



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 North Carolina: 2006 – 2007





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 North Carolina:

2006 – 2007

Final Draft

January 2009

James Ford
Jerry Bates
Lynn Harrison
Dawn McKay
Steven M. Ross
Laura Neergaard
Center for Research in Educational Policy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Results	2
Evaluation Report	5
Rationale and Questions for the Evaluation	5
Methodology.....	6
Procedure.....	6
Instrumentation.....	7
Results	8
Rubric Summaries of Perceived Provider Effectiveness	15
Conclusions and Discussion	64
General Discussion.....	67
Reference.....	69

Index of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Provider Responses, Aggregated for All Providers	9
Table 2: North Carolina 2006-2007 SES Survey Return Overview: by District.....	10
Table 3: Summary of District Coordinator Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	12
Table 4: Summary of Principal/Site Coordinator and Teacher Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	14
Table 5: Summary of Parent Responses, Aggregated for All Providers	15
Table 6: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>All Providers</i>	16
Table 7: Summary of Overall Satisfaction by Respondent Group for Provider.....	17
Table 8: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Academics By Venture</i>	19
Table 9: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Academics Plus, Inc</i>	20
Table 10: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>AlphaBEST Education</i>	21
Table 11: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Brainfuse</i>	22
Table 12: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>BrainWorks Learning Center</i>	23
Table 13: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Brame Institute</i>	24
Table 14: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Bright Futures Learning Center</i>	25
Table 15: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Bright Sky Learning (NC)</i>	26
Table 16: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Cambridge</i>	27
Table 17: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Extended Day Tutorial Program</i>	28
Table 18: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Clinton City Schools</i>	29
Table 19: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Club Z!</i>	30
Table 20: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Communities in Schools: Brunswick County</i>	31
Table 21: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Community Education Durham Public Schools</i>	32
Table 22: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Community Technology Learning Center</i>	33
Table 23: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Education Station (NC)</i>	34
Table 24: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Educational Enterprises</i>	35
Table 25: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Failure Free Reading</i>	36
Table 26: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Guilford County Schools Beyond the Bell</i>	37
Table 27: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Huntington Learning (NC)</i>	38
Table 28: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>It's Simply English</i>	39
Table 29: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>MasterMind Prep</i>	40
Table 30: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Monore 21st Century Community Learning Center</i>	41
Table 31: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>North Carolina Central University</i>	42
Table 32: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Prime Time for Kids</i>	43
Table 33: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sky Link</i>	44
Table 34: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Southridge Learning Center</i>	45
Table 35: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sweethearts 21st Century Catawba County Schools</i>	46
Table 36: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Ace It Bladen, Brunswick, Columbus, Lumberton, & Robeson</i>	47
Table 37: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Ace It Duplin and Sampson</i>	48
Table 38: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Ace It Greenville, Washington, Kinston, Jacksonville, and New Bern</i>	49
Table 39: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Ace It Harnett, Wayne, and Wilson</i>	50
Table 40: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Ace It Henderson and Roanoke Rapids</i>	51
Table 41: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Ace It Wake</i>	52
Table 42: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Charlotte University</i>	53
Table 43: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Columbus</i>	54
Table 44: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Elizabeth City</i>	55
Table 45: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Hickory</i>	56
Table 46: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Johnston</i>	57
Table 47: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Mocksville</i>	58
Table 48: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Mooresville</i>	59
Table 49: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Mount Airy</i>	60

Table 50: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Robeson</i>	61
Table 51: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center: Shelby and Denver</i>	62
Table 52: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>University Instructors</i>	63

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006 – 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the study of the 2006-2007 implementation progress of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in North Carolina. 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 North Carolina. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process to assist the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (DPI) in meeting federal monitoring requirements. A rubric, or summary of provider progress and outcomes, was developed for DPI to help evaluate individual providers and make decisions regarding approval status.

During the 2006-2007 school year, 69 local educational agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina were required to offer supplemental educational services. Within these districts, 164 Title I schools were designated SES-eligible. Statewide, 45 individual provider companies were authorized by the DPI.

Two complementary studies were conducted to address the research questions. The first study examined two questions: (1) *Whether students served by SES providers have shown statistically significant academic gains in Reading and Mathematics from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007;* and (2) *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 North Carolina: 2006-2007 Student Achievement Analysis* (Gallagher & Zoblotsky, 2009). 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 or school site coordinators, and both teachers and parents of students receiving SES services. The current report addresses those research questions statewide across all providers, presents individual provider Rubrics of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, and includes provider-specific data summaries from each respondent group.

Results

This report presents results in the context of the guiding questions for the second study. In addition, the report presents both a statewide Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness across all providers as well as rubrics for individual providers. Rubrics were scored using both the summary perceptual data and the achievement findings from the achievement report¹.

Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?

- Parents had overwhelmingly positive perceptions of LEA efforts to implement SES in their districts. Most parents noted that they were pleased with the way their school district helped them obtain SES for their child (94.1% strongly agree or agree: n=2,029/2,156).
- Most providers were either highly satisfied or satisfied with district cooperation and involvement (87.2%: n=157/180).

2. What are teachers' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?

- Nearly half of the teachers were satisfied with provider services (46.6% strongly agree or agree: n=380/815). However, a third (33.4% Don't Know: n=272/815) were unsure of their satisfaction with provider services, and 19% were dissatisfied (strongly disagree or disagree: n=154/815).
- The 205 comments from teachers reflected diverging opinions about provider services; there were 64 positive comments (31.2%), 71 negative comments (34.6%) and 70 neutral comments (34.1%).

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

- Providers indicated that they communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (92.8%: n=167/180) and parents (98.3%: n=177/180) regarding students' progress.
- Most district coordinators reported that communication by providers occurred frequently or occasionally (73.9%: n=34/46).
- Of the principal/site coordinators, 48.1% (n=159/330) noted that providers communicated with them during the school year either frequently or occasionally; 26.1% (n=86/330) did not receive any communication from the providers at all and 25.5% (n=84/330) chose "Don't Know" in response to this question.
- Teachers did not agree with the provider assessment of communication. Of the 815 respondents, 45.5% (n=371/815) received no communication from the providers. While 42.5% (n=346/815) reported frequent or occasional communication, 11.3% (n=92/815) chose "Don't Know" in response to this question.
- Of the 2156 parent respondents, more than half reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year (74% frequently or occasionally:

¹Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (January 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.

n=1,595/2,156). Over three-quarters (75.4% frequently or occasionally: n=1,626/2,156) of parents noted the provider send letters or notes home about their child's progress.

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

- Over half of providers reported that they were able to integrate their tutoring services with classroom learning activities (56.6% frequently or occasionally: n=102/180).
- The majority of responding district coordinators (60.9%: n=28/46) indicated providers did not collaborate with them to set goals for student growth.
- Of the 330 principals/site coordinators who responded, 51.3% (n=169/330) reported that providers frequently or occasionally collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. However, 41.8% (Not At All: n=138/330) did not experience any collaboration.
- Collaboration was lower between providers and teachers: while 45.8% (n=373/815) did not experience any collaboration; 35.0% (n=285/815) reported that providers collaborated with them frequently or occasionally. Still, 17.9% (n=146/815) responded "Don't Know" to this question.
- Most parents agreed that they were given an opportunity to discuss their child's learning goals with the tutors (60.9% frequently or occasionally: n=1,313/2,156).

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

- Providers reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic standards (98.9% frequently or occasionally: n=178/180).
- Most district coordinators also reported that providers' services were aligned with state and local academic standards (71.7% strongly agree or agree: n=33/46).
- The majority of principal/site coordinator respondents found that providers aligned their services with state and local standards (77.9% strongly agree or agree: n=257/330). Only 5.4% (n=18/330) of this respondent group disagreed that services were aligned with standards.
- Although nearly half of the teachers (49.3%: n=401/815) did not know if the providers' services were aligned with state and local standards, nearly as many (46.2%: n=377/815) of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed that alignment was occurring.

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

- Most provider representatives reported that their tutors gave instructions to students with disabilities, consistent with their Individualized Education Plans or Individualized Services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (92.2% frequently or occasionally: n=166/180). Providers also reported offering appropriate instruction to ELL students when needed (65.0% frequently or occasionally: n=117/180).
- District coordinators stated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (76.1% strongly agree or agree: n=35/46).
- Most principals/site coordinators found that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (74.2% strongly agree or agree: n=245/330).
- Over half of the teacher respondents reported that they did not know about the providers' activities related to the offering of services to special education and ELL students (57.2% Don't Know: n=466/815). Nearly all of the remaining teacher respondents strongly

agreed or agreed that the providers offered services to special education and ELL students (38.3%: n=312/815).

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

- While district coordinator assessments were divided, they were mostly satisfied with provider services overall (65.3% strongly agree or agree: n=30/46; 30.5% strongly disagree or disagree: n=14/46).
- Most principals/site coordinators reported that they were satisfied with providers' services (72.1% strongly agree or agree: n=238/330).
- Teacher satisfaction was lower than other school personnel with 46.6% (n=380/815) indicating satisfaction. However, 33.4% (n=272/815) of the teachers responded with "Don't Know" to the survey question about overall satisfaction. The remaining teachers (19.0% strongly disagree or disagree: n=155/815) indicated that they were dissatisfied with provider services.
- Parents were the most satisfied group among all involved stakeholders: 84.3% (n=1,818/2,156) strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the services their children received.

Evaluation Report

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006 – 2007

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in North Carolina, 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 North Carolina school districts where these services were offered during the 2006-07 school year. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process that allows the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to meet federal monitoring requirements. A rubric, or summary of provider progress and outcomes, was developed for DPI to help evaluate individual providers and make decisions about continuing approval or removal from the state-approved list.

During the 2006-2007 school year, 69 local educational agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina were required to offer supplemental educational services. Within these districts, 164 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, 45 individual provider companies were authorized by the DPI. 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 two questions: (1) *Whether students served by SES providers have shown statistically significant academic gains in Reading and Mathematics from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007*; and (2) *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 North Carolina: 2006-2007 Student Achievement Analysis* (Gallagher & Zoblotsky, 2009).

