

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama

2010-2011

Implementation Overview

Kathryn E. Murphy

The University of Memphis

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama 2010–2011

Implementation Overview

This summary presents an overview of the implementation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in Alabama during the 2010-11 school year as reported by SES District/Local Education Agency (LEA) coordinators. The findings are part of the 2010-11 evaluation of SES in Alabama, which was conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to examine SES provider effectiveness by analyzing SES student achievement outcomes and the perceptions of key stakeholders in districts required to offer SES in Alabama. Those results are presented in separate reports (Murphy & Signorelli, 2012; Zoblotsky, Qian, & Winter, 2012).

A secondary purpose of the evaluation was to review implementation efforts throughout SES-eligible districts in Alabama. District/LEA coordinators were given the opportunity to respond to items regarding the implementation and facilitation of SES through an online questionnaire. The findings have been assimilated into this separate overview since the responses regarding implementation of SES in Alabama serve a separate purpose from that of the provider evaluation. Data from this report may be used in conjunction with data from other respondent groups as part of the state's interest in continued SES improvement.

SES District/LEA Coordinators

During the 2010-11 school year, District/LEA coordinators in 22 of the 27 SES-eligible districts responded to questions regarding the state's facilitation of SES. Overall, District/LEA coordinator respondents indicated satisfaction with the implementation of SES at the state level. All responding District/LEA coordinators agreed that the state maintained a list of approved providers. Of the 22 respondents, 19 (86.4%) agreed that the state developed objective criteria for approving potential providers. The majority of respondents (95.5%; $n = 21/22$) agreed that the state organized or supported provider and LEA meetings. Most District/LEA coordinators (90.9%; $n = 20/22$) agreed that state monitoring of the quality and effectiveness of provider services took place during the 2010-11 school year. Less than two-thirds of respondents (63.6%; $n = 14/22$) indicated the state developed methods for withdrawing approval from providers. District/LEA coordinator respondents noted that the state: 1) Facilitated in settling disputes and working out concerns, 2) Hosted sessions whereby we could meet as LEAs and discuss issues

with SES providers, clarify outstanding issues, etc., and 3) Provided insight on how to respond to various scenarios. All 22 responding District/LEA coordinators (100%) indicated satisfaction with the SES implementation assistance provided at the state level. Results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: District/LEA Coordinator Responses: State Implementation
N=22

1. The state facilitated SES in the following ways: (check all that apply)	Percentage
Developed objective criteria for approving potential providers.	86.4
Maintained a list of approved providers.	100.0
Organized or supported provider and LEA technical assistance.	95.5
Monitored the quality and effectiveness of provider services.	90.9
Developed methods for withdrawing approval from providers.	63.6
Other	13.6
Facilitated in settling disputes and working out concerns	
Hosted Sessions whereby we could meet as LEA's and discuss issues with SES providers, clarify outstanding issues, etc.	
Provided insight on how to respond to various scenarios	
The SEA...	Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree
2. Overall, I am satisfied with the way my SEA helped our district implement Supplemental Educational Services.	100.0

Summary

Overall, SES District/LEA coordinators who participated were satisfied with the state coordinator department's assistance in implementing SES in their districts. Furthermore, the majority of respondents agreed that the department had successfully fulfilled the task of facilitating SES. Based upon perceptions reported in previous years and in this SES implementation overview¹, the state should consider reviewing current methods for withdrawing approval from providers to identify and correct limitations in the existing process. Additionally, communicating this process with the District/LEA coordinators can serve an important role in addressing questions or concerns. As Alabama continues providing SES services in the 2011-

¹ *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009-2010 Implementation Overview* reported that less than three-fourths of district/LEA coordinator respondents (70.8%; n = 17/24) indicated the state developed methods for withdrawing approval from providers.

2012 school year, the state should continue its focus on implementation activities at all levels—state, district and school.

References

- Murphy, K. & Hunter, C., (March 2011). *Supplemental educational services in the state of Alabama: 2009–2010 Technical Appendix*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.
- Murphy, K. & Signorelli, B., (January 2012). *Supplemental educational services in the state of Alabama: 2010–2011 Technical Appendix*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.
- Zoblotsky, T., Qian, H., & Winter, B. (2012). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis.