

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Survey Process	3
CEPI Source Data	3
Parent Survey	4
Teacher Survey	5
District Coordinator Survey	8
Analysis of Impact of SES on Michigan Education Assessment Program Scores	11
Analysis Overview	11
Source Data	11
Identifying the Sample	12
Matched Control Group	13
Exploratory Analysis	14
Hierarchical Linear Modeling	14
Provider Coefficients	16
Provider Profiles	19
Recommendations for Change	23
Non-DPS District Coordinator Guidance Material	Appendix A
DPS District Coordinator Guidance Material	Appendix B



Acknowledgments

Public Policy Associates, Inc. (PPA) would like to thank Michael Radke, Leah Breen, and Regina Allen of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Office of School Improvement for their guidance and input in the design and execution of the evaluation as well as their interest in its products.

Other members of the MDE also made critical contributions to the evaluation. Dave Judd extracted Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) data to support an analysis of the impact of Supplemental Education Services (SES) on student achievement, and Joseph Martineau provided extensive and invaluable support in the use of hierarchical linear modeling methods as well as guidance on the structure of Michigan Education Assessment Program scoring.

We are also indebted to SES coordinators in districts throughout Michigan. District Coordinators provided PPA with timely guidance on the content of parent, teacher, and coordinator surveys used in the evaluation. They furthermore oversaw the distribution of parent surveys and identified the most appropriate teachers to evaluate the effects of SES on every participating student in Michigan. The evaluation would not have been possible without their involvement.

PPA team members contributing to this report include Ferzana Havewala, Nancy Hewat, Nancy McCrohan, Jennifer Perez-Brennan, Scott Southard, and consultant Lisa Marckini-Polk. Any errors in the implementation of the evaluation or interpretation of the data are the sole responsibility of PPA.

Public Policy Research,
Development,
and Evaluation

Jeffrey D. Padden

President

119 Pere Marquette
Lansing, MI 48912-1231

517-485-4477

Fax: 485-4488

ppa@publicpolicy.com

www.publicpolicy.com

Introduction

This report describes the methods used in the first of a planned series of annual evaluations of Supplemental Education Services (SES) in Michigan. The evaluation was conducted by Public Policy Associates, Inc. (PPA), a national public policy research, evaluation, and program development firm located in Lansing, Michigan. Although work to develop the evaluation design began in 2006, most of the work of the evaluation was conducted in 2007.

SES is provided to students throughout Michigan under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Under NCLB, it is the State's responsibility to ensure that the providers that are approved to offer SES meet certain quality standards. The evaluation represented a first step toward creating an effective system for evaluating the performance of SES providers and disseminating this information to parents and school districts throughout the state.

The evaluation included four primary strands of activity:

- A survey of parents measured perceptions of the convenience of tutoring services, the quality of communication from the SES provider, student improvement, and overall satisfaction with tutoring.
- A survey of teachers measured the nature and extent of communications between tutors and teachers and captured data on perceived student improvement and an overall assessment of providers.
- A survey of district-based SES coordinators measured the degree to which providers met the administrative requirements of their contracts, perceptions of program quality, and perceptions of program fidelity.
- An analysis of Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) scores estimated the impact of SES on student achievement in math and English language arts/reading (ELA).

The findings were reported through provider-specific profiles as well as a statewide summary report.

This report was designed as an accompaniment to the statewide summary report and provides a detailed review of the data collection and analysis methods. The report is organized as follows:

- This section, the *Introduction*, provides an overview of the evaluation activities and context
- *Survey Process* describes the parent, teacher, and District Coordinator surveys and describes the processes by which they were implemented.
- *Analysis of Impact of SES on MEAP Scores* reviews the data sources and methods used in a statistical exploration of the impact of SES delivered in 2005-2006 on participants' 2006 math and ELA MEAP scores.
- *Provider Profiles* describes the system by which providers were assigned performance ratings.
- *Recommendations for Change* identifies weaknesses in the evaluation approach and offers suggestions for how they may be remedied in future evaluation of SES.

Appendix A includes guidance materials that were distributed to coordinators outside of Detroit, including instructions on conducting the parent, teacher, and District Coordinator surveys; and some tracking instruments, primarily for the convenience of the coordinator in managing the survey process. The tracking instruments included pre-filled data specific to the district context (e.g., student names, provider names, etc.). The materials included in Appendix A are blank templates.

Appendix B includes guidance material distributed to coordinators in the Detroit Public School system.

Survey Process

CEPI Source Data

Data on SES participants are captured in the Center for Educational Performance Information (CEPI) data collection. Beginning early in the evaluation and over the course of several months, PPA staff worked with state staff to define and obtain the data elements needed to implement parent and teacher surveys.

There were a few lessons learned in this process. One issue that had not been immediately apparent was that the CEPI system was structured to gather SES information for 2006-2007 at the end of the school year. This was at odds with the need to complete data collection for the evaluation before the end of the school year, when teachers and district staff would be inaccessible to PPA, and also at odds with the Michigan Department of Education's (MDE's) desired timeline for receiving evaluation results. In response to this, state staff worked aggressively to develop a process to collect some SES data early in 2007, and then re-open the system in the spring to collect data that would only be available after services had been delivered.

The CEPI data made available to PPA in March 2007 included student name, State of Michigan unique identification code (UIC), date of birth, gender, grade, district name and code, building name and code, and provider name. As districts must manually enter each student's information into the CEPI database via an online data-entry system, it was unwieldy to have the Detroit Public Schools (DPS) enter their cases, which numbered more than 11,000. Therefore, PPA received DPS SES data directly from the DPS technology office in February 2007.

During the discovery process, it became apparent that there were some data elements that would be extremely useful for the evaluation that did not exist in the CEPI system or were not readily available in similar data systems. The evaluation design was updated to compensate for the lack of information on elements such as the subject of tutoring, the amount of service hours, and contact information for parents or guardians. It had been intended that parents and teachers would receive surveys targeted for math tutoring only and/or for ELA tutoring only; surveys had to become more "universal."¹ State staff worked with Michigan Department of Information Technology (DIT) staff to add variables capturing the subject area of tutoring and hours of service delivered to the Web-based data system for collection late in the school year.

Although MDE's work to advance data collection on student name and provider made the evaluation possible, the SES service-delivery system in the districts was both dynamic and ongoing at the time districts were required to submit their student lists, resulting in a sample file with significant inaccuracies. For example, the data systems did not necessarily reflect students who signed up but dropped out before services were delivered, students who changed providers,

¹ In practice, as noted in the summary report on the SES evaluation, parents, teachers, and district coordinators rarely distinguished between providers' math and ELA programs when evaluating quality and impact.

students who needed a new provider because the provider had dropped, and students who were offered SES very late in the school year. Districts varied widely in the timeline with which they implemented SES, and some with winter and spring service-startup goals were delayed in initiating their programs due to contract problems and other administrative issues. For districts that implemented SES relatively late in the year, the data collected in winter was necessarily preliminary and subject to change.

The CEPI data file upon arrival had some issues such as missing data and duplicate cases. These were minor issues and subsequent updated data files eventually appeared to reflect the intact and complete cases in the system. Additionally, in the course of processing surveys it has become apparent that certain providers' names were variably entered into the data system, complicating the process of reporting provider-specific evaluation findings to MDE.

Parent Survey

The parent survey was a hardcopy survey delivered via postal mailing to the home addresses of parents or guardians of students listed in CEPI (or DPS records) as participants in SES. The survey was designed with the input and guidance of MDE staff, and PPA also consulted available materials developed by U.S. Department of Education contractors on best practices in SES evaluation. The survey instrument was printed on one double-sided piece of paper and contained 24 questions, the last being open-ended. It was designed to be machine-readable (scannable) using Remark, a scanning software program, and was personalized using mail merge fields that supplied the students' full name, UIC number (both in numerals and in barcode), and provider name. Both the survey and its cover letter were written at the 6th grade reading level. The cover letter was on State of Michigan letterhead and included a footnote in Spanish directing Spanish-speaking parents to call PPA's toll-free number to receive assistance in completing the survey.

The subcontracted printing company packaged the survey, cover letter and a PPA pre-paid business reply envelope in a sealed standard-sized envelope with a PPA return address. The envelope was labeled with both the UIC number and "To the Parent/Guardian of STUDENT NAME."

PPA arranged with the two largest districts, DPS and Flint, to mail the parent survey directly from PPA. This process required these districts to provide files with parent contact information to PPA and freed them from any physical handling of the mailing.

For each of the other school districts in the state, PPA took the stuffed envelopes, grouped them in batches by building and alphabetically by student, and mailed them to District Coordinators with instructions for their distribution (District Coordinators also coordinated the teacher survey process, as described later in this report). District Coordinators were to generate, match, and affix mailing labels to these prepared envelopes. PPA also included extra self-addressed stamped envelopes in anticipation of some parents returning their surveys to the schools rather than using the reply envelope.

Technical assistance to District Coordinators for the parent survey was provided in the form of a written instruction packet that described the materials in the mailing, their responsibilities in the survey process (in most cases, generating the mailing labels and dropping surveys in the mail), and special considerations if approached by parents for help. PPA had previously contacted each District Coordinator by e-mail or telephone to describe the survey process and their role within it and generally to set their expectations for the evaluation. Technical assistance was lent parents during the fielding of the survey via telephone; both a direct-dial and toll free number to PPA offices was provided in the cover letter. A Spanish version of the survey was drafted for PPA staff so that staff could conduct the parent survey via telephone as needed. All incoming phone calls by parents were documented to track quantity, type, and the outcome of the issues they raised. Seven incoming calls to PPA were from Spanish-speaking parents requesting assistance in completing the survey.

District Coordinators were asked to mail parent surveys so that they would be in the field by May 7, 2007 at the latest. Progress was then verified through contact on a weekly basis by PPA staff (via fax, e-mail or telephone). In some cases (particularly in charter schools), District Coordinators reported encouraging parents to fill out the survey.

There were small challenges in fielding the survey from the point of view of executing the mailing. The parent survey materials were shipped one day later from the other materials although they were intended to be packaged together. In one district, an assistant dropped the surveys in the mail without affixing the mailing label and these were returned to PPA by the postal service. Also, as was to be expected, some addresses on district lists were not current, and this resulted in undeliverable returned mail as well.

While technical assistance was provided to parents this activity did not present any specific challenge for execution. Most questions and comments pertained to the student's status with a given provider.

Returned surveys were scanned using Remark software and analyzed in SPSS 14.0. The survey earned a 9.9% response rate, or 7.7% when parents reporting their child did not receive SES are excluded. The survey was pilot tested in Chadsey High School in the Detroit Public School District.

Teacher Survey

The teacher survey consisted of two separate online survey instruments, both implemented through SurveyMonkey, a Web service allowing users to design and implement their own online surveys. The survey variants had identical questions but different data structures and invitation methods. Both surveys were designed to collect one survey for every student enrolled in SES.

The first survey instrument was dedicated exclusively to DPS, and requests to complete the survey were sent via e-mail to specific teachers for specific, named students. Teachers receiving the e-mail were instructed to click the embedded link to evaluate the impact of SES delivered by the provider named in the e-mail to the student named in the e-mail. A separate e-mail was sent

for each SES student, meaning that in many cases teachers received multiple requests to complete surveys. The e-mail-based survey invitation process was not originally intended for use in the evaluation, but was developed at the request of DPS, and allowed PPA to track response among specific teachers for specific students and to issue reminders where appropriate. The “from” address associated with the e-mail was a PPA research assistant e-mail address (ensuring that PPA would be aware of undeliverable addresses that “bounced back” to the sender), and the body of the e-mail alerted the reader that “The Michigan Department of Education is working in partnership with Public Policy Associates, Incorporated to evaluate Supplemental Education Services (SES) providers.”

PPA worked with the DPS SES District Coordinator, Patricia Owens, to secure the assignment and contact information necessary to deliver e-mail survey requests directly to appropriate teachers for each SES participant. PPA used the participant data previously submitted by DPS to generate electronic student lists by building. These lists were compiled in a MS Excel document and provided to the DPS District Coordinator, who distributed them to building coordinators. Building coordinators were then asked to identify (assign) the most appropriate teacher for each SES student on the list, and to add that address information to the Excel document. The completed lists were returned to the District Coordinator, who in turn sent them to PPA staff. This process was promoted during two informational meetings of SES Building Coordinators (of which PPA attended one).

The second online survey instrument was used to gather information for all other districts providing SES in the state (non-DPS), as well as those DPS buildings where coordinators could not develop an e-mail list on the necessary timeline. In these cases, PPA had no advance knowledge of which teacher would complete the survey for a given student (nor was this information captured during the survey process). The online survey instrument was thus generic across all students and required the responding teacher to identify the student who was the focus of the survey by manually entering identifying information.

In order to facilitate the proper identification of SES students as well as their assignment to an appropriate teacher for the purpose of the evaluation, PPA generated hardcopy survey-request letters that described the purposes and timeline of the survey; identified the student through merge fields supplying the student’s name, grade, UIC number, and provider; and told teachers how to access the survey via a “tinyURL” address² or a longer SurveyMonkey uniform resource locator (URL). The letter was printed on state letterhead and was signed by the Assistant Director of the Office of School Improvement.

The survey-request letters were sent via postal service to District Coordinators at the same time as other materials were distributed. District Coordinators were instructed to identify the most appropriate teacher for each SES student and to distribute the request letters (one hardcopy invitation per student) accordingly. As part of their guidance packet, coordinators were provided with a list of district SES students in grid format with space to write the name of the assigned teacher. Given that the survey covered student improvement in both ELA and math and that students in middle school and beyond would typically have different teachers for these classes,

² tinyURL is a free online service where users submit a lengthy URL and are provided with a unique and significantly shorter URL that points to the same online location.

PPA also generated a random “E” or “M” for each student as an optional aid to the coordinator in selecting teachers in a balanced manner.

There were known drawbacks to distributing hardcopy invitation letters, chief among them being that PPA did not know which teachers were ultimately assigned to respond with respect to any given student. Without this linking information, no targeted follow-up could be pursued, nor could a paper trail indicate whether the papers had been distributed by District Coordinators. As the survey was implemented, it was also observed that administrators did not always realize that the hardcopy invitations were personalized (the merged information figured at the bottom of the invitation letter). As a result, in one district, just one invitation to each chosen teacher was distributed, with the remaining invitations discarded. In some other cases, teachers did likewise upon receiving several invitations. PPA resent invitations where necessary.

There were also significant pros and cons to the electronic distribution method devised for DPS. The chief advantage of the e-mail system was the ability to automate e-mail reminders and to link a student with a particular assigned teacher, thereby allowing targeted follow-up. It also was convenient for teachers to reach PPA staff for technical assistance via e-mail inquiry. Finally, this freed the district staff from any role in follow-up contact with individual teachers and simplified the distribution process from the coordinator perspective.

However, the electronic method also engendered a variety of challenges and technical assistance needs. Building coordinators seemed to underestimate the amount of work it took to compile e-mail addresses and many did not turn the information in by the established deadline. Many of the contact lists returned to PPA were incomplete, leading PPA to calculate the percent completion rates for each building and determine whether response was sufficient to proceed with e-mail invitations. The cut-off point was set at 80%. For those schools below the cut-off point (36 school buildings), hardcopy request letters were mailed instead.

PPA tallied building-specific response rates from both the generic and targeted surveys on a weekly basis and communicated progress to District Coordinators. Among those buildings with very low response rates using the e-mail approach, it was discovered that, in several cases, the building coordinators had provided teacher e-mail addresses that were either universally inactive or infrequently checked by teachers. Some teachers reported erasing all but the first e-mail invitation they received, thinking the additional messages were duplicates. Typographical errors in teacher e-mail addresses were also an issue. In other cases, teachers communicated to PPA that they were unable or unwilling to respond to the survey for a variety of reasons: some complained via e-mail that they were assigned an unreasonable amount of students; were incorrectly assigned students; had students whose truancy affected their ability to judge the effect of tutoring; had conflicts of interest due to a relationship with (or as) a provider; or had concerns about how privacy laws would affect their sharing of student information (this list of concerns was not unique to the e-mail distribution system). PPA worked in collaboration with the DPS District Coordinator to address these and other issues on an as-needed basis.

The results from both surveys were merged and analyzed in SPSS 14.0. The survey earned a 30.8% response rate; however, nearly 700 surveys were entirely composed of missing data and

had to be discarded. After these exclusions, the response rate was 22%. The e-mail survey was pilot-tested by teachers in Chadsey High School.

District Coordinator Survey

The District Coordinator survey was a survey administered in hard copy and consisted of ten topic areas printed on one double-sided piece of paper. The number of surveys given to each District Coordinator was equal to the number of providers in his or her district as reported by districts in CEPI. The hardcopy surveys were not personalized with the provider or district name, but included spaces for capturing this information at the top of the page; a list of providers in each district was submitted along with the surveys for reference in personalizing them.

The District Coordinator surveys were provided to District Coordinators via postal mailing in a package containing District Coordinator survey instructions, teacher survey instructions and hardcopy invitations, a fax-back checklist form for coordinators' administrative duties, and return envelopes.³

Technical assistance materials for this survey consisted of "District Coordinator Survey Instructions," which was provided with the surveys. The instructions listed materials, survey responsibilities, addressed special considerations, and referred questions to PPA staff. This document was supplemented with e-mail and telephone technical assistance on an as-needed basis.

The surveys were in the field starting in the last week of April 2007. On June 1st, a reminder e-mail was sent to District Coordinators who had not returned surveys, requesting a reply as to their status. On June 5, PPA sent electronic versions of the survey instrument to those coordinators who did not respond to the June 1st e-mail. This was followed with phone calls in the second week of June.

PPA anticipated that a challenge in the process might involve discrepancies between the providers actually working with a district and those listed in the CEPI database. The technical assistance document recommended that District Coordinators make photocopies of the survey in the event that they needed to add additional active providers to the list provided by PPA. During the fielding of the survey no coordinators sought technical assistance for this issue.

One challenge which did arise, however, regarded the limited access by some District Coordinators to providers' contractual and operational information, which was central to the survey. In two cases, a District Coordinator was in fact a building coordinator of SES for a charter school whose provider records were kept off-site at the school's charter school management company. One individual sought to retrieve information from the management

³ Due to a vendor oversight, PPA was obliged to mail Parent Survey materials separate from this first mailing. In most cases this had no negative impact except where, for one district, the coordinator overlooked the first mailing (of District Coordinator and teacher survey materials) until follow up was made.

company, while another reported that he had consulted providers to verify information requested in the District Coordinator survey.

The District Coordinator surveys were manually entered into Microsoft Excel and analyzed in SPSS 15.0. The survey earned an 82.5% response rate.

Analysis of Impact of SES on Michigan Education Assessment Program Scores

Analysis Overview

Unlike other elements of the 2007 SES Evaluation, analysis of the impact of SES on Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) scores focused on services delivered in the 2005-2006 school year. Evaluation of the impact of SES on MEAP scores requires both a pre- and post-services MEAP score, and for students receiving SES in the 2006-2007 school year, no post-services score will be available until fall 2007 MEAP tests have been taken and processed. The 2005-2006 school year was thus the most recent instance of SES delivery that could be evaluated.

The analysis of the impact of SES on MEAP scores was restricted to students in grades 3 through 7 in 2005. Students in other grades did not take MEAP tests in math and English language arts/reading in both 2005 and 2006 and thus could not be included in the analysis.

The analysis was conducted using a hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) approach relying on a matched group of students that did not participate in SES. HLM is the most appropriate form of analysis in many types of educational research as it accommodates “nested” data: that is, where students are grouped into classrooms, school buildings, and districts and these settings are expected to influence student outcomes. Additional information about HLM and the execution of the analysis for the SES evaluation is provided in the sections that follow.

Source Data

Source data for the MEAP analysis included extracts from the 2005 and 2006 statewide research files, containing:

- Raw and scaled MEAP scores for individual students
- Student identifying information including name, unique identification code (UIC), and school-issued student identification number (where such existed)
- The names and codes of the building and district in which the student was enrolled
- The student’s grade level
- Demographic information including economic disadvantage status, Limited English Proficiency (LEP status), special education status, Former Limited English Proficiency (FLEP) status (all coded “yes” or “no), gender, and race.

These data were provided by the Michigan Department of Education for students in grades 3 through 9 in 2005 and for the same grades in 2006.

The statewide research file does not include information on whether a student received SES. Accordingly, PPA received a separate file from the MDE Office of School Improvement with data on 13,203 students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year. The file information included the student name and UIC, grade, date of birth, and SES provider name and was extracted from the Center for Educational Performance Information (CEPI) data collection.

The 2005 and 2006 statewide research files were matched to one another to facilitate use of both the 2005 and 2006 MEAP data. Subsequently, the SES student data was matched to the consolidated statewide research file to connect SES participants to their MEAP data.

Identifying the Sample

Many of the 13,203 SES recipients in 2005-2006 could not be considered in the analysis. Table 1 lists exclusion factors and the number of SES students dropped from the analysis for each reason.

Table 1: Exclusion Factors for Analysis of SES Impact on MEAP Scores	
Factors	Number of SES Recipients Dropped (Total SES Recipients = 13,203)
Duplicate record	121
Student not in grades 3 – 7 in 2005	7,776
Retained in 2006 or promoted by more than one grade	240
Not present in statewide research database	
2005	293
2006	430
Missing data	
ELA	205
Math	293
Unable to confirm state of tutoring for district	
ELA	828
Math	876
Only student with named provider in grade/building	
ELA	46
Math	90
Total available for analysis	
ELA	3,264
Math	3,084

The final count of SES students used in the analysis is shown in Table 2 by grade and subject and overall.

Table 2: Final Count of Useable SES Student Records for MEAP Analysis

Grade	Useable SES Student Records	
	<i>Math</i>	<i>ELA</i>
3 rd grade	592	659
4 th grade	561	595
5 th grade	635	636
6 th grade	637	670
7 th grade	659	704
Totals	3,084	3,264

Matched Control Group

The analysis relied on a matched control group drawn from the residual population in the merged 2005-2006 statewide research file. The raw data, including SES students, consisted of 895,679 student records for 2005 and 869,290 student records in 2006. Several exclusions were implemented to the combined database to eliminate students inappropriate for matching. These exclusions included:

- SES students
- Students retained or promoted more than once between 2005 and 2006
- Duplicate records (based on UIC)
- Missing UICs
- Students not attending a school building with at least one SES student
- Students with missing data for the MEAP scores in question

These exclusions reduced the number of records available for matching to 59,806 for the analysis of math scores and to 56,230 for the analysis of ELA scores.

The matching protocol was developed in consultation with MDE and considered students' grades, buildings, 2005 scaled math/ELA MEAP scores, economic disadvantage status, LEP status, and special education status. The protocol was implemented separately for math and ELA, resulting in different groups of matching students for each subject-matter area.

SES participants were, by definition, matched to a student in the same grade attending the same building. Within this pool, the matching protocol selected the student with the closest 2005 scaled MEAP score (math and ELA considered separately, negative and positive differentials given equal preference). If more than one student was available, the protocol selected the student with the same economic disadvantage status. If more than one student remained available, the protocol selected the student with the same special education status. If more than one student remained available, the protocol selected the student with the same LEP status. If more than one student remained available, the first available match was selected without further discrimination between available cases. These priorities were established on the basis of bivariate correlations between the variables and the outcomes of interest, the 2006 scaled math

and ELA MEAP scores, which showed an extremely strong correlation between the 2005 and 2006 scaled scores and modest relationships for the remaining variables.

No non-SES student was matched to more than one SES student and matches were implemented in the order of the SES students' 2005 scaled scores, with those scoring lowest matched first and those scoring highest matched last. The protocol was implemented using a macro written for SPSS.

Exploratory Analysis

A limited exploratory analysis was conducted to confirm that the independent variables had a linear relationship with the dependent variables, to confirm that the dependent variables were normally distributed, and to identify outliers in the data. Scatterplots and histograms were reviewed for evidence of nonnormal distributions, curvilinear relationships, and outliers. These analyses helped to identify data problems associated with students who had been retained or promoted more than once between the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. After these cases had been eliminated, all histograms revealed normal distributions in the independent variables and scatterplots revealed presumptively linear relationships between independent and dependent variables. One outlier was identified among the pool of students in the 3rd grade in 2005. The student's 2006 (4th grade) scaled math MEAP score was 598 and the record also contained a social studies scaled score (an entry that should not have been present for a student at this grade level). The case as well as the associated match was deleted.

Hierarchical Linear Modeling

The analysis of the impact of SES on student academic achievement was conducted using HLM 6.04, a software program developed exclusively for hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). Michigan's SES program represents a cross-nested structure, where students are grouped in school buildings and with SES providers, but all students in a school building do not necessarily use the same provider and SES providers can and do work with numerous school buildings and districts. Accordingly, the analysis relied on the program's HCM2 model for cross-classified linear models.

The level-one model was initially conceptualized as follows:

$$MATHSS_06 = B_{0jk} + B_{1jk}(MATHSS) + B_{2jk}(SES) + B_{3jk}(MATHSES) + e_{ijk}$$

■ Where

- j = the student's home school building
- k = the student's SES provider
- B_0 = the intercept term
- $B_{1,2,3}$ = the estimated impact (coefficient) associated with each independent variable
- e = a residual or error term
- $MATHSS_06$ = the scaled score for math in 2006 (the dependent variable)

- **MATHSS** = the scaled score for math in 2005⁴
- **SES** = a dummy variable set to 1 for SES participants and 0 for non-SES matching students
- **MATHSES** = an interaction term consisting of the 2005 scaled math score (minus the mean 2005 scaled math score for the full SES and non-SES sample) multiplied by the SES score (minus the mean, or 0.5)

The level 2 model was specified as follows:

$$B_{0jk} = \theta_0 + \mathbf{SCHOOLCODE}_{00} + \mathbf{PROVIDER}_{00}$$

$$B_{1jk} = \theta_1 + \mathbf{SCHOOLCODE}_{10}$$

$$B_{2jk} = \theta_2 + \mathbf{PROVIDER}_{20}$$

$$B_{3jk} = \theta_3 + \mathbf{PROVIDER}_{30}$$

■ Where

- θ_0 = The model intercept
- $\mathbf{SCHOOLCODE}_{00}$ = the unique increment to the intercept associated with the student's building
- $\mathbf{PROVIDER}_{00}$ = the unique increment to the intercept associated with a specific SES provider
- θ_1 = the model estimate for the impact of 2005 scaled scores on 2006 scaled scores
- $\mathbf{SCHOOLCODE}_{10}$ = the unique increment to the estimate of the impact of 2005 scaled scores on 2006 scaled scores associated a specific building
- θ_2 = the model estimate for the impact of SES participation
- $\mathbf{PROVIDER}_{20}$ = the unique increment to the estimate of the impact of SES participation associated with a specific provider
- θ_3 = the model estimate for the interaction of SES participation and 2005 scaled MEAP score
- $\mathbf{PROVIDER}_{30}$ = The unique increment to the slope for the interaction of SES participation and 2005 scaled MEAP score associated with a specific SES provider

More generally stated, at level 2, the intercept term was specified with random school and provider effects, the 2005 MEAP score (prior achievement) was specified with random school effects, SES participation was specified with random provider effects, and the interaction of SES participation and prior achievement was specified with random provider effects.

An examination of the proportional reduction in error associated with each of these terms demonstrated that there were virtually no explanatory gains associated with the interaction term (SES participation and prior achievement). Accordingly, the term was dropped from all analyses.

The analysis was conducted using standard, default settings in HLM.

⁴ This term was grand-mean centered in the analysis.

Provider Coefficients

One of the recognized benefits of using an HLM approach was that it would specify unique coefficients associated with each provider. These estimates are produced in external SPSS files generated by the software, but must be tested for statistical significance through additional calculations in SPSS or another appropriate software package.

HLM generates an empirical Bayes (EB) parameter estimate and an associated posterior variance (pv) for each column-level variable (here, each specific provider) in the course of executing the model analysis. Confidence intervals around the EB estimate may be generated by multiplying the desired Z score by the square root of the posterior variance and both adding and subtracting the resultant figure from the EB estimate. The equation for a 95% confidence interval is thus:

$$EB \pm (1.96 * \sqrt{pv})$$

Where both the minimum and maximum associated with the confidence interval exceeded zero (positive impact) or both the minimum and maximum were less than zero (negative impact), the provider was deemed to have significant impact on the MEAP scores of SES students in attendance.

The original protocol, developed in consultation with MDE, was to identify providers with significant impacts at the 95% level of confidence and classify them based on the magnitude of the estimated impact: providers with impacts in excess of 7.50 points (one-half of a standard deviation on the MEAP) would be rated as “A” providers, providers with impacts between 3.75 and 7.50 points (one-quarter to one-half of a standard deviation) would be rated as “B” providers, providers with no measurable positive or negative impacts would be rated as “C” providers, and so on into the negative ranges of coefficient estimates. Initial results showed fewer than 10 instances where providers had any measurable impact for a given grade and subject level. After review of the data, MDE hoped to find a means that better discriminated among providers, and ultimately recommended a new approach relying on looser confidence standards and different verbiage to describe the nature of the impact: the categories considered included “possible impact” (50% confidence interval), “plausible impact” (67% confidence interval), “probable impact” (80% confidence interval) and “highly probable impact” (95% confidence interval). The equations used to generate the upper and lower bounds for each provider-specific parameter were as follows:

- 80% confidence interval: $EB \pm (1.28 * \sqrt{pv})$
- 67% confidence interval: $EB \pm (0.975 * \sqrt{pv})$
- 50% confidence interval: $EB \pm (0.675 * \sqrt{pv})$

Unfortunately, the reanalysis was responsible for only two additional instances in which a provider was recognized as having impacted the achievement of SES participants, and each of these operated at the 50% confidence level. Because the revised scale (e.g., “possible impact,” “plausible impact,” etc.) was less intuitive than the graded scale initially planned and the

additional analysis yielded very little additional provider-specific information, PPA reverted to the A – E grading scale. The vast majority of providers, then, earned “Cs” for all grades served and both math and ELA tutoring.

Provider Profiles

Survey data, results of the MEAP analysis, and descriptive information about the SES program (submitted with providers' applications to serve students in 2007-2008) were drawn on to generate a profile of each SES provider. The profile included an overall grade for the provider as well as selected survey statistics and results of the analysis of the provider's impact on MEAP scores in 2006 for students in each of grades 3 through 7 and for both math and ELA scores.

While most of the data reported in the profile is based on individual survey questions and presented in its original units (i.e., percent "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing," average letter grade for program quality offered by parents), the overall grade considers several data elements, as does one teacher-survey item included in the profile. The methods used to calculate these items were as follows:

- *Letter grade from teachers for effects on classroom performance.* The letter grade was derived from responses to seven agree-disagree survey questions:
 - During the time tutoring was provided, this student's attitude toward class improved.
 - During the time tutoring was provided, this student's homework improved.
 - During the time tutoring was provided, this student's classroom achievement improved.
 - During the time tutoring was provided, this student's class attendance improved.
 - During the time tutoring was provided, the student's math grades improved.
 - During the time tutoring was provided, the student's ELA grades improved.
 - During the time tutoring was provided, the student's overall grades improved.

Each question was scaled "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree," and these ordinal values were converted to a four-point numeric scale with "agree" values at the high end. An examination of the question responses showed the items to be highly interrelated, with Cronbach's alpha in excess of 0.8.⁵ The mean across all seven items was calculated for each respondent (the mean for cases with partial missing data was developed on the basis of the available responses), and these respondent-specific means were then averaged at the provider level. Providers in the top 20% of the distribution were assigned an "A" or 4.0, the next 20% were assigned a "B" or 3.0, and so on.

- *Overall provider letter grades.* The overall provider letter grade was a weighted function of the following items:
 - Parent survey.
 - ◆ "Overall, are you satisfied with this tutor?"
 - Parents could respond "yes," "no," or "not sure." The item grade was based on the percentage of "yes" responses; 90% - 100% was graded as "A" or 4.0, 80% -

⁵ Cronbach's alpha is a reliability statistic typically used to determine whether a scale can be appropriately created by combining distinct variables. It ranges from 0 to 1, and higher values indicate a close interrelationship among the tested variables.

89% was graded as “B” or 3.0, 70% - 79% was graded as “C” or 2.0, 60% - 69% was graded as “D” or 1.0, and below 60% was graded as “E” or 0.0.

- ◆ “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 as described in this section, above.
- Teacher survey, “This tutor is positively impacting this student's learning.” Response options included “strongly agree,” “agree,” “disagree,” and “strongly disagree.” The percentage of respondents choosing “agree” or “strongly agree” was calculated and providers in the top 20% of the distribution were assigned an “A” or 4.0, providers in the next 20% were assigned a “B” or 3.0, and so on.
- MEAP analysis. All providers were initially assigned a letter grade of “C” (2.0) for MEAP performance overall (including those without any data on MEAP impacts⁶). Any single statistically significant finding of positive impact on the MEAP for any subject at any grade level resulted in a one-grade increase (from “C” to “B” or 3.0). Additional findings of positive impact resulted in an additional one-grade increase (from “B” to “A”). Statistically significant finding of negative impact were similarly managed with grade reductions imposed for each instance of a negative finding. The one exception to this rule was that, where findings of statistically significant impact were based on a 50% confidence interval—an exceedingly weak standard—provider grades were increased or reduced by a half-grade (0.5 on a four-point scale).

For the survey-based items, no minimum number of surveys was established; one completed survey was sufficient to establish a grade.

The data elements were combined as follows:

- Parent survey questions resulting in a letter grade for the provider’s performance in math and ELA were weighted at 10% each, or 20% considered jointly.
- All other items were weighted at 20%.
- No grade was calculated for providers with fewer than three survey-based elements.
- If parents graded a provider’s math or ELA program only, the answered item was increased to 20% of the score
- Where other elements of the score were missing, the weight associated with the remaining items was proportionally upgraded. For example, with three items at the 20% level and two at the 10% level available, the weights would increase to 25% and 12.5%, respectively.

⁶ The purpose of assigning providers without any data a “C” or 2.0 was to ensure that providers without MEAP data were not advantaged by this fact. MEAP ratings for those providers with useable MEAP data were typically a “C,” and in the absence of a comparable statistic for providers without data, would have exerted negative pressure on their overall grades relative to providers without useable MEAP data.

- Resulting average ratings on a four-point scale were converted back to letter grades using the following protocol:
 - 3.50 – 4.00 = A
 - 3.34 – 3.49 = B+
 - 3.00 – 3.33 = B
 - 2.67 – 2.99 = B-
 - 2.34 – 2.66 = C+
 - 2.00 – 2.33 = C
 - 1.67 – 1.99 = C-
 - 1.34 – 1.66 = D+
 - 1.00 – 1.33 = D
 - 0.67 – 0.99 = D-
 - Below 0.67 = Failing

Recommendations for Change

The 2006-2007 evaluation was the first-ever evaluation of Michigan's SES program and several lessons were learned in the course of conducting the work. The following recommendations are focused on ways to improve the evaluation process in the interests of improving data quality and reducing burden on evaluation participants.

- *Consider use of a rolling data collection procedure for parent and teacher surveys.* This would require knowing in advance, for each district, the time of year that services would be delivered. For example, if services in District A, B, and C are delivered from September to December (only), then surveys could be implemented in January for those districts. If Districts D, E, and F are providing services in January through April, then data collection could begin at the end of April. Such a system would simplify some of the logistics of collecting data on 14,000 cases annually, capture data when services are complete and memory is fresh, and allow a design that avoids data collection in the summer months when targeted audiences are unlikely to be available or responsive.
- *Revamp the CEPI data-collection windows and expectations.* Under current practice, CEPI is open for short periods of time to allow districts to input their SES information. Were the CEPI system generally open for data input and districts expected to update their SES participant information when districtwide services begin, when districtwide services end, and at reasonable intervals between (particularly in the case of districts running year-long SES programs), the data to support the evaluation would be of considerably better quality; not only more accurate, but including measures of quantity of service and subject matters for students whose services were complete. Such a change is also necessary to support a rolling data-collection process, and a final benefit is that the data system would provide better up-front information about the distribution of SES students and allow District Coordinators managing the process at the district end more time to identify appropriate teachers.
- *Consider adding an upload facility to the CEPI system or otherwise allowing districts to submit electronic files of student information.* For districts with numerous students, such an option would considerably ease the burden of recording SES data to the CEPI system and likely improve data quality.
- *Consider options to improve parent participation in the survey.* Several options are available to improve parent participation in the survey. A cleaner data set on SES participants would allow feedback from more parents of SES students. Additionally, the following considerations could help to improve response rates:
 - Consult with districts about the best means of reaching parents of their particular student body and implement a more customized process that allows for district-level variation (potentially as an accompaniment to the existing process). Some districts may advise that parent surveys be sent home with students or distributed with the aid of providers.

- Implement a follow-up protocol or second distribution. In conjunction with more flexibility in distribution methods or in the form of a second mass mailing, some form of follow-up with nonrespondents is advisable to improve participation.
- Aggressively assess what language alternatives are needed for parent surveys, and find the resources to offer these. District communication to parents in a relevant language is mandated under ESEA Title I Sec. 1116 (b) (3) (A) (vi). According to Zenaida Arraiz-Rivera (in the Office of Title I & Section 31a Compliance for DPS), in the DPS district, the language needs for individual students are captured in a DPS database, and the district routinely communicates in a relevant language with these non-English speaking households. There are thousands of student households requiring non-English communication. In the Detroit district, among SES students in 2006-07 there were 4,806 such households. This represents approximately 40% of the SES students in this district. Efforts to reach these households could significantly improve survey response rates and improve the data.

The relevant languages for DPS are Spanish, Arabic, Hmong, Bengali, Romania. In order to offer language options for the parent surveys, ones computer must be set to recognize the different characters for each language. Ms. Arraiz-Rivera has expressed willingness to assist in this arena.

- Consultation with the school districts may also yield additional suggestions for improving response rates.
- *Consider options to improve teacher participation in the survey.* As with the parent survey, a cleaner data set on SES participants would allow feedback from more teachers of SES students. Given that teachers are often asked to complete multiple surveys, a better data set would also diminish the likelihood that teachers will be asked to complete surveys on students that ultimately did not receive SES, a circumstance that would compromise their sense of responsibility to the evaluation. Additionally, the following considerations could help to improve response rates:
- Offer districts more lead time in identifying the most appropriate teacher to evaluation each student's progress and work with coordinators to better set teacher expectations regarding the survey.
 - Improve the quality of e-mail addresses used in the e-mail distribution system. While the e-mail system should, in theory, have resulted in better response rates and more control of the process by PPA, the poor quality of e-mail addresses—particularly, the instances where school e-mail addresses had not been activated—reduced the effectiveness of this approach. DPS had a very strong interest in this option and may retain it even if asked to do more to pre-qualify e-mail addresses.
 - Revamp the survey structure to better manage the issue of multiple surveys for any given teacher. Both when paper invitations and e-mail invitations were used, PPA received occasional reports that all invitations in excess of the first had been discarded on the

assumption that they were received in error. SurveyMonkey, the online survey system used to implement the teacher survey, will no longer permit multiple invitations to the same survey to be distributed to any given individual. These factors, in combination, suggest the need to develop an integrated, database-driven online system in which teachers are first presented with the list of students assigned to them, then begin the process of completing individual surveys.

- Consider development of a process for reassignment of students to another teacher. The survey had no built-in mechanism to deal with situations in which the teacher felt he or she was unable to evaluate the progress of a named student.
- *Consider transitioning the District Coordinator survey to online implementation with paper backup.* There do not appear to be any reasons why this more efficient means of data collection would not be effective for this population.
- *Improve the content of the parent, teacher, and District Coordinator surveys.*
 - The parent survey can be improved with clearer processes for identifying parents whose child did not ultimately participate in SES. Additionally, information about the circumstances that led to the student's nonparticipation (disinterest, dropped out, provider dropped out, left the district, etc.) may be valuable to MDE.
 - The teacher survey can be substantially improved by offering teachers an early opportunity to declare that the student in question a) did not receive SES, b) is no longer enrolled at the school, c) has not been in class to the degree necessary to support an evaluation of progress, or d) cannot be evaluated for other reasons.
 - The District Coordinator survey can be improved by offering District Coordinators the opportunity to answer questions about contract structure once rather than in conjunction with each provider. While the opportunity to report custom contract situations should be retained to capture any variation across a district's providers, many elements of the contract are likely standard across providers and consolidating the questions could substantially reduce the burden on District Coordinators. Additionally, based on substantial nonresponse to some questions about contractor program quality, curriculum alignment, and fidelity to the service plan, District Coordinators should be consulted to better understand the reasons for nonresponse before any future evaluation survey is implemented.
- *Revise analysis of MEAP scores to accommodate quantity of tutoring.* Survey findings call into question the degree to which the student population listed in CEPI received the full complement of available SES services. Some students dropped out, some never received any service at all, and not all providers offered the same level of service. SES could be specified as a ratio variable (amount of variable) as opposed to a simple yes-or-no and would likely yield more reliable and interesting findings. The analysis should also make use of subject-matter data now being captured in CEPI.

Appendix A. Non-DPS District Coordinator Guidance Material



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

April 23, 2007

Dear Supplemental Educational Services Coordinators:

The Michigan Department of Education is working in partnership with Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA) to evaluate supplemental educational services (SES) providers in the state. Our evaluation plan calls for compiling information from multiple sources in order to get a full understanding of providers' effectiveness.

As you know, we are asking you to facilitate distribution of the parent surveys and the teacher surveys in your district, and to complete a district-level survey on each of your providers.

Enclosed are more specific instructions from PPA, including due dates and contact information should you have questions.

We appreciate your time and effort in this important work. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Perez-Brennan, Research Assistant, at (517) 485-4477 or via e-mail at jperezbrennan@publicpolicy.com.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Radke, Ph.D.
Assistant Director
Office of School Improvement

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324



April, 2007

Dear District Coordinator:

The research team at Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA) is glad to be a part of the Michigan Department of Education's evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) providers. We look forward to working constructively with you as we implement a systematic approach to this federally mandated evaluation. PPA would like to thank you in advance for your vital contributions to the evaluation process.

This letter is meant to provide an overview of tasks and of enclosed materials, as well as anticipate answers to common questions. More detailed instructions for each survey are attached to the corresponding survey packets.

Overview of District Coordinator Role

District Coordinator Survey: Complete one survey for each provider delivering tutoring services to students in your district.

Teacher Survey: Assign and distribute Teacher Request Letters to invite teachers to participate in an online survey

Parent Survey: Generate labels with parent mailing addresses, match to corresponding pre-stuffed parent survey envelopes, and mail.

General: Track progress on these tasks and share this information with PPA regularly until tasks are completed via the enclosed fax back checklist.

Package Contents

■ *District Coordinator Survey Materials*

- Instructions
- List of providers serving district students
- District coordinator surveys
- Return envelope to PPA

■ *Teacher Survey Materials*

- Instructions to coordinators
- Teacher request letters
- List of students by building

■ *Parent Survey Materials*

- Instructions to coordinators
- Stuffed envelopes, one per child, containing cover letter, survey, and pre-paid return envelope
- Additional prepaid envelopes

Public Policy Research,
Development,
and Evaluation

Jeffrey D. Padden
President

119 Pere Marquette
Lansing, MI 48912-1231

517-485-4477

Fax: 485-4488

ppa@publicpolicy.com

www.publicpolicy.com

- *General Materials*
 - Fax back progress report form

Common Questions

Jennifer Perez-Brennan, a Research Assistant at PPA, is your primary contact for questions or concerns regarding the surveys. She will be contacting you at regular intervals for support purposes and you may call her directly at our office at (517) 485-4477.

1. *The materials I have been given appear incomplete.*
Please refer to the checklists for your district first. If you still believe materials are missing, please call Jennifer for assistance.
2. *Do the various surveys (district, teacher and parent) need to be completed in a specific order?*
No. They are independent of each other.
3. *How can I get extra copies of a survey?*
The district coordinator surveys are generic in format and can be photocopied if extra copies are needed. The teacher and parent surveys are personalized by student and provider, so you will need to discuss this option with Jennifer.
4. *What is the deadline for this work?*
Teachers and parents should have their materials in hand by May 7. The survey ends May 31.

Again, we thank you for your indispensable assistance in this federally-mandated evaluation process.

Sincerely,



Nancy McCrohan, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate

Teacher Survey Instructions

Please distribute all Teacher Request Letters by 05/7/2007.

The provider evaluation process includes a survey of classroom teachers whose students are receiving SES during the current academic year. It consists of an online survey to be completed for each student regarding the student's progress and the perceived impact of the SES providers.

Your materials include Teacher Request Letters from the Michigan Department of Education (personalized for each student and sorted by building) and a list of students by building.

Your Responsibilities

You are asked to:

1. Identify the teacher most likely to be aware of a given student's progress in the subject tutored.
2. Distribute the request letters accordingly. Teachers need to have the personalized letter for each student; they will be asked to enter information from the request letter into the survey Web site to proceed.
3. **Please distribute these by May 7**, so that teachers can complete their surveys by May 31.
4. Also, please use the fax back progress form provided to note when Teacher Request Letters were distributed in each building in the district. Please fax the form to PPA at (517) 485-4488 on the dates listed until administrative tasks are completed.

Some Important Considerations

- *Track assignments.* For your own records, you may wish to document which teacher was assigned to each student on the checklist provided. This list does not need to be shared with PPA.
- *The most appropriate teacher teaches the tutored subject.* For elementary students, this will most likely be the general classroom teacher. For middle and high school students, this is a two-step process. First verify the subject in which the student was tutored by the named provider. Then find the classroom teacher.
- *Some students are found to receive tutoring in **both** math and English language arts.* For these cases, the teacher survey request letter only needs to be given to one of the two teachers. Please alternate assignments between math and English language arts teachers to achieve an approximate 50/50 split. You may wish to distribute these randomly according to a code assignment PPA has printed on each teacher request letter: "E" for English language

arts or “M” for math. While the code appears at the end of the district name on the top right of every letter, it is only meant to assist in distribution of letters for middle or high school students who are being tutored in more than one subject. *PPA does not know the subject students are tutored in and this is not a guide for general distribution of all request letters.*

- *Multiple surveys.* Some teachers may be given multiple request letters if numerous students in their classes receive SES. A survey will have to be completed in each case. Distributing request letters in one batch will promote survey response among teachers.
- *Survey format and access.* The surveys are available online 24 hours a day. Teachers will be directed to a survey Web site where they will identify the student(s) and answer approximately 20 questions. Expected duration is five minutes per survey. Teachers with multiple surveys to complete will be prompted to begin the survey again for the next student. Teachers who find they are unable to complete the survey online due to technology barriers may request a hard copy, and contact information for PPA is provided directly to them on the Teacher Request Letter.
- *SES service timeframe.* Teachers will be better able to respond to the survey if they are aware of when SES services began for their building this school year.

We appreciate your time and effort in this important work. You may call Jennifer Perez-Brennan at (517) 485-4477 to report any difficulties with this process that require consultation. Of particular urgency are those cases directly impeding the survey process, for example:

- Refusal of a group of teachers to fill out surveys.
- High volume need for technical assistance with the online survey.

District Coordinator Survey Instructions

Please complete and return all district surveys by 05/31/07.

The provider evaluation process includes surveys of SES or Title I district coordinators asking about each provider that is serving the district in the current academic year. The questions in the two-page survey cover the degree to which providers meet administrative requirements and program quality standards, as well as whether they adhere to the service plan and program content contracted with the district.

Your materials include hard copy surveys and a list of all SES providers serving your district.

Your Responsibilities

You are asked to:

1. Please complete *one survey for each provider* serving students in your district. You are welcome to refer questions to district staff members to assist in the information-gathering process.
2. Return the surveys in the provided envelope or box to Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA).

Some Important Considerations

Some important information regarding the provider list and number of surveys:

- Your list of contracted providers is drawn from CEPI data reported by districts.
 - If you work with an additional provider that is not listed, you may copy the provider survey to complete a survey for that provider.
 - Any other inconsistencies in the list should be reported to Jennifer Perez-Brennan.

We greatly appreciate your time in completing this survey. Jennifer Perez-Brennan is available to provide technical assistance as needed at (517) 485-4477.

Parent/Guardian Survey Instructions

Please mail all parent surveys for delivery by 05/07/07.

The provider evaluation process includes a survey of parents and guardians whose children are receiving SES in the current academic year. The two-page survey focuses on tutor services, student improvement, and communication. If a parent has more than one child in SES, they will receive multiple surveys.

Your materials include prepaid sealed envelopes holding parent surveys and return envelopes (labeled with the student name and grouped by building).

Your Responsibilities

To distribute the parent surveys, we ask that you:

1. Generate labels with the name and mailing address of students' parent(s) or guardian(s).
2. Match these to the appropriate, pre-assembled envelopes, relying on the student name on the outer envelope.
3. Mail the letters.
4. Also, please use the fax back progress form provided to note when surveys were mailed for each building in the district. Please fax the form to PPA at (517) 485-4488 on the dates listed until administrative tasks are completed.

Some Important Considerations

- *Non-English speaking households.* PPA offers Spanish-speaking parents assistance in filling out the survey via phone at (800) 665-8449. There is no other foreign language support at this time; districts may choose at their option to offer assistance in other languages.
- *Some parents may return the survey to the school instead of mailing it.* Please advise building administrators to accept the survey, seal it immediately, and mail it back to PPA. We have provided some additional prepaid envelopes for this purpose.

We appreciate your time and effort in this important work. You may call Jennifer Perez-Brennan at (517) 485-4477 to report any difficulties with this process that require consultation.

FAX BACK PROGRESS FORM

Due: _____ *Friday, May 4, 2007* _____ *Friday, May 11, 2007* _____ *Friday, May 18, 2007*

To: Jennifer Perez-Brennan
Organization: Public Policy Associates, Inc.
Fax: (517) 485-4488
Tel: (517) 485-4477

From: _____
District: (merge dist name)
Fax: _____
Tel: _____

BUILDING	Parent surveys mailed	Teacher letters distributed	Comments
[list building names]			

If you have questions or concerns about the process, please contact Jennifer Perez-Brennan at (517) 485-4477.

Teacher Survey Assignment Form

This form is provided to record the names of teachers to whom students are assigned. This is strictly for your reference. You do not need to return this information to Public Policy Associates, Inc.

Buildings and Students		
	Teacher Assigned	Teacher Letters Distributed
[list building name- alphabetically]		
[student name- alphabetically]		
[student name]		
[list building names]		
[student name]		
[student name]		
[student name]		
[list building names]		
[student name]		
[student name]		
[student name]		
Etc.		

Appendix B. DPS District Coordinator Guidance Material



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

April 23, 2007

Dear Supplemental Educational Services Coordinators:

The Michigan Department of Education is working in partnership with Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA) to evaluate supplemental educational services (SES) providers in the state. Our evaluation plan calls for compiling information from multiple sources in order to get a full understanding of providers' effectiveness.

As you know, we are asking you to facilitate distribution of the parent surveys and the teacher surveys in your district, and to complete a district-level survey on each of your providers.

Enclosed are more specific instructions from PPA, including due dates and contact information should you have questions.

We appreciate your time and effort in this important work. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Perez-Brennan, Research Assistant, at (517) 485-4477 or via e-mail at jperezbrennan@publicpolicy.com.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Radke, Ph.D.
Assistant Director
Office of School Improvement

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324



April, 2007

Patricia Owens
Program Supervisor
Supplemental Educational Services
Detroit City Public Schools

Dear Ms. Owens:

The research team at Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA) is glad to be a part of the Michigan Department of Education's evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) providers. We look forward to working constructively with you as we implement a systematic approach to this federally mandated evaluation. PPA would like to thank you in advance for your vital contributions to the evaluation process.

This letter is meant to provide an overview of tasks and of enclosed materials, as well as anticipate answers to common questions. More detailed instructions for each survey are attached to the corresponding survey packets.

Public Policy Research,
Development,
and Evaluation

Overview of Detroit District Coordinator Role

District Coordinator Survey: Complete one survey for each provider delivering tutoring services to students in your district.

Teacher Survey: Assign appropriate teachers to SES students and compile teacher e-mail addresses allowing PPA to request their participation in an online survey

Parent Survey: Provide parent addresses to PPA to mail surveys directly.

Package Contents

- *District Coordinator Survey Materials*
 - Instructions
 - List of providers serving district students
 - District coordinator surveys
 - Return envelope to PPA
- *Teacher Survey Materials*
 - Instructions to coordinators
- *Parent Survey Materials*
 - Instructions to coordinators
 - Additional prepaid envelopes

Jeffrey D. Padden
President

119 Pere Marquette
Lansing, MI 48912-1231
517-485-4477
Fax: 485-4488

ppa@publicpolicy.com
www.publicpolicy.com

Common Questions

Jennifer Perez-Brennan, a Research Assistant at PPA, is your primary contact for questions or concerns regarding the surveys. She will be contacting you at regular intervals for support purposes and you may call her directly at our office at (517) 485-4477.

1. *The materials I have been given appear incomplete.*
If you believe materials are missing, please call Jennifer for assistance.
2. *How can I get extra copies of a survey?*
The district coordinator surveys are generic in format and can be photocopied if extra copies are needed.
3. *What is the deadline for this work?*
The last day to complete surveys is May 31.

Again, we thank you for your indispensable assistance in this federally-mandated evaluation process.

Sincerely,



Nancy McCrohan, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate

Teacher Survey Instructions for Detroit

The provider evaluation process includes a survey of classroom teachers whose students are receiving SES during the current academic year. It consists of an online survey to be completed for each student regarding the student's progress and the perceived impact of his or her SES provider. The last day for completion of online surveys is May 31.

The Detroit Public School District has opted to use SES enrollment data to assign teachers to SES students and provide PPA with teacher e-mails by student. PPA will send the teacher survey request e-mail(s) directly to the teacher and will also manage follow up for non respondents. The information below is meant only to help anticipate issues that teachers may bring to the attention of the district as they move through the survey process.

Some Important Considerations

- *Multiple survey requests.* Teachers may be sent multiple requests to fill out the online survey, one per SES student assigned to them. These e-mail requests will arrive in batches; it is very important to note that they will appear identical until opened, because they will have the same subject line. However, once opened, each e-mail request will name a specific SES student and provide a unique link (URL) to follow to the survey Web site for entering that student's survey responses. A teacher will therefore have to use each e-mail one time only. If a teacher reopens an e-mail for a student he or she has entered data for already, the teacher will be redirected to the end of the survey and will not be able to enter new information. It is important for teachers to understand this in advance so as not to inadvertently delete "extra" e-mails from their inbox.
- *Follow-up e-mails.* PPA will resend e-mail requests for all unanswered surveys after approximately 10 days.
- *"Bounce back" e-mails.* Some e-mail requests may return as undeliverable because of invalid addresses or spam filters. If this occurs in high volume PPA will contact the district to troubleshoot the problem.
- *Survey format and access.* The surveys are available online 24 hours a day. The links in the request e-mails will direct teachers to the Survey Monkey Web site where they will re-enter the name of the student listed on the e-mail, then answer approximately 20 questions. Expected duration is five minutes per survey. Teachers will be prompted to begin the survey again for the next student provided if they have multiple surveys to complete. Teachers who find they are unable to complete the survey online due to technology barriers may request a hard copy, and contact information for PPA is provided directly to them on the Teacher Request Letter.
- *SES service timeframe.* Teachers will be better able to respond to the survey if they are aware of when SES services began for their building this school year.

We appreciate your time and effort in this important work. You may call Jennifer Perez-Brennan at (517) 485-4477 to report any difficulties with this process that require consultation. Of particular urgency are those cases directly impeding the survey process, for example:

- Refusal of a group of teachers to fill out surveys.
- High volume need for technical assistance with the online survey.
- Conflict of interest concerns where classroom teachers are also employed as SES tutors.

District Coordinator Survey Instructions for Detroit

Please complete and return all district surveys by May 31 2007.

The provider evaluation process includes surveys of SES or Title I district coordinators asking about each provider that is serving the district in the current academic year. The questions in the two-page survey cover the degree to which providers meet administrative requirements and program quality standards, as well as whether they adhere to the service plan and program content contracted with the district.

Your materials include hard copy surveys and a list of all SES providers serving your district.

Your Responsibilities

You are asked to:

1. Please complete *one survey for each provider* serving students in your district. Please be careful to copy the provider name exactly as it appears on the furnished list to prevent identification problems. You are welcome to refer questions to district staff members to assist in the information-gathering process.
2. Return the surveys in the provided envelope or box to Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA).

Some Important Considerations

Some important information regarding the provider list and number of surveys:

- Your list of contracted providers is drawn from CEPI data reported by districts.
 - If you work with an additional provider that is not listed, you may copy the provider survey to complete a survey for that provider.
 - Any other inconsistencies in the list should be reported to Jennifer Perez-Brennan.

We greatly appreciate your time in completing this survey. Jennifer Perez-Brennan is available to provide technical assistance as needed at (517) 485-4477.

Parent/Guardian Survey Instructions for Detroit

The provider evaluation process includes a survey of parents and guardians whose children are receiving SES in the current academic year. The two-page survey focuses on tutor services, student improvement, and communication. If a parent has more than one child in SES, they will receive multiple surveys. The last day for completion of online surveys is May 31.

The Detroit Public School District has furnished PPA with parent addresses for students in SES. These surveys will be mailed directly to parents without further assistance from the district. The information below is meant only to help anticipate issues that teachers may bring to the attention of the district as they move through the survey process

Some Important Considerations

- *Non-English speaking households.* PPA offers Spanish-speaking parents assistance in filling out the survey via phone at (800) 665-8449. There is no other foreign language support at this time; districts may choose at their option to offer assistance in other languages.
- *Some parents may return the survey to the school instead of mailing it.* Please advise building administrators to accept the survey, seal it immediately, and mail it back to PPA. We have provided additional prepaid envelopes for this purpose.

We appreciate your time and effort in this important work. You may call Jennifer Perez-Brennan at (517) 485-4477 to report any difficulties with this process that require consultation.