The second study investigated stakeholder perceptions of provider implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, district coordinators, principals or school site coordinators, and both 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. What are teachers' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?
3. Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents of students eligible for SES?
4. Are providers working with districts, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
5. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic standards?
6. Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?
7. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?

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 site 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.

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/site 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.

All respondent groups were given several weeks to complete the surveys near the end of the academic year. Open-ended comments were reviewed by the evaluators and individual names removed.

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.

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 site 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 four or five point Likert-style responses (e.g., 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/site coordinator, and teacher instruments, one set of 13 close-ended questions was 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 2006-2007 school year. 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. Of the 45 providers authorized to provide services in North Carolina during 2006-2007 representatives from 16 provider organizations completed the online provider survey. Providers who responded to the survey indicated that their tutors communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (92.8%: n=15/16) and parents (98.3%: n=15/16) regarding student progress. The majority of provider respondents indicated satisfaction with district cooperation and involvement (87.2%: n=14/16). Just over half of the providers (56.6%: n=9/16) indicated that tutors integrated their services with classroom learning activities either frequently or occasionally (See Table 1; the complete data summary table for the aggregated provider survey is in the Technical Appendix).

Provider responses were generally positive regarding alignment with state academic and achievement standards, with 98.9% (n=15/16) of the responses indicating that this occurred frequently or occasionally. Most providers (92.2%: n=15/16) indicated that services were offered to students with

disabilities, and instruction was in compliance with students' Individualized Plans or as designated by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. In addition, the majority (65%: n=10/16) of provider responses reported that tutors offered instruction to ELL students. However, 28.9% (n=5/16) indicated instruction was not offered to English Language Learners.

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

	Providers N=180*
Provider Perceptions and Activities	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	92.80%
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	98.30%
Tutors adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	48.90%
Tutors aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	98.90%
Tutors integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	56.60%
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	43.90%
Tutors gave instruction to students with disabilities, consistent with their Individualized Education Plans or Individualized Services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.	92.20%
Tutors protected from public disclosure the identities of all students served and all students eligible for services.	95.60%
Tutors give appropriate instruction to English Language Learners if it is needed.	65.00%
Tutors use appropriate timetables for improving each student's achievement.	98.90%
Provider satisfaction with:	Percentage Satisfied or Highly Satisfied
Parent cooperation/involvement	68.40%
Student attendance	77.80%
Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	88.30%
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum.	90.50%
Teacher cooperation/involvement	68.30%
District cooperation/involvement	87.20%
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	60.60%

*While 180 individual online surveys were received, these included multiple representatives from 12 providers. A total of 16 separate providers were represented in the survey responses.

Response Rates of Other Respondent Groups. Only 5% (n=8/69) of SES eligible districts completed an on-line survey about at least one SES provider. Of the 164 schools where students were eligible for SES services, 62% (n=101) had either a principal/site coordinator or at least one teacher respond to the online survey about one or more SES service providers. By contrast, 71% (n=111) of the 164 schools had parents who responded to the paper survey. Of the schools where parents returned an SES survey, 13% (n=21) had no school personnel respond to any of the online surveys. See Table 2 for a district by district summary of survey returns.

Table 2: North Carolina 2006-2007 SES Survey Return Overview: by District

District	Numbers of SES Eligible Schools Submitting Types of Surveys									
	School Personnel (District Coordinator, Principal/ Site Coordinator, Teacher)							Parent		
	School Total: SES eligible	District surveys (Y/N)	BOTH principal/ SC & teacher surveys	ONLY principal/ SC surveys	ONLY teacher surveys	EITHER principal/ SC or teacher surveys	Percent EITHER type (principal/ SC or teacher)	Schools with parent surveys	Percent schools with parent surveys	Schools with parent surveys, but NO school personnel
Alamance-Burlington	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Anson County	4	N	4	0	0	4	100%	4	100%	0
Ashe County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Beaufort County	1	Y	0	0	1	1	100%	0	0%	0
Bertie County	2	N	1	0	0	1	50%	1	50%	0
Bladen County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	50%	1
Brunswick County	3	N	3	0	0	3	100%	2	67%	0
Burke County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Caldwell County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Carter Community	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Caswell County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	13	N	4	3	2	9	75%	13	100%	4
Chatham County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Clinton City	2	N	2	0	0	2	50%	2	100%	0
Columbus County	4	N	3	0	0	3	75%	3	75%	0
Craven County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Crossroads Charter	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Cumberland County	12	N	7	0	0	7	58%	6	50%	0
Duplin County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Durham Public	6	N	1	1	2	4	67%	5	83%	1
Edenton/Chowan	3	N	1	0	1	2	67%	2	67%	0
Edgecombe County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Forsyth County	6	Y	2	3	0	5	83%	6	100%	1
Grandfather Acad	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Granville County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Greene County	2	Y	1	0	1	2	100%	2	100%	0
Guilford County	13	Y	4	3	2	9	69%	10	77%	1
Halifax County	2	Y	0	1	0	1	50%	1	50%	0
Haliwa-Saponi Tribal	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Harnett County	2	N	0	0	1	1	50%	2	100%	1
Healthy Start Acad	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Hertford County	2	Y	0	0	2	2	100%	2	100%	0
Hoke County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Iredell-Statesville	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Kennedy Charter	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Lenoir County	2	N	0	0	1	1	50%	1	50%	0

Table 2, continued

District	Numbers of SES Eligible Schools Submitting Types of Surveys									
	School Personnel (District Coordinator, Principal/ Site Coordinator, Teacher)							Parent		
	School Total: SES eligible	District surveys (Y/N)	BOTH principal/ SC & teacher surveys	ONLY principal/ SC surveys	ONLY teacher surveys	EITHER principal/ SC or teacher surveys	Percent EITHER type (principal/ SC or teacher)	Schools with parent surveys	Percent schools with parent surveys	Schools with parent surveys, but NO school personnel
Lexington City	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Lincoln County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Maureen Joy	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
McDowell County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Moore County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Nash-Rocky Mount	2	N	0	0	1	1	50%	2	100%	1
Northampton County	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Omuteko Gwamaziima	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Onslow County	2	N	0	1	0	1	50%	2	100%	1
Pender County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Pitt County	12	N	9	0	0	9	75%	10	83%	1
Provisions Charter Acad	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Quality Education Acad	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Richmond County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Roanoke Rapids City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Robeson County	7	N	1	0	2	3	43%	3	43%	0
Rockingham County	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Rocky Mount Prep	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Rowan-Salisbury	2	N	2	0	0	2	100%	1	50%	0
Sallie B. Howard	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Sampson County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	50%	1
Stanly County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Sugar Creek Charter	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Torchlight Acad	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Union County Public	1	N	0	0	1	1	100%	1	100%	0
Vance County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Wake County	1	N	0	0	1	1	100%	1	100%	0
Washington County	2	N	0	1	0	1	50%	1	50%	0
Wayne County Public	10	N	6	3	0	9	90%	10	100%	1
Weldon City	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Whiteville City	1	N	0	0	1	1	100%	1	100%	0
Wilkes County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Yadkin County	<u>2</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>101</i>		<i>117</i>		<i>21</i>
Statewide percentage		5%	37%	13%	12%	62%		71%		13%

Aggregate District Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide. District coordinators from 8 of 69 eligible SES districts submitted surveys (5%: n=8/164) about their experiences with and reactions to 22 providers. Respondents were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the district. A total of 46 district coordinator surveys were received. Most noted providers communicated either frequently or occasionally (73.9%: n=34/46) during the school year. Over half reported providers collaborated with them to set goals for student growth “Not At All” (60.9%: n=28/46). The majority (71.7%: n=33/46) agreed that providers aligned their services with state and local standards. Most (76.1%: n=35/46) indicated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students. Over half (65.3%: n=30/46) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating; while 30.5% (n=14/46) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Finally, 63.1% (n=29/46) of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that services offered by the provider they were rating positively impacted student achievement. (See Table 3; the complete data summary table for the aggregated district coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix.)

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

	District Coordinator N=46*
How often does the provider...	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally
Communicate with you during the year?	73.90%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	73.90%
Communicate with teachers during the school year?	52.20%
Communicate with parents during the year?	58.70%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	32.60%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	43.50%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.00%
Aligned their services with federal, state and local standards.	71.70%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	76.10%
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	67.40%
Complied with applicable federal, state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	69.50%
Overall Assessment	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	63.10%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	65.30%

*District coordinator responses were derived from 8 separate districts with a total of 46 surveys completed about 22 separate providers.

Aggregate Principal/Site Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide. Principals/Site coordinators from 82 separate schools submitted surveys about their experiences with and reactions to 32 providers. Respondents were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the school. A total of 330 principal/site coordinator surveys were received. Less than half noted providers communicated with them during the school year either frequently or occasionally (48.1%: n=159/330).

More than a quarter (26.1 %: n=86/330) of principal responses reported that providers communicated “Not At All” and nearly the same number (25.5%: n=84/330) responded “Don’t Know.”

With regard to providers aligning services with state and local standards, the majority (77.9%: n=257/330) of principal/site coordinators agreed that the providers did so. Slight more than half (51.3%: n=168/330) indicated providers collaborated either frequently or occasionally with them to set goals for student growth. However, 41.8% (n=138/330) indicated there was no collaboration. Many (74.2%: n=245/330) indicated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students.

Nearly three-fourths (72.1%: n=238/330) expressed overall satisfaction with the services of the provider they were rating. Finally, 69.4% (n=229/330) of the respondents agreed that services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement. (See Table 4; the complete data summary table for the aggregated principal/site coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix.)

Aggregate Teacher Perceptions, Statewide. Teachers from 79 of the 164 SES eligible schools statewide submitted surveys about their experiences with and reactions to 33 providers. Like the district and principals/site coordinators, teachers were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the school. Subsequently, a total of 815 teacher surveys were received. Less than half (46.6%: n=380/815) indicated satisfaction with provider services; while 19% (n=155/815) were not satisfied with the provider’s services. However, 33.4% (n=272/815) responded “Don’t Know” to this question. Almost half of teacher responses were positive regarding the impact providers had on student achievement (49.3%: n=402/815), while 14.7% (n=120/815) disagreed with this statement (See Table 4; the complete data summary table for the aggregated principal/site coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix).

Close to half of the teacher responses (45.5%: n=371/815) reported no communication with providers existed. However, 42.5% (n=346/815) reported that providers communicated frequently or occasionally. In terms of collaboration to set student goals, nearly half (45.8%: n=373/815) of the responses reported no collaboration by providers; while more than a third (35%: n=285/815) of the responses reported frequent or occasional collaboration to set student goals. Still, 17.9% (n=146/815) stated teachers were unsure regarding collaboration. In terms of integrating tutoring services with classroom learning activities, 46.1% (n=376/815) of the responses indicated that teachers were unsure regarding integration. However, over a third (34.2%: n=279/815) of the teacher responses concurred that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities, and 18.8% (n=153/815) of the respondents disagreed.

Nearly half (49.3%: n=402/815) chose “Don’t Know” in regards to whether provider services were in alignment with federal, state, and local standards. Over forty-six percent (46.2%: n=377/815) of

the teachers' responses indicated providers' services were in alignment with federal, state, and local standards. Over half (57.2%: n=466/815) of teacher responses were unsure regarding provider services for special education and ELL students. Less than half of teacher responses (38.3%: n=312/815) reported that services for special education and ELL students were offered (See Table 4; the complete data summary table for the aggregated teacher survey is in the Technical Appendix).

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

	Principal/Site Coordinator N=330*	Teachers N=815**
How often does the provider...	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally	
Communicate with you during the year?	48.10%	42.50%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	89.40%	48.10%
Communicate with teachers during the school year?	87.30%	35.40%
Communicate with parents during the year?	71.20%	37.50%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	51.30%	35.00%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	63.70%	43.00%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	42.70%	34.20%
Aligned their services with federal, state and local standards.	77.90%	46.20%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	74.20%	38.30%
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	77.30%	37.10%
Complied with applicable federal, state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	84.00%	40.20%
Overall Assessment	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	69.40%	49.30%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	72.10%	46.60%

* Principal/Site coordinator responses are derived from a total of 82 separate schools offering SES tutoring representing 32 separate providers.

** Teacher responses are derived from a total of 79 separate schools offering SES tutoring representing 33 separate providers.

Aggregate Parent Perceptions, Statewide. Unlike district coordinators, principal/site coordinators and teachers, parents were asked to complete only one survey. They identified the tutoring company serving their child by selecting the company name from the list of state-wide approved providers. Parent surveys regarding 38 individual providers were received from a total of 117 of the 164 schools (71%) which were required to make SES available to the students. Responding parents were the most satisfied group among all involved stakeholders. An overwhelming majority of responding parents noted that they were pleased with the way their school helped them obtain SES for their child (94.6%: n=2,040/2,156). The majority of respondents (84.3%: n=1,818/2,156) indicated they were pleased with the services their children received. A large majority of parent respondents also indicated their belief that tutoring services helped their child improve in reading or math in his/her classes at school (84%: n=1,811/2,156). Three-fourths of parent respondents, (75.4%: n=1,626/2,156) indicated they received frequent or occasional written communication from providers, and 74% (n=1,595/2,156) reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year either frequently or occasionally (See Table 45; the complete data summary table for the aggregated parent survey is in the Technical Appendix)..

Table 5: Summary of Parent Responses, Aggregated for All Providers

Parent N=2,156*	
How often does the provider...	Percentage Often/Sometimes
Talk to me about my child's progress?	74.00%
Talk to my child's teachers about his/her progress?	54.20%
Send letters or notes home to me about my child's progress?	75.40%
Answer my questions about tutoring?	72.90%
Start and end the tutoring sessions at the scheduled time?	83.10%
Talk to me about my child's progress?	75.40%
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the provider.	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree
Tutoring helped my child improve in reading or math in his/her classes at school.	84.00%
The information on the progress reports helped me understand my child's strengths, weakness, and progress towards his/her learning goals.	77.90%
I was given a chance to meet with the tutor and discuss my child's learning goals.	60.90%
Overall, I am happy with the tutoring my child received.	84.30%
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree
I was notified by my child's school about free tutoring.	94.60%
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring provider I wanted for my child.	91.20%
The district provided the necessary information to help me select a provider.	87.30%
The district returned phone calls, addressed questions in a timely manner.	74.00%
I am happy with the way my school district helped to get free tutoring for my child.	94.10%
I was notified by my child's school about free tutoring.	84.70%

*Parent survey responses are derived from 117 separate schools who offered SES tutoring representing 38 separate providers.

Aggregate Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness. Using the data from individual response groups, together with the achievement analysis², the following statewide aggregate rubric is presented (see Table 6 with ratings shaded in blue). This rubric represents all respondents (district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers and parents) to the respective survey regarding all providers. Across all providers statewide, there was some satisfaction with providers overall. Alignment of services to local and state standards, and accommodations to special education and ELL students were rated as acceptable, while communication and developing instructional plans geared to student needs was rated as marginal, based on the data provided.

² Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (January 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.

Table 6: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *All Providers*

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

District Coordinators N=46		Principals/Site Coordinators N=330		Teachers N=815		Parents N=2156	
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 +.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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. Based on all survey returns, table 7 summarizes, by provider, the overall statewide satisfaction, by respondent group.

Table 7: Summary of Overall Satisfaction by Respondent Group for Provider

Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider/with the services that my child received	District Coordinators		Principals/Site Coordinators		Teachers		Parents	
	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree/Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree/Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree/Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree/Agree
		Provider		Provider		Provider		Provider
Academics By Venture	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	7	71.4%	42	75.0%
Academics Plus, Inc	4	75.5%	49	34.7%	94	35.1%	339	84.9%
AlphaBEST Education	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Brainfuse	2	50.0%	2	0.0%	1	0.0%	6	100.0%
BrainWorks Learning Center	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	4	25.0%	7	85.7%
Brame Institute	1	100.0%	9	88.9%	26	65.4%	73	85.0%
Bright Futures Learning Center	6	83.3%	57	73.7%	99	65.7%	205	94.2%
Bright Sky Learning (NC)	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Cambridge	1	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Extended Day Tutorial Program	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	6	66.6%	2	100.0%
Clinton City Schools	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	4	50.0%	2	100.0%
Club Z!	4	25.0%	6	50.0%	4	25.0%	26	80.8%
Communities in Schools: Brunswick County	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	3	0.0%	4	75.0%
Community Education Durham Public Schools	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Community Technology Learning Center	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Education Station (NC)	2	50.0%	20	60.0%	16	75.0%	187	82.9%
Educational Enterprises (NC)	1	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	1	100.0%
Failure Free Reading (NC)	2	50.0%	16	81.3%	18	50.0%	63	88.8%
Guilford County Schools Beyond the Bell	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Huntington Learning (NC)	1	0.0%	15	70.0%	37	54.0%	92	76.1%
It's Simply English	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
MasterMind Prep	5	100.0%	32	71.9%	99	32.4%	125	78.4%
Monore 21st Century Community Learning Center	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	6	100.0%
North Carolina Central University	1	100.0%	20	60.0%	70	32.9%	73	83.6%
Prime Time for Kids	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	5	60.0%	10	70.0%
Sky Link	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Southridge Learning Center	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	22	77.3%	27	88.9%
Sweethearts 21st Century Catawba County Schools	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sylvan Ace It Bladen Brunswick Columbus Lumberton Robeson	0	0.0%	5	80.0%	44	79.5%	74	81.0%
Sylvan Ace It Duplin and Sampson	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	9	0.0%	64	78.1%
Sylvan Ace It Greenville Washington Kinston Jacksonville New Bern	2	100.0%	10	90.0%	48	45.8%	180	83.3%
Sylvan Ace It Harnett, Wayne, Wilson	0	0.0%	7	85.7%	14	35.7%	74	89.2%
Sylvan Ace It Henderson and Roanoke Rapids	2	50.0%	3	66.7%	0	0.0%	17	70.6%
Sylvan Ace It Wake	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	75.0%	91	91.2%
Sylvan Learning Center: Charlotte University	1	100.0%	11	45.5%	7	42.9%	61	80.3%
Sylvan Learning Center: Columbus	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	25	36.0%	15	93.4%
Sylvan Learning Center: Elizabeth City	1	100.0%	5	60.0%	39	15.4%	95	77.9%
Sylvan Learning Center: Hickory	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	4	25.0%	9	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center: Johnston	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sylvan Learning Center: Mocksville	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sylvan Learning Center: Mooresville	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center: Mount Airy	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	41.2%
Sylvan Learning Center: Robeson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	55.4%	22	86.4%
Sylvan Learning Center: Shelby and Denver	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	4	100.0%	12	100.0%
University Instructors	3	66.7%	39	69.2%	73	39.7%	118	82.2%

Rubric Summaries of Perceived Provider Effectiveness

The following section presents individual rubrics for each of the providers for whom survey data and/or student achievement data were received (see [TABLE 8] through [TABLE 52]). Although the providers *Cambridge*, *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Extended Day Tutorial Program*, *Clinton City Schools*, *Community Technology Learning Center*, *Guilford County Schools Beyond the Bell*, *Slyvan Learning Center: Robeson*, and *Slyvan Learning Center: Shelby and Denver* were evaluated by at least one respondent group, no student data was received from DPI regarding these providers. Therefore student achievement results for these providers have been rated “Insufficient Information.”

The rubric ratings are based on survey results together with achievement results. [Recall that full achievement results are presented in a separate report³ 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.

³ Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (January 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.

Table 8: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Academics By Venture*

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

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=7	Parents N=42	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 9: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Academics Plus, Inc*

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

District Coordinators N=4		Principals/Site Coordinators N=49		Teachers N=94		Parents N=339	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 Education*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Brainfuse*

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

	District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=1	Parents N=6	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *BrainWorks Learning Center*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=4	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Brame Institute*

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

District Coordinators N=1		Principals/Site Coordinators N=9		Teachers N=26		Parents N=73	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Bright Futures Learning Center*

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

District Coordinators N=6		Principals/Site Coordinators N=57		Teachers N=99		Parents N=205	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Bright Sky Learning (NC)*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Cambridge**

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

District Coordinators N=1		Principals/Site Coordinators N=1		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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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		

*This provider either (1) did not provider services to any students during the 2006-2007 school year or (2) no student data was submitted.

