



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: 2007 – 2008





Center for Research in Educational Policy

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

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2007 – 2008

June 2009

James Ford
Lynn Harrison
Laura Neergaard
Carson Hunter
Jerry Bates
Dawn McKay
Center for Research in Educational Policy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Evaluation Report	4
Rationale and Questions for the Evaluation.....	4
Methodology	5
Procedure	5
Instrumentation	6
Results.....	7
Rubric Summaries of Perceived Provider Effectiveness	21
Conclusions.....	69
Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes	69
General Discussion	72
References.....	74

Index of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Provider Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	8
Table 2: North Carolina 2007-2008 SES Survey Return Overview: by District.....	9
Table 3: Comparison Summary of District Coordinator Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	12
Table 4: Comparison Summary of Principal/Site Coordinator Aggregated for All Providers.....	13
Table 5: Comparison Summary of Teacher Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	15
Table 6: Comparison Summary of Parent Responses, Aggregated for All Providers.....	16
Table 7: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>All Providers</i>	18
Table 8: Summary of Overall Satisfaction by Respondent Group for Provider.....	19
Table 9: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>A to Z- In Home Tutoring</i>	22
Table 10: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Academics By Venture</i>	23
Table 11: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Academics Plus, Inc</i>	24
Table 12: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors, Inc.)</i>	25
Table 13: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Beaufort County 21st Century Community Learning Center</i>	26
Table 14: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Brain Works Learning Center</i>	27
Table 15: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Brainfuse One-to-One Tutoring</i>	28
Table 16: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Brame Institute</i>	29
Table 17: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Bright Futures Learning Center</i>	30
Table 18: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Bright Sky Learning</i>	31
Table 19: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Capitol Education Support, Inc.</i>	32
Table 20: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Carter Reddy & Associates, Inc.</i>	33
Table 21: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Communities in Schools of Brunswick County, Inc.</i>	34
Table 22: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Community Education in Durham Public Schools</i>	35
Table 23: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Community Technology Learning Center</i>	36
Table 24: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Cool Kids Learn Inc.</i>	37
Table 25: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Eastern Carolina Educational Assistance Center</i>	38
Table 26: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Education Station</i>	39
Table 27: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Failure Free Reading</i>	40
Table 28: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Glossio Speech Language and Educational Services, Inc.</i>	41
Table 29: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>I Can Kids, Inc.</i>	42
Table 30: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>It's Simply English</i>	43
Table 31: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.</i>	44
Table 32: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Measurement, Inc.</i>	45
Table 33: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>North Carolina Central University</i>	46
Table 34: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Prime Time for Kids</i>	47
Table 35: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>RICCE Inc</i>	48
Table 36: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>S & L Consultants</i>	49
Table 37: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Southridge Learning Center</i>	50
Table 38: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Swan Learning Center*</i>	51
Table 39: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Clinton</i>	52
Table 40: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Elizabeth City</i>	53
Table 41: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Greenville, Kinston, Washington, New Bern, Morehead City</i>	54
Table 42: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Henderson and Roanoke Rapids</i>	55
Table 43: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Lumberton</i>	56
Table 44: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Onslow County</i>	57
Table 45: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Whiteville</i>	58
Table 46: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte</i>	59
Table 47: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte University Area</i>	60
Table 48: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Hickory</i>	61
Table 49: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Johnston</i>	62
Table 50: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Mooresville</i>	63
Table 51: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Mount Airy</i>	64
Table 52: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>Sylvan Learning Center Shelby and Denver</i>	65
Table 53: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>TCAL Center for Accelerated Learning/A&T State University Learning Academy</i>	66
Table 54: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>TRAC Enrichment Center, Inc</i>	67
Table 55: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, <i>UCPS/21st CCLC/TEAM/FROGS</i>	68

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2007 – 2008

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of the 2007-2008 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.

During the 2007-2008 school year, 78 districts/local educational agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina were required to offer supplemental educational services. Within these districts, 269 Title I schools were designated SES-eligible. Statewide, 47 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 2006-2007 to 2007-2008*; 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 Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (March 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis. Results from the first study were also used to inform the second study.

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

Results

Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?

- Responses from principals/site coordinators were positive regarding how their school district helped their school implement services from SES providers (92.6% strongly agree or agree; n=338/365).
- Parent submissions indicate overwhelmingly positive perceptions of LEA efforts to implement SES in their districts. Most parent responses 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=4,045/4,299). Many parent submissions strongly agreed or agreed that their district provided information to assist them in selecting a provider (87.4%; n=3,757/4,299). Nearly three-fourths of parent responses strongly agreed or agreed that their district returned phone calls and addressed questions in a timely manner (74.3%; n=3,194/4,299).

2. *What are district coordinators', principals/site coordinators', teachers', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?*
 - Many responses from district coordinators strongly agreed or agreed that services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement (72.1%; n=93/129).
 - Nearly three-fourths of principal/site coordinator submissions strongly agreed or agreed that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (71.5%; n=261/365).
 - Fewer than half of teacher responses reported that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (44.1% strongly agree or agree; n=247/560).
 - The majority of parent respondents indicated that provider tutoring helped their child's achievement (86.2% strongly agree or agree; n=3,706/4,299).

3. *Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?*
 - Most providers indicated that tutors communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers regarding students' progress (87.8%; n=36/41). The majority of providers indicated that tutors communicated either frequently or occasionally with parents regarding their child's progress (90.3%; n=37/41).
 - An overwhelming majority of responses from district coordinators reported that communication by providers occurred either frequently or occasionally (92.3%; n=119/129).
 - The majority of principal/site coordinator submissions stated that providers communicated either frequently or occasionally during the school year (91.5%; n=334/365).
 - Fewer than half of the teachers' responses reported that provider communication occurred either frequently or occasionally during the year (40.9%; n=229/560).
 - Of the 4,299 parent respondents, 78.0% (n=3,353/4,299) reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year either a lot or sometimes. Many parent respondents noted that providers sent letters or notes home about their child's progress either a lot or sometimes (83.9%; n=3,607/4,299).

