

# Globutronic Technology

**Overall Rating: C**

**Contact Information:**

Melvin Hatcher  
29556 Southfield Road Suite 210  
Southfield, Mi 48076

**Telephone:** (248) 808-3135  
**Fax:** (248) 424-9542  
**E-mail:** globutronic@sbcglobal.net

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by Globutronic Technology:** Programs offered at Globutronic Educational Services are totally individualized, and based on the student's academic needs. Academic instruction is offered in the following areas: Reading, writing and math strategies with methods of instruction as outlined by the state and district standards used by all our staff. The educational technology with manual instructions provided by our tutors in math and reading allow each student to have a fully integrated learning prescription. We seek to address developmental needs of the total child from elementary through high school intellectually, culturally and behaviorally. Accomplishments can be validated by the increase in students' achievement in classes, along with mastery of skills on state and district tests. All students are given a pretest, mid-test and post-test assessments. The length of a tutorial session is usually two hours, three days a week. We typically recommend a minimum of thirty hours for improved achievement.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 209 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> Yes <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple)	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 20 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 25 - 1200 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 10 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
---	--

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	10	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	50%
	10	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B-
	9	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B-
Teachers	6	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	6	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	66.7%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	No data available	3	0	No data available
4	5	<10	4	5	<10
5	5	<10	5	5	<10
6	9	<10	6	10	C
7	10	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 209 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 10, or 5%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	9	100	67
Attendance	10	80	70
Study habits	10	60	63
Ease of completing math homework	10	80	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	10	70	68
Math grades	10	80	61
English language arts grades	10	80	64
Overall grades	10	80	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	9	38	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	10	20	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between every two months and 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **37.5** (number responding to the question = 8, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	9	89	78
Tutoring location is convenient	10	20	94
Tutoring time is convenient	10	90	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **70** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **70** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **50** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 209 surveys for this evaluation and 6, or 3%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	6	67	52
Attendance	6	50	52
Classroom achievement	6	67	58
Homework	6	67	56
Math grades	4	75	49
English language arts grades	4	100	50
Overall grades	6	50	43

**Table 5: 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	100	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	3	100	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **67** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **60** (number of respondents = 5, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	1	1	1	1
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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B

## Program & Project Management Services

**Overall Rating: B-**

### Contact Information:

Terry A. Lang  
3370 Cambridge  
Detroit, Mi 48221

**Telephone:**  
(313) 445-8168

**Fax:**  
(313) 341-5655

**E-mail:**  
TLang1@comcast.net

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by Program & Project Management Services:** The A+ Supplemental Program utilizes a "small-group" and individualized "self-paced" learning environment with curriculum that is consistent with the Michigan State Standards/grade level expectations and District's Pacing Guides in mathematics and reading. The A+ Supplemental Program also uses a technology component: The Anywhere Learning Management System; and uses a math and reading intervention component, developed by: MacMillan/McGraw Hill. Academic research has shown that a student using the technology component complimented with small-group instructions on an average of 30-90 minutes, three (3) days per week, demonstrated academic gains on an average, of 35% in Mathematics and 40% in reading. Students receive an assessment in math and reading to determine the Individual Educational Plan, designed specifically for tutoring. Tutoring sessions are held, 3 days per week, for 2 hours per session. All tutors are State certified and have completed all police clearances required of the NCLB Legislation.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 84 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple)	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 35 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 100 - 500 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
---	--

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	13	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	100%
	13	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	A-
	12	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	4	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	4	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	50%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

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	31	D
4	27	C	4	28	C
5	23	C	5	23	C
6	13	C	6	13	C
7	51	C	7	60	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 84 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 13, or 15%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	12	75	67
Attendance	11	55	70
Study habits	13	77	63
Ease of completing math homework	13	77	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	13	69	68
Math grades	12	58	61
English language arts grades	13	46	64
Overall grades	12	58	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	13	91	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	13	39	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **90.9** (number responding to the question = 11, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	13	92	78
Tutoring location is convenient	13	39	94
Tutoring time is convenient	13	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **92** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **100** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 84 surveys for this evaluation and 4, or 5%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	4	50	52
Attendance	4	25	52
Classroom achievement	4	50	58
Homework	4	50	56
Math grades	3	33	49
English language arts grades	3	33	50
Overall grades	4	25	43

**Table 5: 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	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	50	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **50** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **50** (number of respondents = 4, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	1	1	1	1
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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B

## EduTech Cognitive Therapy, LLC

www.edutech4learning.com

**Overall Rating: B-**

### Contact Information:

Roderica James	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
8900 East Jefferson Ste #1030 Detroit, MI 48214	(248) 224-3445	(313) 864-8292	director@edutech4learning.com

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by EduTech Cognitive Therapy, LLC:** EduTech Cognitive Therapy is a state-approved SES provider that provides free tutoring in reading and math 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 educational needs (e.g., mildly cognitively impaired, at risk for failing, and ELL-Spanish-speaking). Our highly-qualified tutors service students in school, at our center, or in the home or library; and many are Sp. Ed. Certified. Students attend 1-2 sessions per week, and they receive a total of 32 hours of high-intensity tutoring in one-on-one or small group sessions. Tutors diagnose each student's needs, and prepare individualized learning plans 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.*

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 344 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> Yes <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home, Via Technology	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 24 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 0 - 750 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per student <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per student <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per student
---	--

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	49	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	75.5%
	45	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B+
	47	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	68	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	B
	68	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	52.9%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	22	B	3	24	C
4	19	C	4	19	C
5	8	<10	5	9	<10
6	39	C	6	46	C
7	30	C	7	29	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 344 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 50, or 15%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	50	70	67
Attendance	49	67	70
Study habits	50	64	63
Ease of completing math homework	48	75	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	50	70	68
Math grades	50	74	61
English language arts grades	50	70	64
Overall grades	49	69	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	49	79	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	49	61	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between monthly and every two months."** 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **79.1** (number responding to the question = 43, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	50	76	78
Tutoring location is convenient	49	61	94
Tutoring time is convenient	47	94	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **80** (number of respondents = 50, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **74** (number of respondents = 50, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **76** (number of respondents = 49, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 344 surveys for this evaluation and 72, or 21%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	68	57	52
Attendance	67	54	52
Classroom achievement	68	62	58
Homework	68	54	56
Math grades	41	22	49
English language arts grades	40	55	50
Overall grades	67	37	43

