

Provider Profile

AAA Resource Learning Centers

aaaresourcelearning.com

Overall Rating 2010: D+

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: C-

Contact Information:

ELIZABETH MARTIN
17500 CHANDLER PARK DR
DETROIT, MI 48224

Telephone:
313-258-5356

Fax:
313-469-7087

E-mail:
evangelistelizabeth@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by AAA Resource Learning Centers: AAA Resource Learning Centers (AAA) mission is to motivate every child with a Love for Learning. AAA will teach them the skills that will help them to achieve academic success for the rest of their lives, and improve their MEAP, ACT, MME, SAT, Terra Nova and other standardized test scores. AAA's program offers 36 hours of instruction in the areas of reading and math for grades K-12. Each student is provided with a snack and juice or milk prior to each tutoring session. Bi-weekly progress reports will be provided to the students' parents and teachers upon request. Additionally, each student will be provided with an assessment test, a review of their strengths and weaknesses with their parents, and an Individual Educational Plan. AAA believes that every child is capable of learning with proper teaching, strategic resources, patience, & motivation. Tutoring sessions last for 2-4 hours.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 125 Offers Transportation: At select sites only English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology, Other	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36 Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 3000 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students
--	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	17	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	65%	80%
	16	Average overall letter grade from parents	C+	B+
Teachers	68	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	68	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	22%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	17	C	6	14	C
7	11	C	7	11	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 1255 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 18, or 1%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	18	39	55
Attendance	18	28	40
Study habits	18	22	56
Ease of completing homework	18	44	61
Overall grades	18	44	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	17	53	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	18	33	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **60%** (number responding to the question = 5, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **53%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **71%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 1186 surveys for this evaluation and 68, or 6%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	57	35	36
Attendance	57	23	23
Classroom achievement	57	35	39
Homework	57	28	33
Math grades	28	39	41
English language arts grades	43	35	36
Overall grades	46	39	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	17	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	17	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **22%** (number of respondents = 68, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **19%** (number of respondents = 68, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	1	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	1	1	1

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Academic Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: C

Contact Information:

S. Adrienne Fletcher
P.O. Box 39939
Redford, MI 48103

Telephone:
734-330-0358

Fax:
734-769-8727

E-mail:
aatutoring@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Academic Achievement Tutoring Services, LLC: Kindergartens thru 12th graders enrolled in the AATS program are taught reading, writing and mathematics lessons that complement their school's curriculum. These lessons, which includes strategies for special education and ELL students focus on state content standards. Each student is given a pretest to diagnose his/her instructional level. An individual educational plan is written based on that diagnosis and discussed with the student's parent and teacher. At the end of the tutoring program the student is given a posttest to evaluate his/her level of achievement. The AATS tutors are certified teachers and degreed professionals. All tutors are trained by educational consultants on the research-based AATS program. The two hour sessions are held two - four times weekly, after school, on weekends and during the summer. The sites include student's home, school, library, church and community center. Parents and teachers receive written quarterly reports from the tutors.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 85
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 300
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	6	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	67%	80%
	5	Average overall letter grade from parents	B-	B+
Teachers	14	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	14	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	36%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	5	C	6	5	C
7	4	<10	7	4	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 85 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 6, or 7%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	6	50	55
Attendance	6	33	40
Study habits	6	67	56
Ease of completing homework	6	67	61
Overall grades	6	67	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	6	50	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	6	50	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **67%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **67%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 85 surveys for this evaluation and 14, or 16%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	13	23	36
Attendance	13	8	23
Classroom achievement	13	23	39
Homework	13	23	33
Math grades	10	40	41
English language arts grades	13	38	36
Overall grades	12	25	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	3	33	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	3	33	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **36%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **21%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 7 districts. Coordinators in 4 districts, or 57%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	4	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	4	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	4	0	1	0	1
Submission of invoices	4	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	4	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	4	75	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	4	75	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	4		50
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	4		75

Provider Profile

Ace IT

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Frank Jacoby	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
Sylvan Learning Center 2040 Monroe	313-724-1500	313-724-8317	Sylvan Dbn@aol.com
St. Suite 202			
Dearborn, MI 48124			

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Ace IT: "Ace it!" is a program designed by Sylvan Learning, Inc. to serve No Child Left Behind students. It is delivered in convenient locations (schools and community centers). The Reading and Math programs are highly structured, systematic and allow the student excellent growth. Our teachers are highly trained and love teaching. We meet with parents regularly and conference with classroom teachers to achieve maximum student growth. Our instruction is a minimum of one hour. Our class size is a maximum of 8 students with every teacher. Average sessions are 2-6 per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 87 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30 Number of Students to be Served: 8 - 600 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
---	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Wayne County. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	9	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	33%	80%
	8	Average overall letter grade from parents	C	B+
Teachers	4	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	4	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	50%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	2	<10	6	2	<10
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 87 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 9, or 10%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	9	44	55
Attendance	9	11	40
Study habits	9	11	56
Ease of completing homework	9	22	61
Overall grades	9	44	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	9	78	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	9	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **33%** (number responding to the question = 3, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **44%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **38%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 11 surveys for this evaluation and 4, or 36%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	3	0	36
Attendance	4	0	23
Classroom achievement	4	50	39
Homework	4	50	33
Math grades	4	50	41
English language arts grades	2	50	36
Overall grades	3	33	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **50%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **50%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Poor"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

Alkebu-lan Village Tutorial Program

alkebulanvillage.org

Overall Rating 2010: B-

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Cynthia Williams-LaNier
7701 Harper Ave.
Detroit, MI 48213

Telephone:
313-268-4041

Fax:
313-921-1151

E-mail:
cwmslanier@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Alkebu-lan Village Tutorial Program: Alkebu-lan Village is an African Centered community-based organization committed to developing, nurturing an environment where families work together to build healthy minds, bodies and communities. The Building Positive Leaders' (BPL) Learning System provides ability, age-appropriate academic tutoring to improve a student's READING, WRITING, AND MATH skills. Alkebu-lan Village (BPL) Community-Based Tutorial system includes individual assessment, focused instruction reinforced by "face-to-face" individualized or small group and computerized practice activities. Students attend a minimum of 36 to 60 hours of tutorial instructional delivery during the program. Individual Learning Plans are prescribed for daily sessions. Students can attend weekly and Saturday sessions for practical learning experiences to reinforce or remediate academic development skills through Alkebu-lan Village Academy of the Arts. Daily nutritional snacks are available. In order for Alkebu-lan Village Tutorial Program to service a LEA, a minimum of 60 students must enroll.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 108
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36
Number of Students to be Served: 60 - 500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	9	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	9	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	19	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	19	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	42%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	9	C	3	9	C
4	3	<10	4	2	<10
5	9	C	5	9	C
6	12	C	6	12	C
7	9	C-	7	8	D

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 108 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 11, or 10%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	10	40	55
Attendance	10	20	40
Study habits	10	30	56
Ease of completing homework	10	40	61
Overall grades	10	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	10	70	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	9	22	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Monthly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **50%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 108 surveys for this evaluation and 19, or 18%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	17	53	36
Attendance	17	53	23
Classroom achievement	17	59	39
Homework	17	59	33
Math grades	17	47	41
English language arts grades	17	59	36
Overall grades	17	53	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	11	64	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	11	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **42%** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **42%** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	0		
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	0		

Provider Profile
American Tutoring Services
www.atstutoring.com

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Frank Tyndell
220 N Center
Royal Oak, MI 48067

Telephone:
248-291-4686

Fax:
248-246-2234

E-mail:
ftyndell@atstutoring.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by American Tutoring Services: American Tutoring Services is a data driven program that will provide Public School students in Grades K-12 with on-site research based tutorial services. The goal of ATS is to improve student achievement under the "No Child Left Behind Act" in English Language Arts and Mathematics with instructional content aligned to the local district Grade Level Content Expectations. Typically students will receive two hours of instruction per day, three times a week from highly qualified teachers. The program will run for approximately ten weeks and with a total of (60) sixty hours of instruction. Every participating student will be assessed (Skills Tutor, Focus on MEAP, ACT Preparation) for skill level needs with an individualized learning plan developed for each student. ATS instructors will utilize Computer Based Software programs for measuring student progress. All materials and manuals necessary for successful participation in the program will be provided by ATS.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 17
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 60
Number of Students to be Served: 15 - 1200
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers	4	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	4	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	25%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	6	C	3	7	C
4	5	C	4	6	C
5	4	<10	5	4	<10
6	5	C	6	4	<10
7	11	C	7	11	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 17 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 6%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	100	55
Attendance	1	100	40
Study habits	1	100	56
Ease of completing homework	1	100	61
Overall grades	1	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 17 surveys for this evaluation and 4, or 24%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	4	50	36
Attendance	4	25	23
Classroom achievement	4	50	39
Homework	4	25	33
Math grades	3	33	41
English language arts grades	2	100	36
Overall grades	4	25	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **25%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **25%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 50%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile
C&B Tutoring, LLC
www.cbtutoring.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: D

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

MIGNON FOOTMAN
10756 SOMERSET
DETROIT, MI 48224

Telephone:
313-399-8938

Fax:
313-885-4358

E-mail:
MFOOTMAN@ATT.NET

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by C&B Tutoring, LLC: C&B Tutoring, LLC (C&B Tutoring) provides local off-site tutoring to students in grades kindergarten-8th grade and includes small group instruction in ratios of 5 students : 1 tutor or 1 student : 1 tutor. Group size is held at 25 students; 2 hours per day over a period of 3-4 days per week for 8 weeks. Progress reports are completed weekly and individualized academic plans for students are created and assessed for strengths while recognizing areas which need improvement. C&B Tutoring utilizes curriculum components from Great Source and SkillsTutor. The Every Day Counts Math curriculum will be used and under SkillsTutor, Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary will be used. Both curricula connect to the specific content expectations identified by the state and LEAs in that each curriculum component listed in the state standards corresponds with specific locations within the Great Source and SkillsTutor curricula.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 83

Offers Transportation: Yes

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-8

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 38

Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 500

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students

■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 25 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	4	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	75%	80%
	3	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	50%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	4	<10	3	4	<10
4	11	C	4	11	C
5	4	<10	5	4	<10
6	18	C	6	19	C
7	18	C	7	19	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 83 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 4, or 5%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	4	50	55
Attendance	4	25	40
Study habits	4	75	56
Ease of completing homework	4	75	61
Overall grades	4	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	4	50	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	4	50	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 3, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **75%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **75%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 83 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 2%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	0	36
Attendance	2	0	23
Classroom achievement	2	0	39
Homework	2	0	33
Math grades	2	0	41
English language arts grades	2	50	36
Overall grades	2	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Carter, Reddy and Associates, Inc.

www.crandassociates.org

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: C

Contact Information:

Raahul Reddy
24123 Greenfield Rd-Ste. 307
Southfield, MI 48075

Telephone:
248-233-6370

Fax:
248-233-6173

E-mail:
rreddy@crandassociates.org

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Carter, Reddy and Associates, Inc.: Carter, Reddy & Associates' (C&R) Self-Directed Learners Program offers the following FREE after school tutoring courses: (1) Reading and Writing Acceleration Program (RWAP), (2) Mathematics Acceleration Program (MAP), (3) English as a Second Language Program (ESLP). We guarantee each course strengthens students' reading, mathematics, and writing skills and helps each child to perform better in school. Students complete comprehensive assessments and learn to use learning strategies that help them read better and faster, solve mathematical problems, and write sentences and paragraphs that are correct and in accordance with writing standards. Additionally, we have numerous sites with various schedules (typically 1-2 hour sessions) so that it is very convenient for you no matter where you live. Finally, C&R provides ALL of the materials at NO COST. Let C&R, The Learning Experts, help your student(s) to succeed in school by becoming a Self-Directed Learner! Call us toll-free at 866-903-7323.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 471
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 2500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	13	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	69%	80%
	13	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	38	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	38	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	24%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	4	<10	6	4	<10
7	2	<10	7	2	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 471 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 14, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	14	50	55
Attendance	14	36	40
Study habits	14	21	56
Ease of completing homework	14	64	61
Overall grades	14	71	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	14	29	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	14	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **79%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **77%** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 353 surveys for this evaluation and 38, or 11%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	34	26	36
Attendance	32	19	23
Classroom achievement	34	29	39
Homework	35	29	33
Math grades	23	43	41
English language arts grades	24	33	36
Overall grades	31	29	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	10	40	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	10	40	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **24%** (number of respondents = 38, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **26%** (number of respondents = 38, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 6 districts. Coordinators in 6 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	5	4	4	3	4
Submission of student attendance data	5	1	3	2	2
Submission of student progress reports	5	3	3	1	2
Submission of invoices	6	1	4	2	2

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1
Program content	1
Assessments	1

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	5	80	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	5	80	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	5	80	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	4		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	3		0

Provider Profile

Educate Online (formerly Catapult Online)

www.educate-online.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

John McAuliffe
506 S. Central Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21202

Telephone:
410-843-2672

Fax:
410-843-2629

E-mail:
state@educate-online.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Educate Online (formerly Catapult Online): Educate Online is America's leading provider of live, personalized, at-home tutoring. On average, students who complete either our math or reading program gain at least a grade level. All instruction takes place on a computer and headset (with internet connectivity, if needed) provided by Educate Online. Using headset and computer, students log onto our secure website from home, while a teacher logs on from another location. U.S. state-certified teachers work with each student one-one-one in a virtual classroom. Student-to-teacher ratios do not exceed 3:1. Families can choose their own schedules, because sessions are offered seven days a week, after school on weekends. Students typically take two to four one-hour sessions each week, but may choose to accelerate their programs. Our curriculum is all online, and includes more than 15,000 lessons. Students receive all the equipment they need at the beginning of the program. Families incur no extra costs.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 149
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Yes
Students With Disabilities: Yes
Place(s) of Service: Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: 3-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 20000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** Not available
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 3 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	10	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	90%	80%
	10	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	17	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	17	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	24%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	2	<10	3	2	<10
4	4	<10	4	4	<10
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	3	<10	6	2	<10
7	2	<10	7	2	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 149 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 11, or 7%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	9	56	55
Attendance	9	44	40
Study habits	9	33	56
Ease of completing homework	9	67	61
Overall grades	9	56	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	10	40	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	10	20	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **67%** (number responding to the question = 6, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **90%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **90%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 95 surveys for this evaluation and 17, or 18%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	11	36	36
Attendance	11	9	23
Classroom achievement	11	27	39
Homework	11	18	33
Math grades	7	29	41
English language arts grades	8	13	36
Overall grades	11	18	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	3	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	3	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **24%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **29%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	3	0	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	3	0	1	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	0	2	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair to Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Class Act Tutoring and Educational Services

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: C-

Overall Rating in 2008: C

Contact Information:

Francine Duncan-Martin
19015 Elsmere
Eastpointe, MI 48021

Telephone:
313-657-1993

Fax:
586-776-4553

E-mail:
fdmartin@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Class Act Tutoring and Educational Services: Class Act Tutoring and Educational Services, LLC provides tutoring in Math and Reading in-home, off-site, or school to children in grades K-12 including special needs students. Our program is a dynamic tutoring program designed to engage students in one-on-one instruction and in small groups of no more than five (5) in creative instructional strategies. Grades K-8 use the SRA McGraw Hill Reading and Math curriculum. For high school, we use Math textbooks (algebra, geometry, precalculus, calculus, etc.), English and Literature textbooks and many other resources such as ACT and SAT Prep books. Tutors are trained and equipped to work with your child. In addition, Class Act tutors work closely with the parents/guardians of its students and keeps them informed of the learner's progress. Sessions will be held 2-3 times a week in up to two-hour intervals. Tutoring is also available on weekends.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 135
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 1000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	16	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	88%	80%
	17	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	34	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	34	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	56%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	2	<10	3	2	<10
4	4	<10	4	4	<10
5	5	C	5	5	C
6	3	<10	6	3	<10
7	2	<10	7	2	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 135 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 17, or 13%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	17	53	55
Attendance	17	18	40
Study habits	17	76	56
Ease of completing homework	17	53	61
Overall grades	17	59	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	17	88	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	17	71	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 5, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **88%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **94%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 126 surveys for this evaluation and 34, or 27%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	30	63	36
Attendance	30	60	23
Classroom achievement	30	63	39
Homework	30	70	33
Math grades	25	76	41
English language arts grades	16	50	36
Overall grades	23	52	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **56%** (number of respondents = 34, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **56%** (number of respondents = 34, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 8 districts. Coordinators in 4 districts, or 50%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	67	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	33	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	50	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	3		100

Provider Profile Education Fundamentals

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: D

Overall Rating in 2008: B

Contact Information:

Constance L. Jackson Jackson Telephone: Fax: E-mail:
18498 Birchcrest Drive 313-863-9197 313-863-9991 educationfundamentals@hotmail.com
Detroit, MI 48221

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Education Fundamentals: Education Fundamentals LLC will feature the Camelot Learning Language Arts and Mathematics Program. Camelot is a manipulative rich, hands on experience that all students will love. Camelot Learning was designed specifically for after school and was created using research proven strategies to close the achievement gap. It incorporates all facets of what makes after school and supplemental instruction effective for all students. Camelot is aligned with the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations and is proven to raise student achievement in mathematics and language arts. Education Fundamentals will provide 40-42 hours of tutoring to each student. Each student is pre-tested and the skills not mastered will be the focus. After the program is finished, students will be post tested and the skills that they mastered will be identified. Education Fundamentals looks forward to serving you and your child!

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 653 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-9 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40 Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 1000 Student-Teacher Ratios: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Computer-based: Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Online instruction: Not available
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	13	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	85%	80%
	13	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	62	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	62	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	21%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	23	C	7	23	C-

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 653 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 13, or 2%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	13	38	55
Attendance	13	23	40
Study habits	13	46	56
Ease of completing homework	13	62	61
Overall grades	13	46	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	13	46	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	13	23	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 4, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **92%** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **92%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 653 surveys for this evaluation and 62, or 9%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	35	37	36
Attendance	36	31	23
Classroom achievement	36	33	39
Homework	36	31	33
Math grades	25	36	41
English language arts grades	27	22	36
Overall grades	32	28	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	16	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	16	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **21%** (number of respondents = 62, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **21%** (number of respondents = 62, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Poor**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

EduLutions

www.edulutions.org

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: B-

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Pamela Taylor
100 Riverfront Dr. Suite 2406
Detroit, MI 48226

Telephone:
313-407-4842

Fax:
313-893-2902

E-mail:
pamelaataylor@comcast.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by EduLutions: EduLutions is offering the PLATO, Achieve Now comprehensive design program to students in Michigan. PLATO, Achieve Now is an effective research based reading and math program offered to grades K-8 as an after school program to supplement the students' regular school day curriculum. PLATO, Achieve Now utilizes Sony Playstations as well as customized software. The aim of EduLutions is to integrate standards based processes and technology into the students' daily routine. EduLutions provides free transportation to and from the learning centers utilizing state certified school buses and vehicles. Our staff meet the criteria for school bus safety in Michigan. Transportation is provided at no cost to assist in providing the consistency of learning necessary for measurable gains in student achievement and test scores. Math and Reading tutoring sessions are 2 hour sessions, four times per week. Sessions will run six weeks.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 92

Offers Transportation: Yes

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Place of Business, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-8

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40

Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 300

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students

■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Oakland and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	10	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	70%	80%
	10	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	15	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	15	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	27%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	2	<10	3	2	<10
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	2	<10	5	2	<10
6	0	Not available	6	2	<10
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 92 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 10, or 11%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	10	60	55
Attendance	10	60	40
Study habits	10	50	56
Ease of completing homework	10	60	61
Overall grades	10	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	9	78	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	10	20	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **90%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **80%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 92 surveys for this evaluation and 15, or 16%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	15	33	36
Attendance	15	7	23
Classroom achievement	15	47	39
Homework	15	20	33
Math grades	12	17	41
English language arts grades	15	27	36
Overall grades	15	40	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	8	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	8	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **27%** (number of respondents = 15, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **13%** (number of respondents = 15, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	0		
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	0		

Provider Profile

Flaggs and Associates Educational Services

Overall Rating 2010: C+

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: C-

Contact Information:

Brian Flaggs
4156 Old Dominion Drive
West Bloomfield, MI 48323

Telephone:
248-877-5544

Fax:
248-538-4570

E-mail:
info@flaggsandassociates.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Flaggs and Associates Educational Services: Flaggs and Associates Educational Services will offer a high quality research based instructional program that is designed to raise student achievement. The major components of our program include, diagnostic assessment linked with state standards, development of individualized learning plans, collaboration among teachers, parents, tutors, small group tutoring, ongoing assessments, positive reinforcement, instructional materials and strategies that promote mastery of skills and concepts. The instructional programs are aligned to Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations, Michigan Curriculum Framework and individualized school district curriculum. Our curriculum gives K-5 students the opportunity to enhance skills in English Language Arts and Mathematics. We will utilize problem solving and critical thinking skills with the rigors of our program while incorporating test taking strategies. We will provide students with the opportunity to receive thirty-two (32) hours of service during the program. Tutoring is conveniently held in the student's residential school.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 202	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Offers Transportation: No	Grades Served: K-8
English Language Learner: Not available	Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32
Students With Disabilities: Not available	Number of Students to be Served: 50 - 500
Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship	Student-Teacher Ratios:
	■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students
	■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students
	■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Ingham, Oakland, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	11	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	11	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	17	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	17	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	65%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	23	C	3	22	C
4	23	E	4	25	C
5	16	C	5	16	C
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 202 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 11, or 5%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	11	64	55
Attendance	11	55	40
Study habits	11	55	56
Ease of completing homework	11	64	61
Overall grades	11	64	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	11	27	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	11	9	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **75%** (number responding to the question = 4, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **91%** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 202 surveys for this evaluation and 17, or 8%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	17	18	36
Attendance	17	6	23
Classroom achievement	17	29	39
Homework	17	12	33
Math grades	17	29	41
English language arts grades	17	29	36
Overall grades	17	29	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	14	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	14	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **65%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **71%** (number of respondents = 17, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile Global Learning Solutions

Overall Rating 2010: D+

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: B

Contact Information:

Kila Heath
18701 Grand River, Suite 186
Detroit, MI 48223

Telephone:
313-835-7323

Fax:
313-835-8255

E-mail:
kilaheath25@comcast.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Global Learning Solutions: Global Learning Solutions, hereafter referred to as GLS, is FREE computer based instructional after school tutoring for students grades 2 - 8 who qualify. Technology is our platform for instruction which consist of a computer based curriculum that engage large group (1:8), small group (1:3) and isolated (1:1) instruction. While GLS supports distance learning, all tutoring sessions have an instructor onsite. Our curriculum has been designed to evaluate and strengthen cognitive ability specifically in mathematics and language arts. All instructional methods, curriculum components and evaluation tools used by GLS are aligned with the Michigan Department of Educations Curriculum Framework and Grade Level Content Expectations. The instructional curriculum is intended to increase the student achievement on the MEAP exam. Furthermore, the curriculum is also intended to increase the students experience and confidence towards standardized tests. Only three participants are needed for this great opportunity!

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 157
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: 2-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 28
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 200
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	6	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	83%	80%
	6	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	20	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	20	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	15%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	18	C	6	18	C
7	13	D	7	13	E

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 157 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 6, or 4%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	5	40	55
Attendance	6	0	40
Study habits	6	17	56
Ease of completing homework	6	33	61
Overall grades	6	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	6	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	6	33	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **50%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **83%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **83%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 157 surveys for this evaluation and 20, or 13%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	16	25	36
Attendance	17	12	23
Classroom achievement	17	29	39
Homework	17	24	33
Math grades	13	31	41
English language arts grades	12	25	36
Overall grades	14	29	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	4	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	4	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **15%** (number of respondents = 20, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **15%** (number of respondents = 20, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Higher Ground Program

www.highergroundprogram.org

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B+

Contact Information:

Jackey Wilson
8131 E. Outer Drive
Detroit, MI 48213

Telephone:
313-245-4191

Fax:
313-245-4390

E-mail:
jwil@highergroundprogram.org

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Higher Ground Program: Since 2005 Higher Ground Program has gained recognition in the State of Michigan in raising the academic achievement levels of students from elementary through 12th grade. Through our nationally recognized, researched-based curriculum (Triumph, Coach Series; which is aligned with Michigan Benchmarks) we tutor students in Mathematics, English/Language Arts, Science,, and Social Studies. Higher Ground Program received a B+ grade from the State of Michigan in 2007-2008. The Key components of our program are (1) We employ Certified and Highly-qualified Tutors (2) A strong emphasis is placed on the individual needs of each student by utilizing small classroom settings; we place teacher-assistants in classrooms with students with special needs; we allow parents/students to create flexible schedules (3) We measure student progress by giving: student pre-tests; individual student learning plans; bi-weekly progress reports; and parent/tutor meetings as needed. Free transportation provided in most cases.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 593
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 2500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Genesee, Macomb, Oakland, Saginaw, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	37	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	84%	80%
	37	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	56	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	56	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	29%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	4	<10	3	6	C
4	10	D	4	7	C
5	8	C	5	7	C
6	39	C	6	41	C
7	49	D	7	50	C-

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 593 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 38, or 6%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	37	65	55
Attendance	37	35	40
Study habits	37	59	56
Ease of completing homework	36	75	61
Overall grades	37	70	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	36	64	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	36	47	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **62%** (number responding to the question = 21, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **86%** (number of respondents = 37, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **86%** (number of respondents = 37, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 478 surveys for this evaluation and 56, or 12%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	48	38	36
Attendance	47	17	23
Classroom achievement	48	44	39
Homework	48	33	33
Math grades	38	45	41
English language arts grades	37	46	36
Overall grades	40	48	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	17	6	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	17	6	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **29%** (number of respondents = 56, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **32%** (number of respondents = 56, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 5 districts. Coordinators in 4 districts, or 80%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	4	1	1	1	1
Submission of student attendance data	4	1	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	4	2	1	1	1
Submission of invoices	4	1	1	1	1

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair to Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	4	75	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	4	50	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		100

Provider Profile
iLEARNED Online, LLC
 www.ilearnedonline.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Haaris Ahmad
 4153 Monarch Ave.
 Canton, MI 48188

Telephone:
 734-652-0345

Fax:
 480-287-9780

E-mail:
 info@ilearnedonline.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by iLEARNED Online, LLC: iLEARNED takes an individualized approach of 1:1 tutoring tailored to MDE and MEAP standards. The student uses an interactive whiteboard where worksheets are worked on in an online real-time collaborative environment. Tutors see what the student is doing and can easily send supplementary material immediately if the student does not understand the topic. Interaction is also via online voice/text chat. This allows multiple touchpoints between tutor and student and allows the student to review the session afterwards. This is especially helpful as the student's learning continues even after the session. Typical sessions are 1 hour with 5 minutes in the beginning to quickly review past material and 5 minutes at the end to answer questions. Students improve academic achievement because they progress at their own pace with a personal tutor watching every step and able to correct mistakes immediately.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 131
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: 1-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 15
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 150
Student-Teacher Ratios:
 ■ **Classroom:** Not available
 ■ **Computer-based:** Not available
 ■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per student

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	18	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	61%	80%
	18	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	3	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	3	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	33%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	4	<10	7	4	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 131 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 18, or 14%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	18	56	55
Attendance	18	39	40
Study habits	18	50	56
Ease of completing homework	18	56	61
Overall grades	18	72	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	18	17	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	18	22	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **73%** (number responding to the question = 11, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **61%** (number of respondents = 18, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **61%** (number of respondents = 18, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 87 surveys for this evaluation and 3, or 3%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	50	36
Attendance	2	50	23
Classroom achievement	2	50	39
Homework	2	50	33
Math grades			41
English language arts grades	2	50	36
Overall grades	2	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **33%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **33%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	3	0	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	1	2	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	33	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	33	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	3	33	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		50

Provider Profile

IMAGE Personal Success Training Institute

www.imageofsuccess.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: C-

Overall Rating in 2008: B+

Contact Information:

Carlos Johnson	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
21500 Northwestern Hwy., Ste 1105	248-569-6234	248-569-6336	info@imageofsuccess.com
Northland Mall-lower level			
Southfield, MI 48075			

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by IMAGE Personal Success Training Institute: Founded 14 years ago, I.M.A.G.E Personal Success Training Institute (IPSTI) is an organization which provides support to parents and students. Through SRA's researched-based Corrective Mathematics and Reading curricula and individualized learning plans, students in grades sixth through eighth grades are able to increase their comprehension, confidence, and grades. IPSTI strives to help students take full advantage of learning opportunities and achieve personal success. IPSTI has been providing supplemental tutoring services in the community for over three years. Sessions occur in local churches, local schools, libraries, at the IPSTI office and in student homes, when appropriate. During the school year, sessions meet for two hours, twice per week. During the summer months, students meet for two hours, three times a week. On occasion, weekend hours are available to make up missed sessions. All necessary materials, including workbooks and supplies are provided during these sessions.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 90 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: 6-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 15 Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 300 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
--	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Macomb, Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	3	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	3	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers	12	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	12	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	17%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	8	C	6	8	C
7	4	<10	7	4	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 90 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 3, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	3	100	55
Attendance	3	33	40
Study habits	3	67	56
Ease of completing homework	2	100	61
Overall grades	3	67	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	3	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	3	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 90 surveys for this evaluation and 12, or 13%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	9	11	36
Attendance	9	0	23
Classroom achievement	9	22	39
Homework	9	11	33
Math grades	4	0	41
English language arts grades	7	14	36
Overall grades	7	0	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	1	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	1	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **17%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **17%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 75%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	50	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Instant Student Academic Achievement Centers

Instant Reading Achievement

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Richard Hogan
16910 Shaftsbury
Detroit, MI 48219

Telephone:
313-538-2523

Fax:
313-538-2527

E-mail:
hoganinstant@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Instant Student Academic Achievement Centers: Instant Reading Achievement Centers tutors all students, but specialize in the therapeutic treatment of mild-to-severe learning disabilities in students of all ages. At-risk students who defied traditional reading methodologies in the early years, often struggle or experience total academic failure in later years. These same students usually experience immediate success with the reading process shortly after beginning our computer-assisted tutorials. His success is reflected in grades, attitudes and post assessment results. Speed and results distinguish us from many other reading and diagnostic centers. Our streamline approach helps us achieve the targeted outcomes quickly. We do not waste time, energy and other resources on low-payoff routines. We assess the students using valid reliable diagnostic/prescriptive assessments. We set goals and timelines based on the results of these assessments. We schedule two hours per day and three days per week to attain the 30-35 hours of needed instruction.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 67
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 35
Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 1500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 15 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	2	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	2	Average overall letter grade from parents	C-	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	0%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	6	C	3	6	C
4	9	C	4	9	C
5	2	<10	5	2	<10
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 67 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 2, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	2	100	55
Attendance	2	100	40
Study habits	2	100	56
Ease of completing homework	2	100	61
Overall grades	2	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	2	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	2	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Monthly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 67 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 3%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	0	36
Attendance	2	0	23
Classroom achievement	2	50	39
Homework	2	50	33
Math grades	2	0	41
English language arts grades	2	0	36
Overall grades	2	0	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **0%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	2	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	2	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	67	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	67	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	3	67	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		67
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	3		67

Provider Profile

International After School Program

www.iaspdetroit.com

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Darryl Sawyers
9200 Gratiot Avenue Suite 100
Detroit, MI 48213

Telephone:
313-213-6355

Fax:
313-731-0222

E-mail:
darrylsawyers@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by International After School Program: The International After School Program is a quality after school enrichment program for students in grades 1-12. We offer students computer based tutoring in Language Arts and Mathematics. Our program provides computers for students and we also directly engage parents in the program through parent training sessions designed to increase parental involvement and participation in the educational process. Parents enrolling their child into our program can choose to participate in our onsite and online program or our strictly online program from home. Our onsite program is held at locals schools and also in the cultural district of Detroit at the Charles Wright Museum of African American History, Detroit Science Center and Youthville. Scheduling is flexible to accommodate parent and students schedules and issues surrounding transportation. IASP is a preferred provider and has well qualified tutors to meet the needs of your child. Please visit us at www.iaspdetroit.com or contact us at 1-313-213-6355.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 430
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: 1-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 27
Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 2500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	40	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	93%	80%
	38	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	118	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	118	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	11%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	15	C	6	14	C
7	21	C	7	21	E

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 430 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 42, or 10%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	41	54	55
Attendance	41	44	40
Study habits	41	61	56
Ease of completing homework	41	54	61
Overall grades	41	61	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	41	46	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	41	63	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **48%** (number responding to the question = 21, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **88%** (number of respondents = 40, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **95%** (number of respondents = 41, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 430 surveys for this evaluation and 118, or 27%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	64	22	36
Attendance	64	9	23
Classroom achievement	64	23	39
Homework	64	20	33
Math grades	30	30	41
English language arts grades	46	9	36
Overall grades	47	26	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	5	20	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	5	20	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **11%** (number of respondents = 118, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **12%** (number of respondents = 118, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 50%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Learning Disabilities Clinic

ldclinic.com

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Lynne Master, M.Ed.
25611 Coolidge
Oak Park, MI 48237

Telephone:
248-545-6677

Fax:
248-545-2152

E-mail:
lynneldc@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Learning Disabilities Clinic: Opened in 1968, LDC is a respected Detroit area business working with gifted, regular, remedial, and special education students, including learning disabled, emotionally impaired, head injured, cognitive impaired, speech and language impaired, hearing impaired, visually impaired, physically and health impaired, autistic spectrum, Asperger syndrome, Downs syndrome, and others. All teachers are Masters and Ph.D. level, and we provide one-to-one instruction ONLY. Students improve reading, math, social studies, science, study skills, test-taking, and time management. We also offer ACT Test Prep courses. Some students have earned college scholarships as a result of improved test scores. Study rooms have computers, software, and research based instructional materials. We are the only education clinic in the USA to earn accreditation by NCA. Tutoring lasts one to four hours, depending on student's attention span. We are open seven days at our location in Oak Park. Students are welcome from Kindergarten – Grade 12.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 35

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: No

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30

Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 500

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per student

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	10	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	10	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers	4	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	4	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	0%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	4	<10	3	4	<10
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	2	<10	6	2	<10
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 35 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 10, or 29%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	10	70	55
Attendance	10	40	40
Study habits	10	50	56
Ease of completing homework	10	60	61
Overall grades	10	60	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	10	90	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	10	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **80%** (number responding to the question = 10, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 35 surveys for this evaluation and 4, or 11%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	3	0	36
Attendance	3	0	23
Classroom achievement	3	0	39
Homework	3	0	33
Math grades	1	0	41
English language arts grades	3	0	36
Overall grades	3	0	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **0%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **0%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 75%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good to Excellent"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	67	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	3		100

Provider Profile Learning Edge, The

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: A

Contact Information:

Juliana Trent
P.O. Box 3474
Southfield, MI 48076

Telephone:
313-617-2606

Fax:
248-353-1977

E-mail:
tle.tutoring@gmail.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Learning Edge, The: THE LEARNING EDGE uses fun, hands-on learning activities to teach reading and math to students in Kindergarten through 5th grade FREE! Our highly qualified, certified teachers use creative ways to keep students motivated and always looking forward to the next session. We believe that in the right environment every child can experience success. Our groups are kept small and meet often so that lesson time can be meaningful and effective. We will design an individual plan of action that focuses on learning needs using age appropriate testing, parent and classroom teacher input. Our program will increase student confidence as skills are mastered and strategies develop that help them become successful learners. Parents will notice student improvement right away through detailed weekly progress reports. So, join us at THE LEARNING EDGE where we are Sharpening Minds One A At Time. (Minimum of 10 students per site)

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 47
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-5
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 38
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 100
Student-Teacher Ratios:
☒ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
☒ **Computer-based:** Not available
☒ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Oak Park City School District, Academy of Oak Park, Detroit City School District, Highland Park City Schools, Redford Union School District, Detroit Community Schools, Detroit Service Learning Academy, Old Redford Academy

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	7	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	86%	80%
	7	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	7	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	7	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	100%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	2	<10	6	0	Not available
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 47 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 7, or 15%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	7	0	55
Attendance	7	0	40
Study habits	7	0	56
Ease of completing homework	7	0	61
Overall grades	7	14	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	7	71	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	7	14	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **86%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **86%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 47 surveys for this evaluation and 7, or 15%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	7	29	36
Attendance	7	29	23
Classroom achievement	7	43	39
Homework	7	29	33
Math grades	7	43	41
English language arts grades	7	43	36
Overall grades	7	43	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	7	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	7	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **100%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

M.A.D.E. Training and Consulting, Inc.