4. *Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?*
 - Fewer than half of the providers reported that tutors showed their lesson plans or materials to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they tutored (46.4% frequently or occasionally; n=19/41). Many providers stated that they were able to integrate their tutoring services with classroom learning activities (73.2% frequently or occasionally; n=30/41) and adapt supplemental services to each school's curriculum (68.3% frequently or occasionally; n=28/41).
 - Slightly more than half of the responses from district coordinators indicated that providers frequently or occasionally collaborated to set goals for student growth (53.5%; n=69/129). Responses also indicated that providers adapted tutoring services to each school's curriculum (65.1% strongly agree or agree; n=84/129). Also, 44.2% of the responses noted that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (strongly agree or agree; n=57/129).
 - Over half of principals/site coordinators' responses indicated that providers collaborated to set goals for student growth either frequently or occasionally (53.5%; n=195/365). Furthermore, responses noted that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (61.6% strongly agree or agree; n=225/365), while 51.7% reported that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (strongly agree or agree; n=189/365).

- Of the 560 teacher responses, 33.5% (n=188/560) reported that provider collaboration to set goals for student growth occurred either frequently or occasionally. Over a quarter of teacher responses stated that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (26.2% strongly agree or agree; n=147/560). Over one-third of teacher responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (37.2%; n=208/560) and adapted tutoring services to individual students' needs (38.8%; n=217/560).
 - Most parents indicated providers assisted their child with subjects their child is working on in school (84.7% a lot or sometimes; n=3,641/4,299).
5. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?*
- The majority of providers reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic content and standards (92.6% frequently or occasionally; n=38/41).
 - Most responses from district coordinators indicated that providers' services were aligned with state and local standards (85.3% strongly agree and agree; n=110/129).
6. *Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?*
- The majority of provider representatives reported that tutors offered services to special education and ELL students as needed (87.8% frequently or occasionally; n=36/41).
 - Responses from most district coordinators indicated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (85.3% strongly agree or agree; n=110/129).
 - Many principal/site coordinator responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (69.3%; n=253/365).
7. *What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?*
- Most responses from district coordinators indicated satisfaction with provider services overall (73.7% strongly agree or agree; n=95/129).
 - Nearly three-fourths of principal/site coordinator responses indicated satisfaction with provider services (71.8% strongly agree or agree; n=262/365).
 - Fewer than half of teacher responses reported satisfaction with provider services (39.7% strongly agree or agree; n=222/560).
 - Parents were the most satisfied stakeholder group with 83.4% (n=3,585/4,299) strongly agreeing or agreeing that they were pleased with the tutoring services their child received.

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina 2007 – 2008

Evaluation Report

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 2007-2008 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.

During the 2007-2008 school year, 78 districts/local educational agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina were required to offer supplemental educational services. Within these districts, 269 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, 47 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 2006-2007 to 2007-2008*; 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 Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (March 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis. Results from the first study were also used to inform the second study.

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

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?
2. What are district coordinators', principals/site coordinators', teachers', and parents' 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, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
5. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement 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 site coordinators in participating SES schools (d) teachers of students receiving SES and (e) parents of students receiving SES.

SES provider representatives received individual email notifications containing their unique login information and instructions for completing the provider surveys. Providers were directed to complete one online survey concerning their company's involvement and satisfaction with SES in North Carolina. Each provider survey was counted as a separate response.

The evaluators provided district coordinators with their online survey login information via email notification. Likewise, the evaluators provided district coordinators with principal/site coordinator and teacher survey login information and instructions for the online surveys via email notification. District coordinators were instructed to distribute login information and instructions for the principal/site coordinator and teacher surveys to SES eligible schools. All personnel were instructed to complete a

separate online survey for each provider currently providing services to students in their districts (district coordinators), schools (principals/site coordinators) or classes (teachers). At the school level, either the principal or the site coordinator completed the survey, depending on who had the most contact with the SES tutoring program. Each district coordinator, principal/site coordinator and 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. Parent surveys with distribution and return instructions were shipped to each district with schools required to offer SES tutoring. District coordinators then dispersed parent surveys to SES schools for distribution by principals/site coordinators. Each parent envelope contained the survey, an introductory letter, and a 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 then 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, and annotated as such in the transcriptions.

Evaluation study of provider effectiveness. Provider effectiveness for this 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. Parameters were established for determining an acceptable number of responses per respondent group and were based on the number of districts/schools a provider indicated were served. In order for a category to be rated, responses were needed from at least two respondent groups, with the exception of the category "Local and State Standards," in which only district coordinator responses were necessary, and "Special Education and ELL" in which either district coordinator or principal/site coordinator responses were necessary. 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 of the following stakeholder groups: (1) SES providers, (2) district coordinators in participating SES districts/counties, (3) principals or 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, satisfaction with district assistance in SES implementation). For each survey item, the respondent chose from a range of three, four or five point Likert-style responses (e.g., 3-point: 3=Frequently, Occasionally, 1=Not at all; 4-point: 4=Frequently, Occasionally, Not at all, 1=Don't Know; 5-point: 5=Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, 1=Don't Know), with higher scores indicating a more positive perception of the provided services. During the 2007-2008 evaluation period, survey instruments were revised in order to address the respondent group(s) with items in which they were most knowledgeable.

For the district coordinator, principal/site coordinator, and teacher instruments, one set of close-ended questions was used to collect data about provider services and an overall assessment of the tutoring program. Principals/Site coordinators and teachers were asked to indicate whether the respondent was employed by the provider being rated. The parent survey was composed of questions addressing the provider's service and the information regarding SES provided to parents by their district. Each instrument included an "Additional Comments" section.

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, for the 2007-2008 school year. When available, cross-year comparisons are made. 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 2007-2008. Representatives from 41 provider organizations completed an online survey about their experiences with SES in North Carolina during the 2007-2008 school year. Many providers indicated satisfaction with student attendance (73.2% highly satisfied or satisfied; n=30/41) and student attitudes (90.3%; highly satisfied or satisfied; n=37/41). Most provider respondents were highly satisfied or satisfied with the cooperation and involvement of teachers (65.9%; n=27/41), principals/site coordinators (80.5%; n=33/41), district coordinators (82.9%; n=34/41), and the state SES coordinator (80.5%; n=33/41). However, less than half of provider respondents were satisfied with parent cooperation and involvement (48.8% highly satisfied or satisfied; n=20/41). (See Table 1; the complete data summary for the aggregate provider survey is presented in the Technical Appendix).

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

	<i>Providers N=41</i>
Provider Perceptions and Activities	Percentage Frequently or Occasionally
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	87.8%
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	90.3%
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	46.4%
The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	92.6%
The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	73.2%
The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	68.3%
The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	87.8%
Provider satisfaction with:	Percentage Highly Satisfied or Satisfied
Student attendance	73.2%
Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	90.3%
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	80.5%
Parent cooperation/involvement	48.8%
Teacher cooperation/involvement	65.9%
Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	80.5%
District SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	82.9%
State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	80.5%
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	87.8%

Response Rates of Other Respondent Groups. Less than half of the SES eligible districts completed an online survey about at least one SES provider (38%; n=30/78). Of the 269 SES eligible schools, 41% (n=109/269) had at least one principal/site coordinator or at least one teacher complete an online survey regarding one or more SES providers. By contrast, 69% (n=189/269) of the SES eligible schools had at least one parent return a SES survey concerning at least one provider. (See Table 2 for a district by district summary of survey returns).

Table 2: North Carolina 2007-2008 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 survey (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	2	N	1	1	0	2	100%	2	100%	0
Alleghany County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Anson County	4	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	50%	2
Ashe County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Avery County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Beaufort County	1	Y	0	1	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Bertie County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	50%	1
Bladen County	3	Y	1	0	1	2	67%	2	67%	0
Brunswick County	2	Y	1	0	1	2	100%	2	100%	0
Burke County	5	Y	3	0	2	5	100%	5	100%	0
Cabarrus County	2	Y	1	0	1	2	100%	2	100%	0
Caldwell County	2	Y	1	0	0	1	50%	2	100%	1
Carter Community Charter	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Caswell County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	17	Y	6	4	1	11	65%	14	82%	3
Chatham County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
CIS Academy	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Clinton City	3	Y	1	0	0	0	0%	3	100%	3
Columbus County	8	N	0	0	0	0	0%	4	50%	4
Crossroads Charter	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Cumberland County	34	Y	2	2	0	4	12%	7	21%	3
Downtown Middle	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Duplin County	3	Y	0	0	1	1	33%	3	100%	2
Durham Public	16	N	1	7	0	8	50%	13	81%	5
Edenton/Chowan	3	N	0	2	0	2	67%	2	67%	0
Edgecombe County	1	N	0	1	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Forsyth County	8	Y	1	3	0	4	50%	7	88%	3
Franklin County	2	N	0	0	1	1	50%	2	100%	1
Gaston County	1	Y	0	0	1	1	100%	1	100%	0
Grandfather Academy	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Granville County	3	N	0	2	1	3	100%	3	100%	0
Greene County	2	Y	0	0	2	2	100%	2	100%	0
Guilford County	18	Y	5	2	2	9	50%	17	94%	8
Halifax County	6	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	33%	2
Harnett County	4	Y	2	1	0	3	75%	0	0%	0

Table 2: North Carolina 2007-2008 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 survey (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
Healthy Start Academy	1	N	1	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Hertford County	3	Y	0	2	0	2	67%	3	100%	1
Hickory City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Hoke County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Jackson County	1	Y	0	0	1	1	100%	0	0%	0
Kannapolis City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Kennedy Charter	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Lenoir County	4	Y	1	3	0	4	100%	3	75%	0
Lexington City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Lincoln County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Maureen Joy Charter	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
McDowell County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Montgomery County	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Moore County	8	Y	1	4	0	5	63%	6	75%	1
Nash-Rocky Mount	3	N	0	0	0	0	0%	3	100%	3
Northampton County	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Omuteko Gwamazima	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Onslow County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	100%	2
Pasquotank County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Pender County	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Perquimans County	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	100%	2
Pitt County	13	N	5	4	2	11	85%	11	85%	0
Provisions Academy	1	N	0	0	1	1	100%	0	0%	0
Richmond County	3	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	67%	2
Robeson County	15	N	0	0	0	0	0%	11	73%	11
Rockingham County	2	N	0	0	2	2	100%	2	100%	0
Rocky Mount Prep	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Rowan-Salisbury	2	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	100%	2
Sallie B. Howard	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Sampson County	4	N	0	0	0	0	0%	3	75%	3
Stanley County	2	N	0	0	1	1	50%	2	100%	1
Sugar Creek	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Thomasville City	2	Y	0	0	2	2	100%	2	100%	0
Torchlight Academy	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Union County	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0

Table 2, continued

District	Numbers of SES Eligible Schools Submitting Types of Surveys									
	School Total: SES eligible	School Personnel (District Coordinator, Principal/Site Coordinator, Teacher)						Parent		
		District survey (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
Vance County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Warren County	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Washington County	2	N	1	0	0	1	50%	2	100%	1
Wayne County	8	Y	6	2	0	8	100%	8	100%	0
Weldon City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Whiteville City	3	N	0	0	0	0	0%	2	67%	2
Wilkes County	2	Y	1	0	0	1	50%	2	100%	1
<u>Yadkin County</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>1</u>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>269</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>109</i>		<i>186</i>		<i>85</i>
Statewide percentage		38%	17%	16%	9%	41%		69%		32%

Aggregate District Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide 2007-2008. District coordinators from 30 of 78 (38%) SES eligible districts submitted at least one online survey about their experiences with and reactions to SES provider services. Respondents were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the district and a total of 129 surveys were submitted regarding 37 individual providers.