Table 17: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Extended Day Tutorial Program*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=6	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Clinton City Schools*

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

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=3	Teachers N=4	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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!*

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

		District Coordinators N=4	Principals/Site Coordinators N=6	Teachers N=4	Parents N=26
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Communities in Schools: Brunswick County*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=3	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Community Education Durham Public Schools*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=0	Parents N=9
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Community Technology Learning Center*

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

District Coordinators N=0		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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Education Station (NC)*

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

		District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=20	Teachers N=16	Parents N=187
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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=1	Teachers N=1	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Failure Free Reading*

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

		District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=16	Teachers N=18	Parents N=63
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Guilford County Schools Beyond the Bell*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 (NC)*

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

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=15	Teachers N=37	Parents N=92
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *It's Simply English*

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

District Coordinators N=1		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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *MasterMind Prep*

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

District Coordinators N=5		Principals/Site Coordinators N=32		Teachers N=99		Parents N=125	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Monore 21st Century Community Learning Center*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=1	Parents N=6
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *North Carolina Central University*

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

District Coordinators N=1		Principals/Site Coordinators N=20		Teachers N=70		Parents N=73	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Prime Time for Kids*

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

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=5	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sky Link*

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

District Coordinators N=1		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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Southridge Learning Center*

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

District Coordinators N=2		Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=22	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sweethearts 21st Century Catawba County Schools*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sylvan Ace It Bladen, Brunswick, Columbus, Lumberton, & Robeson*

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

District Coordinators N=0		Principals/Site Coordinators N=5		Teachers N=44		Parents N=74	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sylvan Ace It Duplin and Sampson*

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

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=2	Teachers N=9	Parents N=64	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sylvan Ace It Greenville, Washington, Kinston, Jacksonville, and New Bern*

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

District Coordinators N=2		Principals/Site Coordinators N=10		Teachers N=48		Parents N=180	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sylvan Ace It Harnett, Wayne, and Wilson*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=7	Teachers N=14	Parents N=74
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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, *Sylvan Ace It Henderson and Roanoke Rapids*

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

		District Coordinators N=2	Principals/Site Coordinators N=3	Teachers N=0	Parents N=17
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 41: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Ace It Wake*

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

District Coordinators N=0		Principals/Site Coordinators N=0		Teachers N=20		Parents N=91	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 42: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Charlotte University*

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

	District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=11	Teachers N=7	Parents N=61	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 43: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Columbus*

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

		District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=4	Teachers N=25	Parents N=15
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 44: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Elizabeth City*

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

		District Coordinators N=1	Principals/Site Coordinators N=5	Teachers N=39	Parents N=95
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 45: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Hickory*

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

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=4	Parents N=9	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 46: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Johnston*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 47: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Mocksville*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 48: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Mooresville*

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=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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 49: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Mount Airy*

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=17
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 50: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Robeson*

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

District Coordinators N=0		Principals/Site Coordinators N=0	Teachers N=9	Parents N=22	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 51: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center: Shelby and Denver*

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

	District Coordinators N=0	Principals/Site Coordinators N=1	Teachers N=4	Parents N=12	
	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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 52: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *University Instructors*

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

	District Coordinators N=3	Principals/Site Coordinators N=39	Teachers N=73	Parents N=118	
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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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 +.17	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +.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

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

Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes

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

- Parents had overwhelmingly positive perceptions of LEA efforts to implement SES in their districts. Most parents noted that they were pleased with the way their school district helped them obtain SES for their child (94.1% strongly agree or agree: n=2,029/2,156).
- Most providers were either highly satisfied or satisfied with district cooperation and involvement (87.2%: n=157/180).

2. *What are teachers' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?*

- Nearly half of the teachers were satisfied with provider services (46.6% strongly agree or agree: n=380/815). However, a third (33.4% Don't Know: n=272/815) were unsure of their satisfaction with provider services, and 19% were dissatisfied (strongly disagree or disagree: n=154/815).
- The 205 comments from teachers reflected diverging opinions about provider services; there were 64 positive comments (31.2%), 71 negative comments (34.6%) and 70 neutral comments (34.1%).

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

- Providers indicated that they communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (92.8%: n=167/180) and parents (98.3%: n=177/180) regarding students' progress.
- Most district coordinators reported that communication by providers occurred frequently or occasionally (73.9%: n=34/46).
- Of the principal/site coordinators, 48.1% (n=159/330) noted that providers communicated with them during the school year either frequently or occasionally; 26.1% (n=86/330) did not receive any communication from the providers at all and 25.5% (n=84/330) chose "Don't Know" in response to this question.

- Teachers did not agree with the provider assessment of communication. Of the 815 respondents, 45.5% (n=371/815) received no communication from the providers. While 42.5% (n=346/815) reported frequent or occasional communication, 11.3% (n=92/815) chose “Don’t Know” in response to this question.
- Of the 2156 parent respondents, more than half reported that providers spoke with them about their child’s progress throughout the year (74% frequently or occasionally: n=1,595/2,156). Over three-quarters (75.4% frequently or occasionally: n=1,626/2,156) of parents noted the provider send letters or notes home about their child’s progress.

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

- Over half of providers reported that they were able to integrate their tutoring services with classroom learning activities (56.6% frequently or occasionally: n=102/180).
- The majority of responding district coordinators (60.9%: n=28/46) indicated providers did not collaborate with them to set goals for student growth.
- Of the 330 principals/site coordinators who responded, 51.3% (n=169/330) reported that providers frequently or occasionally collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. However, 41.8% (Not At All: n=138/330) did not experience any collaboration.
- Collaboration was lower between providers and teachers: while 45.8% (n=373/815) did not experience any collaboration; 35.0% (n=285/815) reported that providers collaborated with them frequently or occasionally. Still, 17.9% (n=146/815) responded “Don’t Know” to this question.
- Most parents agreed that they were given an opportunity to discuss their child’s learning goals with the tutors (60.9% frequently or occasionally: n=1,313/2,156).

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

- Providers reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic standards (98.9% frequently or occasionally: n=178/180).
- Most district coordinators also reported that providers’ services were aligned with state and local academic standards (71.7% strongly agree or agree: n=33/46).
- The majority of principal/site coordinator respondents found that providers aligned their services with state and local standards (77.9% strongly agree or agree: n=257/330). Only

5.4% (n=18/330) of this respondent group disagreed that services were aligned with standards.

- Although nearly half of the teachers (49.3%: n=401/815) did not know if the providers' services were aligned with state and local standards, nearly as many (46.2%: n=377/815) of the teachers strongly agreed or agreed that alignment was occurring.

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

- Most provider representatives reported that their tutors gave instructions to students with disabilities, consistent with their Individualized Education Plans or Individualized Services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (92.2% frequently or occasionally: n=166/180). Providers also reported offering appropriate instruction to ELL students when needed (65.0% frequently or occasionally: n=117/180).
- District coordinators stated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (76.1% strongly agree or agree: n=35/46).
- Most principals/site coordinators found that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (74.2% strongly agree or agree: n=245/330).
- Over half of the teacher respondents reported that they did not know about the providers' activities related to the offering of services to special education and ELL students (57.2% Don't Know: n=466/815). Nearly all of the remaining teacher respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the providers offered services to special education and ELL students (38.3%: n=312/815).

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

- While district coordinator assessments were divided, they were mostly satisfied with provider services overall (65.3% strongly agree or agree: n=30/46; 30.5% strongly disagree or disagree: n=14/46).
- Most principals/site coordinators reported that they were satisfied with providers' services (72.1% strongly agree or agree: n=238/330).
- Teacher satisfaction was lower than other school personnel with 46.6% (n=380/815) indicating satisfaction. However, 33.4% (n=272/815) of the teachers responded with "Don't Know" to the survey question about overall satisfaction. The remaining teachers

(19.0% strongly disagree or disagree: n=155/815) indicated that they were dissatisfied with provider services.

- Parents were the most satisfied group among all involved stakeholders: 84.3% (n=1,818/2,156) strongly agreed or agreed that they were pleased with the services their children received.

General Discussion

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in North Carolina during the 2006-2007 school year received mixed outcomes from those responding to questionnaires. Parental response was more robust in numbers than those of district coordinators or school personnel populations. Parents were generally more pleased with tutoring services than other SES stakeholders, and the majority of parent respondents were very positive about district and school personnel assistance with SES services. District and school personnel were more likely to note challenges and areas for improvement. Overall, responding providers generally expressed satisfaction with district and teacher cooperation and involvement.

A limiting factor associated with the perceptual findings in this study was the lack of representation from participating districts throughout the state. Although 69 districts were required to make SES services available to their students, only 8 districts had coordinators who participated in the evaluation. Similarly, only 16 of 45 approved providers completed the online survey for 2006-2007. With 164 schools required to make SES services available to their students, 101 schools were represented in principal/site coordinator and/or teacher survey responses. Parent responses were the largest in terms of response rates with 117 of 164 SES eligible schools represented.

Of those respondents who participated in the evaluation process, most expressed a desire for increased communication and the ability to share information regarding student needs. Adapting tutoring services and integrating these services with classroom learning activities was noted as a challenge by all respondent groups. Teachers could benefit from provider results from pre/post assessments; likewise, providers could benefit from teachers' insights regarding their students' strengths and weaknesses.

Communication is also vital whether providers serve students at home or online. Online providers need to monitor students diligently when they are in tutoring sessions, insuring students stay on task and avoid inappropriate websites. Closer monitoring of providers working at school sites and in individual homes will bring awareness to actions that are not compatible with student learning and safe environments.

In addition to increased communication, district and principal/site coordinators should be encouraged by the state to participate more actively in the evaluation process, as every district and school where children are receiving SES services should be represented in the survey findings. Similarly, provider involvement during the evaluation process should be emphasized in the upcoming evaluation. The design and methods in this study will be improved as more stakeholders are encouraged to participate in the process, as all stakeholders work together to help students achieve their academic goals. Increasing the participation of all stakeholders should be of paramount importance to the state.

As North Carolina moves into its fourth year of SES implementation, the knowledge gained through the evaluation process should continue to provide insight into areas for improvement and areas to celebrate. Efforts should also be continued to encourage adherence to federal regulations at all levels, while continuing to make sure all eligible students are able to take advantage of this opportunity to improve academic achievement.

References

Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (January 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.