Overall Rating 2010: C+

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: B+

Contact Information:

Glynis Thornton
17515 West 9 Mile Road Suite 180
Southfield, MI 48075

Telephone: 313-318-6687

Fax: 248-595-8056

E-mail: makingadifferenceeveryday@netscape.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by M.A.D.E. Training and Consulting, Inc.: M.A.D.E. (Making A Difference Everyday) provides an individualized educational experience based on McMillan/McGraw-Hill's standards-based curriculum. This program helps students to develop a foundation for the following: reading, math, science and social studies. Developed by experienced educators, Macmillan/McGraw-Hill's programs are based on scientifically based research and best practices. The Macmillan/McGraw-Hill's Triumphs and Building Math Skills Series have been adopted by hundreds of districts nationwide. Both general education and special education students who used these series showed significant gains in both reading and mathematics scores as measured by the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP). M.A.D.E. provides Supplemental Educational Sessions in after school settings primarily in the public schools the students attend. Typically group sessions will be held in (2) hour sessions, two (2) days per week. Students will receive an average of 30 hours of instruction. The instructional approach consists of specially tailored, small group tutoring delivered

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 731
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 2000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	14	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	86%	80%
	14	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	39	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	39	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	26%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	26	C	3	23	C
4	22	C	4	22	C
5	9	C	5	9	C
6	24	C	6	22	C
7	7	C	7	7	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 731 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 14, or 2%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	14	57	55
Attendance	14	36	40
Study habits	14	71	56
Ease of completing homework	14	79	61
Overall grades	14	71	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	13	62	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	14	50	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **89%** (number responding to the question = 9, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **86%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **85%** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 731 surveys for this evaluation and 39, or 5%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	30	40	36
Attendance	30	40	23
Classroom achievement	30	43	39
Homework	30	37	33
Math grades	23	43	41
English language arts grades	16	44	36
Overall grades	14	43	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	9	22	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	9	22	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **26%** (number of respondents = 39, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **28%** (number of respondents = 39, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	1	1	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	50	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		0

Provider Profile
Math Savvy Institute
 mathsavvyinstitute.com

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: C-

Overall Rating in 2008: C

Contact Information:

Rhonda Alford
 18701 Grand River Ave #126
 Detroit, MI 48223

Telephone:
 313-330-3970

Fax:
 313-538-1113

E-mail:
 ralford@mathsavvyinstitute.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Math Savvy Institute: The Mathematics Savvy Institute creates small learning communities that engage students in hands-on, real-world activities through the use of computers, software, calculators, mathematics manipulatives and more. The two-hour tutoring session will be available, four days per week between the hours of 4-8 pm to coincide with most school schedules. We feel that our practical application of instruction will produce long term improved academic achievement.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 286	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Offers Transportation: Yes	Grades Served: K-12
English Language Learner: Not available	Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 240
Students With Disabilities: Not available	Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 3000
Place(s) of Service: Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship	Student-Teacher Ratios:
	■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students
	■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students
	■ Online instruction: Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Oakland and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	20	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	85%	80%
	20	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	26	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	26	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	38%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	3	<10	3	3	<10
4	4	<10	4	3	<10
5	4	<10	5	5	C
6	4	<10	6	3	<10
7	14	A	7	13	A

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 286 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 22, or 8%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	20	35	55
Attendance	20	35	40
Study habits	20	40	56
Ease of completing homework	20	50	61
Overall grades	20	60	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	20	65	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	20	70	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Monthly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **88%** (number responding to the question = 17, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **84%** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **84%** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 286 surveys for this evaluation and 26, or 9%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	23	39	36
Attendance	23	17	23
Classroom achievement	23	48	39
Homework	23	39	33
Math grades	22	45	41
English language arts grades	21	43	36
Overall grades	23	39	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	11	9	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	11	45	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **38%** (number of respondents = 26, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **46%** (number of respondents = 26, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile McCall Educational Services

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: B-
Overall Rating in 2008: B+

Contact Information:

R McCall P.O. Box 20097 Ferndale, MI 48220	<u>Telephone:</u> 313-384-0166	<u>Fax:</u> 313-368-1622	<u>E-mail:</u> mccalledservices@aol.com
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by McCall Educational Services: McCall Educational Services is dedicated to improving student achievement through the use of research based instructional strategies. The research validated reading and math programs have a demonstrated success of student achievement in both areas. Each program is aligned with the State standards and produce results that may be demonstrated on both State and LEA assessments. McCall Educational Services provides both small group and individual instruction, each session has a 1 hour minimum. Technology is incorporated to support student achievement. Depending on LEA, sessions will be offered after-school, weekends, and summer. Transportation is provided at select sites. MES has identified 9 as their minimum number of students to be serviced in each district.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 419 Offers Transportation: At select sites only English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32 Number of Students to be Served: 9 - 2000 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students
---	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	12	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	83%	80%
	12	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	27	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	27	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	41%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	13	C	3	14	C+
4	11	C	4	10	C
5	17	C-	5	19	C
6	5	C	6	7	C
7	11	C+	7	11	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 419 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 12, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	12	67	55
Attendance	12	50	40
Study habits	12	75	56
Ease of completing homework	12	67	61
Overall grades	12	83	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	12	92	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	12	42	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **83%** (number responding to the question = 6, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **75%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **75%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 414 surveys for this evaluation and 27, or 7%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	25	48	36
Attendance	25	28	23
Classroom achievement	25	52	39
Homework	25	40	33
Math grades	19	53	41
English language arts grades	21	48	36
Overall grades	23	57	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	10	30	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	10	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **41%** (number of respondents = 27, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **33%** (number of respondents = 27, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Poor**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

Academic Tutoring/McCullys Educational Resource C

www.merctutoring.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

William McCully
7664 N Canton Center Road
Canton, MI 48187

Telephone:
734-414-7884

Fax:
734-455-2455

E-mail:
bmccully@merctutoring.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Academic Tutoring/McCullys Educational Resource C: Academic Tutoring / McCully's was the recipient of the annual award from the Michigan Association of State and Federal Program Specialists for 2008, "In recognition of excellent service and dedication to providing Michigan Teachers with quality professional development and educational programs to help all students succeed." Academic Tutoring/McCully's provides 3 students per teacher as our average student to teacher ratio with a maximum of 5 students. Smaller group sizes or individual tutoring may be provided as needed. Special education students receive services as determined by their Individualized Educational Learning Plan. Our assessment results show an average increase, after approximately 30 hours of tutoring, to be 1 stanine score, or above, of academic growth. We serve students in kindergarten through high school. All instructional materials and books are provided based upon the student's academic assessment. Consistent parent and teacher communication is an important part of our tutoring program.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 335
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 15
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 1500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	24	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	88%	80%
	24	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	21	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	21	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	19%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	22	C	3	22	C
4	32	C+	4	31	C
5	19	C-	5	20	C
6	76	C	6	76	C
7	35	B	7	35	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 335 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 24, or 7%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	24	63	55
Attendance	24	21	40
Study habits	24	50	56
Ease of completing homework	24	71	61
Overall grades	24	67	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	24	50	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	23	70	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **84%** (number responding to the question = 19, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **88%** (number of respondents = 24, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **88%** (number of respondents = 24, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 233 surveys for this evaluation and 21, or 9%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	20	15	36
Attendance	20	10	23
Classroom achievement	20	15	39
Homework	20	10	33
Math grades	12	8	41
English language arts grades	21	14	36
Overall grades	19	11	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	11	9	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	11	45	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **19%** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **29%** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 13 districts. Coordinators in 10 districts, or 77%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	6	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	9	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	9	0	1	0	1
Submission of invoices	9	0	0	1	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1
Program content	1
Assessments	1

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	9	78	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	9	78	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	9	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	9		56
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	9		56

Provider Profile

Metropolitan Certified Teachers Association, LLC

www.themcta.com

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: B-

Overall Rating in 2008: C

Contact Information:

Angeli Jones
1245 Harding
Detroit, MI 48214

Telephone:
313-821-6448

Fax:
313-821-6449

E-mail:
themctaemail@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Metropolitan Certified Teachers Association, LLC: Metropolitan Certified Teachers Association, (MTCA) offers a 32-hour Academic Intervention and Extension Support Program in Reading, Math and Content-Area academics for K-12th grade students. The MCTA Tutorial program delivers customized comprehensive instruction in Reading Comprehension, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary Development, Writing, state-adopted standardized tests preparation (bonus hours), and Mathematical Concepts & Applications. The math component involves students using pencil-to-paper techniques to learn mathematic functions, writing across the curriculum paired with the Fastt Math? and Go Solve? computerized-integrated learning systems which build mathematic fluency, problem-solving, decoding word problems, number functions and accuracy in a short period of time. The DIMTERQ!180 program is the premiere product utilized by MCTA. This highly acclaimed reading system promotes direct, explicit comprehension instruction, text-based collaborative learning, strategic tutoring, and a technology component for all students. Students have been found to experience favorable grade level gains after completing this program.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 462
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 1500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 10 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	14	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	71%	80%
	14	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	57	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	57	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	12%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	3	<10	6	3	<10
7	2	<10	7	2	C+

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 462 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 14, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	14	50	55
Attendance	14	29	40
Study habits	14	50	56
Ease of completing homework	14	36	61
Overall grades	14	43	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	14	57	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	14	50	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **88%** (number responding to the question = 8, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **86%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **71%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 462 surveys for this evaluation and 57, or 12%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	28	25	36
Attendance	29	14	23
Classroom achievement	29	31	39
Homework	29	31	33
Math grades	15	53	41
English language arts grades	20	20	36
Overall grades	18	28	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	3	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	3	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **12%** (number of respondents = 57, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **9%** (number of respondents = 57, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 33%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	1	0	1
Submission of invoices	1	1	1	1	1

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Poor**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	0		
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

MI Learning Unlimited, LLC

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Carolyn Darden
8162 E. Jefferson 7A
Detroit, MI 48214

Telephone:
313-492-6626

Fax:
832-442-6626

E-mail:
milearningunlimited@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by MI Learning Unlimited, LLC: MI LEARNING UNLIMITED (MI L.U.) uses the Diagnostic/Prescriptive Model, recognized widely as being highly effective, to increase student achievement. The staff assesses the skills levels of each student. This information is used to determine those instructional goals and conditions necessary for each student's learning. The tutoring groups consist of 1-8 students with a certified or highly qualified teacher. Each student has a computer generated skills profile for both subjects. The MI.L.U. curricula have been aligned closely with the state content standards. The instructional staff of MI.L.U. are current or retired certified teachers who meet the standards set by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The staff is led and supervised by Carolyn StarkeyDarden (Retired) who served for 37 years in Detroit Public Schools as a reading specialist, administrator and Director of Grant Development. Ms. Darden is also a nationally published author and trainer in the educational industry.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 702
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 3000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	23	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	74%	80%
	22	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	52	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	52	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	37%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	2	<10	7	2	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 702 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 24, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	24	46	55
Attendance	24	50	40
Study habits	23	39	56
Ease of completing homework	24	54	61
Overall grades	23	48	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	24	58	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	24	42	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **86%** (number responding to the question = 14, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **70%** (number of respondents = 23, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **74%** (number of respondents = 23, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 702 surveys for this evaluation and 52, or 7%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	36	50	36
Attendance	37	32	23
Classroom achievement	37	54	39
Homework	36	39	33
Math grades	33	48	41
English language arts grades	22	55	36
Overall grades	30	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	18	22	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	18	11	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **37%** (number of respondents = 52, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **38%** (number of respondents = 52, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		100

Provider Profile

Saturday School of Excellence, The

www.thesaturdayschoolofexcellence.com

Overall Rating 2010: A

Overall Rating in 2009: A

Overall Rating in 2008: A

Contact Information:

Katrina Dunigan
P. O. Box 754
Southfield, MI 48037

Telephone:
248-552-9404

Fax:

E-mail:
kvdunigan@thesaturdayschoolofexcellence.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Saturday School of Excellence, The: The Saturday School of Excellence (SSE) provide instruction in reading/language arts and mathematics during 8-week, five hour bi-weekly Saturday sessions. We supplement, reinforce and support academic instruction provided in the classroom. We service grades kindergarten through eighth via direct and differentiated instruction and interactive learning. The SSE's curriculum is aligned with state Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE), district adoptions and schools' instructional programs. Highly-qualified, certified teachers use an array of assessments to focus instruction on each child's specific needs. We work with parents and the classroom teacher to set goals that lead to higher performance. Each child's confidence increases as skills are mastered and strategies developed that help them become successful learners. The SSE utilizes effective and research-based curriculum (SRA's Open Court Intervention and Breaking the Code, Project Read and Foresman/Wesley Math Reteach). Incentives are given for good attendance and citizenship.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 23

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility,
Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-8

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40

Number of Students to be Served: 30 - 200

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Berrien, Oakland, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	5	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	5	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	100%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	10	C	3	9	C
4	7	C	4	7	C
5	7	C+	5	6	C
6	6	C	6	5	C
7	4	<10	7	3	C+

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 23 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 5, or 22%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	5	60	55
Attendance	5	20	40
Study habits	5	80	56
Ease of completing homework	5	80	61
Overall grades	5	60	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	5	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	5	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 4, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 23 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 9%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	100	36
Attendance	2	50	23
Classroom achievement	2	100	39
Homework	2	100	33
Math grades	2	100	41
English language arts grades	2	100	36
Overall grades	2	100	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	100	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	100	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Monthly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Sylvan Auburn Hills - ACE IT

www.sylvanlearning.com

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: B-

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Brenda Jegede
4161 Baldwin Road
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

Telephone:
248-253-1732

Fax:
248-253-1750

E-mail:
sylvanaubhills@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Auburn Hills - ACE IT: Ace it! Tutoring is a program developed by Sylvan Learning, Inc. The curriculum is targeted to essential skills in reading and math. The Ace it! Tutoring program is delivered in-person in the school or another community location. An assessment is administered to determine specific learning needs. Students are placed in small groups (no more than 5 per group) based on their learning needs and ability levels. The Ace it! Tutoring Reading program teaches word analysis, fluency, comprehension and vocabulary skills. The Ace it! Tutoring Math program teaches basic facts, computational and problem solving skills. Teachers provide instruction on learning objectives, motivate students and reward them for their achievement and effort. Students are given a pre and post assessment to measure student growth. Each session is an hour long and students attend 2 to 6 hours per week. Instructional materials provided. Minimum of 5 students.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 24

Offers Transportation: At select sites only

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 28

Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 250

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 3 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	2	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	50%	80%
	2	Average overall letter grade from parents	C-	B+
Teachers	4	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	4	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	25%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	5	C	3	5	C
4	3	<10	4	3	<10
5	5	C+	5	5	C
6	3	<10	6	3	<10
7	8	C	7	7	C+

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 24 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 2, or 8%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	2	50	55
Attendance	2	0	40
Study habits	2	50	56
Ease of completing homework	2	0	61
Overall grades	2	0	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	2	50	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	2	50	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Monthly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **0%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 24 surveys for this evaluation and 4, or 17%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	3	33	36
Attendance	3	33	23
Classroom achievement	3	33	39
Homework	3	33	33
Math grades	2	50	41
English language arts grades	3	33	36
Overall grades	3	33	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	50	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	100	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **25%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **25%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 33%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning Center - Dearborn, Lincoln Park, Livonia, N. Canton

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: B-

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Frank Jacoby	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
Sylvan Learning Center 2040 Monroe	313-724-1500	313-724-8317	SylvanDbn@aol.com
St. Suite 202			
Dearborn, MI 48154			

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning Center - Dearborn, Lincoln Park, Livonia, N. Canton:

Sylvan Learning Center, the nation's leader in supplemental education offers personalized programs in reading and math. We begin by identifying your child's specific needs with a Sylvan Skills Assessment. We administer each program using a method of instruction called mastery learning. Students are taught to master a skill before they move on to the next level. Our teachers are highly trained and certified, they love teaching and motivating students. We keep parents and teachers updated every step of the way. We serve students in grade levels K-12. We offer our services after school, evenings, weekends, and in the summer. We have a maximum student:teacher ratio of 3:1. Length of sessions is a minimum of one hour. Our students attend from 2-6 hours per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 31	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Offers Transportation: No	Grades Served: K-12
English Language Learner: No	Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36
Students With Disabilities: Not available	Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 600
Place(s) of Service: Place of Business	Student-Teacher Ratios:
	■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 3 students
	■ Computer-based: Not available
	■ Online instruction: Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Oakland and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers	15	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	15	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	36%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	2	<10	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 31 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	0	55
Attendance	1	0	40
Study habits	1	0	56
Ease of completing homework	1	0	61
Overall grades	1	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 31 surveys for this evaluation and 15, or 48%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	12	42	36
Attendance	14	14	23
Classroom achievement	14	36	39
Homework	12	42	33
Math grades	8	50	41
English language arts grades	10	40	36
Overall grades	9	33	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	4	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	4	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **36%** (number of respondents = 15, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **50%** (number of respondents = 15, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 8 districts. Coordinators in 6 districts, or 75%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	6	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	6	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	6	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	6	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	6	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	6	17	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	4	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	5		80
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	5		80

Provider Profile
W. Salome Tutoring
 www.wsalometutoring.com

Overall Rating 2010: D+

Overall Rating in 2009: B-

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Jeffery L Frazier
 1428 W Court St
 Flint, MI 48503

Telephone:
 810-287-3244

Fax:
 810-496-9542

E-mail:
 WSALOMELLC@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by W. Salome Tutoring: Program Summary W Salome Consultants' LLC mission is to provide quality in-class and online tutoring services that improves academic performance and self-esteem for ALL students in grades K-12 including students with disabilities. We are responsive to the learner in our efforts to build partnerships and demonstrate increases in learning and achievement utilizing research based programs and strategies. Our programs are aligned to the Michigan Curriculum Framework and focus on grade level content standards and extended grade level content standards. Our instructors work on math and reading individually and across the curriculum, while building learner partnerships. We uplift the learner, as well as give the learner the opportunity to uplift others. Service location is W Salome Tutoring located at 1428 W Court, Flint, MI 48503 and other satellite faith based and community centers in the Flint area. Transportation is provided with parent permission.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 679
Offers Transportation: Yes
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 28
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 1000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
 ■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
 ■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
 ■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	33	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	79%	80%
	34	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	55	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	55	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	20%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	2	<10	3	0	Not available
4	4	<10	4	6	C
5	0	Not available	5	2	<10
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	38	C-	7	37	E

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 679 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 34, or 5%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	32	56	55
Attendance	32	59	40
Study habits	32	72	56
Ease of completing homework	34	68	61
Overall grades	34	68	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	34	59	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	34	18	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **73%** (number responding to the question = 15, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **85%** (number of respondents = 33, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **71%** (number of respondents = 34, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 450 surveys for this evaluation and 55, or 12%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	42	19	36
Attendance	41	15	23
Classroom achievement	42	31	39
Homework	42	26	33
Math grades	35	34	41
English language arts grades	31	29	36
Overall grades	33	33	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	19	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	19	5	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **20%** (number of respondents = 55, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **16%** (number of respondents = 55, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 5 districts. Coordinators in 4 districts, or 80%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	4	0	2	1	0
Submission of student attendance data	4	0	3	3	2
Submission of student progress reports	4	0	2	1	1
Submission of invoices	4	0	3	3	2

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	4	75	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	67	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	4	75	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		67
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		50

Provider Profile
EduTech Mobile Learning Center
www.edutech4learning.com

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Mary James, M.Ed. Telephone: Fax: E-mail:
4475 W. Outer Dr. 313-595-1496 313-340-0086 edutechmobile@edutech4learning.com
Detroit, MI 48235

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by EduTech Mobile Learning Center: EduTech Mobile Learning Center provides on-line and off-line tutoring to K-12 students. Our tutoring program utilizes a variety of techniques that are proven to help increase the academic achievement levels of all students, including those who are at risk for failing. Our qualified tutors are available to service students at home, at our centers, in schools, or at other locations. Many tutors speak Spanish and are Special Education Certified. Students attend 2-4 hours per class, weekly, after school, weekends, summers and they receive tutoring in one-on-one and/or group sessions. Tutors diagnose each student's needs, and prepare individualized learning plans that utilize direct tutor instruction and on-line computer programs designed to help increase academic achievement, and improve learning and memory skills. Monthly progress is reported to parents and skills growth is measured at the end of the program.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 658 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32 Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 1500 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	34	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	65%	80%
	34	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	84	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	84	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	46%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	12	C	3	12	C
4	10	C	4	12	C
5	17	C+	5	19	C
6	5	C	6	4	<10
7	11	C	7	10	C-

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 658 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 35, or 5%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	35	43	55
Attendance	34	41	40
Study habits	33	61	56
Ease of completing homework	34	62	61
Overall grades	35	57	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	35	80	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	35	57	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **79%** (number responding to the question = 19, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **71%** (number of respondents = 35, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **68%** (number of respondents = 34, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 657 surveys for this evaluation and 84, or 13%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	70	44	36
Attendance	69	30	23
Classroom achievement	70	39	39
Homework	62	29	33
Math grades	44	30	41
English language arts grades	60	35	36
Overall grades	52	31	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	34	62	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	34	32	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **46%** (number of respondents = 84, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **46%** (number of respondents = 84, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 50%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		50
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		50

Provider Profile

EduTech Cognitive Therapy & Tutorial Services

www.edutech4learning.com

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Roderica James	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
8900 East Jefferson, Suite 1030	248-224-3445	313-638-1827	edutechcognitive@edutech4learning.com
Detroit, MI 48214			

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by EduTech Cognitive Therapy & Tutorial Services: EduTech Cognitive Therapy provides on-line and off-line tutoring to K-12 students. Our tutoring program utilizes a variety of effective techniques that are proven to help increase the academic achievement levels of all students, including those with special education needs (e.g. LD, ADHD, ADD, Dyslexia, At-Risk for failure, and ELL Spanish-speaking). Our highly-qualified tutors, service students in schools, churches, on-line, or in the home; and many tutors are Sp.Ed. certified. Students attend up to 4 hours per day, after school, weekends, summers, and they receive a total of 32 hours of tutoring in one-on-one or small group sessions. Tutors diagnose each student's needs, and prepare individualized learning plans (ILP) that utilize direct tutor instruction and computer-based programs designed to help increase academic achievement, and improve learning and memory skills. Monthly progress is reported to parents and skills growth is measured at the end of the program.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 186 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32 Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 750 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students
---	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	7	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	71%	80%
	7	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	14	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	14	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	23%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	2	<10	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 186 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 7, or 4%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	7	57	55
Attendance	7	43	40
Study habits	7	71	56
Ease of completing homework	7	57	61
Overall grades	7	71	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	7	57	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	7	71	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **67%** (number responding to the question = 6, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **71%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **71%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 168 surveys for this evaluation and 14, or 8%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	12	17	36
Attendance	12	8	23
Classroom achievement	12	17	39
Homework	12	8	33
Math grades	11	18	41
English language arts grades	6	17	36
Overall grades	7	14	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	50	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **23%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **23%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	50	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		50
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		50

Provider Profile Exceptional Learning

Overall Rating 2010: C

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Reginia Hansend
5229 W. Michigan Ave Lot 103
yspilanti, MI 48197

Telephone:
313-304-5013

Fax:
313-937-1494

E-mail:
nemiahpickens@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Exceptional Learning: We at Exceptional Learning have created an instructional program that has high quality and is researched based. Our program includes parents, teachers, and the community working collaboratively. We guarantee over 50 hours of tutorial service, we enhance student achievement, we improve student learning, and we create a safe learning environment for all students. We have highly qualified teaching staff, which hold Masters and Bachelor's Degrees. We have 1 teacher for every 5 students, and instruction is individualized to meet each student's need. We set learning goals based on report cards, standardized assessment, and daily monitoring. Our staff receives ongoing professional development, to ensure that Best Practice is being used. Our specialized instructional material includes. Technology, books on tape, graphing calculators, and hands-on materials. We monitor success daily and provide instant feedback to parents, teachers and school officials on a bi-weekly basis. We give many hours of tutorial services.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 226
Offers Transportation: Yes
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility,
Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 400
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District, School District of the City of Inkster, Crestwood School District, Ecorse Public School District, Old Redford Academy, Academy of Inkster, Detroit Midtown Academy

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	12	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	83%	80%
	12	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	11	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	11	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	30%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	3	<10	5	3	<10
6	0	Not available	6	2	<10
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 226 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 12, or 5%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	12	75	55
Attendance	12	33	40
Study habits	12	75	56
Ease of completing homework	12	75	61
Overall grades	12	75	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	12	92	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	12	75	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 8, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **92%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **83%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 226 surveys for this evaluation and 11, or 5%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	5	40	36
Attendance	5	20	23
Classroom achievement	5	40	39
Homework	5	20	33
Math grades	4	50	41
English language arts grades	3	100	36
Overall grades	3	67	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	50	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **30%** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **20%** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		100

Provider Profile Making the Grade

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: B-
Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Frankie Smith
15801 W. Parkway
detroit, MI 48223

Telephone:
313-412-2524

Fax:

E-mail:
makingthegradeab@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Making the Grade: Making the Grade Tutoring Service is a Supplemental Education Service designed to provide exciting instructional services that offer extra help in reading. We provide over 50 hours of tutorial services. Our reading program has over 40 years of proven results. Our reading program is aligned with state and local standards. We require all children to recognize basic sight words according to their grade level, analyze items cross textually, increase reading fluency, and use a variety of reading strategies. All lessons are fun-filled, with materials to motivate, encourage, and engage children. Our company hires highly qualified teaching staff. Our teachers are master teachers, and hold valid teaching certificates. Our teachers attend ongoing Professional Development Classes. We start by giving each student a Diagnostic Test to identify each child's specific needs. We provide bi-weekly feedback to parents and the school district about each student's progress.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 56
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Oakland and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	7	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	7	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	4	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	4	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	25%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	3	<10	3	3	<10
4	2	<10	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 56 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 7, or 13%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	7	71	55
Attendance	7	71	40
Study habits	6	100	56
Ease of completing homework	7	100	61
Overall grades	6	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	7	71	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	7	14	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 7, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 56 surveys for this evaluation and 4, or 7%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	4	50	36
Attendance	4	25	23
Classroom achievement	4	50	39
Homework	4	50	33
Math grades	3	67	41
English language arts grades	4	50	36
Overall grades	4	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	50	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	50	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **25%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **25%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Achieving Maximum Potential, LLC (AMP)

Overall Rating 2010: Failing

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Vencie Jackson
16200 W. Seven Mile Road
Detroit, MI 48235

Telephone:
313-835-3900

Fax:
313-835-7982

E-mail:
vjackson@evoaccounting.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Achieving Maximum Potential, LLC (AMP): AMP staff will meet with each individual student and parents to discuss expectations and program guidelines. Written expectations will be provided to parents and into student personal file. The tutoring model for AMP is one that has been researched by academic professionals and have proven to be statistically effective. A maximum of 3 sessions per week, Monday thru Thursday, and 2 hours per session will be the standard class schedule, typically over a 10-12 week period. Saturday morning, 2-hour sessions can be made available if the LEA has a special need. All classes will be held in rooms that provide security, good lighting and reasonable protection from outside distractions. Chairs and desks will be as comfortable as reasonable can be to enhance the comfort level of the student. Quality literature will be provided and each student will have own materials.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 146
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 1000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 5 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	0%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	E	B+
Teachers	27	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	27	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	15%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	2	<10	4	2	<10
5	2	<10	5	2	<10
6	2	<10	6	2	<10
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 146 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 1%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	0	55
Attendance	1	0	40
Study habits	1	0	56
Ease of completing homework	1	0	61
Overall grades	1	0	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	0	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": % (number responding to the question = , statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 145 surveys for this evaluation and 27, or 19%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	20	25	36
Attendance	20	5	23
Classroom achievement	20	20	39
Homework	20	20	33
Math grades	5	20	41
English language arts grades	18	11	36
Overall grades	19	16	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	3	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	3	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **15%** (number of respondents = 27, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **11%** (number of respondents = 27, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 75%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	50	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		100

Provider Profile

ACCESS Educational Services

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: C-

Contact Information:

Sarah Shoucair
2651 Saulino Court
Dearborn, MI 48120

Telephone:
313-842-6757

Fax:
313-842-5150

E-mail:
sshoucair@accesscommunity.org

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by ACCESS Educational Services: ACCESS' Educational Services is a high quality, research-based program that is designed to increase student achievement in math and reading. Our highly qualified staff works with each child to determine individualized goals, and utilizes research-based instructional methods to help students meet and exceed state standards in math and reading. We offer: *18 years experience as an Educational Provider *Commitment to improving school performance, particularly in Math & Reading *Research-based curriculum and instructional strategies *Ongoing communication with parents on children's progress *Highly qualified, state-certified teachers *Bilingual staff (Arabic, Spanish, Bangali) **A minimum of 10 students per school is required before arrangements are made with your local schools to provide services in their facilities.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 34
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Yes
Students With Disabilities: No
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 10-200
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District, Dearborn City School District, Dearborn Heights School District #7, Melvindale-North Allen Park Schools, Hamtramck Public Schools, Lincoln Park Public Schools

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	5	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	5	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	50%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	3	<10	3	3	<10
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information²

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 34 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 5, or 15%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

² Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	5	80	55
Attendance	5	80	40
Study habits	5	80	56
Ease of completing homework	5	100	61
Overall grades	5	80	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	5	80	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	5	40	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **50%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 34 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 6%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	50	36
Attendance	2	50	23
Classroom achievement	2	50	39
Homework	2	50	33
Math grades	1	100	41
English language arts grades	2	50	36
Overall grades	2	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	1	100	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	1	100	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 1 district, or 50%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Angel Land Child Care and Parent Institute

Overall Rating 2010: C+

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: D

Overall Rating in 2008: B-

Contact Information:

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Telephone: Fax: E-mail:

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Angel Land Child Care and Parent Institute: Not available

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 167 Offers Transportation: Not available English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Not available	Subject Areas: Not available Grades Served: Not available Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: Not available Number of Students to be Served: Not available Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: Not available ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
--	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Not available

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	3	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	67%	80%
	3	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	7	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	7	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	43%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	7	C	6	6	C
7	19	C	7	15	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information¹

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 167 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 3, or 2%, returned a survey.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	3	33	55
Attendance	3	0	40
Study habits	3	33	56
Ease of completing homework	3	67	61
Overall grades	3	67	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider			
Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	3	33	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	3	67	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was "Monthly." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **33%** (number responding to the question = 3, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **67%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 83 surveys for this evaluation and 7, or 8%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	5	60	36
Attendance	5	20	23
Classroom achievement	5	60	39
Homework	5	60	33
Math grades	1	100	41
English language arts grades	5	40	36
Overall grades	5	60	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*			
Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **43%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **43%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	1	1	1	2
Submission of student progress reports	3	1	2	1	2
Submission of invoices	3	1	1	1	1

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Poor to Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	67	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	3	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	3	67	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile
Educational Escapades
 www.myeetutoring.com

Overall Rating 2010: C-

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: D-

Contact Information:

Natasha Smith
 20108 Ferguson
 Detroit, MI 48235

Telephone:
 313-948-9223

Fax:
 313-933-1529

E-mail:
 peart0280@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Educational Escapades: FREE TUTORING Educational Escapades believes that all students can learn while having fun. Our mathematics & Language Arts K-8 instruction is focused on high expectations for the general and special needs population. Tutors deliver learning strategies by using student data to meet individual needs. Students are tested, given individual plans and materials that will address their own needs. Mathematics sessions teach students basic math skills (solving story problems, counting money, etc). Our Language Arts program develops comprehension skills (reasoning tactics, vocabulary, analyzing evidence) and help students to improve their writing. Students improve reading by practicing blending sounds and reading information. Information is taught through demonstration and practiced until fully understood and each child can apply it. Students practice after school, in school, library, or home (\$35.00 per hour). Tutors communicate with parents weekly. Tutors instruct a minimum of 1 up to a maximum of 30 students. Tutor ratio 1:5.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 106
Offers Transportation: Yes
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 2
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
 ■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
 ■ **Computer-based:** Not available
 ■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District, Highland Park City Schools

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	6	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	6	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	37	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	37	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	5%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 106 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 6, or 6%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	6	50	55
Attendance	6	33	40
Study habits	6	83	56
Ease of completing homework	6	83	61
Overall grades	6	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	6	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	6	83	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Monthly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **50%** (number responding to the question = 6, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 106 surveys for this evaluation and 37, or 35%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	24	8	36
Attendance	24	4	23
Classroom achievement	23	13	39
Homework	23	9	33
Math grades	11	9	41
English language arts grades	19	11	36
Overall grades	22	5	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	10	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	10	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **5%** (number of respondents = 37, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **8%** (number of respondents = 37, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Excellent"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	0		
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

K-2 Learning Center, LLC

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: A

Overall Rating in 2008: A

Contact Information:

Jacqueline Logan
16952 Mount Vernon
Southfield, MI 48075

Telephone:
248-225-0191

Fax:

E-mail:
k2learning@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by K-2 Learning Center, LLC: K-2 Learning Center, LLC provides tutoring services for students in grades K-5. We understand that every child is unique and our tutoring program is designed allow each child to progress at his own rate. Our curriculum is research-based to help students meet state and local standards in reading and math. K-2 students learn in a fun environment. Lessons include hands-on activities and games that are designed keep young students engaged and eager to learn. K-2 will assess each student and develop an Individual Learning Plan that defines achievement goals and sets a timeline for their completion. Ideally, tutoring sessions are held 3 times per week for 2 hours for 8 weeks at a local school. If space in a school is not available, we will tutor students in a nearby church, community center, library, or the student's home.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 23
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-5
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32
Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 75
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Oakland International Academy, Detroit City School District, Hamtramck Public Schools, Aisha Shule/WEB Dubois Prep. Academy School

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	3	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	67%	80%
	3	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	100%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 23 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 4, or 17%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	4	25	55
Attendance	4	25	40
Study habits	4	75	56
Ease of completing homework	4	50	61
Overall grades	4	75	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	4	50	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	4	75	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **67%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 23 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 9%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	100	36
Attendance	2	100	23
Classroom achievement	2	100	39
Homework	2	100	33
Math grades	2	100	41
English language arts grades	2	100	36
Overall grades	2	100	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Kids in Progress, LLC

Overall Rating 2010: Failing

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: D+

Contact Information:

Angela English
7602 Cherrywood
Westland, MI 48185

Telephone:
313-218-1582

Fax:
313-535-7818

E-mail:
kidsinprogressllc@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Kids in Progress, LLC: Kids In Progress provides a 15-week Saturday program for students in grades 3-8. Three hours each Saturday we are committed to reading and math instruction. We provide regular education and special education services. Following their academic sessions, students are provided hot/cold nutritious lunches and are invited to participate in the LifeSkills Training series. This program is designed to help students live a happy and productive life. Our program will motivate your child to work harder. We know how to make learning exciting! We focus on the most important concepts in reading and math to give our students the tools they need to succeed. At the end of the day, there is nothing we enjoy more than the look of success on your child's face. We are confident in our ability to offer a quality program where your child will REALLY learn!! We have high academic expectations for all students. (Twenty students minimum.)

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 27

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: 3-8

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 38

Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 60

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Academy of Oak Park, Ann Arbor Public Schools, School District of Ypsilanti, Milan Area Schools, Ann Arbor Learning Community, Detroit City School District, Redford Union School District, Academy for Business and Technology, Chandler Park Academy, Detroit

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	0%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	C	B+
Teachers	8	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	8	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	0%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 27 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 4%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	0	55
Attendance	1	0	40
Study habits	1	0	56
Ease of completing homework	1	0	61
Overall grades	1	0	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": % (number responding to the question = , statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 27 surveys for this evaluation and 8, or 30%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	8	0	36
Attendance	8	0	23
Classroom achievement	8	0	39
Homework	8	0	33
Math grades	6	0	41
English language arts grades	5	0	36
Overall grades	5	20	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **0%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **13%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Fair**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile Future Foundations

Overall Rating 2010: B-

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Vincent Stewart
P.O. Box 731
Maumee, OH 43537

Telephone:
419-349-6570

Fax:
419-740-2293

E-mail:
vstew87@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Future Foundations: Future Foundations is a certified SES provider in several states. Our program which uses the Wilson Reading System is aligned with Michigan Standards. Our program enables our teachers to maximize effective reading instruction through clear and systematic instruction, bridging between word recognition and comprehension, direct instruction, indirect instruction and comprehension strategies. Our program uses "Achieve" assessments to develop student learning plans with 3 state standards and goals for improvement. To support the development of lesson plans and address the state goals identified on the student learning plan, there is a clear delineation of how all WRS educational materials are aligned with Michigan State Standards and grade expectations. We employ group instruction of ratio of 5:1, which allows for some individualized attention to students. Students attend three times each week for 1.5 hour sessions. All tutors meet Michigan SES qualification Requirements.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 183
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 50 - 1000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	21	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	86%	80%
	21	Average overall letter grade from parents	A-	B+
Teachers	26	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	26	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	35%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 183 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 21, or 11%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	21	76	55
Attendance	21	38	40
Study habits	21	52	56
Ease of completing homework	21	57	61
Overall grades	21	43	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	21	67	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	20	45	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **67%** (number responding to the question = 9, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **90%** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **81%** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 183 surveys for this evaluation and 26, or 14%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	21	48	36
Attendance	21	38	23
Classroom achievement	21	43	39
Homework	21	43	33
Math grades	21	48	41
English language arts grades	21	48	36
Overall grades	21	48	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	16	13	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	16	13	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **35%** (number of respondents = 26, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **42%** (number of respondents = 26, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

HTC Tutoring

www.holytempleafc.org

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: B+

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Bernardette Kilgore
8590 Esper Blvd
Detroit, MI 48204

Telephone:
313-247-0590

Fax:
313-416-2364

E-mail:
bkilgore@hollytempleafc.org

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by HTC Tutoring: H.T.C.'s instructional program incorporates a variety of learning and instructional strategies that differentiate instruction, support multiple instructional models, multiple intelligences, and levels of student achievement. The instructional approach consists of individualized tutoring delivered in an 8:1 ratio. Assessment tests are configured to branch up and down "skill trees." This allows educators to identify the lowest and highest levels of mastery of the student. After the assessment test, students are assigned a customized lesson plan containing student-specific activities. The A+AnyWhere System has been adopted by hundreds of districts. The data indicates that students who used this program showed significant gains in reading and mathematics on standardized tests. Typically group sessions will be held for in 1 or 2 hour sessions, 2 to 4 days a week. Sessions will be held between the hours of 4:00pm and 8:00 p.m. Students work at individual computer stations and all supplies are provided.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 72

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30

Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 1000

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students

■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	2	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	2	Average overall letter grade from parents	B-	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	50%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 72 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 2, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	2	50	55
Attendance	2	50	40
Study habits	2	0	56
Ease of completing homework	2	50	61
Overall grades	2	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	2	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	2	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 72 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 3%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	50	36
Attendance	2	0	23
Classroom achievement	2	50	39
Homework	1	0	33
Math grades	1	0	41
English language arts grades	2	50	36
Overall grades	1	0	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	1	100	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	1	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 33%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

1to1 Tutor

www.1to1tutor.org

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Harish Shadadpuri
30305 Woodhaven
Beverly Hills, MI 48025

Telephone:
866-993-2263

Fax:
888-686-2353

E-mail:
ray.narayan@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by 1to1 Tutor: 1 to 1 Tutor provides a high quality, research-based online program proven to increase students' math skills. We tutor students in 2nd through 12th grade in Math. During tutoring, students interact with teachers on a 1:1 ratio via computer in "real time" – they can hear each other and see what each one is doing on the computer screen through a headphone, mic & whiteboard, which are provided to the students at no cost. Students' learning goals are determined by an assessment test & based on students' classroom programs. Tutoring takes place in students' homes on a computer with internet access. One to two hour sessions are offered Monday-Friday before and/or after school until 9:00 pm and on weekends. Our research-based curriculum and assessment tests are aligned with Michigan Department of Education standards & our tutors are college educated & experienced at working with low achieving students.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 86
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: Mathematics
Grades Served: 2-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 350
Student-Teacher Ratios:
☐ **Classroom:** Not available
☐ **Computer-based:** Not available
☐ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per student

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	7	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	86%	80%
	6	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	9	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	9	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	56%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 86 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 7, or 8%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	7	43	55
Attendance	7	57	40
Study habits	7	86	56
Ease of completing homework	7	100	61
Overall grades	7	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	7	71	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	7	29	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 3, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **71%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **86%** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 86 surveys for this evaluation and 9, or 10%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	9	44	36
Attendance	9	44	23
Classroom achievement	9	56	39
Homework	9	33	33
Math grades	5	40	41
English language arts grades	5	60	36
Overall grades	4	75	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **56%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **56%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 33%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	1	1

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Poor"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	0		
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	0		

Provider Profile AVANCEMOS!

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Gloria D' Andrea
4926 Orchard
Dearborn, MI 48126

Telephone:
313-269-0654

Fax:

E-mail:
avancemos2009@gmail.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by AVANCEMOS! ¡Avancemos! A Latino operated, student-centered learning provider allows English Language Learners to take ownership of their own learning. Research shows that 90% of what we teach or use immediately is retained; shared activities are essential instructional tools. These tools are aligned with Michigan Grade Level Content Expectation, Michigan Curriculum Framework and the individual LEA curriculum. At ¡Avancemos! learning is accomplished by encouraging ESL students to undertake projects on a variety of topics while using a range of resources that provide opportunities for practical learning. These advantages have a positive direct impact on English Learners, especially when many have experienced more failure than success in learning situations. All our tutors and staff are bilingual for better understanding with ESL parents. We service grades K – 8 and offer 34 hours of tutoring service. Avancemos! will work with the LEA and parents to help children achieve their maximum potential.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 243
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 34
Number of Students to be Served: 50 - 300
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per student

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	30	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	73%	80%
	31	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	24	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	24	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	75%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 243 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 31, or 13%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	31	81	55
Attendance	31	71	40
Study habits	31	68	56
Ease of completing homework	31	77	61
Overall grades	31	71	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	31	48	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	31	26	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **29%** (number responding to the question = 17, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **74%** (number of respondents = 31, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **74%** (number of respondents = 31, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 243 surveys for this evaluation and 24, or 10%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	24	63	36
Attendance	24	38	23
Classroom achievement	24	67	39
Homework	24	54	33
Math grades	18	56	41
English language arts grades	20	70	36
Overall grades	23	65	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	16	6	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	16	6	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **75%** (number of respondents = 24, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **67%** (number of respondents = 24, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Knowledge Points

<http://www.knowledgepoints.com/grandville/>

Overall Rating 2010: D+

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Lee Cook	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
4693 Wilson Avenue Ste H	616-531-3995	616-534-5163	lee.cook@knowledgepoints.com
Grandville, MI 49418			

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Knowledge Points: KnowledgePoints offers reading and math tutoring (including Algebra and Geometry) to students in Kindergarten through 12th grade. Tutoring takes place in-person at students' schools, community locations, at the KnowledgePoints learning center, or in students' homes (one-on-one tutoring only). Tutoring takes place before or after school or on weekends. Sessions are usually 1-2 hours long, once or twice per week, depending on student/parent schedules. Tutors work with students individually and/or in small groups (5 students or fewer) to provide personalized instruction. KnowledgePoints' tutors are mostly state certified teachers. Our tutors use learning materials (including Continental Press' Finish Line series) that are aligned with the Michigan Curriculum Framework. All goals selected for students are informed by our pre-test and data provided by the school to create an instructional plan that best suits each student. With communication between our staff/tutors, schools/districts, and parents/guardians, we provide the best learning environment to ensure student success.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 52 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25 Number of Students to be Served: 30 - 300 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	5	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	80%	80%
	5	Average overall letter grade from parents	B+	B+
Teachers	8	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	8	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	13%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 52 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 5, or 10%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	4	50	55
Attendance	5	40	40
Study habits	5	40	56
Ease of completing homework	4	25	61
Overall grades	5	40	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	5	80	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	5	60	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 3, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **75%** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **80%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 10 surveys for this evaluation and 8, or 80%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	6	17	36
Attendance	6	0	23
Classroom achievement	6	17	39
Homework	6	17	33
Math grades	4	0	41
English language arts grades	6	17	36
Overall grades	6	33	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	3	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **13%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **13%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	1	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	2	1	1	1	1
Submission of invoices	2	0	1	0	1

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair to Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1
Program content	1
Assessments	1

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

Globutronic Educational Group LLC

Overall Rating 2010: C+

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Melvin Hatcher
29556 Southfield Rd., Ste. 210
Southfield, MI 48076

Telephone:
248-424-9540

Fax:
248-424-9542

E-mail:
globutronic@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Globutronic Educational Group LLC: Globutronic's program is designed to connect with students by using Multiple Intelligences and Brain based instruction to address their individual learning styles. We offer academic instruction for K-12 students in Math, Reading and Language Arts. Accomplishments can be validated by the increase in students' achievement in classes, along with mastery of skills on state and district tests, supported by pre-test and post-test assessments. The program is comprised of a unique staff of committed educators who are reading specialists; highly qualified and certified teachers. In an atmosphere of nurturing empowerment, we work tirelessly to create a program that embraces the individualized learning styles of each student. Consequently, he/she not only is prepared to achieve passing grades on standard tests, but also develops a passion for life purpose. Our instruction is delivered in a 5:1 student/teacher ratio, 2 hours a day and three to four times a week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 33
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 800
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	0%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	C	B+
Teachers	8	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	8	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	75%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 33 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 3%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	100	55
Attendance	1	0	40
Study habits	1	0	56
Ease of completing homework	1	0	61
Overall grades	1	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	0	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": % (number responding to the question = , statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 33 surveys for this evaluation and 8, or 24%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	8	100	36
Attendance	8	100	23
Classroom achievement	8	100	39
Homework	8	100	33
Math grades	7	100	41
English language arts grades	6	100	36
Overall grades	8	100	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	6	83	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	6	83	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **75%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **75%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning Center - Auburn Hills

www.sylvanlearning.com

Overall Rating 2010: D+

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Brenda Jegede
4161 Baldwin Road
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

Telephone:
248-253-1732

Fax:
248-253-1750

E-mail:
sylvanaubhills@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning Center - Auburn Hills: Sylvan Learning Center is the leading provider of tutoring to grades K-12, providing services to over two million students for over 30 years. Sylvan has been working with the NCLB SES Program since its inception and has been highly successful in helping students meet state assessment goals. The Sylvan Learning Center program starts with a Sylvan Skills Assessment. We use the results to create a learning plan to guide each student's reading (phonics, vocabulary, comprehension) or math (basic facts, computation, concepts & application) instruction. We use certified teachers and teachers are Sylvan trained & certified to teach each subject area. Our student/teacher ratio is 3:1 and each student works on his or her own, personalized lesson plan. Each session is an hour and students attend 2 to 6 sessions per week. Sylvan utilizes a variety of instruction materials.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 68

Offers Transportation: At select sites only

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 28

Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 250

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 3 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	8	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	75%	80%
	8	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	9	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	D	C
	9	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	0%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 68 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 8, or 12%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	8	50	55
Attendance	8	38	40
Study habits	8	50	56
Ease of completing homework	8	50	61
Overall grades	8	50	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	8	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	8	75	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **88%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **88%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 34 surveys for this evaluation and 9, or 26%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	8	25	36
Attendance	8	0	23
Classroom achievement	8	25	39
Homework	8	38	33
Math grades	7	0	41
English language arts grades	8	13	36
Overall grades	8	25	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	6	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	6	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **0%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **0%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 4 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good to Excellent"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	3	67	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		67
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	3		67

Provider Profile Learning Land

Overall Rating 2010: B-

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

David Bailey
P.O Box 40874
Redford, MI 48240

Telephone:
313-333-0725

Fax:

E-mail:
learningland09@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Learning Land: We at Learning Land have created an instructional program that has high standards and is researched based. Your child will receive over 50 hours of tutorial service. We include parents, teachers, and the community as a collaborative effort. We will provide transportation if you request it. We guarantee over 50 hours of tutorial service, we enhance student achievement, we improve student learning, and we create a safe learning environment for all students. We have highly qualified teaching staff to support each student that is being tutored in the program. Our staff receives ongoing professional development to ensure that Best Practice is being used. We also monitor success daily and provide instant feedback to parents, teachers and school officials on a bi-weekly basis. We value education and guarantee results.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 108
Offers Transportation: Yes
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 300
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per student
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per student

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	11	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	73%	80%
	11	Average overall letter grade from parents	B	B+
Teachers	14	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	14	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	57%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 108 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 11, or 10%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	11	36	55
Attendance	11	45	40
Study habits	11	36	56
Ease of completing homework	11	55	61
Overall grades	11	64	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	11	64	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	11	27	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Quarterly."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **86%** (number responding to the question = 7, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **73%** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **82%** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 80%).

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 108 surveys for this evaluation and 14, or 13%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	12	58	36
Attendance	12	33	23
Classroom achievement	12	58	39
Homework	12	50	33
Math grades	11	64	41
English language arts grades	12	50	36
Overall grades	12	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	9	78	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	9	56	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **57%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **64%** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile

Know 2 Grow Learning LLC

www.know2growlearning.com

Overall Rating 2010: B-

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Nakia Robinson
3430 E. Jefferson Ave. #152
Detroit, MI 48207

Telephone:
313-486-3011

Fax:
313-486-3012

E-mail:
nrobinson@know2growlearning.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Know 2 Grow Learning LLC: Know 2 Grow Learning, LLC (Know 2 Grow Learning) provides quality tutoring services to grades kindergarten through 8th grade in the areas of Language Arts/Reading and Math. Web-based instruction is provided in a ratio of 1 tutor per 8 students for 2 hours per day, twice a week. Each student is given an assessment at the beginning of tutoring services to analyze areas in need of improvement. The student is then engaged in research-based instruction and assessment using the SkillsTutor online curriculum to improve in the needed areas. The SkillsTutor curriculum is aligned to the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations in Language Arts/Reading and Math and the tutors at Know 2 Grow Learning are trained to help students, along with the support of teachers and parents, reach their academic goals while gaining self-confidence in an encouraging environment.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 61
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 300
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 25 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	5	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	60%	80%
	5	Average overall letter grade from parents	B-	B+
Teachers	5	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	5	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	80%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 61 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 5, or 8%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	5	40	55
Attendance	5	20	40
Study habits	5	40	56
Ease of completing homework	5	0	61
Overall grades	5	60	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	5	80	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	5	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **60%** (number responding to the question = 5, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **60%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 61 surveys for this evaluation and 5, or 8%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	5	80	36
Attendance	5	60	23
Classroom achievement	5	60	39
Homework	5	60	33
Math grades	5	60	41
English language arts grades	5	60	36
Overall grades	5	80	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	50	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **80%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **80%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile
Learn It Systems
www.learn-itsystems.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Adekunle Ayinde
1825 Park Avenue Suite 701

Telephone:
212-289-6277

Fax:
212-289-6299

E-mail:
adekunle.ayinde@learn-itsystems.com

New York, NY 10035

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Learn It Systems: Learn It Systems provides tutoring in small groups in reading or math. Students receive 2-4 sessions each week and each session is 60-120 minutes in length. Learn It produces results. Our goal is to help every student achieve his/her full potential and be a successful learner. Learn It has helped thousands of students nationwide learn the fundamental reading and math skills they need to succeed in school and in life. Our program features: * SMALL CLASSES – 3-5 students on average per instructor, per class * PROFESSIONAL INSTRUCTORS – Experienced and specially trained for our programs * PERSONALIZED LEARNING – Individualized Plans for each student, at any level * LITERACY and/or MATH – Research-based, proven effective programs * SNACKS – Afternoon treats help students focus and give them energy * CONVENIENT LOCATION – After school, weekends, and summer, at your child's school

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 18

Offers Transportation: At select sites only

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-8

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20

Number of Students to be Served: 100 - 3000

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	2	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	50%	80%
	2	Average overall letter grade from parents	B-	B+
Teachers	2	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	2	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	100%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 18 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 2, or 11%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	2	50	55
Attendance	2	50	40
Study habits	2	50	56
Ease of completing homework	2	50	61
Overall grades	2	0	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	2	0	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	2	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": % (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **50%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 18 surveys for this evaluation and 2, or 11%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	2	0	36
Attendance	2	0	23
Classroom achievement	2	50	39
Homework	2	50	33
Math grades	2	50	41
English language arts grades	2	50	36
Overall grades	2	50	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	2	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 1 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile RESULTS MENTORING

www.resultsmentoring.org

Overall Rating 2010: B-

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

ELOIS THOMAS
18135 East Nine Mile Road
EASTPOINTE, MI 48021

Telephone:
313-215-0968

Fax:
877-378-5873

E-mail:
elois@resultsmentoring.org

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by RESULTS MENTORING: Results Mentoring uses an intensive, high-quality researched based and data proven intervention curriculum. We are a data driven, state and district aligned, inclusive, systemic, goal oriented, and student centered company. Our small class size creates classroom environments where students thrive and advance. We utilize Skills Tutor online and textbooks that allow the students and instructors to monitor the progress being made. A standard tutorial session includes a 75-minute session twice a week with ratios of 5:1 onsite, 8:1 in a classroom or lab setting and 30:1 for online instruction. Our tutor preferred qualifications are certified teachers and/or Master Degreed individuals with specialties in the areas of service. The minimal tutorial qualifications include at least 24 college credits in education, math or related field to tutor students. We also incorporate parent training, community involvement and mentoring programs to further enhance the students' success.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 121
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 35
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Genesee, Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	5	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	60%	80%
	5	Average overall letter grade from parents	B-	B+
Teachers	6	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	6	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	100%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E - Failing."
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 121 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 5, or 4%, returned a survey.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	5	20	55
Attendance	5	20	40
Study habits	5	60	56
Ease of completing homework	5	60	61
Overall grades	5	40	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	5	0	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	5	0	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **50%** (number responding to the question = 4, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **80%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **60%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 80%)

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 70 surveys for this evaluation and 6, or 9%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement

Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	6	83	36
Attendance	6	67	23
Classroom achievement	6	100	39
Homework	6	83	33
Math grades	6	100	41
English language arts grades	6	100	36
Overall grades	6	100	38

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	5	40	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	5	100	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")

- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **100%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 6 districts. Coordinators in 5 districts, or 83%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	4	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	5	0	2	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	5	2	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	5	0	2	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair to Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	5	80	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	4	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	3	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		67
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	3		67

Provider Profile Hope4Learning

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No surveys were returned

Overall Rating in 2009: C-

Overall Rating in 2008: A

Contact Information:

Elise Webb
P.O. Box 596
Farmington, MI 48332

Telephone:
313-316-2358

Fax:
248-851-3078

E-mail:
hope4learning@gmail.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Hope4Learning: Hope4Learning is designed to meet the academic needs of all students with a specific focus on the Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE's) which include the knowledge necessary to be successful at each grade level, along with MEAP skills by actively engaging students in "hands-on" activities, research, discovery and learning in order to close achievement gaps, and ensure academic success. Hope4Learning's goal is take students from where they are, to where they need to be.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 1
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32
Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 200
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Oakland and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Academic Achievement Information:

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	2	<10	5	2	<10
6	3	<10	6	3	<10
7	6	C	7	6	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Provider Profile

Kidz University Educational Tutoring Services

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No surveys were returned

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Gina Coleman
26571 West 12 Mile Road
Southfield, MI 48034

Telephone:
248-376-3585

Fax:
248-723-0974

E-mail:
kidzuniversitynj@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Kidz University Educational Tutoring Services: The mode of instruction is consistent with the goals of the public school system in which we consistently work in collaboration. Children are capable of learning despite their background, ethnicity, disability, etc. Once enrolled into the program students are given a pretest to assess their academic needs and in turn are tutored accordingly using a state approved research based curriculum STAMS/STARS. Each group is tutored by a certified teacher 2 to 3 times a week for 90 minute sessions. We are aware that children with disabilities may need additional help and will provide such by adding an assistant to the class. Along with our trained tutors, we rely on feedback from the classroom teacher so that we are given a wide range of information about the student that will be helpful and aid in the improvement of the child's grades and standardized test scores.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 9
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Yes
Students With Disabilities: Yes
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 30 - 200
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Southfield Public School District, Oak Park City School District, Detroit City School District, Highland Park City Schools, Natakali Talibah Schoolhouse of Detroit, George Crockett Academy, Joy Preparatory Academy, George Washington Carver Academy

Summary Academic Achievement Information:

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.



2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Provider Profile Results

resultsedu.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No surveys were returned

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Charles Rencher
17232 East Warren
Detroit, MI 48224

Telephone:
313-715-6100

Fax:

E-mail:
resultsedu@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Results: RESULTS provides Mathematics, English, and Social Studies tutorial services throughout the state of Michigan through innovative curricula and constructive teaching methods. Students are given quantitative and qualitative assessments that pinpoint each individual's functional grade level performance and provides a detailed analysis of learning deficiencies based upon Michigan Content Standards and Expectations. RESULTS administers the Brigance, Terra Nova, ACT, and Multiple Intelligence Inventory with written and observational assessments to develop each student's Individualized Learning Plan. RESULTS provides meaningful student activities that tie into the classroom construction of knowledge. Students receive three 90-minute sessions/week in which time-on-task is maximized by a rotating method of instruction: • 30-minute focused learning kinesthetic skill-building activities based on needs assessments; • 30-minute cognitive application of skills through online course preparation (computer-based); • 30-minute performance assessment (computer based) RESULTS has been successful because all tutors and staff are either certified or meet criteria fulfilling Highly Qualified status.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 3
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 8 - 200
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 15 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Academic Achievement Information:

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.



2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Provider Profile
Tutorial Services
www.tutorialservices.org

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No surveys were returned
Overall Rating in 2009: Not available
Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Kristie Schaufele 166 S. Industrial Dr. Saline, MI 48176	<u>Telephone:</u> 734-470-6387	<u>Fax:</u> 734-470-6402	<u>E-mail:</u> kschaufele@tutorialservices.org
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Tutorial Services: Our program combines on-line instruction with phone-based tutoring support, which is provided to students in their home. We use the on-line K-12 CompassLearning Odyssey (CLO) reading, language arts, science and math curricula, which are aligned with National as well as Michigan State content standards. The ratio with our highly qualified tutors, minimum of 60 college credits, shall be one on one. We will provide students with computers and internet reimbursement. The pre program assessment provides a comprehensive standards-aligned assessment of the students learning needs. Our tutors combine the CLO diagnostic results with standardized test score data and information from parents and teachers to create an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) for the student. We ideally like to see each student on the program 2-4 times per week with a minimum of 30 minutes each session.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 4 Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: No Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Via Technology	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30 Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 250 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 0 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per student ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per student
---	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Academic Achievement Information:

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.



The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Provider Profile 123 Learning

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

*No surveys were returned
Not an approved provider for 2010-2011
Overall Rating in 2009: D+
Overall Rating in 2008: Not available*

Contact Information:

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011
Telephone: Fax: E-mail:

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by 123 Learning: Not available

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 13 Offers Transportation: Not available English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Not available	Subject Areas: Not available Grades Served: Not available Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: Not available Number of Students to be Served: Not available Student-Teacher Ratios: <div> Classroom: Not available Computer-based: Not available Online instruction: Not available </div>
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Not available

Summary Academic Achievement Information:

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores¹

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	11	C	3	12	C
4	17	C-	4	16	C
5	18	C	5	14	C
6	52	C	6	47	C
7	52	C	7	50	B

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

¹ Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Provider Profile

ESRP ComfortZone Tutorial Program

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No data available

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Cozette Calvert
P O Box 401306
redford Twp, MI 48240

Telephone:
313-948-8364

Fax:
313-534-4209

E-mail:
comfortzone@esrpllc.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by ESRP ComfortZone Tutorial Program: The ComfortZone Program incorporates character education and methods of Precision and Direct Instruction to raise academic achievement. Appropriate assessments, covering Michigan Department of Education standards, help set goals to meet MDE, district and classroom objectives. Program effectiveness involves instructor-family-teacher collaboration and practice strategies which foster students' thinking, fluency in subject matters, and positive learning. Standard 1-2 hour sessions, 1-3 times/week, run 6 to 8 weeks to provide approximately 30 service hours; however various schedules may be designed to accommodate families and students. School and community facilities within close proximity to students, schools, and instructional staff are used to provide services. Sites offering environmental intrigue and/or innovative experiences may be used with approval. Presently, the program is not technologically based; however, when needed, public library sessions are held. Instructional materials include course texts and educational resources which foster metacognition, target course objectives and measure performance.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: At select sites only
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility,
Place of Religious Worship, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: 3-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 2 - 10
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 6 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Clarenceville School District, Academy of Oak Park, Willow Run Community Schools, Dearborn City School District, Hamtramck Public Schools, Highland Park City Schools, School District of the City of Inkster, Taylor School District, Westwood Community Schools, Michigan Technical Academy, Academy of Detroit-West, Cesar Chavez Academy, Academy for Business and Technology, Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences, Academy of Inkster, Life Skills Center of Metropolitan Detroit

Provider Profile

EUP Learning Center, Inc.

www.euplearningcenter.org

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Susie Schlehuber
7708 W Partridge Row
Brimley, MI 49715

Telephone:
906-248-2700

Fax:
906-632-6629

E-mail:
info@euplearningcenter.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by EUP Learning Center, Inc.: Tucked away in a scenic corner of the eastern Upper Peninsula, the EUP Learning Center is a refuge for students facing a variety of educational needs, a place where teachers share their love of learning with pupils ? and where those pupils find themselves achieving things they never thought possible. The center provides comprehensive testing that determines a student?s age- or grade-level performance, pinpointing areas where he or she needs help. Also offered is screening to identify each student?s own best style of learning, their ?comfort zone? for different types of instruction, and any other hurdles they may face. Together, the tests give students, parents and center staff a clear picture of what needs to be done, then helps them work together to design the best course of instruction to meet those goals. The EUPLC currently has a 95% success rate of reaching set goals.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: No

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Place of Business, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30

Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 2 students

■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per student

■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per student

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Sault Ste. Marie Area Schools, Detour Area Schools, Pickford Public Schools, Rudyard Area Schools, Brimley Area Schools, Whitefish Township Schools, Joseph K. Lumsden Bahweting Anishnabe Academy, Ojibwe Charter School, Tahquamenon Area Schools, St. Ignace Area Schools, Les Cheneaux Community Schools, Engadine Consolidated Schools, Moran Township School District, Mackinac Island Public Schools

Provider Profile Goodman's Place

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010
Overall Rating in 2009: Not available
Overall Rating in 2008: A-

Contact Information:

Eleanor M. Goodman
840 East Ninth Street
Flint, MI 48503

Telephone:
810-787-4757

Fax:
810-787-4757

E-mail:
goodgen44@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Goodman's Place: Goodman's Place uses Study Island as its model of instruction and assessment. Goal setting begins with data from state, and school assessments. Study Island's web-based, national, state and local content standards-based and alignment, immediate feedback, goal (GLCEs) oriented assessments, cumulative assessment reports for data-driven instruction, and has a positive impact on LEP and underachieving students in the areas of reading and math. Goodman's Place uses the Objective-Based and Inquiry-Based Learning Approaches as the educational approach for building blocks of knowledge and imparting the skills of how-to-learn and apply-that-learning. Goodman's Place works in the school where students spend their regular day; works with small groups (5 to 1) of similar skill needs; uses mini-lessons, appropriate worksheets, charts, and manipulatives to guide student growth. One hour of reading and one hour of math, once per week will give students enough time to connect and digest new information.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 16
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 50
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 5 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Genesee County. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Macomb Intermediate School District

www.misd.net

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Monika Leasure
440001 Garfield
Clinton Twp., MI 48038

Telephone:
586-228-3513

Fax:
586-286-2809

E-mail:
mleasure@misd.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Macomb Intermediate School District: The Macomb Intermediate School District's REACH program will be provided onsite at schools in local districts by district personnel, with MISD supervising the implementation and evaluation of the program. Instruction in reading/English language arts and mathematics will be provided for students in grades two-eight. Certified teachers will deliver instruction in a minimum of two, maximum of four sessions per week in each subject, for 60-75 minutes, depending on student age/grade. Students with disabilities and limited English proficient students will be served by the modification of instruction. The MISD will: -Train all personnel in the REACH curriculum, assessment methods and reporting procedures -Provide access to all curriculum materials and program access for the online assessment. - Monitor/supervise the implementation and provide support for modification of curriculum to meet the needs of special populations. -Collect data on aggregate student performance and growth for evaluating the program.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: 2-8

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 40

Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 250

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Macomb County. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning Center Brownstown,MI

N/A

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No data available

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Barbara Ratusznik
24904 Mapleridge Lane
Brownstown, MI 48134

Telephone:
734-775-9242

Fax:
723-671-6245

E-mail:
bsylvanbrown@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning Center Brownstown,MI: Sylvan provides reading or math instruction to all students. Each student begins with an assessment. Assessments include computer and paper-based tests. A plan is developed for each individual student. Conferences are held with parents after the initial assessment and three more times after every twelve hours of instruction. The program is 36 hours. The length of each session is one hour. Students are recommended to attend two to four hours per week, and may attend two hours in one day. The student to teacher ratio is 3:1. Instruction occurs on-site Monday through Saturday. Instructional materials include textbooks, worksheets, manipulatives, and computer programs. At the end of the program, a final assessment is given. Sylvan guarantees that students will improve at least one grade level within the Academic Reading or Sylvan Math Essentials programs. Sylvan is 90% effective at making the guarantee.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: No

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 100

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Monroe and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning of Battle Creek

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Tina Denanny
4625 Beckley Road, Suite 101
Battle Creek, MI 49015

Telephone:
269-979-0025

Fax:
269-979-2569

E-mail:
sylvabc@comcast.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Battle Creek: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs as identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Branch, Calhoun, Eaton, and Kalamazoo counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning of Grandville

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Lindsay Reynolds
4330 44th St. SW
Grandville, MI 49418

Telephone:
616-530-8488

Fax:
616-530-4910

E-mail:
slcgv@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Grandville: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Allegan, Kent, and Ottawa counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile
Sylvan Learning of Muskegon
 www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No data available

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: A

Contact Information:

Maria Pashak 427 Seminole Drive Suite 201 Muskegon, MI 49444	<u>Telephone:</u> 231-733-1391	<u>Fax:</u> 231-733-8101	<u>E-mail:</u> slcmk.slcmk@verizon.net
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Muskegon: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Place of Business	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36 Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50 Student-Teacher Ratios: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Classroom: 1 teacher per 3 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Computer-based: Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Online instruction: Not available
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Lake, Mason, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, and Ottawa counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning of Petoskey

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Katy Eggle
1420 Plaza Dr.
Petoskey, MI 49770

Telephone:
231-348-2679

Fax:
231-348-2936

E-mail:
slcpetoskey@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Petoskey: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs as identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Antrim, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Chippewa, Emmet, Luce, Mackinac, Otsego, and Presque Isle counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile
Sylvan Learning of Rockford
 www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010
 Overall Rating in 2009: Not available
 Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Carrie Muterspaugh 6840 Northway Dr. Unit B Rockford, MI 49341	<u>Telephone:</u> 616-863-8835	<u>Fax:</u> 616-863-8894	<u>E-mail:</u> slcrockford@sbcglobal.net
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Rockford: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs as identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Place of Business	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36 Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 3 students ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Ionia, Kent, Macomb, Montcalm, Newaygo, Osceola, and Ottawa counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning of Traverse City

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Beth Eggle
2506 Crossing Circle Suite B
Traverse city, MI 49684

Telephone:
231-941-0060

Fax:
231-941-0301

E-mail:
slctc11@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Traverse City: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs as identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Antrim, Benzie, Crawford, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, Leelanau, Manistee, Ogemaw, Roscommon, and Wexford counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Washtenaw Intermediate School District

www.wash.k12.mi.us

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Pam Mish 1819 S. Wagner Rd. PO 1406 Ann Arbor, MI 48106	<u>Telephone:</u> 734-994-8100	<u>Fax:</u> 734-994-2203	<u>E-mail:</u> pmish@wash.k12.mi.us
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Washtenaw Intermediate School District: The WISD will implement after school SES sessions during the school year in mathematics and reading. Student classrooms are grouped by either math OR reading and by grade OR grade range (1-3, 4-5). Each classroom will deliver personalized learning through differentiated instruction and have a maximum of 10 students (minimum 8 students). Students meet one hour after school, three days a week. Based on students' assessment data, a personalized plan with bi-weekly goals will be established for each child. The learning objectives will be aligned with the student learning plan which is co-constructed with parents and district representatives. Instruction will be delivered through individualized and small group instruction. Reading instruction will focus on phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, and comprehension. Mathematics instruction will focus on computation, problem solving, and reasoning. Both content areas will be aligned with the local curriculum, state standards/benchmarks and GLCEs.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: At select sites only

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: 1-5

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 75

Number of Students to be Served: 8 - 10

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Ann Arbor Public Schools, School District of Ypsilanti, Chelsea School District, Dexter Community School District, Lincoln Consolidated School District, Manchester Community Schools, Milan Area Schools, Saline Area Schools, Whitmore Lake Public Schools, Willow Run Community Schools, Honey Creek Community School

Provider Profile

Ypsilanti Community Resource Non-Profit Organization

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No data available

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Ryan Owens 200 Harriet Street Ypsilanti, MI 48197	<u>Telephone:</u> 248-786-8232	<u>Fax:</u> 734-483-3329	<u>E-mail:</u> ryano@messias temple.org
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Ypsilanti Community Resource Non-Profit Organization: The plan will include grade level content expectations; specified by the Michigan Department of Education and that are aligned to the curriculum in use. The tutoring program will be tailored to meet the needs of students, individually. The goal is to help students attain proficiency in meeting the State's academic achievement standards. Teacher(s) within the program will use the same research-based strategies that local school educators utilize. The Ypsilanti Community Non-Profit Organization will provide supplemental educational services at Messiah Temple Church in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Each student will be required to attend at least 6 hours per week. Sessions will be held Monday through Saturday each week during academic year (5-7 pm); Saturday and summer break sessions will be held from 10am to noon. Accelerated Reading and Math will be used to help students increase learning. Incorporating the Work Keys program will assist in meeting requirements of No Child Left Behind.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: At select sites only English Language Learner: No Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36 Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 30 Student-Teacher Ratios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Ann Arbor Public Schools, School District of Ypsilanti, Lincoln Consolidated School District, Willow Run Community Schools

Provider Profile
Sylvan Learning of Lansing
 www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No data available

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Suzanne Schulte 2500 Kerry Street, Suite 100 Lansing, MI 48912	<u>Telephone:</u> 517-372-7410	<u>Fax:</u> 517-372-9925	<u>E-mail:</u> SylvanLansing@sbcglobal.net
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Lansing: Sylvan Learning Center seeks to partner with area school districts to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around specific needs identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each student's progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of each 36 hours of instruction, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1 – 4 hours and 2 – 5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: No Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Place of Business	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36 Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 150 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 3 students ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
--	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Lansing Public School District

Provider Profile
Catapult Learning
 www.catapultlearning.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010
 Overall Rating in 2009: Not available
 Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Joan Aschmann 470 North 2nd St. 2nd Floor Philadelphia, PA 19123	<u>Telephone:</u> 401-330-7303	<u>Fax:</u> 401-633-6267	<u>E-mail:</u> joan.aschmann@yahoo.com
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Catapult Learning: Catapult Learning has provided tutoring services to students for more than 30 years. Last year, more than 100,000 students nationwide participated in our programs. Our programs help students earn better grades, build confidence, and increase self-esteem. Our highly qualified and dedicated teachers understand how to identify and address students' skill gaps to help them perform successfully at their grade level and beyond. All of Catapult Learning's programs include a pre and post assessment to determine what skills students need help throughout the program. Catapult Learning will be providing students in Michigan teacher-led small-group instruction program with a targeted student to teacher ratio of 5:1. We will be providing 20-35 hours of reading or math instruction. Most students will receive instruction in 2-4, 60-90-minute sessions per week at the students' school site and the majority of Catapult Learning's programs will be delivered during after school hours.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-8 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20 Number of Students to be Served: 300 - 10000 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: Not available
--	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Flint City School District, Beecher Community School District, Lansing Public School District, Grand Rapids Public Schools, Detroit City School District, Dearborn City School District

Provider Profile

CKL

www.coolkidslearn.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Clifford Brazier 7975 NW 154th Street Suite 350 Miami Lakes, FL 33016	<u>Telephone:</u> 800-959-0255	<u>Fax:</u> 866-892-2665	<u>E-mail:</u> cbrazier@coolkidslearn.com
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by CKL: Cool Kids Learn is a non-profit organization, providing children with the academic skills and the love of learning they need to succeed in school and life. Personalized tutoring is in small groups (up to 5 students/ tutor) in Reading/Language Arts and Math for K-12th grades, at schools and other community locations. Each student has an individual Learning Plan, working on weak areas. Tutoring is normally twice a week for 90 minutes, after school or on weekends. Parents are consulted before and during the program on needs and progress, in meetings and written reports. Pre-testing helps to find out what is needed academically as well as each student's particular learning style. Tutors are certified teachers, paraprofessionals or educators who have worked with school-age children. CKL currently tutors in 10 states. Over the past five years, 95% of our students have improved their performance, some with gains of up to 40%.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25 Number of Students to be Served: 50 - 1000 Student-Teacher Ratios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: Not available ■ Online instruction: Not available
--	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District

Provider Profile
GPS Educational Services
www.globalpsychology.net

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010
 Overall Rating in 2009: Not available
 Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Brian Thompson 30177 Northwestern Hwy Suite 104 Farmington Hills, MI 48334	<u>Telephone:</u> 248-798-0073	<u>Fax:</u> 248-254-3447	<u>E-mail:</u> brian@globalpsychology.net
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by GPS Educational Services: The goal of this project is to improve student performance in ELA, Math, Social Studies, and Science by providing tutoring services based on the "supplemental instruction" model. This model uses face-to-face interaction combined with online learning to reduce at-risk rates. The program begins with a grade-level assessment, after which an individual learning plan is created for the student. Trained college graduates, or current university students who have completed the course(s) they tutor with a grade of B+ or better, who have passed the GPS Tutoring Skills assessments. Working in 45 minute sessions, with no greater than a 1-to-5 ratio, our tutors use a variety instructional materials including manipulatives, visuals, and online programs to focus on skills mastery. The ongoing assessments and skills mastery certifications are archived so administration and parents will be able to review sessions and assess the quality of tutoring.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: No English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Student's Home, Via Technology	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 38 Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 100 Student-Teacher Ratios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 20 students
---	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Provider Profile

Intelligent Minds Tutoring

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Harriett Murray
1001 Trevor Place
Detroit, MI 48207

Telephone:
313-393-9386

Fax:

E-mail:
Intelligentmindstutoring@yahoo.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Intelligent Minds Tutoring: Intelligent Minds Tutoring will provide tutoring services in language arts and mathematics using direct instruction and computer based learning to improve students' scores on the MEAP test. The Summer Success Program will be used for the direct instruction in math and reading. Study Island a computer based learning system will be used to reinforce the skills taught in the tutoring sessions. Students will be able to use the Study Island program on their home computers through the Internet. Each student will be assessed to create an individualized learning plan for tutoring. There will be 12 tutoring sessions lasting for 3 hours each. The student teacher ratio will be 1-5 during direct instruction and 1-8 during the computer sessions. All direct instruction will be given by certified teachers. The Summer Success Program and Study Island are research based programs shown to have a positive impact on academic achievement.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility,
Place of Religious Worship, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-5
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 30
Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 50
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District, Aisha Shule/WEB Dubois Prep. Academy School, Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences

Provider Profile
Rocket Learning
 www.rocketlearning.net

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010
 Overall Rating in 2009: Not available
 Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Reginald Richardson 1048 W. 37th St Suite 303 Chicago, IL 60609	<u>Telephone:</u> 773-366-8670	<u>Fax:</u> 773-253-5392	<u>E-mail:</u> reggierichardson@rocketlearning.net
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Rocket Learning: Rocket Learning is a minority owned and operated company that was specifically founded to provide high quality tutoring services. Our objective is to help our students acquire the skills they need to succeed in school and in life. We offer eligible students in grades K-12 small group instruction in English Language Arts or Mathematics within the students' school or at a nearby location. Our program is taught by certified and experienced teachers. We offer instruction on weekdays, weekends and during the summer to provide parents and students the flexibility of choosing a session best suited for their schedules. Weekday sessions are between one and three hours in length and occur at up to 5 days a week; Weekend and summer sessions are between three and six hours in length and occur 2 - 4 days a week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A Offers Transportation: At select sites only English Language Learner: Yes Students With Disabilities: Yes Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship	Subject Areas: English, Mathematics Grades Served: K-12 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20 Number of Students to be Served: 200 - 5000 Student-Teacher Ratios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: 1 teacher per 30 students
---	--

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Provider Profile

Brain Hurricane

www.brainhurricane.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: C+

Contact Information:

Paige Woolery
1 East Erie St. Suite 353
Chicago, IL 60611

Telephone:
773-858-1267

Fax:
888-368-6746

E-mail:
andrew@brainhurricane.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Brain Hurricane: WE MAKE LEARNING FUN! The Brain Hurricane program takes place in your child's school during after-school hours. Brain Hurricane's tutoring program is different from other tutoring programs because Brain Hurricane uses fun and engaging methods to teach. After a long day in school, students need activities to keep them interested. Instead of sitting and listening, students are engaged in problem-solving activities designed to teach important reading and math skills. Because students are paying attention during activities, they remember the important math and reading skills. They look forward to the competitive team-based atmosphere, and are inspired to improve grades and test scores because they LIKE the learning activities, and have FUN learning with their peers. Students demonstrate what they have learned during the program at a fun competition. Parents and family members are invited to attend this fun competition, where students are awarded medals and prizes for good attendance and behavior.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A
Offers Transportation: At select sites only
English Language Learner: Yes
Students With Disabilities: Yes
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility,
Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20
Number of Students to be Served: 40 - 2000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Provider Profile

Developing Math Concepts LLC

developingmathconcepts.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: C

Contact Information:

Dyron McCoy
P.O Box 47760
Oak Park, MI 48237

Telephone:
248-259-9900

Fax:
313-340-1494

E-mail:
dmcconsulting@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Developing Math Concepts LLC: DMC's instructional approach is aligned with Michigan's Framework of Mathematics and Language Arts standards. DMC's focuses its' lessons on differentiated instructions to encompass the student's different learning styles in order to reach and teach all learners. All tutors are highly qualified in Math or Reading, undergo background checks, have ongoing monthly workshops to reflect on student achievement, and access to focus groups and a mentor teacher to help facilitate learning. Our sessions usually last 3 to 4 months offering a variety of options. We have Saturday programs lasting 3 to 4 hours and in-school sessions usually 2 days 2 hours per day for 3 to 5 months. All students are given pre-test, information assessed, learning plan created from data and shared with all stake holders, academic team focuses on goals generated, then post-test given at end of session. Data (progress) always shared with all stakeholders.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Via Technology, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 800
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 12 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Genesee, Monroe, Oakland, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Total Education Solutions

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: C+

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Lynne Porter
306 East Fourth Street
Royal Oak, MI 48067

Telephone:
248-544-0360

Fax:
248-544-0388

E-mail:
lporter@tesidea.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Total Education Solutions: Total Education Solutions (TES) is the leading national provider of contracted special education compliance and staffing to public, private and charter schools throughout California, Michigan and Ohio. The goal of TES' Supplemental Education Services is to assist students to improve their functioning and/or learning capacity. TES' program includes: Pre- and post testing using standardized academic assessment tools; Individual goals and objectives developed for each student; and Services to special education students and English language learners. Our professional staff of tutors all meet Michigan state requirement for Supplemental Service Providers including DOJ fingerprint clearance. Tutors typically have a Bachelor's degree have experience working with children with remedial needs. All tutors receive on-going supervision and training provided by Supervisors who are directed by TES Area Coordinator or Regional Manager holding at least a Master's Degree and full special education or related service credentials and at least five years experience in teaching.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: 1-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25

Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 20

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile

Sylvan Learning of Kalamazoo

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Overall Rating in 2009: B

Overall Rating in 2008: B+

Contact Information:

Mindy Olech 1350 West Centre Ave. Suite 120 Portage, MI 49024	<u>Telephone:</u> 269-327-5237	<u>Fax:</u> 269-327-8742	<u>E-mail:</u> slcportage@sbcglobal.net
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning of Kalamazoo: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs as identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: N/A

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Allegan, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph, and Van Buren counties. Contact provider for details.

Provider Profile
Chancellor Supplemental Educational Services, LLC

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: D+

Contact Information:

SEE 2009-2010 application

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Provider Profile
Empowerment Learning Services

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010
Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

SEE 2009-2010 application

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Provider Profile
GLM Associates

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

SEE 2009-2010 application

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Provider Profile
Life Changing Center Inc.

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

SEE 2009-2010 application

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Provider Profile
Metro Educational Concepts

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

SEE 2009-2010 application

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Provider Profile
M.O.R.E. Learning

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

No students served in 2009-2010

Not an approved provider for 2010-2011

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

SEE 2009-2010 application

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Provider Profile

Vanguard Community Development Corporation, LLC

www.vanguardcdc.org

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: B

Contact Information:

Robert Counts
2785 East Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48211

Telephone:
313-872-7831

Fax:
313-872-7832

E-mail:
rcounts@vanguardcdc.org

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Vanguard Community Development Corporation, LLC: Vanguard's tutorial approach utilizes a researched-based delivery system that identifies, addresses, and corrects academic deficits, as well as helping students master math and the English Language Arts. In addition to traditional instructional methods, we seek to achieve "Learning through the back door" so as to engage less motivated and achieving students in the learning process. Innovative learning modalities will be used, to include: Smart Boards, On-line learning, Computer lab time, class room relevant learning, real life situations, all within a positive environment. The SES program will offer tutorial services for Middle and High School students at Vanguard Community Center and Second Ebenezer Church. The program will operate Monday thru Thursday from 4:00 to 6:00, Saturday 9:00am to 12:00 pm. On-line tutoring in both English and math will be accessible to students 24 hours a day using Skills Tutor software aligned with the National Education standards and the Michigan Curriculum framework.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 13
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: 6-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32
Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Detroit City School District, Hamtramck Public Schools, Highland Park City Schools, School District of the City of Inkster, Redford Union School District, South Redford School District, Aisha Shule/WEB Dubois Prep. Academy School, Academy of Detroit-West, Martin Luther King, Jr. Education Center Academy, Woodward Academy, Henry Ford Academy, HEART Academy, Detroit Academy of Arts and Sciences, David Ellis Academy, Old Redford Academy, Cherry Hill School of Performing Arts, David Ellis Academy West

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents		Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	%	80%
		Average overall letter grade from parents		B+
Teachers	1	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	1	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	0%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 13 surveys for this evaluation and 1, or 8%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	1	0	36
Attendance	1	0	23
Classroom achievement	1	0	39
Homework	1	0	33
Math grades			41
English language arts grades	1	0	36
Overall grades	1	0	38

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 30%)

Provider Profile

Club Z In-Home Tutoring

www.clubztutoring.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Todd Walden
15310 Amberly Drive Ste. 110
Tampa, FL 33647

Telephone:
888-434-2582

Fax:
813-549-0185

E-mail:
ses@clubztutoring.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Club Z In-Home Tutoring: Club Z! has been providing SES in almost 30 states since 2005. Club Z! offers two programs of instruction: One-on-one in-home and small group tutoring sessions (Club Z! Choice). Small group sessions range of 2-5 students per instructor. After an initial assessment, a student learning plan is developed for each student identifying areas of weakness and setting goals for student achievement. Our tutoring sessions can range from 1–2 hours and 2-3 times per week. The total length of the Club Z! Program is 20 hours. Club Z! utilizes curriculum products published by Pearson Education that are aligned to research-based methods of teaching as well as Michigan standards. All Club Z! instructors are highly qualified degreed professionals, certified teachers, or individuals with a minimum of 60 hours of college credit. All instructors have an extensive background check prior to placement with students.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 2
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 20
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 1000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents		Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	%	80%
		Average overall letter grade from parents		B+
Teachers	1	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	E	C
	1	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	0%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 2 surveys for this evaluation and 1, or 50%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	1	0	36
Attendance	1	0	23
Classroom achievement	1	0	39
Homework	1	0	33
Math grades	1	0	41
English language arts grades	1	0	36
Overall grades	1	0	38

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **0%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 district. Coordinators in 1 district, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements

	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	1	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	1	1	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	1	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	0		
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	0		

Provider Profile

Ace It! Powered by Sylvan Learning of West Michigan

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Hillary Malone
3910 Burton St. SE Suite 101
Grand Rapids, MI 49546

Telephone:
616-940-6094

Fax:
616-940-6214

E-mail:
hillary.malone@sbcglobal.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Ace It! Powered by Sylvan Learning of West Michigan: Ace It! begins with a diagnostic assessment for each student using either the GMADE or GRADE to place students in a group for instruction. Each student receives 30 hours of tutoring, and a pre and post test. The curriculum is targeted to essential skills in reading or math and is aligned to state and district benchmarks. The reading curriculum is based on the National Reading Panel research and best practices and the math curriculum content and process standards are based on those outlined by the NCTM. The instructional materials include workbooks, visuals and group activities. Each group will meet twice a week for 120 minutes. The group size will range from 5-8 students and will work with a state certified teacher. A teachers assistant may be provided depending on the needs of the students and the size of the group.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 2
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 34
Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 300
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Allegan, Ionia, Kent, Montcalm, Muskegon, and Ottawa counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents		Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	%	80%
		Average overall letter grade from parents		B+
Teachers	1	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	B	C
	1	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	100%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 2 surveys for this evaluation and 1, or 50%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	1	100	36
Attendance	1	0	23
Classroom achievement	1	0	39
Homework	1	0	33
Math grades			41
English language arts grades	1	0	36
Overall grades	1	100	38

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 district. Coordinators in 1 district, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements

	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Excellent"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile
Arithmetic Solutions
www.arithmeticsolutions.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Kalvin L. Houston
P.O. Box 341
Southfield, MI 48037

Telephone:
248-722-0991

Fax:
248-996-9616

E-mail:
houinv11@netzero.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Arithmetic Solutions: Arithmetic Solutions' one-on-one instructional process is designed to implement a continued progression of the student's mathematics skills throughout their 25-hours of tutoring. We start with an initial assessment test to gauge the student's level of mathematical understanding and to create a specialized Student Learning Plan (SLP). After 15-hours of tutoring, a midway evaluation is conducted and any needed adjustments are made to the tutoring process and program effectiveness. Our program has garnered an 80% success rate for the students who have utilized our services. Each session ranges from 1 to 2.5 hours on average and sessions normally take place 2 to 4 times a week. We tutor in the student's home, a nearby library or local community center and students need only bring a pencil and paper or notepad to access our tutoring services.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 1
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, Student's Home, Other

Subject Areas: Mathematics
Grades Served: 4-12
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 20 - 100
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per student
■ **Computer-based:** Not available
■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Birmingham City School District, Ferndale Public Schools, School District of the City of Royal Oak, Southfield Public School District, Hazel Park City School District, Troy School District, West Bloomfield School District, Oak Park City School District, Academy of Oak Park, Academy of Southfield, Academy of Lathrup Village, Detroit City School District

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers		Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance		C
		Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 1 parent was asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 100%, returned a survey.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	0	55
Attendance	1	0	40
Study habits	1	100	56
Ease of completing homework	1	100	61
Overall grades	1	100	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider			
Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 district. Coordinators in 1 district, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Poor**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	0	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

Learning Center of Southwest Flint

www.learningcentersf.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Genevieve Wright
G-3308 Miller Rd. Suite G
Flint, MI 48507

Telephone:
810-733-0740

Fax:
- -

E-mail:
LearningCenterSF@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Learning Center of Southwest Flint: The Learning Center of Southwest Flint, located on Miller Road, provides excellent one-on-one tutoring by high-quality, certified teachers. We provide one-on-one tutoring for all ages and learning areas. The Learning Center assists students with learning disabilities, ADD, autism, and dyslexia. Students will be evaluated at the beginning of each program. This initial assessment is shared with the parents and determines the program and goals for each student. Tutoring sessions will focus on reading comprehension, phonics, vocabulary, writing skills, math, focus of attention, and learning strategies. An evaluation is then given at the conclusion of the program to measure student growth. The tutoring sessions are one hour in length. The student has two sessions weekly, meeting with the same tutor each session. The tutor talks with the parents after each session regarding the student's progress. The Learning Center provides all instructional materials.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 10

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Yes

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25

Number of Students to be Served: 0 - 40

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 1 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Genesee County. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	3	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	3	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers		Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance		C
		Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 10 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 3, or 30%, returned a survey.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	3	67	55
Attendance	3	33	40
Study habits	3	100	56
Ease of completing homework	3	67	61
Overall grades	3	67	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider			
Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	3	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	3	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 3, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 3, statewide average = 80%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 district. Coordinators in 1 district, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was "**Good**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	0		
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	0		

Provider Profile

Sylvan

www.educate.com

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few data sources were available to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Jodi Mikel
3910 Burton St. SE Suite 102
Grand Rapids, MI 49546

Telephone:
616-957-4617

Fax:
616-957-1728

E-mail:
slcgr01@ameritech.net

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Sylvan: Sylvan Learning seeks to partner with area school districts in order to help students that have been identified by the State of Michigan to develop essential reading and mathematical skills. Sylvan Learning will assess the needs of each student through an assessment to determine specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Each participant will have an individual learning plan designed around the specific needs identified through the assessment. This program will be taught in the traditional Sylvan method, with each students' progress based on skill mastery determined by scores earned through daily work. Instructional materials are provided for the student based on each individual lesson plan. At the completion of 36 hours, students participating in either Reading or Math programs will be given a final progress assessment to determine overall growth. Each session will range from 1-4 hours and 2-5 visits per week.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 103

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Place of Business

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 3 - 50

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 3 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Allegan, Barry, Ionia, and Kent counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	9	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	9	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers		Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance		C
		Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 103 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 9, or 9%, returned a survey.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	9	56	55
Attendance	9	33	40
Study habits	9	78	56
Ease of completing homework	9	67	61
Overall grades	9	56	61

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider			
Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	9	78	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	9	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **88%** (number responding to the question = 8, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **78%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 80%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements					
	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good to Excellent"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan	
	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation			
	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		100

Provider Profile Beyond the Basics

Overall Rating 2010: D

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: D+

Contact Information:

Margaret Rainer
3121 W. McNichols
Detroit, MI 48221

Telephone:
313-345-5111

Fax:
313-345-8441

E-mail:
MargaretRainer@aol.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Beyond the Basics: Beyond The Basics is designed to meet the individual needs of kindergarten through eighth grade students. We provide quality tutoring that engages and addresses individual learning styles using technology and other learning materials that are fun and challenging. Students will experience activities that will help build their knowledge and competence in reading, language arts and mathematics, as well as computer skills, while improving academic achievement. Our Tutors are trained and experienced in delivering services to students based on research proven pedagogical methods. Students are assessed to ascertain their strengths and challenges. Additional assessments are used to monitor progress and growth. Based on assessments and individual learning styles, tutor, parents, and the students' teachers design Individualized Learning Plans that align with the state standards and local district curriculum. We identify and support the needs of each student through targeted instructions that ensures success in meeting state standards.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 41
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: Not available
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36
Number of Students to be Served: 10 - 500
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per 30 students

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Berrien, Calhoun, Eaton, Genesee, Ingham, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Lake, Macomb, Monroe, Muskegon, Oakland, Saginaw, Washtenaw, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents		Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	%	80%
		Average overall letter grade from parents		B+
Teachers	8	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	8	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	13%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	18	C	3	18	C
4	19	C+	4	19	C
5	14	C-	5	15	C
6	8	C	6	11	C
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 41 surveys for this evaluation and 8, or 20%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	8	25	36
Attendance	8	13	23
Classroom achievement	8	38	39
Homework	8	25	33
Math grades	7	14	41
English language arts grades	8	38	36
Overall grades	8	38	38

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.	7	0	21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	7	0	17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was **"Never."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **13%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **0%** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 1 district. Coordinators in 1 district, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements

	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	1	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	1	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	0	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		0
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	1		0

Provider Profile

Much Success Tutoring Services

Overall Rating 2010: B+

Overall Rating in 2009: C

Overall Rating in 2008: A-

Contact Information:

Gregory J. Hattaway
17907 E. Warren
Detroit, MI 48224

Telephone:
313-882-3632

Fax:
313-882-0184

E-mail:
muchsuccess@netscape.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Much Success Tutoring Services: Much Success Tutoring Services is in the business of raising test scores and ensuring academic success in all of our students. We provide small group tutoring (6 students or less), interactive hands on, and minds-on learning for our students. After school tutoring sessions are 2 hours a day, two days a week. Our program aligns with the Michigan Department of Education standards to guarantee your child will receive the best education possible that meets the Michigan Department of Education guidelines. We are equipped to educate our students (from grades K-12) in Math, Reading, and English Language Arts. We develop academic goals that are unique to your child's needs based upon our assessments.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 36

Offers Transportation: No

English Language Learner: Not available

Students With Disabilities: Not available

Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility,
Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics

Grades Served: K-12

Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 36

Number of Students to be Served: 5 - 3000

Student-Teacher Ratios:

■ **Classroom:** 1 teacher per 5 students

■ **Computer-based:** Not available

■ **Online instruction:** Not available

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Numerous in Genesee, Ingham, Jackson, Kent, Macomb, Muskegon, Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne counties. Contact provider for details.

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents		Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	%	80%
		Average overall letter grade from parents		B+
Teachers	5	Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	A	C
	5	Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	60%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	8	C	7	7	C

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance is from responses to seven questions about students' classroom performance. An average across all items (excluding items with no response) was calculated for each provider and the top 20% of scores were coded as "A," the next 20% were coded as "B," and so on through "E."
- The rating of teachers' perceptions of provider impact on student learning is based on responses to the agree-disagree question, "This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning." Responses of "agree" or "strongly agree" are considered.

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 35 surveys for this evaluation and 5, or 14%, were returned.

Teacher Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward class	4	50	36
Attendance	4	50	23
Classroom achievement	4	75	39
Homework	4	75	33
Math grades	4	75	41
English language arts grades	1	100	36
Overall grades	2	100	38

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Teacher Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider*

Survey Question	Number of Teachers Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed the student's goals or tutoring plan with me before tutoring began.			21
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student			17

*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers statewide were not aware specific students were receiving SES until they were asked to complete the survey and were not asked these questions.

- When asked, "Approximately how often has the tutor given you written or verbal reports about the student's progress?" the most frequent response was "." Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Teachers choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered. (The most common statewide response was "never.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **60%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 30%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **60%** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 30%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements

	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	1	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	1	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Fair to Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	50	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	2	100	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	2		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		100

Provider Profile

Your Financial Insight

www.yourfinancialinsight.org

Overall Rating 2010: Not available

Too few surveys were returned to estimate an overall grade

Overall Rating in 2009: Not available

Overall Rating in 2008: D+

Contact Information:

Vicky Franklin 19785 W. 12 Mile Rd. #211 Southfield, MI 48076	<u>Telephone:</u> 248-930-8485	<u>Fax:</u> 313-493-8955	<u>E-mail:</u> vroshall@yourfinancialinsight.org
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by Your Financial Insight: Your Financial Insight's "Banking Your Skills" (BYS) Tutoring Program is designed to help increase academic achievement in math for students in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade. Our program will use the Direct Instruction Method approach. The BYS program integrates financial literacy, mathematics and technology. The BYS program will be offered during the academic year. Each session will be held 2 days a total of 2 hours per week. Students will have one hour of classroom instruction which will include differentiated lessons, lecture, drills and practices and one hour of computer-based instruction to re-enforce materials taught. Students will receive a total of 32 sessions. All materials provided will be aligned to Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. Classes will be held at a location that is accessible for students (school, community center, etc.). A minimum of 25 students must enroll in order to serve a LEA and a maximum of 200.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 56 Offers Transportation: At select sites only English Language Learner: Not available Students With Disabilities: Not available Place(s) of Service: Community Center, LEA Facility, Place of Religious Worship, Student's Home	Subject Areas: Mathematics Grades Served: 6-8 Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 32 Number of Students to be Served: 25 - 200 Student-Teacher Ratios: ■ Classroom: 1 teacher per 5 students ■ Computer-based: 1 teacher per 8 students ■ Online instruction: Not available
---	---

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	1	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	1	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers		Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance		C
		Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	0	Not available	5	0	Not available
6	4	<10	6	2	<10
7	2	<10	7	4	<10

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 56 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 1, or 2%, returned a survey.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	1	100	55
Attendance	1	100	40
Study habits	1	100	56
Ease of completing homework	1	0	61
Overall grades	1	100	61

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	1	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	1	100	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **100%** (number responding to the question = 1, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 82%).
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 1, statewide average = 80%).

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 2 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements

	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	1	1	0	0
Submission of invoices	2	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	2	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	1	100	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	1	0	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	1		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	0		

Provider Profile

ATS Educ. Cons. Serv.-Proj. Success

www.ATSProjectSuccessWorks.com

Overall Rating 2010: B

Overall Rating in 2009: B+

Overall Rating in 2008: Not available

Contact Information:

Renee Weaver-Wright
20674 Hall Rd.
Clinton Township, MI 48038

Telephone:
800-297-2119

Fax:
586-465-9481

E-mail:
info@ATSProjectSuccessWorks.com

Program Information:

Program Description as Provided by ATS Educ. Cons. Serv.-Proj. Success: ATS Project Success offers eligible K-8 students support in language arts, reading, and mathematics. Services are provided online in the comfort and safety of the students' homes with a loaned, pre-programmed computer, SuccessMaker(r) software, and dial-up Internet service at no cost. Tutors assess students to determine the curriculum, learning objectives, and instructional level activities. Students are encouraged to complete two one-hour sessions a week. Students' progress is monitored online, followed by e-mails to the students, weekly calls and monthly reports (English or Spanish) to the parents, and monthly reports to the district. We work with schools and teachers to make sure the students' efforts in the program are helping them succeed in the classroom as well. Tutors meet or exceed the qualifications for paraprofessionals to comply with NCLB legislation; 66% have two years experience, at a minimum, tutoring SES students in the program.

The program description was created by the provider and has not been edited by the Michigan Department of Education.

Number of Students Served in 2009-2010: 48
Offers Transportation: No
English Language Learner: No
Students With Disabilities: Not available
Place(s) of Service: LEA Facility, Student's Home, Via Technology

Subject Areas: English, Mathematics
Grades Served: K-8
Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student: 25
Number of Students to be Served: 1 - 1000
Student-Teacher Ratios:
■ **Classroom:** Not available
■ **Computer-based:** 1 teacher per 8 students
■ **Online instruction:** 1 teacher per student

2010-2011 Service Areas:

Statewide

Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:¹

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	This Provider's Rating	Statewide Average
Parents	12	Percent of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	100%	80%
	12	Average overall letter grade from parents	A	B+
Teachers		Constructed letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance		C
		Percent of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	%	30%

*For many tutors, the number of surveys completed is very low. Readers should consider the number of responses when drawing conclusions about any provider.

¹ Where parent or teacher data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Academic Achievement: Impact of Provider's Services on 2009 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores²

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	Not available	3	0	Not available
4	0	Not available	4	0	Not available
5	4	<10	5	4	<10
6	0	Not available	6	0	Not available
7	0	Not available	7	0	Not available

Key: "A" – substantially above average, "B" – above average, "C" – average, "D" – below average, "E" – substantially below average, "<10" – fewer than 10 students were served for this subject/grade and results are suppressed to protect the confidentiality of students' information.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2008-2009 school year.

How the Statistics Were Calculated:

Consumer satisfaction data is from a mail survey of parents and an online survey of teachers concerning students receiving supplemental education services in the 2009-2010 school year.

- Parent satisfaction statistics are based on responses to the question, "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?" Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure."
- Parent letter grades are based on averaged responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" with response options of "A - Excellent," "B - Good," "C - Average," "D - Poor," or "E – Failing."

Impact on the MEAP score is based on a hierarchical linear regression analysis focused on MEAP scores in fall 2009 for students receiving SES in the prior school year. The scaled math and reading scores of SES participants were compared to a matched control group of students not receiving SES. These nonparticipating students were drawn from the same school buildings and grades as SES participants, and matched to SES recipients on the basis of their 2008 MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2008 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data. Additional information is available upon request from the Michigan Department of Education.

Comprehensive Survey Information

The following sections present all useable data from surveys of parents, teachers, and district coordinators. The reader is cautioned that, for many providers, the count of respondents to the parent, teacher, and/or district coordinator surveys is very low. This means that a small number of people have a large amount of influence on the provider rating.

Parent Survey Data

- 48 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 12, or 25%, returned a survey.

Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement			
Improvement Noted Since Tutoring Began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Percent Noting Improvement Statewide
Attitude toward school	12	92	55
Attendance	12	75	40
Study habits	12	83	56
Ease of completing homework	12	92	61
Overall grades	12	92	61

² Where academic achievement data were not available, tables will appear with empty cells.

Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Yes" Statewide
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	12	100	63
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	12	92	47

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the most frequent response was **"More than once per month."** Choices included "more than once per month," "monthly," "every two months," "quarterly," or "never." Parents choosing "not sure" or leaving the question blank were not considered.
- Among those receiving written reports on their child's progress (64% of parents statewide received a report), percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **92%** (number responding to the question = 12, statewide average = 68%).
- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100%** (number of respondents = 12, statewide average = 80%)

District Coordinator Survey Data

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 3 districts, or 100%, returned a survey.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance With Administrative Requirements

	Number of Districts Reporting That...				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did Not Submit as Required	Submission Was Not Timely	Materials Were Not Accurate	Materials Were Not Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	0	0	0	0

- When asked, "Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of providers to district requests for the required information?" the average response was **"Good"** from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan

	Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0
Program content	0
Assessments	0

District Rating of Provider's Implementation

	Number of Coordinators Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Percent "Mostly Positive"
Tutoring services offered regularly	3	100	
Students frequently absent or have sporadic attendance	2	50	
If provider utilizes school facilities for tutoring, facilities are used in accordance with district guidelines	3	33	
Overall tone of teacher comments/perceptions of provider	3		100
Overall tone of parent comments/perceptions of provider	2		100