**Table 5: 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.	40	33	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	40	23	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **53** (number of respondents = 68, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **46** (number of respondents = 68, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 1 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 200%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	2	2	2	2
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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	1	D+	B	1	D+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B

## Higher School Publishing

www.higherschool.com

**Overall Rating: C+**

### Contact Information:

David Irving 3125 Catrina Lane Annapolis, MD 21403	<u>Telephone:</u> (410) 626-0076	<u>Fax:</u> (240) 235-6621	<u>E-mail:</u> dirving@higherschool.com
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by Higher School Publishing:** HigherSchool's program, correlated to Michigan State Standards, has been successful in improving and increasing student performance in Reading, Language Arts and Math. Underperforming and disadvantaged students in Detroit have improved by over 60% during each of the past two years; including children with learning disabilities, through hands-on tutoring and online instruction. Students build confidence by steady progression through lesson plans and built-in assessments. Instruction, also available in Spanish, focuses on core skills and concepts. Lessons are understandable and provide thorough coverage of each subject to help students achieve grade-level mastery. We offer more than 1000 interactive lessons. Each module begins with a brief introductory tutorial, a lesson, and a test to determine understanding. Students meet for 2 hours, 3-4 times per week. Audio and feedback are incorporated. Our courses are both diagnostic and prescriptive. Workbooks are also provided for group instruction. Our program includes parental involvement workshops and provide professional development for our tutors as well as school staff.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 93 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home, Via Technology	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 26 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 8 - 500 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students</li> <li>■ <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students</li> <li>■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per student</li> </ul>
--	--

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	8	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	100%
	8	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	A-
	8	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B
Teachers	15	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	15	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	46.7%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	6	<10	3	5	<10
4	5	<10	4	6	<10
5	6	<10	5	5	<10
6	20	C	6	18	C
7	17	C	7	18	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 93 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 8, or 9%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	8	38	67
Attendance	8	63	70
Study habits	8	50	63
Ease of completing math homework	8	63	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	8	50	68
Math grades	8	38	61
English language arts grades	8	38	64
Overall grades	8	50	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	8	50	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	7	43	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between every two months and 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **50** (number responding to the question = 8, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	7	71	78
Tutoring location is convenient	7	43	94
Tutoring time is convenient	8	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **88** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **67** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **100** (number of respondents = 8, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 93 surveys for this evaluation and 15, or 16%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	15	60	52
Attendance	14	57	52
Classroom achievement	15	60	58
Homework	14	50	56
Math grades	8	38	49
English language arts grades	9	33	50
Overall grades	15	40	43

**Table 5: 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	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	2	50	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **47** (number of respondents = 15, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **39** (number of respondents = 13, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B

## ExamExperts Learning Centers

www.examexperts.com

**Overall Rating: C**

### Contact Information:

Mark J. Mayberry 45647 Fountain View Drive Canton, MI 48188	<u>Telephone:</u> (313) 289-4232	<u>Fax:</u> (313) 557-0018	<u>E-mail:</u> mmayb58229@aol.com
---	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by ExamExperts Learning Centers:** Since 1995, ExamExperts Learning Centers have vigorously promoted academic achievement and intellectual discipline through innovative personal tutoring, ACT/SAT exam preparation training, and online tutorial instruction for students, grades K - 12. Over 25,000 students have completed our high-quality, motivational academic programs. For your convenience, we maintain two 2,000+ square foot learning centers right in the heart of Detroit, and also service students statewide at our in-school and community locations. Students have attained over 8 million dollars in college scholarships due to higher test scores. New students will complete an assessment to determine academic needs, then academic goals are set. Our goal is "get our students to the top of the class-- and keep them there!" Tutorial sessions take place for 1 to 2 hours, twice per week, after-school and on Saturdays. Our online tutorial module allows our students 24 hour access to 1,500 additional practice questions, and achievement awards are given for academic improvement. Enroll Today!

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 96 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> No <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home, Via Technology	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 23 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 5 - 200 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students</li> <li>■ <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students</li> <li>■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per 30 students</li> </ul>
---	--

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	10	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	90%
	10	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B+
	6	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	11	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	D
	11	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	45.4%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	0	No data available	3	0	No data available
4	0	No data available	4	0	No data available
5	0	No data available	5	0	No data available
6	19	C	6	19	C
7	3	<10	7	3	<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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

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

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	10	70	67
Attendance	9	67	70
Study habits	9	78	63
Ease of completing math homework	10	90	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	8	88	68
Math grades	10	80	61
English language arts grades	9	67	64
Overall grades	10	70	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	10	83	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	10	50	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between monthly and every two months."** 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **83.3** (number responding to the question = 6, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	9	89	78
Tutoring location is convenient	10	50	94
Tutoring time is convenient	10	90	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **90** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **90** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **90** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 96 surveys for this evaluation and 12, or 13%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	9	67	52
Attendance	11	44	52
Classroom achievement	9	67	58
Homework	11	55	56
Math grades	9	0	49
English language arts grades	9	44	50
Overall grades	11	18	43

**Table 5: 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	25	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	8	25	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **45** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **60** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 5 districts, or 125%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	5	1	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	5	1	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	5	1	0	0	0
Submission of invoices	5	1	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 "**Fair to Good**" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	3	A-	B	3	A-	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	3	A-	B	3	A-	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	3	A-	B	3	A-	B

**Contact Information:**

David Booker	<u>Telephone:</u>	<u>Fax:</u>	<u>E-mail:</u>
P. O. Box 14516	(877) 264-2870	(313) 366-5966	amicus2@att.net
Detroit, Mi 48214			

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by Amicus II, Inc.:** Amicus II, Inc program begins with an assessment to identify each student's specific learning needs. Those results create a specific direct-instruction, learning plan to guide and maintain appropriate reading and math instruction. While a variety of teaching materials and research-based strategies are used to provide a rich, comprehensive and individualized program of instruction, Amicus II core philosophy is simply: 1. Identify Student Needs 2. Intervene Strategically Our instructional design and materials strategically addresses the needs of our learners with respect to their skills, knowledge, interest and learning styles. On-going assessments, allows the instructor to provide different levels of instruction and make necessary adjustments as the student works to reaches mastery level and meet all state standards and benchmarks. Students will receive 40 hours of assessments / instruction. Scheduling will be three, 1.5 hours weekly sessions and 4 hours of pre / post testing. Small group and in-home tutoring sessions are provided.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 275 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> At select sites only <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 27 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 5 - 1 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
--	---

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	16	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	81.3%
	16	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B
	15	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B
Teachers	63	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	D
	64	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	29.7%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

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	27	C
4	16	C	4	17	C
5	20	C	5	20	C
6	20	C	6	21	C
7	63	C	7	74	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 275 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 16, or 6%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	16	69	67
Attendance	15	87	70
Study habits	16	56	63
Ease of completing math homework	16	69	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	16	69	68
Math grades	16	44	61
English language arts grades	16	38	64
Overall grades	16	63	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	16	62	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	16	63	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Every two months."** 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **61.5** (number responding to the question = 13, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	15	60	78
Tutoring location is convenient	16	63	94
Tutoring time is convenient	14	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **88** (number of respondents = 16, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **88** (number of respondents = 16, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **81** (number of respondents = 16, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 275 surveys for this evaluation and 66, or 24%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	63	33	52
Attendance	63	35	52
Classroom achievement	63	38	58
Homework	62	34	56
Math grades	41	29	49
English language arts grades	41	32	50
Overall grades	61	30	43

**Table 5: 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.	22	9	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	22	14	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **30** (number of respondents = 64, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **30** (number of respondents = 57, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 8 districts. Coordinators in 7 districts, or 88%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	5	0	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	6	1	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	6	3	3	1	1
Submission of invoices	6	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	3	1
Program content	2	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	2	0
Number of hours of service per student	2	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	C+	B	1	C+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	4	B	B	4	B	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	4	B	B	4	B	B

# Brain Hurricane

www.brainhurricane.com

**Overall Rating: C+**

**Contact Information:**

R. Andrew Howard  
540 North State Street, Suite 5103  
Chicago, IL 60610

**Telephone:** (312) 527-0853  
**Fax:** (773) 598-0566  
**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.*

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 222 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple)	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-8 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 32 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 20 - 1000 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
---	--

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	19	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	94.7%
	18	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B+
	17	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	93	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	94	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	39.4%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	15	D	3	16	C
4	14	C	4	13	C
5	11	C	5	11	C
6	8	<10	6	8	<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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 222 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 19, or 9%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	18	56	67
Attendance	18	50	70
Study habits	19	47	63
Ease of completing math homework	19	74	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	18	78	68
Math grades	19	58	61
English language arts grades	19	74	64
Overall grades	19	68	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	19	89	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	19	68	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **88.9** (number responding to the question = 18, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	19	90	78
Tutoring location is convenient	19	68	94
Tutoring time is convenient	19	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **95** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **95** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **95** (number of respondents = 19, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 222 surveys for this evaluation and 100, or 45%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	91	42	52
Attendance	91	40	52
Classroom achievement	93	48	58
Homework	92	36	56
Math grades	78	39	49
English language arts grades	78	40	50
Overall grades	89	36	43

**Table 5: 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.	59	17	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	59	14	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **39** (number of respondents = 94, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **41** (number of respondents = 91, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 10 districts. Coordinators in 7 districts, or 70%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	7	1	1	1	1
Submission of student attendance data	7	1	1	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	7	2	2	3	2
Submission of invoices	6	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	2	1
Program content	2	1
Number of tutoring sessions per student	1	0
Number of hours of service per student	1	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	4	B-	B	4	B-	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	5	B+	B	5	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	5	B+	B	5	B+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	5	B	B	5	B	B

## Club Z In-Home Tutoring

www.clubztutoring.com

**Overall Rating: C+**

### Contact Information:

M. Dean Thompson  
P.O. Box 87890  
Canton, MI 48187

Telephone:  
(248) 344-2200

Fax:  
(248) 344-2206

E-mail:  
clubz17@comcast.net

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by Club Z In-Home Tutoring:** ClubZ! prides itself on providing individualized programs that fit specific needs of students. One-on-one tutoring has been proven to be most effective in raising achievement and confidence in learning. First, an individual assessment is given by a trained facilitator. Using the results of the assessment, a learning plan is developed to increase the student's achievement. (Learning goals match the district and state learning objectives.) Most tutoring takes place in students' homes where parents can observe the strategies that work best for their child. Our tutoring sessions can range from 1 - 3 hours, based on the schedule of the family and the ability of the student to stay focused. We prefer to meet at least two times per week, but again, we plan with the family creating a schedule that works. Materials needed to achieve the goals are provided by ClubZ!

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

**Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:** 281

**Offers Transportation:** No

**English Language Learner:** Yes

**Students With Disabilities:** Yes

**Place(s) of Service:** Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home

**Subject Areas:** English language arts, Mathematics

**Grades Served:** K-12

**Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:** 26

**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

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	38	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	76.3%
	39	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B
	34	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B
Teachers	67	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	69	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	50.7%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Grade Level	Math		English Language Arts		
	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	42	C	3	44	C
4	39	C	4	42	C
5	44	C	5	44	C
6	42	C	6	42	C
7	24	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 281 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 39, or 14%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	38	55	67
Attendance	36	56	70
Study habits	37	57	63
Ease of completing math homework	38	66	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	37	62	68
Math grades	37	51	61
English language arts grades	38	61	64
Overall grades	37	57	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	37	89	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	38	61	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **88.9** (number responding to the question = 27, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	39	64	78
Tutoring location is convenient	38	61	94
Tutoring time is convenient	39	90	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **80** (number of respondents = 39, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **80** (number of respondents = 39, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **76** (number of respondents = 38, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 281 surveys for this evaluation and 71, or 25%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	66	42	52
Attendance	66	38	52
Classroom achievement	66	52	58
Homework	65	42	56
Math grades	50	32	49
English language arts grades	51	51	50
Overall grades	67	34	43

**Table 5: 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.	28	15	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	28	16	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **51** (number of respondents = 69, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **49** (number of respondents = 65, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 9 districts. Coordinators in 8 districts, or 89%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	7	2	0	1	2
Submission of student attendance data	7	2	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	7	4	2	3	4
Submission of invoices	7	2	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	3	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	2	0
Number of hours of service per student	2	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	4	C+	B	4	C+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	3	B+	B	3	B+	B

# Education Fundamentals

**Overall Rating: B-**

**Contact Information:**

Constance L. 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.*

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 321 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-9 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 26 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 25 - 300 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
--	---

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	21	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	71.4%
	18	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B-
	18	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B-
Teachers	115	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	B
	116	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	68.1%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	5	<10	3	5	<10
4	0	No data available	4	0	No data available
5	0	No data available	5	0	No data available
6	8	<10	6	8	<10
7	13	C	7	16	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

Oakland Schools, Wayne RESA

**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**

- 321 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 21, or 7%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	21	76	67
Attendance	21	71	70
Study habits	21	67	63
Ease of completing math homework	21	57	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	20	65	68
Math grades	21	52	61
English language arts grades	21	67	64
Overall grades	21	76	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	21	53	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	21	43	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **52.6** (number responding to the question = 19, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	20	60	78
Tutoring location is convenient	21	43	94
Tutoring time is convenient	21	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **71** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **67** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **71** (number of respondents = 21, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 321 surveys for this evaluation and 135, or 42%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	112	74	52
Attendance	113	66	52
Classroom achievement	114	73	58
Homework	113	64	56
Math grades	42	17	49
English language arts grades	45	58	50
Overall grades	114	45	43

**Table 5: 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.	96	54	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	96	55	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **68** (number of respondents = 116, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **71** (number of respondents = 112, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	1	1	1	1
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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	2	A-	B	2	A-	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	2	A-	B	2	A-	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	2	A-	B	2	A-	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	2	B+	B	2	B+	B

## Education Station

www.edstation.net

**Overall Rating: C-**

### Contact Information:

Kristen Lander  
10106 West San Juan Way, Suite 100  
Littleton, CO 80127

**Telephone:** (303) 526-3380  
**Fax:** (303) 526-3379  
**E-mail:** EducationStation@klcorp.com

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by Education Station:** Education Station's small group direct instruction is available for students in Grades K-12 who are functioning at instructional levels K-8. Our intensive research-based reading and math programs deliver results by targeting each student's skill gaps. Each student completes an initial assessment which is used to create an individualized Student Plan, our road map to your child's success. Our programs will help your child master the skills needed to catch up and get ahead. Our dedicated and trained teachers understand your child's needs. Our programs are generally delivered at school sites, after the regular school day. Our online programs are, in most cases, offered in the safety and convenience of each student's home. Most students will receive two or more, 60-90 minute instructional sessions each week. Education Station strives to minimize student:teacher ratios in the on-site small group instructional programs with a targeted student:teacher ratio of 5:1.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 550	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics
<b>Offers Transportation:</b> No	<b>Grades Served:</b> K-12
<b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes	<b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 21
<b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes	<b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 25 - 10000
<b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Via Technology	<b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students</li> <li>■ <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available</li> <li>■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per 3 students</li> </ul>

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	20	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	90%
	17	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	A-
	19	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	116	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	D
	115	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	31.3%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	86	D	3	108	C
4	82	C	4	89	D
5	108	C	5	114	C
6	85	C	6	88	C
7	55	C	7	58	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 550 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 21, or 4%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	20	70	67
Attendance	20	60	70
Study habits	19	63	63
Ease of completing math homework	20	75	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	20	80	68
Math grades	20	70	61
English language arts grades	20	70	64
Overall grades	21	62	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	21	43	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	20	40	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between every two months and 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **43** (number responding to the question = 14, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	21	86	78
Tutoring location is convenient	20	40	94
Tutoring time is convenient	20	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **95** (number of respondents = 20, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **85** (number of respondents = 20, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **90** (number of respondents = 20, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 550 surveys for this evaluation and 121, or 22%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	116	36	52
Attendance	114	39	52
Classroom achievement	114	33	58
Homework	115	32	56
Math grades	103	28	49
English language arts grades	101	26	50
Overall grades	113	29	43

**Table 5: 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.	51	13	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	51	18	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **31** (number of respondents = 115, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **40** (number of respondents = 110, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 50%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	2	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	1	0
Number of hours of service per student	1	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	2	A-	B	1	A+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	B+	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	2	A-	B	1	A+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	2	A-	B	1	A+	B

**Contact Information:**

Rahshida Stephens 24724 Lahser Road Southfield, MI 48034	<u>Telephone:</u> (248) 396-8794	<u>Fax:</u> (248) 350-9411	<u>E-mail:</u> gidpw@yahoo.com
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by Get It Done:** Our assessment pinpoints the precise areas students need help in. We develop a clearly defined individualized program for our students with feedback from both parents and teachers. During the 2005-2006 school year, our students increased as much as 70% on the Math Post-Test. This demonstrates that once students acquire key skills needed they are able to become successful. Our reading students increased by as much as 30% on the post-tests. We adhere strongly to the Grade Level Content Expectations, and assuring students that they can meet those expectations. Students are taught in small settings. Students also attend Skills Workshops to assure that skills are acquire and retained. Tutoring classes last 1-4 hours, and occur Monday - Saturday, up to 4 times a week. Tutoring takes place at our Learning Center. All materials are provided and computers are available for instructional use

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 772 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> Yes <b>English Language Learner:</b> No <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Via Technology	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 29 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 15 - 750 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students</li> <li>■ <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available</li> <li>■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per student</li> </ul>
---	--

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

Consumer Satisfaction				
Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	60	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	78.3%
	44	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B
	34	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B-
Teachers	132	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	D
	131	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	30.5%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Grade Level	Math		English Language Arts		
	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	10	B	3	9	<10
4	8	<10	4	10	C
5	10	C	5	11	C
6	10	C	6	9	<10
7	24	C	7	28	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 772 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 61, or 8%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	59	58	67
Attendance	59	70	70
Study habits	60	55	63
Ease of completing math homework	58	43	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	48	48	68
Math grades	59	53	61
English language arts grades	50	54	64
Overall grades	61	57	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	61	44	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	61	59	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **43.6** (number responding to the question = 39, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	61	79	78
Tutoring location is convenient	61	59	94
Tutoring time is convenient	59	97	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **83** (number of respondents = 60, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **80** (number of respondents = 60, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **78** (number of respondents = 60, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 760 surveys for this evaluation and 145, or 19%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	132	39	52
Attendance	130	31	52
Classroom achievement	131	40	58
Homework	127	31	56
Math grades	84	17	49
English language arts grades	85	29	50
Overall grades	126	22	43

**Table 5: 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.	61	8	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	61	7	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **31** (number of respondents = 131, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **30** (number of respondents = 125, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 4 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 50%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	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	1	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	1	0	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	1	1	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 "Good" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	1	0
Number of hours of service per student	1	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	1	C+	B	1	C+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	1	C+	B	1	C+	B

## Higher Ground Program

www.highergroundprogram.org

**Overall Rating: B-**

### Contact Information:

Jackey Wilson Telephone: (313) 245-2925 Fax: (313) 245-4390 E-mail: jwil@highergroundprogram.org  
 8131 East Outer Drive  
 Detroit, MI 48213

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by Higher Ground Program:** Higher Ground Program has proven its ability to raise the achievement level of students at the elementary through 12th grade levels in mathematics, reading and language arts. Emphasis is placed on the individual needs of each child. We assure this by employing certified and highly qualified teachers, and also utilize the small classroom concept. Through its pre-testing procedures Higher Ground is able to provide an educational prescription aimed at the removal of academic deficiencies of each student. We measure progress by using post-tests and progress reports throughout the program. Students learn in two hour sessions 2-3 hours after school per week or 3-5 hours on Saturdays. We charge \$40.00 per hour for in-school services and \$60.00 per hour for off-site services. Higher Ground Program also provides free transportation in most cases. Nominal incentives are also offered as a means of maintaining student participation

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 987 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> At select sites only <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 26 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 50 - 2000 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
---	---

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	53	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	71.7%
	48	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B
	44	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B
Teachers	341	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	A
	343	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	73.6%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	34	C	3	40	D
4	36	C	4	35	C
5	36	C	5	36	C
6	20	C	6	21	C
7	28	C	7	30	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

Flint City School District, Grand Rapids Public Schools, Pontiac City School District, Saginaw City School District, Buena Vista School District, Detroit City School District, Hamtramck Public Schools, Highland Park City Schools, School District of the City of Inkster, Redford Union School District,

**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**

- 987 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 53, or 5%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	52	65	67
Attendance	49	78	70
Study habits	52	64	63
Ease of completing math homework	52	62	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	50	64	68
Math grades	51	61	61
English language arts grades	50	58	64
Overall grades	53	62	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	53	65	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	52	35	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was "Every two months." 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **65.1** (number responding to the question = 43, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	53	77	78
Tutoring location is convenient	52	35	94
Tutoring time is convenient	52	98	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **81** (number of respondents = 52, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **75** (number of respondents = 52, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **72** (number of respondents = 53, statewide average = 81%)

#### Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 987 surveys for this evaluation and 350, or 35%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	335	76	52
Attendance	328	75	52
Classroom achievement	337	77	58
Homework	335	75	56
Math grades	207	53	49
English language arts grades	218	72	50
Overall grades	325	66	43

**Table 5: 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.	261	76	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	261	22	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **74** (number of respondents = 343, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **77** (number of respondents = 329, statewide average = 54%)

#### District Coordinator Survey Data

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	3	0	0	0	0
Submission of student attendance data	3	0	0	1	0
Submission of student progress reports	3	1	1	1	1
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 "Good" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	2	C+	B	2	C+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	1	B+	B	1	B+	B

## Sylvan Learning Center - Detroit

**Overall Rating: C**

### Contact Information:

Rahnetta Stephens  
66 Lothrop  
Detroit, MI 48202

**Telephone:** (313) 875-7772

**Fax:** (866) 778-2940

**E-mail:** sylvandetroitcenter@yahoo.com

### Program Information:

**Program Description as Provided by Sylvan Learning Center - Detroit:** Sylvan Learning Center uses a diagnostic-prescriptive instructional model that allows for customization and personalization of academic programs. The Sylvan Skills Assessment identifies strengths and weaknesses. Then we design a program to help students catch up and/or move head. Our instruction is delivered by caring, certified teachers who love to teach. In 2005, 81% of Sylvan's reading students, and 87% of Sylvan's math students increased at least one grade equivalent 36 hours of instruction. We offer individualized instruction as well a motivation program to boost self-confidence. Students are tutored onsite at the center. Students are not required to bring any instructional materials to the center. Students receive their own Notebooks that include their personalized lesson plans. Reading texts/anthologies and math manipulatives are provided. Computers are available for instructional use. Tutoring is offered after school Monday - Friday, and on Saturday, for 1- 4 hours, up to four days per week.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 43 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> Yes <b>English Language Learner:</b> No <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Place of Business	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 29 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 1 - 300 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 3 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per student
---	---

### Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:

#### Consumer Satisfaction

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	2	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	100%
	1	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B
	2	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B-
Teachers	26	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	D
	27	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	44.4%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	5	<10	3	5	<10
4	3	<10	4	3	<10
5	2	<10	5	3	<10
6	13	C	6	16	C
7	14	C	7	16	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 43 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 2, or 5%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	2	100	67
Attendance	2	100	70
Study habits	2	50	63
Ease of completing math homework	1	0	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	2	50	68
Math grades	2	50	61
English language arts grades	2	100	64
Overall grades	2	100	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	2	50	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	2	100	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": 50 (number responding to the question = 2, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	2	100	78
Tutoring location is convenient	2	100	94
Tutoring time is convenient	2	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **100** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **100** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **100** (number of respondents = 2, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 43 surveys for this evaluation and 31, or 72%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	26	35	52
Attendance	26	23	52
Classroom achievement	26	42	58
Homework	26	23	56
Math grades	8	38	49
English language arts grades	8	38	50
Overall grades	25	16	43

**Table 5: 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.	13	0	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	13	0	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **44** (number of respondents = 27, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **43** (number of respondents = 28, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 7 districts. Coordinators in 5 districts, or 71%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	5	1	2	1	1
Submission of student attendance data	5	1	1	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	4	2	2	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1	0
Program content	2	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	2	A-	B	2	A-	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	3	A-	B	3	A-	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	3	A-	B	3	A-	B

# International After School Program

www.iaspdetroit.com

**Overall Rating: C-**

**Contact Information:**

Darryl Sawyers  
5859 West Saginaw, #227  
Lansing, MI 48917

**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. Our onsite program is held at local 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 1-800-723-9802.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 200	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics
<b>Offers Transportation:</b> At select sites only	<b>Grades Served:</b> 1-12
<b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes	<b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 23
<b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No	<b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 25 - 2500
<b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Student's Home, Via Technology	<b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b>
	■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students
	■ <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students
	■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per 30 students

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	6	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	66.7%
	6	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B-
	6	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B-
Teachers	39	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	D
	39	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	35.9%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	14	C	3	16	C
4	18	C	4	16	C
5	27	C	5	25	C
6	15	C	6	14	C
7	3	<10	7	3	<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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

Flint City School District, Grand Rapids Public Schools

**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**

- 200 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 7, or 4%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	7	57	67
Attendance	7	57	70
Study habits	7	71	63
Ease of completing math homework	7	71	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	6	67	68
Math grades	7	43	61
English language arts grades	6	67	64
Overall grades	7	57	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	7	40	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	7	43	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **40** (number responding to the question = 5, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	7	86	78
Tutoring location is convenient	7	43	94
Tutoring time is convenient	7	86	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **71** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **86** (number of respondents = 7, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **67** (number of respondents = 6, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 200 surveys for this evaluation and 41, or 21%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	39	44	52
Attendance	38	40	52
Classroom achievement	39	44	58
Homework	38	34	56
Math grades	29	24	49
English language arts grades	29	38	50
Overall grades	39	28	43

**Table 5: 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.	12	18	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	12	18	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **36** (number of respondents = 39, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **36** (number of respondents = 36, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 67%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	1	1
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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	1	B+	B	1	B+	B

# Kumon Math and Reading Centers

www.kumon.com

**Overall Rating: C-**

**Contact Information:**

Matt Lupsha  
300 Frank Burr Boulevard, 5th Floor  
Teaneck, NJ 07666

Telephone: (201) 406-0138

Fax: (800) 520-4162

E-mail: educate@kumon.com

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by Kumon Math and Reading Centers:** Based on the results of an initial assessment test, goals are set for each student and shared at the beginning of services and periodically throughout the program. Students advance at their own pace through the Kumon skill levels by completing daily assignments using the Kumon Math and Reading curriculum. They visit the Kumon Center twice a week and complete brief homework assignments the other five days. Research done at schools in Oklahoma and Michigan that used Kumon showed impressive gains in test scores and in the retention of skills. Parents are free to ask the Instructor for their own local success stories. Parents are responsible for transportation to and from the Kumon Center. There is a 5 student enrollment minimum - and 50 student maximum - at each Kumon Center location. More information is at www.kumon.com

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 54 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Place of Business	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-8 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 53 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 5 - 50 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
---	--

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	10	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	50%
	9	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B-
	7	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	C+
Teachers	9	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	9	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	44.4%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	15	D	3	15	C
4	4	<10	4	5	<10
5	11	C	5	9	<10
6	0	No data available	6	0	No data available
7	0	No data available	7	0	No data 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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

Grand Rapids Public Schools, Academy of Michigan, Willow Run Community Schools, Detroit City School District, Hamtramck Public Schools, Highland Park City Schools, School District of the City of Inkster, Redford Union School District, Cherry Hill School of Performing Arts

**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**

- 54 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 12, or 23%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	12	58	67
Attendance	11	36	70
Study habits	11	46	63
Ease of completing math homework	12	42	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	12	33	68
Math grades	12	25	61
English language arts grades	12	50	64
Overall grades	12	42	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	12	22	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	12	75	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **22.2** (number responding to the question = 9, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	11	64	78
Tutoring location is convenient	12	75	94
Tutoring time is convenient	11	73	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **55** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **55** (number of respondents = 11, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **50** (number of respondents = 10, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 54 surveys for this evaluation and 9, or 17%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	9	44	52
Attendance	9	33	52
Classroom achievement	9	44	58
Homework	9	44	56
Math grades	9	22	49
English language arts grades	9	33	50
Overall grades	9	33	43

**Table 5: 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	0	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	5	20	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **44** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **33** (number of respondents = 9, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 3 districts. Coordinators in 2 districts, or 67%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	1	1
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 "Fair" from choices including "Excellent," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor." Responses of "not sure" are excluded.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	1	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	1	0
Number of hours of service per student	1	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	1	B+	B	1	B+	B

# Life Changing Center, Inc

lcctutoring.com

**Overall Rating: B-**

**Contact Information:**

Bishop Michael Jones  
9801 Chalmers Street  
Detroit, MI 48213

**Telephone:**  
(313) 245-4684

**Fax:**  
(313) 839-2007

**E-mail:**  
bishopmjones@aol.com

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by Life Changing Center, Inc:** Life Changing Center takes pride in our educational program's effectiveness toward increasing academic achievement. Our program is focused, intensive and tailored to meet individual student's need. When a student enrolls, they will first engage in our assessment process; Test, Asses, Diagnose, & Design of Individual Student Plan. Upon ascertaining any deficiency from State (MI) Content Expectations, IEP's are designed to cover specific needs with realizable short and long term goals. Before entering the classroom, LCC also determines student learner type (haptic, visual, auditory). Partnering the IEP with a specific teaching emphasis, that promotes the student's learning style, brings increased academic achievement. Tutorial sessions are held within the student's school (LEA) or in-home. They last 2 hours and are held 2-3 days a week. Sessions include instructional materials, pen/paper, and a meal. Note: a minimum of 35 students must enroll in LEA's schools for LCC to service that site.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 1745	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics
<b>Offers Transportation:</b> At select sites only	<b>Grades Served:</b> K-12
<b>English Language Learner:</b> No	<b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 16
<b>Students With Disabilities:</b> No	<b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 35 - 2500
<b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Student's Home	<b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b>
	■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students
	■ <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students
	■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per 30 students

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	50	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	64%
	45	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B-
	40	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B
Teachers	305	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	A
	304	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	91.4%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

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	11	C
4	8	<10	4	8	<10
5	7	<10	5	7	<10
6	0	No data available	6	3	<10
7	0	No data available	7	0	No data 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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

Detroit City School District, Highland Park City Schools

**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**

- 1745 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 51, or 3%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	48	60	67
Attendance	46	67	70
Study habits	51	55	63
Ease of completing math homework	49	59	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	46	57	68
Math grades	49	61	61
English language arts grades	44	61	64
Overall grades	49	57	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	51	57	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	51	10	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **57.1** (number responding to the question = 28, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	47	87	78
Tutoring location is convenient	51	10	94
Tutoring time is convenient	50	98	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **77** (number of respondents = 51, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **71** (number of respondents = 51, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **64** (number of respondents = 50, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 1745 surveys for this evaluation and 314, or 18%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	303	91	52
Attendance	301	87	52
Classroom achievement	302	90	58
Homework	305	80	56
Math grades	115	47	49
English language arts grades	117	76	50
Overall grades	301	74	43

**Table 5: 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.	279	65	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	279	70	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **91** (number of respondents = 304, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **91** (number of respondents = 301, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> 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	2	0	0
Submission of invoices	3	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	1	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	1	0
Number of hours of service per student	1	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	2	B+	B	2	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	2	B+	B	2	B+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	2	B+	B	2	B+	B

# McCully's Educational Resource Center

www.merctutoring.com

**Overall Rating: B**

**Contact Information:**

Bill McCully Telephone: (734) 414-7884 Fax: (734) 455-2455 E-mail: bmccully@merctutoring.com  
 7664 Canton Center Road  
 Canton, MI 48187

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by McCully's Educational Resource Center:** McCully's Educational Resource Center 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 IEP. Our assessment results show an average increase, after approximately 30 hours of tutoring, to be 1 year or above of academic growth. We serve students in kindergarten through high school. All instructional materials and books are provided based upon the students academic assessment. Parent and teacher communication is an important part of our tutoring program. Student tutoring logs are shared with the parent and the student's teacher weekly. All of our tutors are local, highly qualified, and certified teachers. Teacher training is provided for best researched methods of reading, writing and math skills instruction and best tutoring methods. Snacks and drinks are provided each day. Students earn motivational rewards such as games, basketballs, and CD players.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 510 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-12 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 24 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 1 - 3000 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 5 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
--	--

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	40	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	90%
	40	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B+
	36	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	155	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	C
	161	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	38.5%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	19	B	3	23	B
4	13	C	4	16	C
5	19	C	5	17	C
6	11	C	6	14	C
7	10	C	7	12	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 510 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 40, or 8%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	38	63	67
Attendance	35	69	70
Study habits	40	65	63
Ease of completing math homework	40	63	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	38	71	68
Math grades	39	62	61
English language arts grades	39	64	64
Overall grades	39	69	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	39	81	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	40	55	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between monthly and every two months."** 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **80.6** (number responding to the question = 31, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	39	92	78
Tutoring location is convenient	40	55	94
Tutoring time is convenient	39	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **85** (number of respondents = 40, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **80** (number of respondents = 40, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **90** (number of respondents = 40, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 510 surveys for this evaluation and 177, or 35%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	155	40	52
Attendance	152	40	52
Classroom achievement	154	44	58
Homework	154	40	56
Math grades	92	29	49
English language arts grades	92	39	50
Overall grades	155	28	43

**Table 5: 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.	93	17	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	93	20	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **39** (number of respondents = 161, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **49** (number of respondents = 152, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

- This provider served 12 districts. Coordinators in 10 districts, or 83%, returned a survey.

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	9	0	3	1	2
Submission of student attendance data	10	0	2	1	1
Submission of student progress reports	10	3	5	3	3
Submission of invoices	10	0	1	2	1

■ 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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	6	0
Program content	4	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	4	0
Number of hours of service per student	4	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	4	B+	B	4	B+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	4	B+	B	4	B+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	8	B-	B	8	B-	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	7	B+	B	7	B+	B

# Metropolitan Certified Teachers Association, LLC (MCTA)

www.themcta.com

**Overall Rating: B**

**Contact Information:**

Bernadette Matthews  
1245 Harding

Telephone:  
(313) 414-0575

Fax:  
(313) 821-6449

E-mail:  
reality2u@aol.com and  
themctaemail@aol.com

Detroit, MI 48214

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by Metropolitan Certified Teachers Association, LLC (MCTA):**

Metropolitan Certified Teachers Association, (MCTA) 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 mathematics functions, writing across the curriculum paired with the Fastt Math<sup>®</sup>,<sup>©</sup> and Go Solve<sup>®</sup>,<sup>©</sup> computerized-integrated learning systems which build mathematical fluency, problem-solving, decoding word problems, number functions and accuracy in a short period of time. The READ180 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.*

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 1041	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics
<b>Offers Transportation:</b> No	<b>Grades Served:</b> K-12
<b>English Language Learner:</b> Yes	<b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 24
<b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes	<b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 1 - 1000
<b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Community Center, Some Schools as Selected by the District(s), Place of Business, Place of Religious Worship (e.g., church, synagogue, mosque, temple), Student's Home	<b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b>
	■ <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 4 students
	■ <b>Computer-based:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students
	■ <b>Online instruction:</b> 1 teacher per 10 students

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	97	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	84.5%
	95	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	B+
	85	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	B+
Teachers	288	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	A
	287	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	75.3%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Math			English Language Arts		
Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	15	C	3	15	C
4	6	<10	4	6	<10
5	10	C	5	10	C
6	21	C	6	23	C
7	25	C	7	24	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 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

All

**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**

- 1041 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 97, or 9%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	94	73	67
Attendance	90	74	70
Study habits	94	71	63
Ease of completing math homework	94	74	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	91	68	68
Math grades	95	70	61
English language arts grades	92	71	64
Overall grades	90	72	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	95	73	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	95	57	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between monthly and every two months."** 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **72.7** (number responding to the question = 77, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	95	85	78
Tutoring location is convenient	95	57	94
Tutoring time is convenient	94	95	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **90** (number of respondents = 97, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **85** (number of respondents = 95, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **85** (number of respondents = 97, statewide average = 81%)

#### Teacher Survey Data

- Teachers were asked to complete 1041 surveys for this evaluation and 303, or 29%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	287	76	52
Attendance	285	73	52
Classroom achievement	288	78	58
Homework	288	74	56
Math grades	172	65	49
English language arts grades	174	66	50
Overall grades	284	71	43

**Table 5: 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.	218	80	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	218	81	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **75** (number of respondents = 287, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **75** (number of respondents = 281, statewide average = 54%)

#### District Coordinator Survey Data

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	This is a Requirement	Provider Did <b>Not</b> Submit as Required	Submission Was <b>Not</b> Timely	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Accurate	Materials Were <b>Not</b> Complete
Submission of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)	2	0	1	1	0
Submission of student attendance data	2	0	0	0	0
Submission of student progress reports	2	0	2	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was <i>Not</i> Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	<i>Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade</i>	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	1	D+	B	1	D+	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	1	D+	B	1	D+	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	1	B+	B	1	B+	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	1	D+	B	1	D+	B

**Contact Information:**

Linda Pastucha 13834 Fairmount Detroit, MI 48205	<u>Telephone:</u> (313) 461-5809	<u>Fax:</u> (313) 527-2915	<u>E-mail:</u> lpastucha@sbcglobal.net
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

**Program Information:**

**Program Description as Provided by GLM Associates:** Students will enjoy learning and mastering the math/reading skills they need to be successful in school, on the MEAP, and in life. Students are given pretests, on-going assessments, and a post test to determine their academic success and we create Individual Educational Plans (IEP) for each child. The tutoring sessions are two and one half hours long, three times a week beginning immediately after school. We begin with direct instruction for forty minutes and then the group is divided in half. While one group uses an educational video game on a Sony PlayStation to practice the skill they just learned, the second group receives additional instruction or remediation for 55 minutes, and then the groups reverse. We use the Plato Learning Achieve Now and Great Source After-school Reading/Math Club. Our students love the program and parents love the results.

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

<b>Number of Students Served in 2006-2007:</b> 94 <b>Offers Transportation:</b> No <b>English Language Learner:</b> No <b>Students With Disabilities:</b> Yes <b>Place(s) of Service:</b> Some Schools as Selected by the District(s)	<b>Subject Areas:</b> English language arts, Mathematics <b>Grades Served:</b> K-8 <b>Estimated Hours of Tutoring Per Student:</b> 40 <b>Number of Students to be Served:</b> 24 - 400 <b>Student-Teacher Ratios:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Classroom:</b> 1 teacher per 8 students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Computer-based:</b> Not available <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Online instruction:</b> Not available
---	---

**Summary Consumer Satisfaction and Academic Achievement Information:**

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Type of Rater	Number* of People Completing a Survey	Satisfaction Rating	Statewide Average	This Provider's Rating
Parents	14	Percentage of parents who were satisfied with this tutor	81%	85.7%
	15	Average letter grade from parents for <i>math</i>	B	A-
	14	Average letter grade from parents for <i>English language arts</i>	B	A-
Teachers	59	Average letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance	C	A
	57	Percentage of teachers who agreed this tutor positively impacted students' learning	45%	70.2%

\*Please note that for many providers of tutoring services, 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 2006 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Scores**

Grade Level	Math		English Language Arts		
	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating	Grade Level	Number of Student Scores Considered	Performance Rating
3	34	C	3	39	C
4	30	C	4	29	B
5	44	C	5	43	C
6	16	C	6	19	C
7	15	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.

The analysis of MEAP scores is based on students served in the 2005-2006 school year.

**How the Summary Statistics Were Calculated:**

- 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 responses to the question, "What overall grade would you give your child's tutor?" Parents were asked to provide separate grades for the tutor's performance in math and in English language arts, with response options of "A," "B," "C," "D," or "E – Failing." Responses were converted to a four-point scale and averaged for each provider.
- The teacher letter grade for effects on classroom performance was derived 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 of students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year compared to a control group matched to SES recipients based on 2005 MEAP score, economic disadvantage, special education status, and limited English proficiency status. The analysis controlled for the effects of students' schools and the 2005 MEAP score.

The overall grade is a weighted average of the consumer satisfaction and academic achievement data.

**2007-2008 Service Areas (Limited to Applicable Districts):**

Detroit City School District

**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**

- 94 parents were asked to participate in this evaluation and 15, or 16%, returned a survey.

**Table 1: Parent Responses to Measures of Student Achievement**

Improvement noted since tutoring began in...	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent Noting Improvement	Statewide Average
Attitude toward school	15	80	67
Attendance	14	86	70
Study habits	15	80	63
Ease of completing math homework	15	73	68
Ease of completing English language arts homework	15	73	68
Math grades	15	80	61
English language arts grades	15	73	64
Overall grades	15	80	63

**Table 2: Parent Responses to Questions About Communications With the Provider**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Percent "Yes"	Statewide Average
The tutor discussed learning needs with me before tutoring began	15	87	72
I have seen a copy of the tutoring learning plan	15	60	58

- When asked, "How often does the tutor talk to you or give you a written report about your child's progress?" the average response was **"Between monthly and 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, percentage of parents who found such reports "easy to understand": **86.7** (number responding to the question = 15, statewide average = 58%).

**Table 3: Parent Responses to Questions About Convenience**

Survey Question	Number of Parents Responding to the Question	Applicable Percent of Respondents	Statewide Average
Amount of time spent in tutoring is "about right"	15	93	78
Tutoring location is convenient	15	60	94
Tutoring time is convenient	15	100	95

- Percentage of parents that would send their child to this tutor again: **93** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 84%)
- Percentage of parents that would recommend this tutor to someone else: **93** (number of respondents = 15, statewide average = 82%)
- Percentage of parents that were satisfied with the tutor's overall performance: **86** (number of respondents = 14, statewide average = 81%)

**Teacher Survey Data**

- Teachers were asked to complete 94 surveys for this evaluation and 61, or 65%, were returned.

**Table 4: 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 school	59	58	52
Attendance	59	56	52
Classroom achievement	59	78	58
Homework	59	56	56
Math grades	52	77	49
English language arts grades	52	73	50
Overall grades	58	66	43

**Table 5: 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.	54	41	44
I have seen a copy of the tutoring-specific learning plan for this student	54	39	38

\*All responses in this section are for only those teachers aware a student was receiving SES before receiving the survey. Many teachers (40%) 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 average 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 average statewide response was between "every two months" and "quarterly.")
- Percentage of teachers agreeing that this tutor positively impacted the student's learning: **70** (number of respondents = 57, statewide average = 51%)
- Percentage of teachers that would recommend that other students use this tutor: **82** (number of respondents = 55, statewide average = 54%)

**District Coordinator Survey Data**

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

**Table 6: District Coordinators' Ratings of Compliance with Administrative Requirements**

	<i>Number of Districts Reporting That...</i>				
	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.

**Table 7: District Coordinators' Ratings of Fidelity to the Service Plan**

	Number of Districts Reporting this Issue was Defined/Stated in District Contract	Of Those Addressing the Issue in Contracts, Number of Districts Reporting the Service was Not Delivered as Stated
Instructional format/Approach to delivering instruction	0	0
Program content	0	0
Number of tutoring sessions per student	0	0
Number of hours of service per student	0	0

**Table 8: District Rating of Program Quality**

	English Language Arts			Math		
	Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average	Number of Coordinators Providing a Grade	Average Letter Grade	State-wide Average
Curriculum is aligned with grade level content expectations	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Curriculum aligned with local district curriculum	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
ILPs clearly identify and target individual student needs	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B
Overall quality of the provider's program on this topic	0	Not available	B	0	Not available	B