' positive comments indicated communication regarding student progress and provider professionalism; negative comments noted poor communication, delayed start, and disorganization.

Unlike the district coordinator responses, principal/site coordinator responses were more positive in 2007-2008 than in previous years (Potter et al, 2007; Paek et al, 2008). The percentage of principal/site coordinator respondents who reported that providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth in 2007-2008 (67.2%; n=41/61) nearly doubled from 2006-2007 (35.5%; n=43/121). The percentage of principal/site coordinators who indicated satisfaction with provider services was also greater than in prior years. (See Table 4; the complete data summary table for the aggregate 2007-2008 principal/site coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix.)

Table 4: Comparison Summary of Principal/Site Coordinator Responses, Aggregated for All Providers

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Principals/Site Coordinators	N=50	N=121	N=61
How often did the provider...	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally		
Communicate with you during the year?	68.0%	46.2%	82.0%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	NA	35.5%	67.2%
Communicate with teachers during the year?	NA	67.8%	68.9%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	74.0%	61.1%	82.0%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	NA	NA	63.9%
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	58.0%	43.0%	65.6%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	54.0%	41.4%	65.6%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	56.0%	58.7%	82.0%
Overall Provider Assessment	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	58.0%	44.7%	67.2%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	58.0%	45.4%	65.6%
Overall District Assessment	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	NA	NA	82.0%

NA: Some questions on the 2007-2008 principal/site coordinator survey were not on the 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 surveys.

Aggregate Teacher Perceptions, Statewide. Teachers were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students at their school. A total of 134 teacher surveys were received from 13 of the 54 schools (24.1%) required to offer SES. Teacher surveys represented 18 individual providers.

Over half of the responding teachers (56.7%; n=76/134) reported that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year, but a large percentage (43.3%; n=58/134) said providers did not communicate with them. Less than half of the teacher respondents (47.0%; n=63/134) said service providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Nearly half of the teacher respondents (49.3%; n=66/134) agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to the school's curriculum while fewer (41.1%; n=55/134) said that the tutoring services were integrated with classroom learning activities. Many reported being unaware of whether integration with the school's curriculum (43.3%; n=58/134) and classroom activities (40.3%; n=54/134) was occurring. Just over half of the teachers who answered the survey (53.0%; n=71/134) agreed that tutors adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students. Again, many (37.3%; n=50/134) responded "Don't Know." Finally, the majority of responding teachers (56.7%; n=76/134) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating and agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement (61.2%; n=82/134).

The 2007-2008 responding teachers were slightly more positive than the 2006-2007 responding teachers (Paek et al, 2008); however, the teacher respondents in 2005-2006 were the most positive (Potter et al, 2007). For example, in 2007-2008, 56.7% of responding teachers reported satisfaction with provider services; whereas, in 2006-2007 this percentage was 49.5%, and in 2005-2006, 68.0% reported satisfaction. (See Table 5; the complete data summary table for the aggregate 2007-2008 teacher survey is in the Technical Appendix.)

Table 5: Comparison Summary of Teacher Responses, Aggregated for All Providers

Teachers	2005-2006 N=128	2006-2007 N=475	2007-2008 N=134
How often did the provider...	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally		
Communicate with you during the year?	65.6%	41.7%	56.7%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	NA	36.7%	47.0%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	69.5%	46.1%	49.3%
Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	NA	NA	53.0%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	67.9%	40.4%	41.1%
Overall Provider Assessment	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	74.2%	52.7%	61.2%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	68.0%	49.5%	56.7%

NA: Some questions on the 2007-2008 teacher survey were not on the 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 surveys.

Aggregate Parent Perceptions, Statewide. Parents identified the tutoring company serving their child by selecting the company name from the list of statewide approved providers. Parent surveys were received from 30 of the 54 schools (56%) required to make SES available to the students. Parent surveys represented 22 individual providers.

Responding parents were the most satisfied group among the surveyed stakeholders, with 90.7% (n=313/345) indicating they were pleased with the services their children received. A large majority of parent respondents also indicated their belief that the tutoring services helped their child's achievement (88.7%; n=306/345). Of the 345 parent respondents, 82.9% (n=286/345) reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year either frequently or occasionally, and 76.3% (n=263/345) received frequent or occasional written communication from providers. Parents also largely agreed that the provider helped their child with subjects they worked on in the regular classroom (88.7%; n=306/345).

An overwhelming majority of responding parents (95.6%; n=330/345) noted that they were pleased with the way their school district helped them obtain SES for their child. Most also indicated that they were given information about their child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law (88.1%; n=304/345) and that they were given enough time to decide which tutoring company they wanted for their child (88.4%; n=305/345). Parents were generally satisfied with the number of hours of free tutoring given to their child (87.5%; n=302/345) and with the provider's ability to start and end tutoring sessions on time (87.3%; n=301/345).

Parents were the most consistent respondent group throughout the three years of survey data presented in this report. The percentage of parents reporting overall satisfaction with provider services remained steady over all the three evaluation years (Potter et al, 2007; Paek et al, 2008). (See Table 6; the complete data summary table for the 2007-2008 parent survey is in the Technical Appendix.)

Table 6: Comparison Summary of Parent Responses, Aggregated for All Providers

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Parents	N=355	N=248	N=345
How often did the provider...	Percentage A lot or Sometimes		
Talk to you about your child's progress?	NA	80.2%	82.9%
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	NA	70.6%	76.3%
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	NA	82.7%	88.7%
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	NA	85.1%	87.3%
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	NA	NA	87.5%
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	90.1%	88.7%	88.7%
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	92.4%	91.1%	90.7%
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree		
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	91.0%	91.1%	88.1%
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	87.9%	93.6%	88.4%
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	91.5%	91.5%	95.6%

NA: Some questions on the 2007-2008 parent survey were not on the 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 surveys.

Aggregate Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness. Using the data from individual response groups, together with the achievement analysis presented in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Analyses*, the following statewide aggregate rubric is presented (see Table 7: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, All Providers), with overall ratings shaded in blue. This rubric represents all respondents (district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents) to their respective surveys regarding all providers. There was insufficient data to indicate a student achievement rating (see *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Results*). Across all providers statewide, there was some satisfaction with providers overall. Communication, instructional plans, alignment of services to local and state standards, and accommodations to special education and ELL students were deemed acceptable, based on the data provided.

Table 7: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, All Providers

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=60	Principals/Site Coordinators N=61	Teachers N=134	Parents N=345	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

Respondent Group Satisfaction with Individual Providers. District coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents were each asked about their overall satisfaction with the provider they were ranking. These results by provider are presented in Table 8, which shows the survey respondent numbers and the percentage of these groups that strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the respective provider's services.

Of the 42 authorized providers, no achievement or survey data was submitted for six providers (*Cornerstone Educational Solution, Inc; Fannie Battle Day Home for Children, Inc; Sylvan Learning Center of the Cumberland; Sylvan Learning Center-Florence; Sylvan Learning Center-Tullahoma and Youth Life Foundation*). In addition, four providers' surveys indicated they did not provide services to Tennessee in 2007-2008 (*BELL: Building Educated Leaders for Life, Exceptional Parent Connection, Failure Free Reading, and JBHM Education Group Supplemental Educational Services*), and two providers that submitted surveys did not offer services to the school districts offering Supplemental Educational Services in Tennessee in 2007-2008 school year (*Sylvan Learning Center-Cleveland and The Regional Educational and Environmental Center*). No achievement data was received for any of these providers. Thus, these providers were omitted from the following table, unless a stakeholder submitted a survey about them. Data summary tables for those providers with survey responses are included in the Technical Appendix.

Table 8: Summary of Overall Satisfaction by Respondent Group for Provider

Provider	District Coordinators		Principals/Site Coordinators		Teachers		Parents	
	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree
	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC	4	25.0	12	66.7	13	38.5	33
AlphaBEST	2	100	2	100	7	28.6	16	93.8
Applied Scholastics	1	0	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
ATS Educational Consulting Services- Project Success	3	66.7	0	NA	5	80	2	50
**Babbage Net School, Inc.	2	0	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
**Back on Track Tutoring Association	1	NA	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
*Bethlehem Literacy Academy- After School and Summer Program	1	100	0	NA	0	NA	4	75
*Boys and Girls Clubs in Tennessee	2	0	1	NA	0	NA	0	NA
Bright Sky Learning	3	33.3	5	80	9	66.7	27	92.6
*Catapult Online	2	0	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
Club Z! In-Home Tutoring	3	33.3	2	50	1	NA	7	100
Cool Kids Learn, Inc.	3	66.7	6	83.3	9	33.3	12	66.7
*Education 2020 Virtual Tutor	2	0	0	NA	0	NA	3	100
Education Station	4	25	8	62.5	31	54.8	44	95.5
**Educational Enhancement Services, Inc.	1	NA	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
Educational Enterprises	1	100	2	100	1	NA	30	93.3
**Exceptional Parent Connection	1	0	0	NA	0	NA	1	NA
**Failure Free Reading	2	0	0	NA	1	NA	0	NA
Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.	1	100	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
Kastle Instruction Recovery, LLC	4	75	6	83.3	9	44.4	54	98.1
*Kastle Summer Reading Academy	3	66.7	0	NA	2	0	8	87.5
Knowledge Points of Middle Tennessee	1	100	1	100	1	NA	41	90.2
Learning 4 Today "I Can Do This"	1	100	2	100	2	100	4	100
**Martha O'Bryan Center for Reading Achievement Program	1	100	2	100	0	NA	0	NA
Project Achieve: Intervention Assistance for Students	1	100	2	100	3	66.7	10	100
Success Educational Services	3	66.7	3	100	14	85.7	13	84.7
*Sylvan Learning Center-Knoxville	2	50	0	NA	3	0	5	100
The Learning Zone	2	0	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
The Street Academy	1	100	2	100	14	88.5	24	95.8
Total Learning Center	1	100	1	0	9	88.9	3	100
**University of Memphis Reading Center	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA	2	100
X-CEL Operating Foundation	1	100	4	75	0	NA	2	100