The majority of district coordinator responses noted that providers communicated either frequently or occasionally during the school year (92.3%; n=119/129). Many submissions indicated that providers communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers (62.8%; n=81/129) and parents (76.8%; n=99/129). The majority of district coordinator responses reported that providers met obligations for conducting tutoring sessions either frequently or occasionally (92.2%; n=119/129). (See Table 4; the complete data summary table for the aggregate district coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix).

Comparison of 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 Aggregate District Coordinator Responses. In this section, district coordinators' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007* (Ford et al., 2009) are presented and compared with the findings of this report. In 2006-2007, district coordinators from 8 of 69 (12%) SES eligible districts submitted 46 surveys regarding 22 providers.

Comparing the 2006-2007 to the 2007-2008 evaluation, district coordinators' perceptions of and satisfaction with provider services were much more positive during the 2007-2008 school year in nearly all survey areas. One notable increase was in providers' abilities to comply with federal No Child Left

Behind laws (67.4% in 2006-2007 versus 89.1% in 2007-2008). Another notable increase was providers' capacity to adapt services to school curriculum (43.5% in 2006-2007 versus 65.1% in 2007-2008). (See Table 3 for the complete 2006-2007/2007-2008 comparison data).

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

<i>District Coordinator</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>
	<i>N=46</i>	<i>N=129</i>
	<i>Representing: 8 districts</i>	<i>Representing: 30 districts</i>
How often did the provider...	Percentage Frequently/Occasionally	
Communicate with you during the year?	73.9%	92.3%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	32.6%	53.5%
Communicate with teachers during the school year?	52.2%	62.8%
Communicate with parents during the year?	58.7%	76.8%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	73.9%	92.2%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	43.5%	65.1%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0%	44.2%
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	71.7%	85.3%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	76.1%	85.3%
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	67.4%	89.1%
Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	69.5%	90.0%
Overall Provider Assessment :	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	63.1%	72.1%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	65.3%	73.7%

Note: The district coordinator survey questions differ slightly between the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 evaluation, but the main themes are consistent.

Aggregate Principal/Site Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide 2007-2008. Principals/Site coordinators from 88 of 269 (33%) SES eligible schools submitted a total of 365 surveys representing 39 individual providers. Respondents were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the school, therefore multiple submission were possible.

Responses from most principals/site coordinators noted that providers met obligations for conducting tutoring sessions either frequently or occasionally (90.7%; n=331/365). Of the 365 submissions, 89.3% (strongly agree or agree; n=326/365) indicated that providers started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete. The majority of responses suggested satisfaction with the way districts assisted their school in implementing provider services (92.6% strongly agree or agree; n=338/365). (See Table 4; the complete data summary table for the aggregate principal/site coordinator survey is in the Technical Appendix).

Comparison of 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 Aggregate Principal/Site Coordinator Responses. In this section, principals'/site coordinators' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007* (Ford et al., 2009) are presented and compared with the findings of this report. During the 2006-2007 evaluation, a total of 330 principal/site coordinator surveys from 82 of 164 SES eligible (50%) schools were submitted regarding 32 providers.

Comparing responses between the two years, principals’/site coordinators’ perceptions of and satisfaction with provider services were slightly more positive in several areas during the 2007-2008 school year. However, there was a dramatic increase in the area of provider communication. In the 2006-2007 evaluation, 48.1% of responses (n=159/330) indicated that provider communication existed either frequently or occasionally. During the 2007-2008 evaluation, 91.5% (n=334/365) of responses noted that provider communication occurred either frequently or occasionally. (See Table 4 for the complete 2006-2007/2007-2008 comparison data).

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

<i>Principal/Site Coordinator</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>
	<i>N=330</i>	<i>N=365</i>
	<i>Representing: 82 schools</i>	<i>Representing: 88 schools</i>
How often did the provider...	Percentage Frequently/Occasionally	
Communicate with you during the year?	48.1%	91.5%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	51.3%	53.5%
Communicate with teachers during the school year?	87.3%	48.5%
Communicate with parents during the year?	71.2%	NA
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	89.4%	90.7%
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	NA	89.3%
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	63.7%	61.6%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	42.7%	51.7%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	74.2%	69.3%
Aligned their services with federal, state and local standards.	77.9%	NA
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	77.3%	NA
Complied with applicable federal, state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	84.0%	NA
Overall Provider Assessment :	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	69.4%	71.5%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	72.1%	71.8%
District Assessment:	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	NA	92.6%

Note: The principal/site coordinator survey questions differ slightly between the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 evaluation, but the main themes are consistent.

NA indicates the principal/site coordinator survey did not include the question for the specified school year.

Aggregate Teacher Perceptions, Statewide 2007-2008. Like the district coordinators and principals/site coordinators, teachers were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students in their school. As a result, multiple submissions from a single teacher were possible. A total of 560 individual teacher surveys from 68 of 269 (25%) SES eligible schools were submitted concerning 35 providers.

Fewer than half of the teacher responses indicated that provider communication occurred either frequently or occasionally during the year (40.9%; n=229/560). A third of the responses indicated that provider collaboration to set goals for student growth transpired either frequently or occasionally (33.5%; n=188/560). Finally, fewer than half of the submissions strongly agreed or agreed that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (44.1%; n=247/560). (See Table 5; the complete data summary table for the aggregate teacher survey is in the Technical Appendix).

Comparison of 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 Aggregate Teacher Responses. In this section, teachers' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007* (Ford et al., 2009) are presented and compared with the findings of this report. During the 2006-2007 evaluation, a total of 815 teacher surveys from 79 of 164 (48%) SES eligible schools were submitted regarding 33 providers.

Overall, teachers' perceptions of and satisfaction with provider services were less positive during the 2007-2008 school year. One notable decrease was in providers' abilities to integrate services with classroom learning activities (34.2% in 2006-2007 versus 26.2% in 2007-2008). A second notable decrease was in teachers' overall satisfaction with providers' services (46.6% in 2006-2007 versus 39.7% in 2007-2008). (See Table 5 for the complete 2006-2007/2007-2008 comparison data).

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

<i>Teachers</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>
	<i>N=815</i>	<i>N=560</i>
	<i>Representing: 79 schools</i>	<i>Representing: 68 schools</i>
How often did the provider...	Percentage Frequently/Occasionally	
Communicate with you during the year?	42.5%	40.9%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	35.0%	33.5%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	48.1%	NA
Communicate with teachers during the school year?	35.4%	NA
Communicate with parents during the year?	37.5%	NA
The provider...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	43.0%	37.2%
Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of the individual student.	NA	38.8%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	34.2%	26.2%
Aligned their services with federal, state and local standards.	46.2%	NA
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	38.3%	NA
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	37.1%	NA
Complied with applicable federal, state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	40.2%	NA
Overall Assessment :	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	49.3%	44.1%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	46.6%	39.7%

Note: The teacher survey questions differ slightly between the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 evaluation, but the main themes are consistent. NA indicates the teacher survey did not include the question for the specified school year.

Aggregate Parent Perceptions, Statewide 2007-2008. Unlike other stakeholders, parents were asked to complete only one paper-based survey about the SES provider tutoring their child. Parents identified the tutoring company serving their child by selecting the company name from the list of state-wide approved providers. Parent surveys were received from 186 of 269 (69%) SES eligible schools. A total of 4,299 surveys were submitted and 46 providers were evaluated by parents.

Most parent respondents strongly agreed or agreed that tutors provided progress reports that explained their child’s academic strengths, weaknesses, and progression towards learning goals (81.2%; n=3,491/4,299). The majority of parents reported that providers started and ended tutoring sessions on time (87.6% a lot or sometimes; n=3,766/4,299). Overall, most respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they would participate in SES tutoring again (86.2%; n=3,706/4,299). (See Table 6; the complete data summary table for the aggregate parent survey is in the Technical Appendix).

Comparison of 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 Aggregate Parent Responses. In this section, parents’ perceptions of and satisfaction with providers and school districts as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007* (Ford et al., 2009) are presented and compared with the findings of this report. During the 2006-2007 evaluation, parents from 117 of 164 (71%) SES eligible schools submitted 2,156 surveys concerning 38 providers.

Overall, parents’ perceptions of and satisfaction with provider services in the 2007-2008 evaluation were slightly more positive in comparison to the 2006-2007 evaluation with many survey items receiving consistent positive responses between years. Notably, parent respondents reported that

providers communicated via letters or notes more often during the 2007-2008 school year (75.4% in 2006-2007 versus 83.9% in 2007-2008). (See Table 6 for the complete 2006-2007/2007-2008 comparison data).

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

<i>Parent</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>2007-2008</i>
	<i>N=2,156</i>	<i>N=4,299</i>
	<i>Representing: 117 schools</i>	<i>Representing: 186 schools</i>
How often did the tutoring company...	Percentage A lot/Sometimes	
Talk to you about your child's progress?	74.0%	78.0%
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	75.4%	83.9%
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	NA	84.7%
Answer my questions about tutoring?	72.9%	76.7%
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	83.1%	87.6%
Talk to my child's teachers about his/her progress?	54.2%	NA
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree	
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child improve in reading or math at school.	84.0%	86.2%
I was given a chance to meet with the tutor and discuss my child's learning goals.	60.9%	61.5%
The information on the progress reports helped me understand my child's strengths, weakness, and progress towards his/her learning goals.	77.9%	81.2%
Overall, I am happy with the tutoring my child received.	84.3%	83.4%
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.	94.6%	96.8%
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	91.2%	91.6%
The district provided the necessary information to help me select a provider.	87.3%	87.4%
The district returned phone calls, addressed questions in a timely manner.	74.0%	74.3%
I am happy with the way my school district helped to get free tutoring for my child.	94.1%	94.1%
I would participate in free tutoring next year because I feel it improved my child's academic skills.	84.7%	86.2%

Note: The parent survey questions differ slightly between the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 evaluation, but the main themes are consistent. NA indicates the parent survey did not include the question for the specified school year.

Aggregate Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness. Using the data from individual response groups, together with the achievement analysis (Gallagher & Zoblotsky, 2009), the following statewide aggregate rubric is presented (See Table 7 with ratings shaded in blue). This rubric represents all respondents (district coordinators, principals/site coordinators, teachers, and parents) to the respective surveys regarding all providers. There was insufficient data to indicate a student achievement rating. Across all providers statewide, there was some satisfaction with providers overall. Developing instructional plans geared to student needs, alignment of services to local and state standards, and accommodations to special education and ELL students were rated acceptable, while communication was rated marginal, based on the data provided.

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

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

District Coordinators N= 129	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 365	Teachers N= 560	Parents N= 4299
---------------------------------	--	--------------------	--------------------

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

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

Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider/happy with the tutoring my child received	District Coordinators		Principals/Site Coordinators		Teachers		Parents	
	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree
Provider								
A to Z In Home Tutoring	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	100.0%	5	60.0%
Academics By Venture	2	100.0%	14	71.4%	34	55.9%	114	86.9%
Academics Plus, Inc	12	91.7%	54	77.8%	93	31.2%	760	81.7%
Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors, Inc.)	14	57.1%	29	62.1%	23	39.1%	187	82.9%
Beaufort County 21st Century Community Learning Center	1	100.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	77.8%
Brain Works Learning Center	5	60.0%	4	75.0%	22	50.0%	93	83.9%
Brainfuse One-to-One Tutoring	NA	NA	1	0.0%	NA	NA	7	85.7%
Brame Institute of Education, Inc.	2	50.0%	12	41.7%	21	19.1%	300	84.0%
Bright Futures Learning Center	17	76.5%	41	63.5%	57	57.9%	380	84.5%
Bright Sky Learning	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	100.0%
Capitol Education Support, Inc.	1	0.0%	5	60.0%	4	50.0%	61	86.9%
Carter Reddy and Associates	3	33.3%	4	0.0%	4	25.0%	32	68.8%
Communities in Schools of Brunswick County, Inc.	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	2	100.0%
Community Education in Durham Public Schools-LEAP	NA	NA	3	100.0%	NA	NA	34	79.4%
Community Technology Learning Center	1	100.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	17	53.0%
Cool Kids Learn Inc.	3	33.3%	18	72.3%	8	37.5%	69	81.1%
Eastern Carolina Educational Assistance Center	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	18	83.4%
Education Station	2	100.0%	11	100.0%	24	37.5%	164	83.5%
Failure Free Reading	3	66.7%	5	80.0%	5	60.0%	34	85.2%
Glosso Speech Language and Educational Services, Inc	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	0.0%	17	76.5%
I Can Kids, Inc	3	66.7%	6	50.0%	3	33.3%	37	75.6%
It's Simply English	2	50.0%	10	90.0%	4	0.0%	20	80.0%
MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions	21	57.1%	54	62.3%	74	28.4%	513	86.4%
Measurement, Inc	NA	NA	3	100.0%	NA	NA	13	84.6%
North Caroline Central University	3	100.0%	19	84.2%	14	50.0%	203	85.8%
Prime Time for Kids	1	100.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	12	91.7%
RICCE Inc	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	NA	NA	3	100.0%
S & L Consultants	4	100.0%	6	83.4%	1	0.0%	34	82.4%
Southridge Learning Center, Inc.	1	100.0%	NA	NA	14	100.0%	12	91.6%
Swan Learning Center	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	3	0.0%	1	100.0%
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Clinton	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	2	0.0%	108	83.3%
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Elizabeth City	1	100.0%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	135	89.4%
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Greenville, Kinston, Washington, New Bern, Morehead City	3	100.0%	13	100.0%	29	44.8%	221	88.7%

Table 8, continued

Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider/happy with the tutoring my child received

Provider	District Coordinators		Principals/Site Coordinators		Teachers		Parents	
	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Henderson	2	100.0%	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	70	84.3%
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Lumberton	1	0.0%	1	100.0%	5	0.0%	105	76.2%
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Onslow County	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	39	84.7%
Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Whiteville	NA	NA	1	0.0%	20	30.0%	35	80.0%
*Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte	NA	NA	7	71.5%	29	34.5%	197	81.7%
*Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte University Area	2	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	28.6%	6	83.4%
Sylvan Learning Center Hickory	2	100.0%	3	33.3%	17	23.5%	52	80.8%
Sylvan Learning Center Johnston County	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sylvan Learning Center Mooresville	1	100.0%	3	66.7%	NA	NA	3	99.9%
Sylvan Learning Center Mount Airy	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	23	43.5%	56	85.7%
Sylvan Learning Center Shelby and Denver	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	3	100.0%	1	0.0%
TCAL Center for Accelerated Learning/ A& T State University Learning Academy	3	66.7%	11	63.6%	16	0.0%	88	70.5%
TRAC Enrichment Center, Inc	NA	NA	4	75.0%	1	100.0%	17	82.3%
UCPS/21st CCLC/TEAM/FROGS	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	NA	5	80.0%

NA indicates no respondents completed a survey about this provider.

*Providers Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte and Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte University Area merged into one company during the 2007-2008 school year. The data for each provider has been kept separate and presented individually in this report, per DPI's request.

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 9] through [TABLE 55]). Although the providers *Swan Learning Center*, *Sylvan Learning Center Johnston*, and *Sylvan Learning Center Mooresville* 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 report (Gallagher & Zoblotsky, 2009) which delineates results by individual providers.] Rubric results should be viewed as “suggestive” and not as a sufficiently conclusive means for judging individual providers’ effectiveness. From a formative evaluation standpoint, the results are valuable as a basis for considering ways to improve provider effectiveness in future years. The final ratings were shaded in blue.

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

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= 5
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

Table 10: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Academics By Venture*

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

District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 14	Teachers N= 34	Parents N= 114
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 11: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Academics Plus, Inc*

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

District Coordinators N= 12	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 54	Teachers N= 93	Parents N= 760
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 12: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Achieve Success Tutoring (by University Instructors, Inc.)*

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

District Coordinators N= 14	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 29	Teachers N= 23	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 +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data).	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information.	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information.	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information.	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information.	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information.	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

Table 13: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Beaufort County 21st Century Community Learning Center*

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= 18
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 14: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Brain Works Learning Center*

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

District Coordinators N= 5	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 4	Teachers N= 22	Parents N= 93
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	------------------

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

Table 15: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Brainfuse One-to-One Tutoring*

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

District Coordinators N= 0	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 1	Teachers N= 0	Parents N= 7
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

Table 16: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Brame Institute*

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

District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 12	Teachers N= 21	Parents N= 300
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

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

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

District Coordinators N= 17	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 41	Teachers N= 57	Parents N= 380
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 18: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Bright Sky Learning*

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

Table 19: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Capitol Education Support, Inc.*

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

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

Table 20: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Carter Reddy & Associates, Inc.*

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 4	Teachers N= 4	Parents N= 32
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 21: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Communities in Schools of Brunswick County, Inc.*

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= 2
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

Table 22: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Community Education in Durham Public Schools*

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

District Coordinators N= 0	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 3	Teachers N= 0	Parents N= 34
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 23: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Community Technology Learning Center*

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

Table 24: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Cool Kids Learn Inc.*

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 18	Teachers N= 8	Parents N= 69
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 25: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Eastern Carolina Educational Assistance Center*

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

District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 2	Teachers N= 2	Parents N= 18
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 26: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Education Station*

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

District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 11	Teachers N= 24	Parents N= 164
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 27: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Failure Free Reading*

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 5	Teachers N= 5	Parents N= 34
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 28: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Glossio Speech Language and Educational Services, Inc*

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

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

Table 29: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *I Can Kids, Inc*

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 6	Teachers N= 3	Parents N= 37
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 30: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *It's Simply English*

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

District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 10	Teachers N= 4	Parents N= 20
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 31: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *MasterMind Prep Learning Solutions, Inc.*

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

District Coordinators N= 21	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 54	Teachers N= 74	Parents N= 513
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 32: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Measurement, Inc*

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

District Coordinators N= 0	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 3	Teachers N= 0	Parents N= 13
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 33: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *North Carolina Central University*

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 19	Teachers N= 14	Parents N= 203
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 34: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Prime Time for Kids*

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= 12
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 35: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *RICCE Inc*

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= 3
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

Table 36: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *S & L Consultants*

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

District Coordinators N= 4	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 6	Teachers N= 1	Parents N= 34
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 37: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Southridge Learning Center*

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

District Coordinators N= 1	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 0	Teachers N= 14	Parents N= 12
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	------------------

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

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

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

District Coordinators N= 1	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 2	Teachers N= 3	Parents N= 1
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

*According to provider survey comments, this provider did not service any students during the 2007-2008 school year.

Table 39: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Clinton*

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

		District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 1	Teachers N= 2	Parents N= 108
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
1. Student Achievement	Reading/ Language Arts Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data).	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data).	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information.	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information.	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information.	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information.	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information.	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

Table 40: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Elizabeth City*

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

District Coordinators N= 1	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 5	Teachers N= 3	Parents N= 135
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

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

Table 41: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Greenville, Kinston, Washington, New Bern, Morehead City

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 13	Teachers N= 29	Parents N= 221
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

Table 42: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center 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= 1	Parents N= 70
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 43: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Lumberton*

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

District Coordinators N= 1	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 1	Teachers N= 5	Parents N= 105
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-------------------

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

Table 44: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Onslow County*

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= 39
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 45: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Ace It! Whiteville*

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

District Coordinators N= 0	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 1	Teachers N= 20	Parents N= 35
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	------------------

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

Table 46: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte**

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

District Coordinators N= 0	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 7	Teachers N= 29	Parents N= 197
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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

*Providers Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte and Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte University Area merged into one company during the 2007-2008 school year. The data for each provider has been kept separate and presented individually in this report, per DPI's request. .

Table 47: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte University Area**

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

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

*Providers Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte and Sylvan Learning Center Charlotte University Area merged into one company during the 2007-2008 school year. The data for each provider has been kept separate and presented individually in this report, per DPI's request. .

Table 48: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Hickory*

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

District Coordinators N= 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 3	Teachers N= 17	Parents N= 52
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	------------------

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

Table 49: 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 +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
	Math Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data).	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
2. Communication	Insufficient Information.	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
3. Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information.	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
4. Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information.	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
5. Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information.	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
6. Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information.	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

*According to provider survey comments, this provider did not service any students during the 2007-2008 school year.

Table 50: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *Sylvan Learning Center Mooresville*

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

District Coordinators N= 1	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 3	Teachers N= 0	Parents N= 3
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

Table 51: 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= 1	Teachers N= 23	Parents N= 56
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------	------------------

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

Table 52: 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= 1	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 1	Teachers N= 3	Parents N= 1
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

Table 53: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *TCAL Center for Accelerated Learning/A&T State University Learning Academy*

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

District Coordinators N= 3	Principals/Site Coordinators N= 11	Teachers N= 6	Parents N= 88
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

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

Table 54: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *TRAC Enrichment Center, Inc*

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

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

Table 55: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, *UCPS/21st CCLC/TEAM/FROGS*

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= 5
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------

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

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?

- Responses from principals/site coordinators were positive regarding how their school district helped their school implement services from SES providers (92.6% strongly agree or agree; n=338/365).
- Parent submissions indicate overwhelmingly positive perceptions of LEA efforts to implement SES in their districts. Most parent responses 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=4,045/4,299). Many parent submissions strongly agreed or agreed that their district provided information to assist them in selecting a provider (87.4%; n=3,757/4,299). Nearly three-fourths of parent responses strongly agreed or agreed that their district returned phone calls and addressed questions in a timely manner (74.3%; n=3,194/4,299).

2. What are district coordinators', principals/site coordinators', teachers', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?

- Many responses from district coordinators strongly agreed or agreed that services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement (72.1%; n=93/129).
- Nearly three-fourths of principal/site coordinator submissions strongly agreed or agreed that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (71.5%; n=261/365).
- Fewer than half of teacher responses reported that providers' services positively impacted student achievement (44.1% strongly agree or agree; n=247/560).
- The majority of parent respondents indicated that provider tutoring helped their child's achievement (86.2% strongly agree or agree; n=3,706/4,299).

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

- Most providers indicated that tutors communicated frequently or occasionally with teachers regarding students' progress (87.8%; n=36/41). The majority of providers indicated that tutors communicated either frequently or occasionally with parents regarding their child's progress (90.3%; n=37/41).
- An overwhelming majority of responses from district coordinators reported that communication by providers occurred either frequently or occasionally (92.3%; n=119/129).

- The majority of principals/site coordinators' submissions stated that providers communicated either frequently or occasionally during the school year (91.5%; n=334/365).
 - Fewer than half of the teachers' responses reported that provider communication occurred either frequently or occasionally during the year (40.9%; n=229/560).
 - Of the 4,299 parent respondents, 78.0% (n=3,353/4,299) reported that providers spoke with them about their child's progress throughout the year either a lot or sometimes. Many parent respondents noted that providers sent letters or notes home about their child's progress either a lot or sometimes (83.9%; n=3,607/4,299).
4. *Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?*
- Fewer than half of the providers reported that tutors showed their lesson plans or materials to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they tutored (46.4% frequently or occasionally; n=19/41). Many providers stated that they were able to integrate their tutoring services with classroom learning activities (73.2% frequently or occasionally; n=30/41) and adapt supplemental services to each school's curriculum (68.3% frequently or occasionally; n=28/41).
 - Slightly more than half of the responses from district coordinators indicated that providers frequently or occasionally collaborated to set goals for student growth (53.5%; n=69/129). Responses also indicated that providers adapted tutoring services to each school's curriculum (65.1% strongly agree or agree; n=84/129). Also, 44.2% of the responses noted that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (strongly agree or agree; n=57/129).
 - Over half of principals/site coordinators' responses indicated that providers collaborated to set goals for student growth either frequently or occasionally (53.5%; n=195/365). Furthermore, responses noted that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (61.6% strongly agree or agree; n=225/365), while 51.7% reported that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (strongly agree or agree; n=189/365).
 - Of the 560 teacher responses, 33.5% (n=188/560) reported that provider collaboration to set goals for student growth occurred either frequently or occasionally. Over a quarter of teacher responses stated that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (26.2% strongly agree or agree; n=147/560). Over one-third of teacher responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (37.2%; n=208/560) and adapted tutoring services to individual students' needs (38.8%; n=217/560).
 - Most parents indicated providers assisted their child with subjects their child is working on in school (84.7% a lot or sometimes; n=3,641/4,299).

5. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?*
- The majority of providers reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic content and standards (92.6% frequently or occasionally; n=38/41).
 - Most responses from district coordinators indicated that providers' services were aligned with state and local standards (85.3% strongly agree and agree; n=110/125).
6. *Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?*
- The majority of provider representatives reported that tutors offered services to special education and ELL students as needed (87.8% frequently or occasionally; n=36/41).
 - Responses from most district coordinators indicated that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (85.3% strongly agree or agree; n=110/129).
 - Many principal/site coordinator responses strongly agreed or agreed that providers offered services to special education and ELL students (69.3%; n=253/365).
7. *What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?*
- Most responses from district coordinators indicated satisfaction with provider services overall (73.7% strongly agree or agree; n=95/129).
 - Nearly three-fourths of principal/site coordinator responses indicated satisfaction with provider services (71.8% strongly agree or agree; n=262/365).
 - Fewer than half of teacher responses reported satisfaction with provider services (39.7% strongly agree or agree; n=222/560).
 - Parents were the most satisfied stakeholder group with 83.4% (n=3,585/4,299) strongly agreeing or agreeing that they were pleased with the tutoring services their child received.

General Discussion

Supplemental Educational Services providers serving students in North Carolina during the 2007-2008 school year received generally positive ratings from the stakeholders participating in the evaluation. Providers were mostly positive concerning their experiences with SES in North Carolina. Parents were generally pleased with the tutoring services their child received, and the majority of parent respondents were very positive regarding district and school personnel assistance with SES services. District coordinators and principals/site coordinators were also pleased with provider services overall, however, teachers were the least positive respondent group regarding SES implementation and provider services.

While the findings reveal overall satisfaction with SES implementation and services in most surveyed areas, all respondent groups noted areas for improvement. Providers indicated that they faced several challenges while implementing services such as a lack of parent and teacher participation as well as low student attendance. Adapting tutoring services and integrating these services with classroom learning activities was noted as a barrier by all school personnel. Additionally, all school personnel indicated that there was a lack of provider collaboration to set academic goals for students. All respondents groups noted that child transportation to and from tutoring sites was one of the greatest obstacles they incurred.

While responses indicate communication has improved, communication should remain a vital component whether providers serve students at home or online. Online providers need to monitor students diligently when they are in tutoring sessions, ensuring students stay on task and avoid inappropriate websites. Closer monitoring of providers working at school sites and in individual homes can bring awareness to actions that are not compatible with student learning, safe environments, and local and state standards.

Recommendations. The state could initiate focus groups that include all stakeholders in order to gain insight into how providers can better adapt and integrate tutoring services with classroom activities. Of note is the frequency in which teachers responded “don’t know” in regards to many of the survey items. Focus groups could also be utilized to ascertain why most teachers did not assign a rating for the provider they were evaluating. These focus groups could also examine possible ways in which communication could be enhanced between all stakeholder groups. Focus groups could also be utilized to discuss possible solutions to any child transportation issues parents, schools or providers face. 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.

As North Carolina moves forward with SES, the state should continue to encourage participation in the evaluation of SES providers. District coordinators should be encouraged by the state to continue to participate more actively in the evaluation process, as each district coordinator, principal/site coordinator,

and teacher should evaluate every active provider in each school where children are receiving SES tutoring. Similarly, the state should require provider involvement during the evaluation process as every active provider should be represented in the survey findings. 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

- Ford, J., Bates, J., Harrison, L., McKay, D., Ross, S. M., & Neergaard, L. (January 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2006-2007*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.
- Gallagher, B., & Zoblotsky, T. (March 2009). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of North Carolina: 2007-2008 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.