NA: No response to this question or the response was "Don't Know."

*LEAs offering SES did report student data for this provider. However, there was not sufficient information to include these providers in the statistical analyses so these providers are not mentioned in the achievement report (SAS EVAAS, 2008).

**LEAs offering SES in Tennessee did not provide any student data for this provider.

Rubric Summaries of Perceived Provider Effectiveness

The following section presents individual rubrics for each of the providers for whom survey data were received (see Table 9 through Table 40). The rubric ratings are based on survey results together with achievement results. [Recall that full achievement results are presented in a separate report (SAS EVASS, 2008) which delineates results by individual providers.] Rubric results should be viewed as “suggestive” and not as a sufficiently conclusive means for judging individual providers’ effectiveness. From a formative evaluation standpoint, the results are valuable as a basis for considering ways to improve provider effectiveness in future years. The final ratings were shaded in blue.

Table 9: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=4	Principals/Site Coordinators N=12	Teachers N=13	Parents N=33	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 10: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *AlphaBEST*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=7	Parents N=16
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 11: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Applied Scholastics*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 12: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *ATS Educational Consulting Services-Project Success*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=5	Parents N=2
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 13: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Babbage Net School, Inc.*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 14: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Back on Track Tutoring Association*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 15: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Bethlehem Literacy Academy - After School and Summer Program*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

District Coordinators N=1		Principals/Site Coordinators N=0		Teachers N=0		Parents N=4	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards		
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.		
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.		
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.		
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.		
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.		
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.		
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall		

Table 16: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Boys and Girls Clubs in Tennessee*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

District Coordinators N=2		Principals/Site Coordinators N=1		Teachers N=0		Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards		
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.		
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.		
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.		
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.		
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.		
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.		
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall		

Table 17: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Bright Sky Learning*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=5	Teachers N=9	Parents N=27
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 18: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Catapult Online*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 19: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Club Z! In-Home Tutoring*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=1	Parents N=7
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 20: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Cool Kids Learn, Inc.*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=6	Teachers N=9	Parents N=12	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 21: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Education 2020 Virtual Tutor*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=3
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 22: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Education Station*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=4	Principals/Site Coordinators N=8	Teachers N=31	Parents N=44
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 23: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Educational Enhancement Services, Inc.*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 24: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Educational Enterprises*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=1	Parents N=30
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 25: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Exceptional Parent Connection*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=1	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 26: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Failure Free Reading*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=1	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 27: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Huntington Learning Centers, Inc.*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information.	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 28: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Kastle Instruction Recovery, LLC*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=4	Principals/Site Coordinators N=6	Teachers N=9	Parents N=54	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information.	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 29: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Kastle Summer Reading Academy*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=2	Parents N=8
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 30: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Knowledge Points of Middle Tennessee*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=1	Parents N=41
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 31: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Learning 4 Today "I Can Do This"*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=2	Parents N=4
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 32: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Martha O'Bryan Center for Reading Achievement Program (RAP)*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

District Coordinators N=1		Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 33: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Project Achieve: Intervention Assistance for Students*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=3	Parents N=10
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 34: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Success Educational Services*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=3	Teachers N=14	Parents N=13	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 35: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center-Knoxville*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=3	Parents N=5	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 36: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *The Learning Zone*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=0	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 37: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *The Street Academy*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=14	Parents N=24	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 38: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Total Learning Center*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

District Coordinators N=1		Principals/Site Coordinators N=1		Teachers N=9		Parents N=3	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards		
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.		
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.		
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.		
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.		
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.		
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.		
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall		

Table 39: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *University of Memphis Reading*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=0	Parents N=2	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Table 40: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *X-CEL Operating Foundation*

Rubric Ratings Are Based on Survey Submissions From the Following Groups:

	District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=4	Teachers N=0	Parents N=2	
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall	Some satisfaction with provider overall	Satisfaction with provider overall

Conclusions and Discussion

These conclusions are presented to align with each of the research questions established for the evaluation study. A general discussion follows the presentation of the evaluation questions.

Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes

1. *Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?*

- Responding providers (95.7%; n=22/23) overwhelmingly indicated satisfaction with district cooperation and involvement.
- Responding principals/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) largely noted that they were satisfied with the way the school district helped their school implement services.
- The vast majority of responding parents (95.6%; n=330/345) noted that they were pleased with the way their school district helped them obtain SES for their child. Most also indicated that they were given information about their child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law (88.1%; n=304/345) and that they were given enough time to decide which tutoring company they wanted for their child (88.4%; n=305/345).

2. *Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents of students eligible for SES?*

- Almost all providers who responded to the survey (95.7%; n=22/23) indicated that their tutors communicated student progress frequently or occasionally with parents, and most responding providers (82.6%; n=19/23) indicated their tutors communicated this information to teachers as well.
- Most district coordinators (75.0%; n=45/60) reported that communication by providers occurred frequently or occasionally.
- The majority of responding principal/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) reported that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year.
- Over half of the responding teachers (56.7%; n=76/134) reported that providers frequently or occasionally communicated with them during the school year, but a large percentage (43.3%; n=58/134) said providers did not communicate with them at all.
- Of the 345 parent respondents, 82.9% (n=286/345) reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year either frequently or occasionally, and 76.3% (n=263/345) said they received frequent or occasional written communication from providers.

3. *Are providers working with districts, principals, and teachers to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?*

- Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) indicated that tutors integrated their services with classroom learning activities either frequently or occasionally.
- Just one-fourth of the district coordinators (25.0%; n=15/60) said providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Of the 60 district coordinator survey respondents, 25 reported that the provider adapted tutoring services to each school's curriculum and integrated the services with classroom learning activities (41.7%). About the same percentage (43.3%; n=26/60) said they did not know whether this was occurring.
- The majority of principal/site coordinator respondents (67.2%; n=41/61) stated that providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Most also agreed that providers adapted the tutoring services to the school's curriculum (65.6%; n=40/61) and integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities (65.6%; n=40/61).
- Less than half of the responding teachers (47.0%; n=63/134) said that service providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. Nearly half of the teacher respondents agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to the school's curriculum (49.3%; n=66/134), while fewer said that the tutoring services were aligned with classroom learning activities (41.1%; n=55/134). Many reported being unaware of whether integration with the school's curriculum (43.3%; n=58/134) and classroom activities (40.3%; n=54/134) was occurring. Just over half of the teachers who completed the survey (53.0%; n=71/134) agreed that tutors adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students. Again, many (37.3%; n=50/134) responded "Don't Know."

4. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state standards?*

- All responding providers (100%; n=23/23) agreed that services were aligned with state academic content and achievement standards.
- Fewer than half of the district coordinator respondents (46.6%; n=28/60) agreed that providers aligned their services with state and local standards.

5. *Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?*

- Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) indicated that services were offered to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

- A slight majority of responding district coordinators (51.6%; n=31/60) noted that providers made efforts to service special education and ELL students; many (38.3%; n=23/60) responded “Don’t Know.”
 - Most responding principals/site coordinators (82.0%; n=50/61) agreed that the providers offered services to special education and ELL students.
6. *What are the stakeholders’ experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?*
- Fifty percent of the district coordinator respondents (n=30/60) agreed that providers met the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions; however, 20% (n=12/60) disagreed. Slightly less than half the district coordinators (48.4%; n=29/60) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement.
 - Of the 61 principal/site coordinator respondents, 50 (82.0%) agreed that providers met the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions, and just four respondents (6.6%) disagreed. While most survey participants (63.9%; n=39/61) agreed that the provider started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete, 29.5% (n=18/61) disagreed. Responding principal/site coordinators (67.2%; n=41/61) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement.
 - The majority of responding teachers (61.2%; n=82/134) agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement.
 - Parents were generally satisfied with the number of hours of free tutoring given to their child (87.5%; n=302/345) and with the provider’s ability to start and end tutoring sessions on time (87.3%; n=301/345). Parent respondents (88.7%; n=306/345) largely indicated their belief that tutoring services helped their child’s achievement.
7. *What are the stakeholders’ overall assessments of provider performance?*
- Half of the district coordinator respondents (50.0%; n=30/60) agreed with the statement: “Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.”
 - Most responding principals/site coordinators (65.6%; n=40/61) expressed overall satisfaction with the provider services.
 - The majority of responding teachers (56.7%; n=76/134) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating.
 - Parents were the most satisfied group among the surveyed stakeholders, with 90.7% (n=313/345) indicating they were pleased with the services their children received.
8. *What are providers’ experiences with and assessments of SES interventions?*
- Responding providers indicated satisfaction with state SES coordinator cooperation and involvement (87.0%; n=20/23) and principal/site coordinator cooperation and

involvement (73.9%; n=17/23). Fewer providers (56.5%; n=13/23) indicated satisfaction with parent and teacher cooperation and involvement

- About half of the providers (52.2%; n=12/23) reported being satisfied with student attendance, though the majority (91.3%; n=21/23) said they were satisfied with student attitudes.
- Most providers (87.0%; n=20/23) noted satisfaction with success at raising student achievement to desired levels.

General Discussion

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) providers serving students in Tennessee during the 2007-2008 school year received generally positive ratings from the stakeholders participating in the evaluation. Principals/Site coordinators were more positive than both district coordinators and teachers, but not as positive, but responding parents were by far the most positive respondent group, with most respondents indicating that the services offered helped their child's achievement.

Parents were also generally pleased with the school districts' efforts to increase awareness and participation in SES services. An overwhelming majority of responding providers also reported satisfaction with district-level cooperation. However, slightly more than half of the responding providers noted satisfaction with teacher involvement. Interestingly, just over half indicated that their tutors shared lesson plans with the student's teacher. District coordinators, who participated in the survey, responded similarly to related items, with fewer than half agreeing that the provider integrated the tutoring services with the school's curriculum and classroom learning activities. Responses from providers indicated communication between tutors and parents occurred more frequently than the communication between tutors and teachers.

When reviewing stakeholders' perceptions over time, district coordinators were the only respondent group whose opinions of overall provider effectiveness decreased. District coordinators were also the only group reporting less frequent or occasional communication in 2007-2008 compared to the two previous evaluation years. Parents' positive perceptions remained constant, and principals/site coordinators' views dramatically increased from the previous year. Overall, teachers and providers expressed slightly more positive opinions than in the previous year. Provider responses that were less positive than the previous year include: adapting the supplemental services to each school's curriculum and satisfaction with student attendance, parent involvement, and teacher cooperation.

The findings of this evaluation can guide Tennessee as it continues to improve its implementation of Supplemental Educational Services. Providers should be encouraged to regularly communicate with parents, as well as the students' teachers. Responses suggest the need for more focused and frequent

communication between teachers and providers. District and principals/site coordinators should also encourage teachers and parents of SES students to cooperate with providers. Teachers could benefit from providers' insights regarding pre/post testing results, while providers in turn could benefit from teacher feedback on individual students tutored. Providers can tailor their instruction to the classroom needs of the children they serve only if they are given this information on a regular basis by the student's teachers. As more providers serve students at home or online, increased efforts at maintaining a regular provider-school communication link becomes even more vital.

Parents must be provided with timely information about authorized services so they can make informed choices. Providing parents with the opportunity to access information regarding assessments of providers found in this report may be of assistance in their selection process. This evaluation may also be useful as teachers and principals/site coordinators make recommendations to parents.

The knowledge that can be gained from this study will become more thorough as more stakeholders participate in the evaluation process. In 2007-2008, district coordinators from all five districts that offered SES services completed surveys. However, just 56% of the SES-eligible schools had parents completing surveys, and only 44% of the SES-eligible schools were represented by either a principal/site coordinator or teacher survey. Principals/Site coordinators and teachers should be encouraged by the state to participate more actively in the evaluation process, as every school where children are receiving SES services should be represented in the survey findings.

All schools in which students are eligible for SES are in various stages of "improvement," according to the Title I classification system, and they face serious challenges. Knowledge gained through evaluating providers should give insight both into areas for improvement and into areas for success, as all stakeholders work together to help students achieve their academic goals.

References

- Potter, A., Ross, S. M., Paek, J., & McKay, D. (2007, March). *Supplemental educational services in the state of Tennessee: 2005-2006*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy.
- Paek, J., McKay, D., Harrison, L., Ross, S. M., & Fedde, F. (2008, March). *Supplemental educational services in the state of Tennessee: 2006-2007*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy.
- SAS EVAAS. (2008). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Tennessee: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Analyses*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy.