THE UNIVERSITY OF
MEMPHIS. | Center for Research
in Educational Policy

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama

2010-2011

Summary of Provider Effectiveness

Kathryn E. Murphy

Brittany Signorelli

The University of Memphis

May 2012

Dreamers. Thinkers. Doers.

Table of Contents

Index of Tables

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in Alabama during the 2010–11 school year. The study was conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to examine SES provider effectiveness through analyzing SES student achievement outcomes and the perceptions of key stakeholders in specified school districts in Alabama. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process to assist the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) in meeting federal evaluation/monitoring requirements.

During the 2010–11 school year, 27 Alabama districts/local educational agencies (LEAs) were required to offer SES. Within these districts, 59 Title I schools were designated SES eligible. Statewide, 22 individual provider companies were authorized by the ALSDE to offer SES. Of the 22 authorized provider companies, 16 were active during the 2010–11 school year.

Two complementary studies were conducted to address the research questions. The first study examined two questions: (1) whether students served by SES providers had shown statistically significant academic gains in Reading and Mathematics from the previous year; and (2) how students served by SES providers performed, compared to other students in their schools and grade levels, in terms of Reading and Mathematics. Results of this first study are reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis[1]*. Results from the first study were also used to inform the second study. The second study investigated stakeholder perceptions of provider implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, district coordinators, principals/LEA site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students receiving SES. The current report addresses those research questions statewide across all providers, and includes provider-specific data summaries from each respondent group.

Results

Perceptions of Implementation and Outcomes

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?

- Responses indicated the majority of participating principals/LEA site coordinators were satisfied with how their school district helped their school implement services from SES providers (90.0%; n = 63/70).
- The majority of parent respondents were pleased with the way their school district helped them obtain SES for their child (70.0%; n = 424/437).

---

[1] Zoblotsky, T., Qian, H., & Winter, B. (2012*). Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

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

- Over eighty percent of the responses from participating district coordinators agreed that the services offered by providers positively impacted student achievement (82.2%; n = 60/73).
- The majority of the principal/LEA site coordinators' responses (88.5%; n = 62/70) agreed that provider services positively impacted student achievement.
- Most teacher responses indicated that provider services positively impacted student achievement (87.5%; n = 155/177).
- The majority of parent respondents agreed that SES tutoring helped their child's achievement (92.5%; n = 404/437).

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

- The majority of responding providers indicated that tutors communicated frequently with teachers (81.3%; n = 13/16). Additionally, less than twenty percent of provider respondents indicated that communication with teachers occurred occasionally (18.8%; n = 3/16). All responding providers (n = 16) indicated that tutors communicated with parents/guardians, with three-fourths reporting that communication occurred frequently (75.0%; n = 12/16) and the remaining one-fourth reporting that communication occurred occasionally (25.0%; n = 4/16).
- Slightly more than half of district coordinator responses noted that providers communicated with them frequently during the school year (50.7%; n = 37/73), while the remaining 49.3% indicated that communication with providers occurred occasionally (n = 36/73).
- More than eighty percent of the responses from participating principals/LEA site coordinators reported that providers communicated with them either frequently (50.0%; n = 35/70) or occasionally (35.7%; n = 25/70) during the school year.
- More than half of teacher responses indicated that providers communicated with them frequently during the school year (59.9%; n = 106/177). More than one-fourth (27.7%) of the teacher respondents reported that provider communication occurred occasionally (n = 49/177), while slightly more than ten percent of teacher respondents indicated that there was no communication from the provider (12.4%; n 22/177).
- More than half of responding parents indicated that providers verbally communicated with them about their child's progress (52.9%; n = 231/437) a lot during the school year. More than one-third of responding parents indicated that providers sent letters or notes home about their child's progress (37.3%; n = 163/437) a lot during the school year.

4. *Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?*

- One-fourth of the provider responses indicated tutors frequently showed their lesson plans or materials to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they tutored (25.0%; n = 4/16). More than half indicated that tutors occasionally (30.0%; n = 5/16) showed their

lesson plans or materials to the homeroom/subject teacher, while slightly more than ten percent (12.5%; n = 2/16) indicated this did not occur. The majority of provider submissions indicated that they frequently were able to integrate their tutoring services with classroom learning activities (81.3%; n = 13/16) and frequently adapted supplemental services to each school's curriculum (75.0%; n = 12/16).

- More than one-third of the responses from district coordinators indicated that providers frequently collaborated with them to set goals for student growth (39.7%; n = 29/73). The majority of district coordinator submissions agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (79.5%; n = 58/73). Furthermore, nearly two-thirds of the responses indicated that providers integrated tutoring services with classroom learning activities (65.7%; n = 48/73).

- More than thirty percent (34.3%; n = 24/70) of the principal/LEA site coordinator responses indicated that providers frequently collaborated with them to set goals for student growth. A similar percentage of responses indicated that collaboration to set goals for student growth occurred occasionally (32.9%; n = 23/70) or not at all (31.4%; n = 22/70). The majority of principal/LEA site coordinators agreed providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (85.7%; n = 60/70). More than three-fourths of respondents agreed that providers integrated services with classroom learning activities (77.1%; n = 54/70).

- Over half of teacher submissions noted that provider collaboration to set goals for student growth occurred frequently (52.5%; n = 93/177). The majority of responses (82.0%; n = 145/177) agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to the school's curriculum and to meet the needs of individual students (82.5%; n = 146/177). The majority of teachers' submissions also agreed that classroom learning activities were integrated into the tutoring services (78.6%; n = 139/177).

- More than two-thirds of parent respondents (68.9%; n = 301/437) indicated that providers helped their child with subjects they are working on in school a lot.

5. *Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?*

- All responding providers reported that they aligned their services and curriculum with local and state academic content and standards (N = 16).

- A large majority of responses from district coordinators agreed that providers' services were aligned with state and local standards (91.8%; n = 67/73).

6. *Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?*

- More than half of provider respondents reported that they frequently offered instruction to special education and ELL students (56.3%; n = 9/16). While more than ten percent of provider respondents (12.5%; n = 2/16) indicated that they occasionally offered instruction to special education and ELL students, a larger percent indicated that instruction to special education and ELL students was not offered at all (25.0%; n = 4/16).

- The vast majority of responses from district coordinators (98.6%; n = 72/73) agreed that providers offered services to special education and ELL students.
- The majority of principal/LEA site coordinator responses (84.3%; n = 59/70) agreed that providers offered services to special education and ELL.

7. *What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?*

- The majority of district coordinator submissions indicated satisfaction with provider services (86.3%; n = 63/73).
- The majority of principal/LEA site coordinator responses agreed that they were satisfied with provider services (81.4%; n = 57/70).
- The majority of teacher responses noted satisfaction with provider services (85.3%; n = 151/177).
- Over ninety percent (93.2%; n = 407437) of parent respondents agreed that they were pleased with the tutoring services their child received.

Conclusion

The spring of the 2010–11 school year brought weather-related crisis across large portions of Alabama, causing several school districts to suffer catastrophic losses of facilities and administrative infrastructure. In addition to districts' material losses, in these communities as a whole there were tragic losses of life and significant loss of property. Due to these circumstances, several districts were forced to end the school year early. Meanwhile, contractual issues caused delays in the printing and shipping of parent surveys. These factors adversely affected survey distribution. Therefore, the decrease from previous years in the number of parent survey submissions is not surprising.

Overall, stakeholders throughout Alabama, who participated in the evaluation of SES for the 2010–11 school year, were positive concerning their experiences. Stakeholders from all groups, district level, school personnel, and parents alike, expressed satisfaction with the SES providers as a whole. Not only did the stakeholders express overall satisfaction with SES, but the majority indicated a belief that SES had a positive impact on student achievement. The state should continue its efforts to monitor and facilitate communication and collaboration between providers, districts, and schools. Providers also have a responsibility to assess and implement strategies to enhance cooperation, communication, and collaboration with the district(s) and the schools served, and with the parents of SES students.

Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama
2010-2011 Evaluation Report

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) in Alabama, conducted by the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis. SES is a component of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), and is designed to provide extra academic assistance for eligible children. Specifically, students are eligible to receive SES if they are from low-income families and attend Title I schools that are in their second year or more of school improvement (i.e., have not made adequate yearly progress or "AYP" for three or more years), in corrective action, or in restructuring status.

The primary purpose of this evaluation was to examine SES provider effectiveness through the analysis of SES student achievement outcomes and perceptions from key stakeholders in the Alabama school districts that offered these services during the 2010–11 school year. A secondary goal of this evaluation was to create a systematic process that allows the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) to meet federal evaluation/monitoring requirements.

During the 2010–11 school year, 27 districts/LEAs in Alabama were required to offer SES. Within these districts, 59 Title I schools were designated SES eligible. Parents of students in these schools were informed by the school of their child's eligibility for additional academic assistance provided through SES. Additionally, parents were provided a list of the authorized service providers from which they could choose. Statewide, the ALSDE authorized 22 individual provider companies. Of the 22 ALSDE-authorized provider companies, 16 companies were active during the 2010–11 school year. Providers were authorized in one or more districts and could thus offer services to multiple schools.

Rationale and Questions for the Evaluation

Two complementary studies were conducted to address the research questions. The first study examined two questions: (1) whether students served by SES providers had shown statistically significant academic gains in Reading and Mathematics from the previous year; and (2) how students served by SES providers performed, compared to other students in their schools and grade levels, in terms of Reading and Mathematics. Results of the first study are reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement*

Analysis[2]. Results from the first study were also used to inform the second study. The second study investigated stakeholder perceptions of provider implementation and outcomes statewide, through surveys administered to SES providers, district coordinators, principals/LEA site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students receiving SES. The primary research questions for the second study were:

1. Do LEAs make SES available to eligible students?
2. What are district coordinators', principals'/LEA site coordinators', teachers', and parents' experiences with and reactions to SES interventions?
3. Are providers communicating regularly with district coordinators, principals/LEA site coordinators, teachers, and parents of students eligible for SES?
4. Are providers working with districts, schools, and parents to develop instructional plans geared to student needs?
5. Are providers aligning their curriculum with local and state academic content and achievement standards?
6. Are providers offering services to special education and English Language Learner (ELL) students?
7. What are the stakeholders' overall assessments of provider performance?

Methodology
Procedure

The research design consisted of a descriptive study investigating the implementation of SES in districts and schools, and an evaluation of individual SES providers' compliance and effectiveness.

Descriptive study of SES implementation. The descriptive portion of the study consisted of surveying the following groups of respondents: (1) SES providers, (2) district coordinators in participating SES districts, (3) principals or LEA site coordinators in participating SES schools, (4) teachers of students receiving SES, and (5) parents of students receiving SES.

In the spring of 2011, SES provider representatives received, from researchers at CREP, individual email notifications containing their unique login information and instructions for

---

[2] Zoblotsky, T., Qian, H., & Winter, B. (2012). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis.* Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

completing the provider surveys. Providers were directed to complete an online survey concerning their company's involvement and satisfaction with SES in Alabama. Providers were able to complete the survey throughout spring and summer.

Also in the spring, evaluators provided district coordinators their online survey login information and instructions for completing the district coordinator survey via email notification. District coordinators also received login information for principal/LEA site coordinators and teachers, and were asked to distribute this information to SES eligible schools. All district coordinators and school personnel were instructed to complete a separate online survey for each provider currently providing services to students in their districts (district coordinators), schools (principals/LEA site coordinators), or classes (teachers). At the school level, either the principal or the LEA site coordinator completed the survey, depending on which individual had the most contact with the SES tutoring program. Each district coordinator, principal/LEA site coordinator, and teacher survey was counted as a separate response. All respondent groups were given several weeks to complete the surveys. For all online survey respondents, open-ended comments were reviewed by the evaluators and individual's names and phone numbers removed.

Parent surveys, with distribution and return instructions, were shipped to each district with schools required to offer SES tutoring. Parent surveys were presented in both English and Spanish. District coordinators dispersed parent surveys to SES schools for distribution by principals/LEA site coordinators. Each parent envelope contained a survey, an introductory letter, and a list of all the SES providers authorized by the state. Parents were asked to identify the provider that tutored their child, complete a survey for the provider, and return the survey sealed in a provided envelope. Each school bundled the returned parent surveys and mailed them to CREP using postage-paid return envelopes. Comments on parent surveys were transcribed verbatim and identifying names and phone numbers were removed. Comments provided in Spanish were translated using an online translation tool and were annotated as such in the transcriptions.

Instrumentation

Surveys. Five survey instruments were used, one for each of the following stakeholder groups: (1) SES providers, (2) district coordinators in participating SES districts, (3) principals or LEA site coordinators in participating SES schools, (4) teachers of students receiving SES, and (5) parents of students receiving SES. The surveys contained a set of questions in common

for all groups (e.g., experiences with SES and providers) to facilitate triangulation of findings. In addition, each survey included questions targeted to specific groups (e.g., reactions to particular providers, satisfaction with district assistance in SES implementation). For each survey item, the respondent chose from a range of three-, four- or five-point Likert-style responses (e.g., 3-point: 3=A Lot, Sometimes, 1=Not at all; 4-point: 4=Frequently, Occasionally, Not at all, 1=Don't Know; 5-point: 5=Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, 1=Don't Know), with higher scores indicating a more positive perception of the provided services.

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

Provider Rubric. Provider effectiveness for this study was assessed using a rubric evaluation tool that summarized the respondents' perceptions of provider activities and outcomes. Provider rubrics were ranked separately for the statewide aggregate of providers and for individual providers. The rubric evaluation tool utilizes six outcome categories developed by CREP evaluators to coincide with NCLB SES non-regulatory guidelines: (1) Student Achievement, (2) Communication, (3) Instructional Plans, (4) Local and State Standards, (5) Special Education and ELL Students, and (6) Overall Assessment of Provider. The rubric divides the Student Achievement category into two subject areas: Reading and Mathematics. For each category, providers were rated based on their level of attainment (e.g., Above Standards, Acceptable, Marginal Quality, or Below Standards). A category of Insufficient Information was used in cases where there was not sufficient data to rate the provider. Full descriptors accompany each attainment level for each category in the rubric.

Results

The results section details the statewide aggregated data, for the 2010–11 school year, for each of the survey respondent groups: providers, district coordinators, principals/LEA site coordinators, teachers, and parents. When available, cross-year comparisons are also made. In

addition, the results section includes a discussion of survey responses rates, overall approval ratings for each provider by respondent group, and a statewide rubric of overall provider effectiveness. The section concludes with rubrics of provider effectiveness for individual providers.

Aggregate Provider Perceptions and Activities, Statewide 2010–2011. Representatives from 16 provider organizations completed an online survey about their experiences with SES in Alabama during the 2010–11 school year. All of the 16 responding providers indicated that tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s) either frequently or occasionally. Similarly, all provider responses indicated that tutors communicated either frequently or occasionally with parents/guardians (N = 16). Less than two-thirds (62.6%; n = 10/16) of respondents noted satisfaction with student attendance. The majority of responding providers, 93.8%, (n = 15/16) expressed satisfaction with student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation) as well as with the ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum (93.8%; n = 15/16). Overall, provider respondents were satisfied by the cooperation and involvement of teachers (75.1%; n = 12/16), principals/LEA site coordinators (93.8%; n = 15/16), district coordinators (93.8%; n = 15/16), and state SES coordinators (100.0%; N = 16). Similarly, provider responses indicated satisfaction with parent cooperation and involvement (87.6%; n = 14/16). Table 1 offers a summary of provider responses.

Comparison of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, and 2010–2011 Aggregate Provider Responses. In this section, providers' perceptions of and satisfaction with SES, as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008–2009[3]* and *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010[4],* are presented and compared to the findings in this report. During the 2008–09 evaluation period, 30 provider surveys were submitted, while in 2009–10, 20 provider organizations submitted surveys.

As depicted in Table 1, provider responses have remained favorable over the past three years. Provider response rates have continued to increase from 50% for 2008–09 (n = 30/60) to 80% in 2009–10 (n = 20/25) to 100% for 2010–11 (n = 16/16). Perceptions and reported

---

[3] Ford, J., Harrison, L., Hunter, C., & Nash, T. (2010). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008-2009*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.
[4] Murphy, K., Harrison, L., & Hunter, C. (2010). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009-2010*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

satisfaction from responding SES providers have remained constant with slight variations from year to year. Providers' responses to "tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with" increased, rising from 76.7% in 2008–09, to 55% in 2009–10, to 87.5% in 2010–11. While decreases were observed in response to "the provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners," the level of agreement falling from 73.3% in 2008–09 and 85.0% in 2009–10 to 68.8% in 2010–11. Additionally, decreases were observed in provider satisfaction with student attendance, dropping from 70.0% in 2009–10 to 62.6% in 2010–11, and with perceived success at raising student achievement, 96.7% in 2008–09, and 95.0% in 2009–10 to 87.6% for the current reporting year.

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

Providers	2008–2009	2009–2010	2010-2011
	N = 30	*N* = 20	*N* = 16
Provider Perceptions and Activities	**Percentage Frequently or Occasionally**		
Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%
Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	76.7%	55.0%	87.5%
The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	90.0%	90.0%	93.8%
The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	86.6%	90.0%	87.5%
The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	73.3%	85.0%	68.8%
Provider satisfaction with:	**Percentage Highly Satisfied or Satisfied**		
Student attendance	60.0%	70.0%	62.6%
Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	96.7%	95.0%	93.8%
The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	93.4%	90.0%	93.8%
Parent cooperation/involvement	66.7%	85.0%	87.6%
Teacher cooperation/involvement	76.7%	80.0%	75.1%
Principal/LEA Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	73.3%	85.0%	93.8%
District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	90.0%	85.0%	93.8%
State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	93.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	96.7%	95.0%	87.6%

Response Rates of Other Respondent Groups. Of the 27 district coordinators from school districts required to offer SES, 22 district coordinators submitted at least one survey regarding their experiences with SES providers (81.4%). Two-thirds of the 59 SES eligible schools had at least one survey submission from either a principal/LEA site coordinator or a teacher (66.1%; n = 39/59). Principals/LEA site coordinators had a 50.8% (n = 30/59) response rate while teachers from 55.9% of the SES schools (n = 33/59) submitted surveys. Parent surveys were received from 34 of the 59 SES eligible schools (57.6%). Finally, 7 of the 59 (11.8%) SES eligible

schools were not represented by either school personnel or parent surveys. Table 2 provides a summary of response rates by district.

Table 2: Alabama 2010–2011 SES Survey Return Overview: by District and Respondent Group

District	District Coordinator		School Personnel (Principal/LEA Site Coordinator & Teacher)					Parent		
	Total of SES Eligible Schools	District Coordinator Survey (Y/N)	BOTH Principal/LEA SC & Teacher Surveys	ONLY Principal/ LEA SC Surveys	ONLY Teacher Surveys	EITHER Principal/ LEA SC or Teacher Surveys	% EITHER type:	Schools with Parent Surveys	% Schools with Parent Surveys	Schools with Parent Surveys, but NO School Personnel
Bibb County	2	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	2	100%	2
Bullock County	2	Y	2	0	0	2	100%	2	100%	0
Butler County	2	Y	1	0	0	1	50%	0	0%	0
Chilton County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Coosa County	1	Y	0	0	1	1	100%	1	100%	0
Dallas County	4	Y	3	1	0	4	100%	4	100%	0
Dekalb County	5	Y	1	1	2	4	80%	4	80%	0
Escambia County	1	Y	0	1	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Fayette County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Greene County	1	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Jackson County	3	Y	2	0	0	2	66%	2	66%	0
Limestone County	1	N	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Lowndes County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Monroe County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	0	0%	0
Montgomery County	3	Y	3	0	0	3	100%	3	100%	0
Sumter County	3	Y	0	0	3	3	100%	0	0%	0
Tallapoosa County	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Anniston City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0
Birmingham City	6	Y	0	2	1	3	50%	1	16%	0
Daleville City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Dothan City	2	Y	2	0	0	2	100%	2	100%	0
Fairfield City	1	Y	1	0	0	1	100%	1	100%	0
Huntsville City	4	Y	0	0	0	0	0%	1	25%	1
Midfield City	2	N	2	0	0	2	100%	1	50%	0
Selma City	1	N	0	0	0	0	0%	1	100%	1
Tarrant City	1	Y	0	0	1	1	100%	1	100%	0
Tuscaloosa City	7	Y	1	1	1	3	43%	3	43%	2
Total	*59*	*22*	*24*	*6*	*9*	*39*		*34*		*7*
Statewide percentage		**81%**	**41%**	**10%**	**15%**	**66%**		**58%**		**12%**

Aggregate District Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide 2010–2011. District coordinators from 22 of 27 (81.4%) eligible SES districts submitted at least one survey about their experiences with and reactions to provider services. Respondents were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the district, therefore multiple submissions were possible. A total of 73 surveys were submitted, responses were derived from 22 districts regarding 16 individual providers. Table 3 offers a summary of district coordinators' responses.

Overall, responding district coordinators offered a favorable review of SES providers. Slightly more than half of responses indicated that SES providers frequently communicated with them during the school year (50.7%; n = 37/73), while the remaining 49.3% (36/73) indicated that communication occurred occasionally. The majority of district coordinator responses noted that providers met the obligations for tutoring sessions frequently (69.9%; n = 51/73) or occasionally (26.0%; n = 19/73). The majority also agreed that providers complied with applicable federal NCLB laws (94.5%; n = 69/73).

Although most district coordinators reported frequent communication with providers, fewer than half of district coordinator submissions indicated that providers frequently collaborated with them to set goals for student growth (39.7%; n = 29/73). More than half of responses (52.1%) indicated that collaboration to set goals occurred occasionally (n = 38/73). The majority of responses from district coordinators agreed that providers adapted tutoring services to the school's curriculum (79.5%; n = 58/73), integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities (65.7%; n = 48/73), and offered services to Special Education and ELL students (98.6%; n = 72/73). Over eighty percent of the submissions believed the services offered by the provider positively impacted student achievement (82.2%; n = 60/73) and expressed an overall satisfaction with the provider's services (86.3%; n = 63/73).

Comparison of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, and 2010–2011 Aggregate District Coordinator Responses. In this section, district coordinators' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers, as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008–2009*[5] and *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010*[6], are presented and compared with the findings in this report. During the 2008–09 evaluation period, 18 district coordinators out of 36 submitted surveys for a participation rate of 50%; in the 2009–10 evaluation period, 24 district coordinators out of 25 submitted surveys for a participation rate of 96%; and in 2010–11, 22 out of 27 district coordinators submitted surveys for a participation rate of 81%.

District coordinators' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers' services appear fairly consistent with previous years' responses. An increase in positive responses were

---

[5] Ford, J., Harrison, L., Hunter, C., & Nash, T. (2010). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008-2009*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.
[6] Murphy, K..., Harrison, L., & Hunter, C. (2010). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009-2010*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

indicated regarding providers' collaboration with district coordinators to set goals for student growth and in providers offering services to Special Education and ELL students. Decreases were observed in positive responses to providers' integration of tutoring services with classroom learning activities, from 72.3% in 2009–10 to 65.7% in 2010–11. Favorable responses, regarding the impact on student achievement of responding district coordinators' and in overall satisfaction, continue to increase across evaluation years. Throughout the years, providers' communication with the district coordinator has consistently received a very large percentage of favorable responses. Table 3 presents the comparison data from the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and. 2010-11.

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

District Coordinator	2008–2009 *N* = 78 Representing: 18 districts	2009–2010 *N* = 83 Representing: 24 districts	2010-2011 *N = 73* Representing 22 districts
How often did the provider...	**Percentage Frequently or Occasionally**		
Communicate with you during the year?	100.0%	96.3%	100.0%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	79.5%	79.5%	91.8%
Communicate with teachers during the year?	50.0%	78.3%	71.2%
Communicate with parents during the year?	67.9%	81.9%	78.1%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	89.8%	92.8%	95.9%
The provider...	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	74.3%	80.8%	79.5%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	46.2%	72.3%	65.7%
Aligned their services with state and local standards.	79.5%	89.1%	91.8%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	88.4%	85.6%	98.6%
The provider...	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	79.5%	94.0%	94.5%
Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	64.2%	90.3%	97.2%
Overall Provider Assessment:	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	69.2%	73.4%	82.2%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	74.3%	81.9%	86.3%

Aggregate Principal/LEA Site Coordinator Perceptions, Statewide 2010–2011.
Principals/LEA Site coordinators, from 30 schools where SES was used, submitted a total of 70 surveys. Respondents were asked to complete a separate survey for each provider serving students from the school; therefore, multiple submissions were made by participating respondents. The survey submissions evaluated 11 individual providers. Based upon survey responses, 50.0% (n = 35/70) of the principals/LEA site coordinators reported frequent

communication and 35.7% (n = 25/70) reported occasional communication with providers. Less than half of the principal/LEA site coordinator responses indicated that providers frequently (44.3%; n = 31/70) communicated with teachers, while 35.7% (n = 25/70) of responses indicated that occasional communication with teachers had occurred.

Slightly less than two-thirds of the principal/LEA site coordinator submissions indicated that providers frequently met obligations for conducting tutoring sessions (61.4%; n = 43/70), while 24.3% (n = 17/70) of submissions indicated obligations were met occasionally. The majority of principal/LEA site coordinator responses (91.5%; n = 64/70) agreed that providers started tutoring sessions soon after the registration process was complete. Over eighty percent of the principal/LEA site coordinator responses noted that providers adapted tutoring services to school curriculum (85.7%; n = 60/70) and offered services to Special Education and ELL students (84.3%; n = 59/70). More than three-fourths of the responses from principals/LEA site coordinators agreed that the tutoring services had been integrated with classroom learning activities (77.1%; n = 54/70). Finally, the majority of the principal/LEA site coordinator responses indicated overall satisfaction with provider services (90.0%; n = 63/70).

Comparison of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, and 2010–2011 Aggregate Principal/LEA Site Coordinator Responses. In this section, principals/LEA site coordinators' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers, as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008–2009* (Ford et al., 2010) and *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010* (Murphy et al., 2011), are presented and compared with the findings of this report. In 2008–09, 21 of the 65 SES eligible schools were represented by principal/LEA site coordinator survey submissions, for a participation rate of 32.3%. During the 200910 evaluation period, 33 principals/LEA site coordinators out of 46 submitted surveys, for a participation rate of 71.7%. In 2010–11, 30 of the 59 SES eligible schools were represented by principal/LEA site coordinator survey submissions, for a participation rate of 50.8%.

Although the number of responses decreased from previous the year, overall, favorable responses increased during the 2010–11 evaluation year. Responses for the 2009–10 evaluation had declines in the areas of collaboration and communication, as well as a substantial decrease in the perception of services offered to special education and ELL students. Unlike the evaluation period in 2009–10, the 2010–11 evaluation experienced sizable increases in positive responses, in all survey categories. The declines observed in the 2009–10 evaluation, in the areas of

collaboration and communication, are replaced by increases in these areas for 2010–11. The overall provider assessment increased across years, in positive responses in the perception of providers' positive impact on student achievement (from 68.3% in 2008–09, 60.9% in 2009–10, to 88.5% in 2010–11) and in satisfaction with providers' services (from 66.6% in 2008–09, 59.9% in 2009–10, to 81.4% in 2010–11). The complete aggregate of principal/LEA site coordinator responses is presented in the Technical Appendix.

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

Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	2008–2009 *N = 60* Representing: 21 schools	2009–2010 *N = 97* Representing 33 schools	2010-2011 *N = 70* Representing 30 schools
How often did the provider...	**Percentage Frequently or Occasionally**		
Communicate with you during the school year?	88.3%	71.1%	85.7%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	71.7%	59.8%	67.2%
Communicate with teachers during the year?	56.6%	46.3%	80.0%
Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	80.0%	69.1%	85.7%
The provider...	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	71.6%	72.1%	91.5%
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	61.6%	59.9%	85.7%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	60.0%	47.4%	77.1%
Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	90.0%	64.0%	85.3%
Overall Provider Assessment:	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	68.3%	60.9%	88.5%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	66.6%	59.9%	81.4%
District Assessment:	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	91.7%	72.1%	90.0%

Aggregate Teacher Perceptions, Statewide 2010–2011. A total of 177 surveys from 33 schools were submitted by teachers regarding their perceptions of and experiences with 10 providers. Like district coordinators and principals/LEA site coordinators, teachers completed a separate survey for each provider serving students in their school, therefore multiple survey submissions were possible. Over half (55.4%; n = 98/177) of teacher responses indicated they were employed by the provider for which they completed a survey.

Nearly sixty percent of teacher responses indicated that providers frequently communicated with them during the school year (59.9%; n = 106/177), while more than one-fourth (27.7%; n = 49/177) reported that communication occurred occasionally. Twenty-two teacher responses (12.4%) indicated that there was no communication from the provider during

the school year. Similarly, more than half of teacher responses indicated that collaboration with providers to set goals for student growth occurred frequently (52.5%; n = 93/177), while more than one-fourth of responses (29.4%; n = 52/177) indicated that collaboration occurred occasionally. The majority of teacher responses agreed that the provider adapted the tutoring services to both the school's curriculum (82.0%; n = 145/177) and to meet the needs of individual students (82.5%; n = 146/177). In addition, the majority of respondents agreed that the services received from this provider positively impacted student achievement (87.5%; n = 155/177) and indicated overall satisfaction with the provider's services (85.3%; n = 151/177). The complete summary data table of teachers' responses is presented in the Technical Appendix.

Comparison of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, and 2010–2011 Aggregate Teacher Responses. In this section, teachers' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers, as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008–2009* (Ford et al., 2010) and *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010* (Murphy et al., 2011), are presented and compared with the findings of this report. Teachers from 21 of 65 (32.3%) SES eligible schools submitted surveys during the 2008–09 evaluation period. In the 2009–10 school year, teachers from 24 of the 46 (52.2%), SES eligible schools submitted surveys. During the 2010–11 evaluation period, teachers from 33 of the 59 SES eligible schools submitted surveys for a 55.9% submission rate. Similar to the increases noted in principal/LEA site coordinators' favorable responses, increases were observed in the 2010–11 teachers' responses. Table 5 illustrates the summary of teacher responses for the years 2008–09, 2009–10, and 2010– 11. There is an increase in favorable responses to each question on the 2010–11 survey as compared to responses in 2009–10. Whereas teacher submissions indicating "Don't know" received nearly a fourth or more of all responses in 2009–10, teacher submissions indicating "don't know" decreased in 2010–11 in all responses.

It should be noted that although the total number of teacher submissions have fluctuated, the percentage of schools represented by teacher surveys has continued to increase over the past three years.

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

Teacher	2008–2009 N = 242 Representing 21 schools	2009–2010 N = 153 Representing 24 schools	2010-2011 N = 177 Representing 33 schools
How often did the provider...	**Percentage Frequently or Occasionally**		
Communicate with you during the school year?	88.1%	70.0%	87.6%
Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	76.8%	60.8%	81.9%
The provider...	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	80.1%	64.1%	82.0%
Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	79.7%	64.1%	82.5%
Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	78.1%	60.8%	78.6%
Overall Assessment:	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	73.1%	70.0%	87.5%
Overall, I am satisfied with the services of this provider.	80.2%	64.0%	85.3%

Aggregate Parent Perceptions, Statewide 2010–2011. Parents of students participating in SES were asked to complete a survey about the provider offering tutoring services for their child. A total of 437 parent surveys were submitted from 35 schools for 14 individual providers.

Overall, responding parents indicated positive perceptions of and satisfaction with SES providers. More than half of the submissions (52.9%; n = 231/437) indicated that the provider talked to the parent about their child's progress a lot. More than one-third of respondents indicated that verbal communication about their child's progress occurred sometimes (38.4%; n = 167/437). More than one-third of the parents participating in the evaluation (37.3%; n = 163/437) reported receiving written communication from providers about their child's progress "a lot," while 42.8% (n = 187/437) indicated receiving written communication "sometimes." Nearly twenty percent (19.2%; n = 84/437) indicated that there was no written communication. More than two-thirds of parent respondents (68.9%; n = 301/437) indicated that the provider helped their child with subjects they were working on in school a lot. The vast majority of submissions indicated that parents believed tutoring helped their child's achievement (92.5%; n = 404/437) and that parents were pleased with the services their child received (93.2%; n = 408/437). Finally, 97.0% of the participating parents agreed that they were pleased with the way the school district helped them obtain free tutoring for their child (n = 424/437).

Comparison of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, and 2010–2011 Aggregate Parent Responses. In this section, parents' perceptions of and satisfaction with providers and school districts, as reported in *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008–2009* (Ford et al.,

2010) and *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010* (Murphy et al., 2011), are presented and compared with the findings of this report. In 2008–09, parents from 49 of the 65 SES eligible schools returned 963 surveys concerning 29 providers. For 2009–10, 724 parent surveys were submitted from 38 of the 46 SES eligible schools for 22 individual providers. During the 2010–11 evaluation period, 437 parent surveys were submitted from 35 of the 59 SES eligible schools for 14 individual providers.

Across evaluation years, parents have indicated overall satisfaction with services received by their child. Favorable responses for the 2010–11 evaluation period increased in all survey questions. However, the 2010–11 evaluation experienced a tremendous drop in number of surveys submitted when compared to previous years. The spring of the 2010–11 school year brought weather-related crisis across the state of Alabama. In addition to the natural disaster the state experienced, contractual issues caused delays in the printing and shipping of parent surveys. The combination of districts ending the school year early because of the storm damage and the delay in receiving parent surveys most likely contributed to the reduction in survey submissions. Table 6 provides the complete comparison data across the three evaluation periods.

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

Parent	2008–2009 *N = 963* Representing 49 schools	2009–2010 *N = 724* Representing 38 schools	2010-2011 *N = 437* Representing 35 schools
How often did the tutoring company...	**Percentage A lot or Sometimes**		
Talk to you about your child's progress?	82.4%	84.5%	91.3%
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	73.4%	78.1%	80.1%
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	87.5%	87.6%	91.6%
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	89.0%	89.5%	91.5%
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	92.0%	90.2%	92.2%
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	91.5%	89.7%	92.5%
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	91.7%	90.0%	93.2%
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**Percentage Strongly Agree/Agree**		
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	87.7%	84.5%	84.4%
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	90.3%	85.5%	92.9%
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	94.8%	91.4%	97.0%

Aggregate Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness. Provider effectiveness for this study was assessed using a rubric evaluation tool summarizing the respondents' perceptions of provider activities and outcomes. Provider rubrics were ranked separately for the statewide aggregate of providers and for individual providers. Table 7 presents the provider rubric for the statewide aggregate of providers. The statewide aggregate rubric uses the data

from each response group and the achievement analysis results from the report, *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis.*[7] Based on the data provided, the categories of Communication and Instructional Plans received a rating of Marginal Quality. The categories of Local and State Standards, Special Education and ELL Students, and Assessment of Provider Overall received a rating of Acceptable.

---

[7] Zoblotsky, T., Qian, H. & Winter, B. (2012). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Table 7: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Statewide Aggregate of Providers
Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 73	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 70	Teachers N = 177		Parents N = 437
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block		[b] ($g* = -0.23$)			
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Respondent Group Satisfaction with Individual Providers. In addition to rating providers aggregately, individual rubrics have been constructed for providers with survey submissions and data submitted for students served during the 2010–11 school year. Provider ratings were based on survey results and achievement data. Table 8 presents a summary of results concerning overall satisfaction.

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

	District Coordinators		Principals/LEA Site Coordinators		Teachers		Parents	
Provider	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree	Number of Responses	% Strongly Agree or Agree
A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC	19	25.0%	18	71.4%	60	33.3%	106	93.7%
A+ Tutors for Scholars	4	94.7%	7	72.2%	3	78.3%	32	89.6%
Achievement Academy	8	75.0%	9	77.7%	17	70.6%	32	93.8%
All about Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education)	8	87.5%	6	100.0%	22	100.0%	112	96.4%
Appleton Learning	14	78.5%	15	86.7%	46	89.1%	79	92.4%
Carter Reddy & Associates, Inc.	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	14	92.9%	20	95.0%
Huntsville City Schools	1	100.0%	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
JFK Tutoring, Inc.	1	100.0%	0	NA	0	NA	5	100.0%
Learn-It Systems, LLC	4	100.0%	3	100.0%	4	100.0%	7	71.5%
Learning Express Center (LEC)	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	NA
MTS Tutorial Services	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	NA	2	100.0%
Rocket Learning, LLC	2	100.0%	3	100.0%	6	100.0%	17	94.1%
Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-/Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.	1	100.0%	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA
Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	NA	2	100.0%
The Capitol School, Inc.	1	100.0%	0	NA	1	100.0%	0	NA
University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership	1	100.0%	0	NA	0	NA	0	93.7%
Total	**73**		**70**		**177**		**414***	

*Number of surveys submitted for providers active within that district; 23 surveys were removed from aggregate due to missing or incorrect provider name.

Rubric Summaries of Individual Provider Effectiveness

Provider effectiveness for this study was assessed using a rubric evaluation tool. To obtain overall outcome ratings for each provider, independent examiners analyzed survey and achievement results and assigned a rating for each category based on the percentage of agreement/disagreement on individual items. Parameters were established for determining an acceptable number of responses per respondent group and were based on the number of districts/schools a provider indicated were served. For a category to be rated, responses were needed from at least two respondent groups, with the exception of the category "Local and State Standards," in which only district coordinator responses were necessary, and "Special Education and ELL" in which either district coordinator or principal/LEA site coordinator responses were necessary. To ensure reliability of findings, each evaluation was reviewed by at least two independent raters. Where there was disagreement, consensus was derived through discussion.

The following section presents individual rubrics for each of the providers for which survey data were received. Rubrics are not included in the report for providers when 1) no surveys were submitted for the provider, 2) no data was submitted that indicates the provider served students during the 2010–11 school year, or 3) the evaluator was informed, by the provider or the state, that provider was not active during the 2010–11 school year.

The rubric ratings are based on survey results together with achievement results. The complete achievement results are presented in a separate report, *Supplemental Educational Services in the state of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis*[8]. The achievement report delineates results by individual providers. Using guidelines proposed by Vernez and Zimmer (2007), positive or negative effect sizes of 0.04 or less were classified as very small, between 0.05 and 0.10 were classified as small, between 0.11 and 0.24 were classified as moderate, and 0.25 and greater were classified as large. Rubric results should be viewed as "suggestive" and not as a sufficiently conclusive means for judging individual providers' effectiveness. From a formative evaluation standpoint, the results are valuable as a basis for considering ways to improve provider effectiveness in future years. The final ratings were shaded in blue.

---

[8] Zoblotsky, T., Qian, H., & Winter, B. (2012). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Table 9: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, A+ Tutors for Scholars

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 19	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 18	Teachers N = 60		Parents N = 106
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	**				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 10: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 4	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 7	Teachers N = 3		Parents N = 32
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 11: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Achievement Academy

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 8	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 9	Teachers N = 17		Parents N = 32
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference

** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10

*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria

[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 12: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education)

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

District Coordinators N = 8		Principals/Site Coordinators N = 6	Teachers N = 22		Parents N = 112
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 13: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Appleton Learning
Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 14	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 15	Teachers N = 46		Parents N = 79
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block		[b] ($g*$= -0.41)			
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	*				
Highest Scoring Block	*				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 14: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc.

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 4	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 4	Teachers N = 14		Parents N = 20
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	**				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	**				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 15: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Huntsville City Schools

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable	Above Standards
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block					[a] ($g* = 0.73$)
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 16: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, JFK Tutoring, Inc.

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 17: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Learn-It Systems, LLC
Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

District Coordinators N = 4		Principals/Site Coordinators N = 3		Teachers N = 4		Parents N = 7
Outcome	Insufficient Information	Below Standards	Marginal Quality	Acceptable		Above Standards
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.		There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts						
Lowest Scoring Block	*					
Middle Scoring Block	*					
Highest Scoring Block	*					
Math						
Lowest Scoring Block	*					
Middle Scoring Block						^{a} (g* =0 .50)
Highest Scoring Block	*					
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.		Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.		Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.		Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.		Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.		Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 18: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Learning Express Center (LEC)
Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 19: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, MTS Tutorial Services
Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 20: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Rocket Learning, LLC

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

	District Coordinators N = 2	Principals/Site Coordinators N = 3	Teachers N = 6		Parents N = 17
Outcome	**Insufficient Information**	**Below Standards**	**Marginal Quality**	**Acceptable**	**Above Standards**
Student Achievement	Insufficient Information (insufficient sample size; non-significant results; or no achievement data)	Students have not shown gains related to tutoring. Results are statistically significant and favor non-SES students.	There is evidence that some tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size up to +0.17.	There is evidence that tutored students are making achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size ranging from +0.18 - +0.25.	There is evidence that tutored students are making substantive achievement gains. Overall comparison is statistically significant, with effect size greater than +0.25.
Reading/ Language Arts					
Lowest Scoring Block	*				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	**				
Math					
Lowest Scoring Block	**				
Middle Scoring Block	**				
Highest Scoring Block	***				
Communication	Insufficient Information	Provider communication is weak or nonexistent.	Provider communication exists but is inconsistent.	Provider is adequately communicating with key stakeholders.	Provider regularly and consistently communicates with key stakeholders.
Instructional Plans	Insufficient Information	Instructional plans are not geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.	Provider made some attempts to develop instructional plans that are geared to student needs.	Provider made attempts to plan instruction to meet the individual needs or reinforce regular academic program for the majority of students.	Provider instructional plans are geared to student needs or reinforcement of regular academic program.
Local and State Standards	Insufficient Information	Provider services are not in alignment with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are inconsistently aligned with local and state academic standards.	Most provider services are aligned with local and state academic standards.	Provider services are in alignment with local and state academic standards.
Special Education and ELL Students	Insufficient Information	Provider did not offer accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider inconsistently offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider sometimes offered accommodations to special education or ELL students.	Provider offered accommodations to special education or ELL students as needed.
Assessment of Provider Overall	Insufficient Information	Dissatisfaction with provider overall.	Inconsistent satisfaction with the provider overall.	Some satisfaction with provider overall.	Satisfaction with provider overall.

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 21: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 22: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 23: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, The Capitol School, Inc.

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

Table 24: Rubric Summary of Perceived Provider Effectiveness, University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership

Rubric ratings are based upon survey submissions from the following groups:

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

* No statistically significant difference
** Not able to test due to sample size less than 10
*** No sample available after dropping students who did not meet the sample criteria
[a] SES statistically significantly higher after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison
[b] SES statistically significantly lower after applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison

General Discussion

The spring of the 2010–11 school year brought weather-related crisis across large portions of Alabama, causing several school districts to suffer catastrophic losses of facilities and administrative infrastructure. In addition to districts' material losses, in these communities as a whole there were tragic losses of life and significant loss of property. Due to these circumstances several districts were forced to end the school year early. Meanwhile, contractual issues caused delays in the printing and shipping of parent surveys. These factors adversely affected survey distribution. Therefore, the decrease from previous years in the number of parent survey submissions is not surprising.

Overall, stakeholders throughout Alabama, who participated in the evaluation of SES for the 2010–11 school year, were positive concerning their experiences. Stakeholders, from the district level, school level, and parents alike, expressed satisfaction with the SES providers as a whole. Not only did the stakeholders express overall satisfaction with SES, but the majority also indicated a belief that SES had a positive impact on student achievement. Lastly, provider responses concerning their experiences with SES in Alabama during the 2010–11 school year were primarily favorable.

Although the findings of this study revealed stakeholder satisfaction with SES implementation and services, survey responses from district coordinators, school personnel, and providers identified disconnects between the expectations of these different groups. While providers expressed appreciation for the opportunity to offer services, they reported difficulties in communicating with teachers, either due to not knowing the identity of students' teachers and/or due to conflicting schedules of teachers and tutors; they also put forward concerns regarding inconsistencies in administrative guidelines at the district level and poor student attendance especially at the high school level. At the district coordinator level, though there was enthusiasm for the program as a whole, with one district coordinator describing a provider's services as "exciting" and "engaging," some coordinators expressed concerns over incomplete or late paperwork and unfulfilled promises from providers for services such as transportation. Principals'/LEA site coordinators' concerns related to curriculum alignment. Teachers expressed concerns about the limited amount or lack of feedback from tutors regarding student performance.

While all participants indicated satisfaction with SES services and providers, reviewing feedback and evaluating performance plays a key role in continued success of any program. By

employing the feedback provided, improvements can be made to enrich collaboration and communication among all stakeholder groups. The state should continue its efforts to monitor and facilitate communication and collaboration between providers, districts, and schools. Providers also have a responsibility to assess and implement strategies to enhance cooperation, communication, and collaboration with the district, the schools served, and with the parents of SES students.

Recommendations

The state may consider initiating focus groups that include several members of each stakeholder group, in order to facilitate collaboration and communication amongst all key SES personnel. At the district level, the inclusion of SES providers in professional development offered throughout the year, particularly those sessions geared towards teaching strategies and curriculum alignment. This inclusion offers an environment in which collaboration and communication could occur. The state may wish to consider identifying providers, districts, and schools that facilitate positive relationships among school personnel and SES tutors, and inviting them to share best practices with other providers, districts, and schools. At the school level, administrators might consider allocating time within the school day for teachers and tutors to meet and exchange student progress information. If there is no time during the school day that can be made available for this purpose, schools may wish to consider providing teachers and tutors a time and place to meet, this could be done using in-service days, open house, or parent conference times. Schools might also consider offering some technological communication medium, such as a teacher/tutor forum or online message board, if scheduling face-to-face sessions proves prohibitively difficult.

As Alabama moves forward with SES implementation, the knowledge gained through past, present, and future evaluations should continue to provide insight into areas of success and weakness. The state should continue encourage district coordinators to participate more actively in the evaluation process, as each district coordinator, principal/LEA site coordinator, and teacher should evaluate every active provider in each school where children are receiving SES tutoring. Similarly, the state should continue to require provider involvement during the evaluation process with every active provider represented in the survey findings. Efforts to encourage adherence to federal regulations at all levels, should also be continued, while all

stakeholders continue to work to ensure that all eligible students are able to take advantage of the opportunity that the SES program offers to improve their academic achievement levels.

References

Ford, J., Harrison, L., Hunter, C., & Nash, T. (2010). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2008–2009*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Murphy, K., Harrison, L., & Hunter, C. (2010). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Vernez, G. & Zimmer, R. (2007). *Interpreting the effects of Title I supplemental educational services*. Retrieved March 29, 2010 from http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/implementation/achievementanalysis-sizes.pdf

Zoblotsky, T., & Gallagher, B. (2011). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2009–2010 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Zoblotsky, T., Qian, H., & Winter, B. (2012). *Supplemental Educational Services in the State of Alabama: 2010–2011 Student Achievement Analysis*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Supplemental Educational Services in 2010 - 2011

State: Alabama

Technical Appendix

The following Technical Appendix presents (1) data summary tables for each respondent category, aggregated across all providers (2) survey submission tables by respondent group, and (3) data summary tables for each individual Supplemental Education Service (SES) provider active in Alabama during the 2010-2011 academic year. For each set of provider-specific data summary tables, the tables are presented in the following order:

- Provider Service Information
- Provider Report
- District Coordinator Report
- Principal/LEA Site Coordinator Report
- Teacher Report
- Parent Report

Each data summary table displays the total number of respondents to the survey as well as the percentage of responses in each response category for each item in the survey. Percentages may not total 100%, due to non-responses for certain items.

In cases where no data were received for a particular data group, this fact is noted in a "No Data" Table.

Each survey uses three-, four- or five-point Likert-style responses (e.g., 3-point: 3=Frequently, Occasionally, 1=Not at all; 4-point: 4=Frequently, Occasionally, Not At All, 1=Don't Know; 5-point: 5=Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, 1=Don't Know).

Comments by providers, district coordinators, principals/LEA site coordinators, and teachers are listed verbatim, with the exception that proper names or phone numbers are replaced with [name (or) number removed]. Comments from parent surveys are generally reported verbatim, with the exception that proper names or phone numbers are replaced with [name (or) number removed]. The term "sic" may be inserted when comments contain incorrect spelling and/or grammar or where the meaning is unclear. Comments that were provided in Spanish were translated using an online translator tool and were given the notation [Spanish].

Index of Tables

Table TA-1: Aggregate Provider Report for All Providers

Supplemental Educational Services Provider Report in 2010-2011					
Aggregate Provider Report: All Providers					
First Submission Date:	May 18, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 24, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	16				
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		81.3	18.8	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		25.0	62.5	12.5	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		81.3	12.5	6.3	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		75.0	12.5	6.3	6.3
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		56.3	12.5	25.0	6.3
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	6.3	56.3	37.5	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	43.8	50.0	6.3	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	50.0	43.8	6.3	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	18.8	68.8	12.5	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	18.8	56.3	12.5	6.3	6.3
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	43.8	50.0	0.0	0.0	6.3
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	50.0	43.8	6.3	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	56.3	31.3	6.3	0.0	6.3

Table TA-2: Aggregate District Coordinator Report for All Providers

Aggregate District Coordinator Report for All Providers				
First Submission Date:	May 18, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 29, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	73*			

How often did the provider...		% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		50.7	49.3	0.0	
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		39.7	52.1	8.2	

	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	35.6	35.6	2.7	26.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	41.1	37.0	5.5	16.4
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	69.9	26.0	2.7	1.4

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	24.7	54.8	12.3	1.4	6.8
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	26.0	39.7	15.1	1.4	17.8
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	32.9	58.9	6.8	0.0	1.4
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	34.2	64.4	0.0	0.0	1.4
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	37.0	57.5	1.4	0.0	4.1
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	34.2	63.0	1.4	0.0	1.4
Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	28.8	53.4	11.0	0.0	6.8
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	35.6	50.7	9.6	2.7	1.4

*The 73 responses represent 22 separate districts regarding 16 individual providers.

Table TA-3: Aggregate Principal/Site Coordinator Report for All Providers

Aggregate Principal/Site Coordinator Report for All Providers					
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jul 5, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	70*				
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
				Number	**Percent**
Yes				6	8.6
No				61	87.1
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			50.0	35.7	14.3
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			34.3	32.9	31.4
	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**		**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	44.3	35.7		4.3	15.7
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	61.4	24.3		4.3	8.6
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	42.9	48.6	5.7	0.0	2.9
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	25.7	60.0	2.9	0.0	11.4
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	20.0	57.1	7.1	0.0	15.7
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	25.7	58.6	4.3	0.0	11.4
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	27.1	61.4	4.3	0.0	7.1
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	30.0	51.4	12.9	0.0	5.7
District Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	45.7	44.3	5.7	0.0	4.3

*These 70 responses represent 18 separate districts regarding 11 individual providers.

Table TA-4: Aggregate Teacher Report for All Providers

Aggregate Teacher Report for All Providers					
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jul 8, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	177*				
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
				Number	**Percent**
Yes				98	55.4
No				79	44.6
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			59.9	27.7	12.4
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			52.5	29.4	18.1
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	32.8	49.2	4.0	4.0	10.2
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	32.8	49.7	6.2	4.0	7.3
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	29.4	49.2	7.3	5.6	8.5
Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	31.6	55.9	4.0	3.4	5.1
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	36.7	48.6	5.1	4.0	5.6

* These 177 responses represent 20 separate districts regarding 10 individual providers.

Table TA-5: Aggregate Parent Report for All Providers
N = 437*

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Aggregate Parent Report for All Providers</td></tr>
<tr><td>How often did the tutoring company...</td><td colspan="1" align="center">% A lot</td><td colspan="2" align="center">% Sometimes</td><td colspan="1" align="center">% Not at all</td></tr>
<tr><td>Talk to you about your child's progress?</td><td align="center">52.9</td><td colspan="2" align="center">38.4</td><td align="center">8.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?</td><td align="center">37.3</td><td colspan="2" align="center">42.8</td><td align="center">19.2</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td align="center">% A lot</td><td align="center">% Sometimes</td><td align="center">% Not at all</td><td align="center">% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?</td><td align="center">68.9</td><td align="center">22.7</td><td align="center">2.7</td><td align="center">4.6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?</td><td align="center">73.7</td><td align="center">17.8</td><td align="center">1.6</td><td align="center">5.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.</td><td align="center">% Strongly Agree</td><td align="center">% Agree</td><td align="center">% Disagree</td><td align="center">% Strongly Disagree</td><td align="center">% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.</td><td align="center">53.8</td><td align="center">38.4</td><td align="center">3.4</td><td align="center">1.8</td><td align="center">1.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.</td><td align="center">58.6</td><td align="center">33.9</td><td align="center">3.0</td><td align="center">1.1</td><td align="center">1.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.</td><td align="center">61.6</td><td align="center">31.6</td><td align="center">3.2</td><td align="center">1.8</td><td align="center">1.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.</td><td align="center">% Strongly Agree</td><td align="center">% Agree</td><td align="center">% Disagree</td><td align="center">% Strongly Disagree</td><td align="center">% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.</td><td align="center">46.0</td><td align="center">38.4</td><td align="center">4.6</td><td align="center">2.1</td><td align="center">8.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.</td><td align="center">45.1</td><td align="center">47.8</td><td align="center">2.7</td><td align="center">0.9</td><td align="center">2.3</td></tr>
<tr><td>I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.</td><td align="center">60.4</td><td align="center">36.6</td><td align="center">1.6</td><td align="center">0.5</td><td align="center">0.5</td></tr>
</table>

*437 individual surveys were submitted from 35 schools for 14 individual providers.

Table TA-6: Survey Submissions for Providers by Respondent Group

Provider Name	District Coordinator	Principal/ LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent	Provider
A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC	19	18	60	106	1
A+ Tutors for Scholars	4	7	3	32	1
Achievement Academy	8	9	17	32	1
All about Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education)	8	6	22	112	1
Appleton Learning	14	15	46	79	1
Carter Reddy & Associates, Inc.	4	4	14	20	1
Huntsville City Schools	1	0	0	0	1
JFK Tutoring, Inc.	1	0	0	5	1
Learn-It Systems, LLC	4	3	4	7	1
Learning Express Center (LEC)	1	1	4	0	1
MTS Tutorial Services	2	2	0	2	1
Rocket Learning, LLC	2	3	6	17	1
Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-/Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.	1	0	0	0	1
Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.	2	2	0	2	1
The Capitol School, Inc.	1	0	1	0	1
University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership	1	0	0	0	1
Totals	**73**	**70**	**177**	**414***	**16**

*Number of surveys submitted for providers active within that district; 23 surveys were removed from aggregate due to missing or incorrect provider name.

Table TA-7: Survey Submissions for Providers by District and Respondent Group

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	1	0	0	4
	Birmingham City	1	2	1	3
	Bullock County	1	2	0	1
	Butler County	1	1	3	10
	Chilton County	1	0	0	0
	Coosa County	1	0	0	2
	Daleville City	0	0	0	4
	Dallas County	1	1	0	0
	DeKalb County	1	1	3	8
	Dothan City	1	2	25	24
	Escambia County	1	1	0	0
	Fairfield City	1	0	1	1
	Fayette County	1	1	5	13
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	1	0	0	0
	Jackson County	1	1	2	3
	Limestone County	0	1	2	1
	Lowndes County	1	1	1	0
	Midfield City	0	1	0	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	1	2	16	18
	Selma City	0	0	0	11
	Sumter County	1	0	1	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	1	0	0	2
	Tuscaloosa City	1	1	0	1
	Total	*19*	*18*	*60*	*106*
A+ Tutors for Scholars	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	2	0	0
	Bullock County	1	2	1	8
	Butler County	0	0	0	0
	Chilton County	1	1	2	1
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	0	0	0	0
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Dothan City	0	1	0	0

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
	Escambia County	0	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	0	0	0	0
	Jackson County	1	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Lowndes County	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	1	0	16
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	0	0	0	0
	Selma City	0	0	0	7
	Sumter County	0	0	0	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	0	0	0	0
	Total	*4*	*7*	*3*	*32*
Achievement Academy	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	1	1	2
	Bullock County	1	2	1	13
	Butler County	1	1	5	3
	Chilton County	0	0	0	0
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	1	2	2	0
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Dothan City	0	0	0	0
	Escambia County	0	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	1
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	1	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	0	0	0	0
	Jackson County	0	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Lowndes County	1	1	1	0
	Midfield City	0	1	2	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	1	1	5	6
	Selma City	0	0	0	5
	Sumter County	0	0	0	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
	Tarrant City	1	0	0	2
	Tuscaloosa City	0	0	0	0
	Total	*8*	*9*	*17*	*32*
All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education)	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	0	0	0
	Bullock County	1	1	0	5
	Butler County	0	0	0	0
	Chilton County	0	0	0	0
	Coosa County	1	0	1	28
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	1	3	9	60
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Dothan City	0	0	0	0
	Escambia County	0	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	0	0	0	0
	Jackson County	0	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Lowndes County	1	0	1	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	1	2	10	19
	Selma City	0	0	0	0
	Sumter County	1	0	1	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	1	0	0	0
	Total	*8*	*6*	*22*	*112*
Appleton Learning	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	1	1	2
	Bullock County	1	2	2	18
	Butler County	1	1	0	0
	Chilton County	0	0	0	0
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	0	0	0	0
	DeKalb County	1	1	12	26
	Dothan City	0	0	0	0

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
	Escambia County	1	1	0	0
	Fairfield City	1	1	2	4
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	1	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	1	0	0	4
	Jackson County	1	2	12	11
	Limestone County	0	1	2	4
	Lowndes County	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Monroe County	1	1	3	0
	Montgomery County	1	2	3	8
	Selma City	0	0	0	0
	Sumter County	1	0	4	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	1	0	1	1
	Tuscaloosa City	1	2	4	1
	Total	*14*	*15*	*46*	*79*
Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc.	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	2	1	0
	Bullock County	0	0	0	0
	Butler County	0	0	0	0
	Chilton County	0	0	0	0
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	0	0	0	0
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Dothan City	0	0	0	0
	Escambia County	0	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	0	0	0	0
	Jackson County	0	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Lowndes County	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	1	1	11	16
	Selma City	0	0	0	0
	Sumter County	0	0	0	0
	Tallapoosa County	1	1	2	4

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	1	0	0	0
	Total	*4*	*4*	*14*	*20*
Huntsville City Schools	Huntsville City	1	0	0	0
	Total	*1*	*0*	*0*	*0*
JFK Tutoring, Inc.	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	1	0	0	0
	Total	*1*	*0*	*0*	*5*
Learn-It Systems, LLC	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	1	0	3
	Bullock County	0	0	0	0
	Butler County	0	0	0	0
	Chilton County	0	0	0	0
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	1	2	2	3
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Dothan City	0	0	0	0
	Escambia County	0	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	1	0	0	0
	Jackson County	0	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Lowndes County	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	0	0	0	0
	Selma City	0	0	0	0
	Sumter County	0	0	0	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	1	0	2	1
	Total	*4*	*3*	*4*	*7*
Learning Express Center (LEC)	Montgomery County	1	1	4	0
	Total	*1*	*1*	*4*	*0*
MTS Tutorial Services	Birmingham City	1	2	0	2
	Bullock County	0	0	0	0

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
	Butler County	0	0	0	0
	Chilton County	1	0	0	0
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	0	0	0	0
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	0	0	0	0
	Jackson County	0	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Sumter County	0	0	0	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	0	0	0	0
	Total	*2*	*2*	*0*	*2*
Rocket Learning, LLC	Anniston City	0	0	0	0
	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Birmingham City	1	1	0	3
	Bullock County	0	0	0	0
	Butler County	0	0	0	0
	Chilton County	0	0	0	0
	Coosa County	0	0	0	0
	Daleville City	0	0	0	0
	Dallas County	1	2	6	14
	DeKalb County	0	0	0	0
	Dothan City	0	0	0	0
	Escambia County	0	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Huntsville City	0	0	0	0
	Jackson County	0	0	0	0
	Limestone County	0	0	0	0
	Lowndes County	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Monroe County	0	0	0	0
	Montgomery County	0	0	0	0
	Selma City	0	0	0	0
	Sumter County	0	0	0	0
	Tallapoosa County	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0

Provider Name	District	District Coordinator	Principal/LEA Site Coordinator	Teacher	Parent
	Tuscaloosa City	0	0	0	0
	Total	*2*	*3*	*6*	*17*
Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.	Birmingham City	1	0	0	0
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	0	0	0
	Tarrant City	0	0	0	0
	Total	*1*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.	Birmingham City	1	1	0	2
	Fairfield City	0	0	0	0
	Midfield City	0	1	0	0
	Tarrant City	1	0	0	0
	Total	*2*	*2*	*0*	*2*
The Capitol School, Inc.	Bibb County	0	0	0	0
	Fayette County	0	0	0	0
	Greene County	0	0	0	0
	Tuscaloosa City	1	0	1	0
	Total	*1*	*0*	*1*	*0*
University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership	Tuscaloosa City	1	0	0	0
	Total	*1*	*0*	*0*	*0*
	Total for State	**73**	**70**	**177**	**414***

*Number of surveys submitted for providers approved and active within the district

Table TA-8: A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Provider Service Information

A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC – Provider Service Information	
Provider Name:	A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
21-30 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
Student homes	
Community location (not the provider's building)	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Individual	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors have had training	
Other: 60 hours of college credit and a background check my the Department of Education--minimum requirments	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	

Table TA-9: A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Provider Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Provider Report</td></tr>
<tr><td>First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="5">May 19, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="5">May 19, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="5">1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider Perceptions and Activities</td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td colspan="2">% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider satisfaction with:</td><td>% Highly Satisfied</td><td>% Satisfied</td><td>% Dissatisfied</td><td>% Highly Dissatisfied</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Student attendance</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Parent cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Teacher cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-10: A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - District Coordinator Report

A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 18, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 29, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	19			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		63.2	36.8	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		42.1	52.6	5.3

		% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?		36.8	31.6	5.3	26.3
4. Communicate with parents during the year?		63.2	15.8	5.3	15.8
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		78.9	15.8	0.0	5.3

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	26.3	57.9	10.5	0.0	5.3
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	31.6	42.1	10.5	0.0	15.8
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	36.8	57.9	5.3	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	36.8	57.9	0.0	0.0	5.3
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	47.4	47.4	0.0	0.0	5.3
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	36.8	57.9	0.0	0.0	5.3
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	26.3	68.4	5.3	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	36.8	57.9	5.3	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments
A to Z Tutoring has maintained good communication with all parties involved. Monthly reports are submitted in a timely manner. Overall, I am pleased with this tutoring company.
Accessable, knowledgeable, and a joy to work with on SES.
Students tutoring with this provider were working toward passing the AHSGE or they had passed the AHSGE and were working to improve their ACT scores, school curriculum was not a required collaboration nor was it encouraged by the LEA.
Very sastified with their performance.

Table TA-11: A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Principal/Site Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jul 5, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	18			
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?				
		Number		**Percent**
Yes		0		0.0
No		17		94.4
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?		50.0	27.8	22.2
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		33.3	27.8	38.9

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	33.3	33.3	5.6	27.8
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	50.0	22.2	0.0	22.2

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	38.9	44.4	11.1	0.0	5.6
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	22.2	50.0	0.0	0.0	27.8
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	22.2	38.9	5.6	0.0	33.3
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	33.3	38.9	5.6	0.0	22.2
Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	33.3	44.4	5.6	0.0	16.7
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	33.3	38.9	11.1	0.0	16.7
District Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	44.4	44.4	0.0	0.0	11.1

Comments
Even though I am satisfied with the services provided for students who were assigned tutors, I do have concerns regarding the lack of tutor assignments for all of the students that selected this provider.
Services were provided in the students homes. I did receive a progress report.
The teachers were very dedicated, timely, and professional. Each instructor for this provider went far beyond theit duty to provide exceptional quality instruction every day.
waste of money could be done better by the school

Table TA-12: A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Teacher Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Teacher Report</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="3">May 23, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="3">Jun 29, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="3">60</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4"></td><td align="center">Number</td><td align="center">Percent</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Yes</td><td align="center">24</td><td align="center">40.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">No</td><td align="center">36</td><td align="center">60.0</td></tr>
</table>

How often did the provider...			% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			43.3	30.0	26.7
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			38.3	33.3	28.3

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	30.0	43.3	5.0	6.7	15.0
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	31.7	45.0	3.3	6.7	13.3
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	28.3	43.3	5.0	10.0	13.3

Overall Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	28.3	50.0	3.3	6.7	11.7
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	35.0	43.3	1.7	8.3	11.7

Additional Comments

I had no contact with the tutors.

I taught three students who participated in tutoring. Two of the students I had for an elective, so contact with the tutor was not an issue. I think that the third student I taught who participated in tutoring only began tutoring after first semester. I taught the student during first semester only, so I would not know the effects of the tutoring.

Student participation was good. Students were provided additional help that increased their probability of passing the AHSGE.

Supplemental Educational Services is a great support for students that set some goals either inside of school program or outside it.

The lead person and teachers were not of a standard that should have been put in charge of the program in our district. With the right people in charge, the outcome for the students would have been totally different.

Table TA-13: A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC - Parent Report
N = 106

A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	57.5	32.1	10.4
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	32.1	39.6	26.4

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	59.4	26.4	8.5	5.7
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	69.8	17.9	4.7	6.6

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	50.0	36.8	4.7	5.7	1.9
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	51.9	37.7	2.8	2.8	3.8
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	56.6	33.0	4.7	3.8	1.9
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	34.0	33.0	7.5	4.7	18.9
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	43.4	45.3	3.8	0.9	2.8
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	50.9	42.5	0.9	1.9	1.9

Comments:
I signed up at start of school. Nobody contacted me until Nov. and tutoring didn't start until Feb. He did not get the hours he was supposed to get. Second tutor was better than the first. Hope it gets more organized. [sic]
The tutor called late in the school year to set up tutoring so I declined the services. My son was never tutored by them. Maybe better records should have been kept by the board and/or tutor company. Thanks. [name removed]
We need help with homework. [sic]
I want the teacher/tutor to be allowed to help with homework.
I would like more hours and help with homework. I am a working single parent
Just thank the free tutoring program because it was very helpful to my children They learn easiest subjects. I like that year after year, I offer services like this [sic] [Spanish]
[Name removed] is a wonderful teacher. My daughter enjoyed having her tutoring.
I am very satisfied and pleased of the sucess that the tutoring has helped with my child sucess this year. [sic]
Not pleased my child was not helped with subjects he/she was working on. Otherwise it was useful [sic]
Two seperate applications were turn in for tutoring, one at the beginning of the school year, + one a few months later. Had to call county board and fill out paperwork a third time! Poor organizaiton skills on schools part. But we loved the tutor [sic]
We had a bad start with the first tutor that was either later on time or didn't show up at all. After changing tutors, I felt my child had a great service. I appreciate all of the help received. I filled this out based on the 2nd tutor.

A to Z In-Home Tutoring, LLC
The company did their own tesling & planned their lessons from those results. [sic]
I'm glad they finally got these for the students and hope it continues.
With nine hours remaining the tutor decides to tell me that he was not proficient in math. I am extremely dissatisfied with A to Z tutoring.
With only nine hours remaining the tutor decided to let me know that he is not proficient in math. I am extremely dissatisfied with A to Z tutoring.
I loved my tutor!!!
My child's tutor was [name removed] and she was great. We want her next year
[Name removed] was an excellent tutor.
I feel that students like my child need daily after school tutoring. She learns slower and differently than other students and I feel like tutoring should be ongoing to reinforce her daily learning of classroom lessons. I am so thankful for the free tutoring. I just think we need more of it.
Good program
Wonderful program
Very Good Company- [name removed] [sic] Optional Comments:
#9- Wasn't given a choice
#2- Child tutored in home
#2- It was in home

Table TA-14: A+ Tutors for Scholars - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	A+ Tutors for Scholars
Districts Served:	

1. Program duration
31-40 weeks

2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week
2

3. Length of the average tutoring session
1.5 to 2 hours

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)
School building

5. Format (Mark all that apply)
Individual
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)

6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)
No, parents are responsible for transportation

7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)
Tutors are certified teachers
Tutors have bachelor's degrees
Tutors have had training

8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)
One-on-one tutoring (in person)
Computer-based tutoring

Table TA-15: A+ Tutors for Scholars - Provider Report

A+ Tutors for Scholars - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:		Jun 23, 2011			
Last Submission Date:		Jun 23, 2011			
Total number of respondents:		1			
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
A+ Tutors For Scholars was pleased to see the academic progress made by students with the "Blended Learning" program implemented in Alabama SES eligible schools.					

Table TA-16: A+ Tutors for Scholars - District Coordinator Report

A+ Tutors for Scholars - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 19, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 23, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	4			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		50.0	50.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		25.0	75.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0

Additional Comments

Did not follow through as needed. Took no responsible for late paperwork, beginning tutoring in a timely manner, or following invoice procedures for the district. Made promises to parents and was lax in following through. Tutors for this company were not trained adequately and came to the district for answers to questions about the program, pay schedule, etc.Once [name removed] hired [name removed] to assist she dealt with the issues that had been incomplete with this company. She carried out duties and responsibilities that had been lacking through out the year. The SDE as well as the district bent over backward to assist this company.

Provider did not meet the terms of contract. Netbooks were not available for students to use during tutorial sessions. Provider did pay tutors in a timely manner.

Table TA-17: A+ Tutors for Scholars - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

A+ Tutors for Scholars - Principal/Site Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 3, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	7			
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?				
		Number		**Percent**
Yes		1		14.3
No		4		57.1
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?		28.6	57.1	14.3
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		14.3	28.6	57.1

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	0.0	71.4	0.0	28.6
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	28.6	57.1	14.3	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.0	14.3
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	71.4	14.3	0.0	14.3
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	14.3	71.4	0.0	0.0	14.3
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	14.3	57.1	28.6	0.0	0.0
District Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	14.3	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0
Comments					
It was wonderful once the laptops came in. I wish the teachers could have gotten them too at the end!					

Table TA-18: A+ Tutors for Scholars - Teacher Report

A+ Tutors for Scholars - Teacher Report					
First Submission Date:	May 23, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 24, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	3				
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
			Number		**Percent**
Yes			3		100.0
No			0		0.0
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			33.3	66.7	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			0.0	33.3	66.7
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3

Table TA-19: A+ Tutors for Scholars - Parent Report
N = 32

A+ Tutors for Scholars (formerly Tutors for Scholars)			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	50.0	40.6	9.4
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	34.4	53.1	9.4

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	75.0	21.9	0.0	3.1
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	65.6	25.0	0.0	9.4

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	53.1	40.6	3.1	0.0	3.1
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	56.3	43.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	65.6	28.1	0.0	0.0	6.3
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	43.8	37.5	3.1	3.1	12.5
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	50.0	43.8	0.0	0.0	6.3
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Comments:
I am thankful for this program.
Great program
Please keep this program
This is a good program
Need more of these tutorer program [sic]

Table TA-20: Achievement Academy - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Achievement Academy
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
31-40 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Yes, district/school transports students	
Yes, provider transports students	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	
Direct instruction	
Independent seatwork	
Other: Some students received 1 on 1 tutoring from Site Corrdinators while during site visits	

Table TA-21: Achievement Academy - Provider Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Achievement Academy - Provider Report</td></tr>
<tr><td>First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">Jun 22, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">Jun 22, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="4">1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider Perceptions and Activities</td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider satisfaction with:</td><td>% Highly Satisfied</td><td>% Satisfied</td><td>% Dissatisfied</td><td>% Highly Dissatisfied</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Student attendance</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Parent cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Teacher cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Reports from teachers and site coordinators on students who shared how the program helped them on testing and progress in classes.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">We incurred problem with several district when it came to ANATOMI.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Additional Comments/Recommendations</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">It was a pleasure working with the students and teachers in Alabama. We look forward to more success stories.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-22: Achievement Academy - District Coordinator Report

Achievement Academy - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 29, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	8			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		37.5	62.5	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		37.5	37.5	25.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	25.0	37.5	0.0	37.5
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	12.5	50.0	0.0	37.5
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	50.0	37.5	0.0	12.5
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	12.5	62.5	12.5	0.0	12.5
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	12.5	62.5	12.5	0.0	12.5

Additional Comments

Achievement Academy did remain with our district throughout the school year. They did attempt to continue with tutorials. However, their method of pre-test was of great concern as the teachers were provided scantron answer sheets and told to score the students as opposed to the original agreement of pre-test analysis and interpretation as a part of the ILP. To my knowledge, there was no post-test administered and many of the children in the program were 9th grade and thus, had no AHSGE data on which to compare the earlier pre-test data. In addition, they indicated they would be using PLATO as the software format for the students; however, this was not done.

Services need to address individual student needs to ensure that student achievement is impacted.

Students tutoring with this provider were attempting to pass the AHSGE or were working to improve their ACT score. Class work was not the focus of sessions and was not allowed by the LEA. This provider had a very good success rate among students taking the AHSGE who attended regularly.

Table TA-23: Achievement Academy - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Achievement Academy - Principal/Site Coordinator Report</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="3">May 21, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="3">Jul 5, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="3">9</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td align="center">Number</td><td align="center">Percent</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Yes</td><td align="center">0</td><td align="center">0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">No</td><td align="center">9</td><td align="center">100.0</td></tr>
</table>

How often did the provider...			% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			11.1	66.7	22.2
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			11.1	33.3	44.4

		% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?		33.3	33.3	11.1	22.2
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		33.3	33.3	22.2	11.1

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	44.4	22.2	22.2	0.0	11.1
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	22.2
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	55.6	22.2	0.0	22.2
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	11.1	55.6	22.2	0.0	11.1
Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	22.2
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	55.6	33.3	0.0	11.1
District Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0	0.0

Comments

I did not meet with this tutoring provider. I had a teacher to work for them, but I don't know what was being taught or if the curriculum was aligned with the state standards.

Table TA-24: Achievement Academy - Teacher Report

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Achievement Academy - Teacher Report</th></tr>
<tr><td>First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="5">May 23, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="5">Jul 8, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="5">17</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="2">Number</td><td>Percent</td></tr>
<tr><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="2">10</td><td>58.8</td></tr>
<tr><td>No</td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="2">7</td><td>41.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>How often did the provider...</td><td></td><td></td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2. Communicate with you during the school year?</td><td>52.9</td><td>47.1</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?</td><td>47.1</td><td>29.4</td><td>23.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>The provider...</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.</td><td>17.6</td><td>52.9</td><td>11.8</td><td>11.8</td><td>5.9</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.</td><td>23.5</td><td>52.9</td><td>11.8</td><td>11.8</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>23.5</td><td>47.1</td><td>17.6</td><td>11.8</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Overall Assessment:</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.</td><td>23.5</td><td>58.8</td><td>11.8</td><td>5.9</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.</td><td>29.4</td><td>41.2</td><td>17.6</td><td>11.8</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Additional Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Plato was the only program to be utilized. Any learning activities provided for students positively impacts student achievement.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">We were not provided with any materials. Only meet once with the provider and I did not get paid by the provider.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">When told about testing, they started teaching what I suggested the students needed.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-25: Achievement Academy - Parent Report
N = 32

Achievement Academy			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	50.0	43.8	6.3
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	46.9	40.6	12.5

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	62.5	31.3	0.0	3.1
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	62.5	21.9	0.0	15.6

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	53.1	40.6	0.0	3.1	3.1
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	62.5	34.4	0.0	0.0	3.1
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	62.5	31.3	0.0	3.1	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	40.6	46.9	0.0	3.1	9.4
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	50.0	40.6	0.0	3.1	6.3
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	50.0	43.8	6.3	0.0	0.0

Comments:
Thank you
need to get more involved [sic]
good programs [sic]
The tutoring company Achievement Academy was wonderful. The tutors were awesome.

Table TA-26: All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	All About Partners In Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education)
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
1-10 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
Student homes	
Community location (not the provider's building)	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Individual	
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Yes, district/school transports students	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
Tutors have had training	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	
Direct instruction	
Independent seatwork	

Table TA-27: All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Provider Report

All About Partners In Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Provider Report				
First Submission Date:	Jun 22, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 22, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			
Provider Perceptions and Activities	**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?

Majority of our students made progress and passed the state test.

What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?

The area that needs improvement is having set rules and sticking with them. I found that the rules changed for some providers which is unfair.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Anatomi is still not user friendly. It would be great if Anatomi developed an app or was able to access the site from a mobile phone. The meeting where Anatomi listened to our concerns was great. I hope that most of the concern are being addressed for smoother usage.

Table TA-28: All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - District Coordinator Report

All About Partners In Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - District Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:	May 19, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 29, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	8				
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?			25.0	75.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			50.0	50.0	0.0
		% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?		50.0	37.5	0.0	12.5
4. Communicate with parents during the year?		50.0	37.5	12.5	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	50.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	25.0	12.5	0.0	12.5
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	50.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
Additional Comments					
A few issues concerning marketing at the beginning of the year. After that, a good working relationship with this company. They followed through on the tutoring without any major issues.					
The provider worked closely with teachers for maximum student improvement					

Table TA-29: All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

All About Partners In Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Principal/Site Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 27, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	6				

1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?

	Number	Percent
Yes	2	33.3
No	4	66.7

How often did the provider...	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all
2. Communicate with you during the school year?	66.7	16.7	16.7
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	66.7	33.3	0.0

	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	66.7	16.7	0.0	16.7
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	66.7	16.7	0.0	16.7

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	16.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	16.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	16.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	16.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

District Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-30: All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Teacher Report

All About Partners In Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Teacher Report					
First Submission Date:	May 25, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 29, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	22				

1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
			Number		**Percent**
Yes			19		86.4
No			3		13.6

How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			77.3	22.7	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			72.7	27.3	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	31.8	68.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	27.3	72.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	22.7	72.7	0.0	0.0	4.5

Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	31.8	68.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	40.9	59.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments
The provider cared about the success of the students.
The services offered by this agency proved to be an asset to student learning during the school year, and it is hopeful that these services will extend over into the summer so that the students will get a jumpstart on the school year.

Table TA-31: All About Partners in Education LLC (formerly Partners in Education) - Parent Report
N = 112

All About Partners in Education LLC			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	53.6	37.5	8.0
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	37.5	45.5	17.0

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	76.8	17.0	0.9	3.6
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	75.9	17.9	0.9	3.6

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	53.6	41.1	3.6	0.0	1.8
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	65.2	30.4	2.7	0.9	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	63.4	33.0	1.8	0.9	0.9
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	50.9	41.1	4.5	0.9	2.7
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	42.9	50.9	2.7	1.8	0.9
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	69.6	28.6	1.8	0.0	0.0

Comments:
We need some kind of program for our children while school is out. Give them something to do outside of sitting around the house; and getting into trouble. [sic]
Just wish the services lasted longer than they did.
My child was struggling in reading and math. Her tutor [name removed] helped my child achieve. She encouraged my child her grades are on an average and I am very grateful. [sic]
There were several occasions the tutor didn't show.
My child had a F in Math the first Report card before tutoring was ove she got a A Im very Happy! Thanks [sic]
Would love to talk to someone on how to improve feedback to parents, class day, always seemed to change, no way to set a schedule. Our daughter did recieve some benefit, but don't feel it made very much improvement in subject areas, or student comprehension [phone number removed] [sic]
I think the tutoring is good for the children need to be a little longer. they need at least 2 day week or 40 hr instead of 20. [sic]
I was really amazed with the progress my son made while beening tutored. Hope the tutoring continue next year also. [sic]
I would greatly appreciate any help my child my receive outside the regular classroom. [sic]
Better [unreadable] and other [unreadable]
needs more one on one [sic]

All About Partners in Education LLC
I didn't get no notes. There is a chacn that my kid didn't give me paper. I didnt pick. I do remember she stay after school for 2 day of week, but it just 1 month. No note, how she doing, no written note to do so, thought teacher was just doing it. Guess I can stay Blind by it. [sic]
Am very pleased with the free tutoring my child has recived and hope the district continues with the program. Thank you! [sic]
This is a good thing for my child
Thanks for everything
I am glad that they [unreadable] my child [unreadable] tutoring [unreadable] a [unreadable].
Im please at this tutoring company, because they supply my child with away back home [sic]
Im just Happy that I attended tutoring, because it brought me a long way. [sic]
Tutoring really helped me passed my classes and my graduation exams [sic]
I would like to say thanks for allowing me to attend the all about partners program because it really helped me pass my Grad Exams that I needed. [sic]
I feel as if free tutoring was a great help for my child.
The program was good it help me alot with my child. [sic]
I thought that this had a positive influence on my child
The free tutoring help my child alot. [sic]
I am glad that she attended the Tutoring program because, It really helped her out. [sic]
Keep up the good work?
Tutoring is a great program.
Grate tutoring program I passed all parts [sic]
Tutoring helped me past the main parts of the Grad exam [sic]
It helped alot on the AHSGE. [sic]

Table TA-32: Appleton Learning - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Appleton Learning
Districts Served:	

1. Program duration
1-10 weeks

2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week
2

3. Length of the average tutoring session
1.5 to 2 hours

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)
School building
Community location (not the provider's building)

5. Format (Mark all that apply)
Individual
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)

6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)
Yes, district/school transports students
Yes, provider transports students

7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)
Tutors are certified teachers
Tutors have bachelor's degrees
Tutors have had training

8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)
One-on-one tutoring (in person)

Table TA-33: Appleton Learning - Provider Report

Appleton Learning - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	Jun 20, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 20, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
The most positive aspect was reaching more students on the high school level; that help led them to passing the parts fo the grad exam they needed to graduate.					
What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?					
The most negative part was not getting enough parents to get involved witht eh day to day operations and the push back from schools.					

Table TA-34: Appleton Learning - District Coordinator Report

Appleton Learning - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 18, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 23, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	14			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		42.9	57.1	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		21.4	57.1	21.4

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	28.6	35.7	7.1	28.6
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	21.4	35.7	14.3	28.6
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	71.4	28.6	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	7.1	64.3	21.4	0.0	7.1
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	7.1	57.1	21.4	0.0	14.3
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	21.4	78.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	21.4	78.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	21.4	78.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	7.1	64.3	21.4	0.0	7.1
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	21.4	57.1	21.4	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments

Appleton began very promising for our district but issues involving transportation and promises made but unkept there really cast a poor light on the provider services. Our school is rural and our students homes very spread out throughout the county. They rely heavily on transportation to get them to and from school. Initially Appleton agreed to pay the transportation costs but once they learned they would not be the sole provider, they did not pay even half. In hindsight, the transportation terms should have been put in writing with specifics prior to the beginning of the program. On the one day that an Appleton representative came to survey the program, the weather was inclement and many of our students were gone as a result of being part of auxillaries or basketball team to an out of town game. We had few students and shortly thereafter, Appleton pulled out of our district. That was unfortunate.

Did not communicate with parents.

We had a few bumps with this provider, but they corrected things in a timely and satisfactory way. For example, ILPs would be entered into ANATOMI for students that had not been pre-tested. Their correction was to not bill for time that those students had tutored until pretests were on file. This was satisfactory to the LEA. Classwork and school curriculum were not the focus of tutoring with this provider. Students assigned to this provider were working toward passing the AHSGE or were attempting to improve their ACT scores. Classwork/Homework was not allowed in tutoring sessions.

Were quick to address any issue that came up during the school year.

Table TA-35: Appleton Learning - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

Appleton Learning - Principal/Site Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 27, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	15				
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
			Number		**Percent**
Yes			1		6.7
No			14		93.3
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			60.0	33.3	6.7
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			46.7	40.0	13.3
		% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?		60.0	33.3	0.0	6.7
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		73.3	26.7	0.0	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	46.7	53.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	26.7	66.7	6.7	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	26.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	26.7	60.0	13.3	0.0	0.0
District Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	53.3	33.3	6.7	0.0	6.7
Comments					
Appleton Learning has helped our students improve greatly. I am displeased that the students were unable to complete the tutoring program during the second semester. The students were very disappointed.					
It took entirely to long for services to begin due to district level timetable.					
This was a great opportunity for students to receive assisance in academic subjects for a successful school year.					

Table TA-36: Appleton Learning - Teacher Report

Appleton Learning - Teacher Report					
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jul 1, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	46				
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
			Number		**Percent**
Yes			24		52.2
No			22		47.8
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			63.0	30.4	6.5
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			56.5	30.4	13.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	43.5	43.5	2.2	2.2	8.7
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	43.5	39.1	10.9	2.2	4.3
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	32.6	45.7	13.0	2.2	6.5
Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	45.7	45.7	4.3	2.2	2.2
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	47.8	41.3	8.7	0.0	2.2
Additional Comments					
Appleton Learning was a wonderful company to work. They were first and foremost concerned with student achievement. Again, I strongly agree that the services offered by the provider positively impacted the students at South Highlands Middle School					
Appleton was very instrumental in helping struggling students achieve the skills and additional assistance needed to excel in their acedemics. They targeted the specific needs of the students and provided the teachers with everything needed to provide an individualized curriculum to meet those needs.					
Great program, I believe I really reached my students academically.					
I believe with our schools population the tutoring service has really helped our students. I am so happy that our school does this for our students.					
I really enjoyed working with Appleton Tutoring Services this year. I was very much satisfied with the services they provided.					
Once, the initial problems were corrected with the changing of tutors and schedules were corrected Appleton provided the needed services for our students. [Name removed] did an excellent job working with the students and incorportated many of the students classroom activities within his lessons.					
The materials were not appropriate for our students and duplicated materials we already use on campus during the school day.					
The only time the tutors communicated with me about my students was when the tutor was another teacher at the same school.					
There seemed to be lots of confusion as far organization and paperwork was concerned. I was very unhappy in the last session of tutoring because my students and I never received any results from their pretests so I didn't really know what to focus on with them. My students kept asking about their results, and I felt like the let down really unmovitated them. Also they were forced to take a posttest when the session was cut short due to funding problems and the test was on things I hadn't even tutored them on because I never got their pretest results.					

Table TA-37: Appleton Learning - Parent Report
N = 79

Appleton Learning			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	53.2	44.3	2.5
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	36.7	41.8	21.5

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	72.2	19.0	1.3	5.1
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	78.5	19.0	0.0	2.5

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	43.0	45.6	5.1	1.3	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	50.6	36.7	5.1	1.3	1.3
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	53.2	39.2	5.1	1.3	0.0

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	45.6	45.6	2.5	0.0	6.3
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	38.0	57.0	2.5	0.0	2.5
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	51.9	46.8	1.3	0.0	0.0

Comments:
I really would like for my child to apply for Appleton Learning again in the near future.
that a good things to have people to teach the kids something they dont know [name removed] [sic]
He did a lot better with the tutoring. It improved his grade amazingly. Thank you tutoring service for giving our free tutoring. [sic]
I believe that once the students begin the program, they should be allowed to finish even if the funds run out. Someone needs to keep better tabs on where the money is going.
I feel my child was blessed. to have a chance for the help she needed. Thank you so much [name removed] her father [sic]
[Name removed] was a wonderful teacher
They were supposed to test my child to see what he needed help with before beging. They didn't. The first 2 weeks they had them doing Accelerated math instead of pamplets. I called the tutoring company. They started using pamplets. I don't think it was the material my child needed. I also didn't like that the company hired the teacher my child already had and wasn't helping him. They should have brought in their people. [sic]
My child really enjoyed each session.
I think this was a excellent program + would use it again.
I was very satisfied with the progress that my children accomplished while in tutoring. It is a very good program and definately recommend to others. [sic]
Specific help with Exit Exam Testing Math + Reading. Some math is just not understood.

Appleton Learning
I'd like to see and hear more about programs like the tutoring. With me being a working single mom these types of programs help. I'd just like to get more feedback on my child's achievements + progress.
26.5 hours was not enough time
Thank you for all the help you gave my child.
I am very proud of his progressed. [sic]
I just wish that my child would have had more than 30 hours of tutoring.
Great job everyone!!

Table TA-38: Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc.
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
21-30 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
Community location (not the provider's building)	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Individual	
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Yes, district/school transports students	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
Tutors have had training	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	
Direct instruction	

Table TA-39: Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. - Provider Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. – Provider Report</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 18, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 18, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="4">1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider Perceptions and Activities</td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider satisfaction with:</td><td>% Highly Satisfied</td><td>% Satisfied</td><td>% Dissatisfied</td><td>% Highly Dissatisfied</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Student attendance</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Parent cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Teacher cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Seeing positive results in terms of academic achievement and improvement among students who attended regularly.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Need to improve student attendance.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-40: Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. - District Coordinator Report

Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. – District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 8, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	4			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		25.0	75.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		25.0	75.0	0.0
	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Additional Comments				
Once [name removed] came on board as their local coordinator; all aspects of the program were in order.				

Table TA-41: Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. – Principal/Site Coordinator Report</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="3">May 27, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="3">Jun 27, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="3">4</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td colspan="2">Number</td><td>Percent</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Yes</td><td colspan="2">0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">No</td><td colspan="2">4</td><td>100.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">How often did the provider...</td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2. Communicate with you during the school year?</td><td>75.0</td><td>25.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?</td><td>25.0</td><td>50.0</td><td>25.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">4. Communicate with teachers during the year?</td><td>75.0</td><td>25.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>The provider...</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.</td><td>50.0</td><td>50.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.</td><td>25.0</td><td>75.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>0.0</td><td>75.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>25.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.</td><td>25.0</td><td>50.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>25.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Overall provider assessment:</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.</td><td>50.0</td><td>50.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.</td><td>50.0</td><td>50.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>District Assessment:</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.</td><td>50.0</td><td>50.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">There are no Ell students enrolled at this school.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-42: Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. - Teacher Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">**Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. – Teacher Report**</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 26, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">Jun 15, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="4">14</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">**1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?**</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td colspan="2">**Number**</td><td>**Percent**</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Yes</td><td colspan="2">11</td><td>78.6</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">No</td><td colspan="2">3</td><td>21.4</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">**How often did the provider...**</td><td>**% Frequently**</td><td>**% Occasionally**</td><td>**% Not at all**</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2. Communicate with you during the school year?</td><td>92.9</td><td>0.0</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?</td><td>85.7</td><td>7.1</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>**The provider...**</td><td>**% Strongly Agree**</td><td>**% Agree**</td><td>**% Disagree**</td><td>**% Strongly Disagree**</td><td>**% Don't Know**</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.</td><td>21.4</td><td>71.4</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.</td><td>28.6</td><td>64.3</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>21.4</td><td>71.4</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Overall Assessment:**</td><td>**% Strongly Agree**</td><td>**% Agree**</td><td>**% Disagree**</td><td>**% Strongly Disagree**</td><td>**% Don't Know**</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.</td><td>28.6</td><td>64.3</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.</td><td>28.6</td><td>64.3</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>7.1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">**Additional Comments**</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">The representatives from Carter Reddy worked diligently with the young people who reported for tutoring. The tutor genuinely cared for the learning process of all her students.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-43: Carter, Reddy, and Associates, Inc. - Parent Report
N = 20

Carter Reddy & Associates, Inc.			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	80.0	20.0	0.0
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	75.0	25.0	0.0

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	70.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	85.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	70.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Comments:
Thank you!

Table TA-44: Huntsville City Schools - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Huntsville City Schools
Districts Served:	

1. Program duration
31-40 weeks

2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week
2

3. Length of the average tutoring session
1.5 to 2 hours

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)
School building

5. Format (Mark all that apply)
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)

6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)
Yes, district/school transports students

7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)
Tutors are certified teachers

8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)
One-on-one tutoring (in person)
Computer-based tutoring

Table TA-45: Huntsville City Schools - Provider Report

Huntsville City Schools - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	May 18, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 18, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities	**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**	
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
We were very pleased with the interaction of the State and Local Coordinators and how they were able to work very wel with our programs and provide support.					
What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?					
We were unable to fine ways to motivat the High school students to be mor consistant. Because these students have so many other things going on after school they could not be consistant. Many had jobs that helped support home.					

Table TA-46: Huntsville City Schools- District Coordinator Report

Huntsville City Schools - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	Jun 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 20, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		0.0	100.0	0.0
	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-47: Huntsville City Schools - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

No principals/site coordinators in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-48: Huntsville City Schools - Teacher Report

No teachers in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-49: Huntsville City Schools - Parent Report

No parents in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-50: JFK Tutoring, Inc. - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	JFK Tutoring, Inc.
Districts Served:	

1. Program duration
21-30 weeks

2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week
2

3. Length of the average tutoring session
1.5 to 2 hours

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)
School building
Student homes
Community location (not the provider's building)

5. Format (Mark all that apply)
Individual
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)

6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)
Yes, district/school transports students
No, parents are responsible for transportation

7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)
Tutors are certified teachers
Tutors have bachelor's degrees
Tutors have had training
Other: Tutors must have at a minimum of 60 hours of college credits

8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)
One-on-one tutoring (in person)
Direct instruction
Independent seatwork

Table TA-51: JFK Tutoring, Inc. - Provider Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">JFK Tutoring, Inc. - Provider Report</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 25, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 25, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="4">1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider Perceptions and Activities</td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider satisfaction with:</td><td>% Highly Satisfied</td><td>% Satisfied</td><td>% Dissatisfied</td><td>% Highly Dissatisfied</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Student attendance</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Parent cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Teacher cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">The most positive outcome of our work this year was that several of the students who began our program early in the school year passed their exit exams.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">The area in need of improvement would have to be not having a cut off date for tutoring to end. Most districts have a set beginning and ending date, I find this helpful.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Additional Comments/Recommendations</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">This, being our first year with Alabama was awesome! Looking forward to next year.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-52: JFK Tutoring, Inc. - District Coordinator Report

JFK Tutoring, Inc. - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	Jun 8, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 8, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		0.0	100.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		0.0	100.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-53: JFK Tutoring, Inc. - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

No principals/site coordinators in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-54: JFK Tutoring, Inc. - Teacher Report

No teachers in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-55: JFK Tutoring, Inc. - Parent Report
N = 5

JFK Tutoring, Inc.			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	20.0	60.0	20.0
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	0.0	60.0	40.0

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	40.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Comments:					
the teachers never or send a note of the progress of my daughter just the carts report [sic] [Spanish]					

Table TA-56: Learn-It Systems, LLC - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Learn-It Systems, LLC
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
11-20 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Yes, district/school transports students	
Yes, provider transports students	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
Tutors have had training	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	
Direct instruction	

Table TA-57: Learn-It Systems, LLC - Provider Report

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">Learn-It Systems, LLC - Provider Report</td></tr>
<tr><td>First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 23, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">May 23, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="4">1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider Perceptions and Activities</td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Provider satisfaction with:</td><td>% Highly Satisfied</td><td>% Satisfied</td><td>% Dissatisfied</td><td>% Highly Dissatisfied</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Student attendance</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Parent cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. Teacher cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">The most positive outcome or aspect of our work this year was seeing the academic growth of our students at the end of the program.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Fiquring our how to get middle school students to attend tutoring is an area we can improve upon.</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-58: Learn-It Systems, LLC - District Coordinator Report

Learn-It Systems, LLC - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 20, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	4			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		75.0	25.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		75.0	25.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments

After a few issues involving marketing at the beginning of the year; this company followed through completely. We have a good working relationship with [name removed]. She does an excellent job of coordinating the program at the schools along with [name removed]. Any concern brought to their attention by the district was dealt with in a timely manner.

Table TA-59: Learn-It Systems, LLC - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

Learn-It Systems, LLC - Principal/Site Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:	May 23, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 31, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	3				

1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?

		Number		Percent	
Yes		0		0.0	
No		3		100.0	

How often did the provider...		% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	
2. Communicate with you during the school year?		33.3	33.3	33.3	
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		33.3	0.0	66.7	

		% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?		66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

District Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-60: Learn-It Systems, LLC - Teacher Report

Learn-It Systems, LLC - Teacher Report				
First Submission Date:	May 23, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 26, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	4			
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?				
			Number	**Percent**
Yes			0	0.0
No			4	100.0
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?		75.0	0.0	25.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		75.0	0.0	25.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	0.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-61: Learn-It Systems, LLC - Parent Report
N = 7

Learn-It Systems, LLC			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	42.9	28.6	28.6
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	28.6	57.1	14.3
	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	28.6	57.1	14.3	0.0
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	57.1	28.6	14.3	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	57.1	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	0.0	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	28.6	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	42.9	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Comments:					
I am very pleased with tutoring services					
(Learn-It) has been ever such an inspiration, and a great resource in helping my child develop skills to work both independently and competently. [name removed] [sic]					

Table TA-62: Learning Express Center (LEC) - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Learning Express Center (LEC)
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
21-30 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
Provider's location	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Individual	
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	

Table TA-63: Learning Express Center (LEC) - Provider Report

Learning Express Center (LEC) - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	May 27, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 27, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
Increase of student participants and the quality of tutors					
What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?					
The beginning of SES was not a smooth transition. We did not expect SES to start so soon in the school year. It started a month earlier this year. Also we did not expect such an increase in the number of student participants. Combined, we were not exactly ready to start the program, because we did not have enough tutors in place to start unexpectedly earlier.					

Table TA-64: Learning Express Center (LEC) - District Coordinator Report

Learning Express Center (LEC) - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	Jun 3, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 3, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		100.0	0.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-65: Learning Express Center (LEC) - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

Learning Express Center (LEC) - Principal/Site Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:		Jun 27, 2011			
Last Submission Date:		Jun 27, 2011			
Total number of respondents:		1			

1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
			Number		**Percent**
Yes			1		100.0
No			0		0.0

How often did the provider...	**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?	100.0	0.0	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	100.0	0.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

District Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-66: Learning Express Center (LEC) - Teacher Report

Learning Express Center (LEC) - Teacher Report					
First Submission Date:		Jun 13, 2011			
Last Submission Date:		Jun 13, 2011			
Total number of respondents:		4			
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
				Number	**Percent**
Yes				4	100.0
No				0	0.0
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			100.0	0.0	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			100.0	0.0	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-67: Learning Express Center (LEC) - Parent Report

No parents in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-68: MTS Tutorial Services - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	MTS Tutorial Services
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
21-30 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
2	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
Other: 1.0 hour	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
Other: 8 students maximum group size with a tutor	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Yes, district/school transports students	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have had training	
Other: Highly-qualified teachers	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
One-on-one tutoring (in person)	
Computer-based tutoring	
Direct instruction	
Independent seatwork	

Table TA-69: MTS Tutorial Services - Provider Report

MTS Tutorial Services - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	May 18, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 18, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities	**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**	
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?

Several students took full advantage of the tutoring sessions and attended the maximum number of hours per the district contract.

What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?

The company uses a hosted software for instructing students along with printed resources; there were problems accessing the software sometimes because the districts' Internet service would be down. This happened occasionally.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Students enroll in the SES program and do not attend tutoring services even after contact from the Provider via phone and mail. Many of the students dropped out of tutoring. Phone calls were made and letters were sent to parents/guardians encouraging students to continue tutoring. Maybe the school staff could take a more active role in encouraging students to attend tutoring.

Table TA-70: MTS Tutorial Services - District Coordinator Report

MTS Tutorial Services - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 19, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	2			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		100.0	0.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments

A joy to work with! [Name removed] was organized and followed through on every aspect of SES. Paperwork was always on time and complete. Tutors had what they needed. It was obvious that tutors were trained adequately. Schools, parents, and the district could not have been more pleased to work with [name removed] and MTS.

Table TA-71: MTS Tutorial Services - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

MTS Tutorial Services - Principal/Site Coordinator Report			
First Submission Date:	May 27, 2011		
Last Submission Date:	May 31, 2011		
Total number of respondents:	2		

1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	0.0
No	2	100.0

How often did the provider...	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all
2. Communicate with you during the school year?	100.0	0.0	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	0.0	50.0	50.0

	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

District Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-72: MTS Tutorial Services - Teacher Report

No teachers in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-73: MTS Tutorial Services - Parent Report
N = 2

MTS Tutorial Services				
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**		**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	50.0		0.0	50.0
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	100.0		0.0	0.0
	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-74: Rocket Learning, LLC - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Rocket Learning, LLC
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
11-20 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
3	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
1.5 to 2 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
Community location (not the provider's building)	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Yes, provider transports students	
Other: When needed (not needed this previous year)	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
Tutors have had training	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
Direct instruction	

Table TA-75: Rocket Learning, LLC - Provider Report

Rocket Learning, LLC - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	Jun 24, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 24, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
Being able to work directly with the students and see real improvement in their learning. This was our first year in Alabama and we found that students were extremely eager to learn.					
What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?					
In certain cases, it seemed as though students and families actually learning about the opportunity to receive tutoring was so restricted that some students that could have benefitted from tutoring were not able to register.					
Additional Comments/Recommendations					
I am very honored and thankful for the opportunity to serve the students and families of Alabama. The state and districts have done a remarkable job in the implementation of the program.					

Table TA-76: Rocket Learning, LLC - District Coordinator Report

Rocket Learning, LLC - District Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:	May 20, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 22, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	2				
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		50.0	50.0	0.0	
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		50.0	50.0	0.0	
		% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?		50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?		50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Additional Comments					
After a few glitches with marketing; Rocket Learning provided a most exciting tutoring program for students. Tutors were well trained and enthusiastic about the program. Rocket Learning provided every pencil and piece of paper needed by the students and tutors.The only improvement they could make is to send in invoices in a more timely manner.					

Table TA-77: Rocket Learning, LLC - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

Rocket Learning, LLC - Principal/Site Coordinator Report					
First Submission Date:	May 23, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 31, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	3				
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
			Number		**Percent**
Yes			1		33.3
No			2		66.7
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			33.3	66.7	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			33.3	33.3	33.3
		% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?		66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
District Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-78: Rocket Learning, LLC - Teacher Report

Rocket Learning, LLC - Teacher Report					
First Submission Date:		May 23, 2011			
Last Submission Date:		May 26, 2011			
Total number of respondents:		6			
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?					
				Number	**Percent**
Yes				3	50.0
No				3	50.0
How often did the provider...			**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
2. Communicate with you during the school year?			66.7	33.3	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?			16.7	73.3	0.0
The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	16.7	73.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall Assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Additional Comments					
The curriculum issued by this provider kept the students engaged and excited about learning. I was impressed that Rocket's curriculum addressed the different learning styles. It was interesting, hands-on and interactive for the learner because an art activity was embedded in each lesson. Nice -going Rocket!					
The students really enjoyed the different activities. They were really engaged in the learning process.					

Table TA-79: Rocket Learning, LLC - Parent Report
N = 17

Rocket Learning, LLC			
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	41.2	52.9	5.9
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	23.5	52.9	23.5

	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	47.1	47.1	0.0	5.9
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	82.4	5.9	0.0	11.8

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	70.6	23.5	5.9	0.0	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	47.1	47.1	5.9	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	64.7	29.4	0.0	5.9	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	47.1	52.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	52.9	35.3	11.8	0.0	0.0
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	88.2	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Comments:
Not only did I see improvement in subjects that my child needed help in. His confidence level was raised and he was able to comprehend much better. [sic]
I think that the tutoring program was a good thing for the kids to do after school, and that they should bring it back next school year.
Student went in hospital Didn't get all her time I believe it was helping [sic]
Thank you so much!
I would strongly appreciate if the free tutoring after school session, will continue in our school district. Thank you very much. [sic]
The tutoring was very good for my son just wasn't enough time [sic]

Table TA-80: Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
11-20 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
1	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
.5 to 1.0 hour	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
Provider's location	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
No, parents are responsible for transportation	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
Tutors have bachelor's degrees	
Tutors have had training	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
Direct instruction	

Table TA-81: Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Provider Report

Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 21, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
Anatomi made billing easier.					
What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?					
Student attendance was poor, which made reaching desired outcomes difficult.					

Table TA-82: Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - District Coordinator Report

Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		0.0	100.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		0.0	100.0	0.0

	% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments

Good working relationship with this company. Parents in particular were pleased with the tutoring provided at the center.

Table TA-83: Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

No principals/site coordinators in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-84: Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Teacher Report

No teachers in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-85: Sylvan Learning Center in Hoover-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Parent Report

No parents in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-86: Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.
Districts Served:	

1. Program duration
11-20 weeks

2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week
2

3. Length of the average tutoring session
.5 to 1.0 hour

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)
Provider's location

5. Format (Mark all that apply)
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)

6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)
No, parents are responsible for transportation

7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)
Tutors are certified teachers
Tutors have had training

8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)
One-on-one tutoring (in person)
Direct instruction
Independent seatwork

Table TA-87: Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Provider Report

Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Provider Report				
First Submission Date:	May 26, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 26, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			
Provider Perceptions and Activities	**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?

Watching the academic growth of each child and positive comments from parents.

What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?

Transportation issues and attendance of some students, especially with high school students.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Overall, very pleased with the program this year and the support of the Site, District and State Coordinators.

Table TA-88: Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - District Coordinator Report

Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 20, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	2			
How often did the provider...		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**
1. Communicate with you during the school year?		100.0	0.0	0.0
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?		100.0	0.0	0.0

		% Frequently	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?		50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall provider assessment:	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Additional Comments

Great working relationship with this center. Appreciated the fact that they would call with questions when needed. Well organized. All paperwork in order.

Sylvan was very easy to work with and had clear procedures for communicating with the LEA and parents. Classwork and school curriculum were not the focus of these tutoring sessions. Students working with this provider were working toward passing the AHSGE or improving their ACT scores. Pre-assessments were used to determine skills to focus on. This provider had an impact on specific students' success, especially when participation was consistent.

Table TA-89: Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Principal/Site Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	May 24, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	May 31, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	2			
1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?				
	Number		**Percent**	
Yes	0		0.0	
No	2		100.0	

How often did the provider...	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all
2. Communicate with you during the school year?	100.0	0.0	0.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	50.0	50.0	0.0

	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
4. Communicate with teachers during the year?	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Started tutoring soon after the registration process was complete.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
10. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

District Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the way the school district helped our school implement services from this provider.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-90: Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Teacher Report

No teachers in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-91: Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck-Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc. - Parent Report
N = 2

Sylvan Learning Center in Roebuck- Birmingham/ T Learning, Inc.				
How often did the tutoring company...	**% A lot**	**% Sometimes**		**% Not at all**
Talk to you about your child's progress?	100.0	0.0		0.0
Send letters or notes home about your child's progress?	50.0	0.0		50.0
	% A lot	**% Sometimes**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
Help your child with subjects s/he is working on in school?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Start and end the tutoring sessions on time?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the tutoring company.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I am happy with the number of hours of free tutoring given to my child this year.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I believe that the free tutoring helped my child's achievement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall, I am pleased with the services that my child received.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following items about the school district.	**% Strongly Agree**	**% Agree**	**% Disagree**	**% Strongly Disagree**	**% Don't Know**
I was given information about my child's rights under the No Child Left Behind law.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I was given enough time to decide which tutoring company I wanted for my child.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I am pleased with the way my school district helped me get free tutoring for my child.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Comments:					
I was very pleased with his tutoring sessions. His grades has increased greatly. [sic]					
Need more hour so they can cover both math + reading. The only problem I had was at the end of the second year. Keep call so they can be tested but no one never return my call so they did not do their end of the year test. [sic]					

Table TA-92: The Capitol School, Inc. - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	The Capitol School, Inc.
Districts Served:	
1. Program duration	
21-30 weeks	
2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week	
3	
3. Length of the average tutoring session	
2.5 to 3 hours	
4. Setting (Mark all that apply)	
School building	
5. Format (Mark all that apply)	
Large group (6-10 students per tutor)	
6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)	
Other: School picks up from child's school and then parents pick up at 5:15 p.m.	
7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)	
Tutors are certified teachers	
8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)	
Direct instruction	

Table TA-93: The Capitol School, Inc. - Provider Report

The Capitol School, Inc. - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:		Jun 20, 2011			
Last Submission Date:		Jun 20, 2011			
Total number of respondents:		1			
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?

We had a much larger percentage of students who attended regularly during the fall (Oct. - Jan session) and spring sessions (Feb. - May) so their progress was outstanding.   While you could expect 4 months of progress--all students achieved 8 months or more. Some children improved up to two (2) grade levels on their post test scores.

What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?

Since we aren't allowed to help with homework, there is no way to integrate what the children do in tutoring with their classroom studies.   We only get general scores from the school in math or reading of "3" so we must test to see what math and reading objectives the students have mastered and then reteach the objectives that they have not attained. All of this must be done before the tutoring starts as we have no information, not even the classroom teacher's name or email.   The biggest challenge is the ANATOMI software where all documents must be scanned in

The Capitol School, Inc. - Provider Report
Additional Comments/Recommendations
The Tuscaloosa City Schools office does a great job and has hired a Facilitator to come over and supervise our tutoring. The communication breaks down at the local school level as we can't meet with teachers during their school day and when we go to the school, we may catch one or two at the end of the day.   We know the child's grade level but not the teacher's names or emails.   We have good rapport with our parents since they pick up the children here after 5:15 p.m. and sign them out. When we give out monthly progress reports directly into the hands of the parents, the parents sign our copy and keep their personal copy.   We have just been approved to continue tutoring for the next 3 years. So, we are hopeful to be able to work with each child to help them make academic gains.

Table TA-94: The Capitol School, Inc. - District Coordinator Report

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">The Capitol School, Inc. - District Coordinator Report</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">First Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">Jun 8, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Last Submission Date:</td><td colspan="4">Jun 8, 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Total number of respondents:</td><td colspan="4">1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">How often did the provider...</td><td colspan="2">% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">1. Communicate with you during the school year?</td><td colspan="2">100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?</td><td colspan="2">0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>% Frequently</td><td>% Occasionally</td><td>% Not at all</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3. Communicate with teachers during the year?</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">4. Communicate with parents during the year?</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>The provider...</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Overall provider assessment:</td><td>% Strongly Agree</td><td>% Agree</td><td>% Disagree</td><td>% Strongly Disagree</td><td>% Don't Know</td></tr>
<tr><td>12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.</td><td>0.0</td><td>100.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td></tr>
</table>

Table TA-95: The Capitol School, Inc. - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

No principals/site coordinators in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-96: The Capitol School, Inc. - Teacher Report

The Capitol School, Inc. - Teacher Report					
First Submission Date:	May 26, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	May 26, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				

1. Are you employed by the provider for which you are completing this survey?

	Number	Percent
Yes	0	0.0
No	1	100.0

How often did the provider...	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all
2. Communicate with you during the school year?	0.0	0.0	100.0
3. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	0.0	0.0	100.0

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
4. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5. Adapted the tutoring services to meet the needs of individual students.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
6. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Overall Assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
7. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-97: The Capitol School, Inc. - Parent Report

No parents in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-98: University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - Provider Service Information

Provider Name:	University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership
Districts Served:	

1. Program duration
31-40 weeks

2. Average number of sessions attended by students each week
3

3. Length of the average tutoring session
1.5 to 2 hours

4. Setting (Mark all that apply)
School building

5. Format (Mark all that apply)
Individual
Small group (2-5 students per tutor)

6. Is transportation provided to students? (Mark all that apply)
No, parents are responsible for transportation

7. Qualifications of tutors (Mark all that apply)
Tutors are certified teachers

8. Instructional activities (Mark all that apply)
One-on-one tutoring (in person)
Direct instruction

Table TA-99: University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - Provider Report

University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - Provider Report					
First Submission Date:	Jun 22, 2011				
Last Submission Date:	Jun 22, 2011				
Total number of respondents:	1				
Provider Perceptions and Activities		**% Frequently**	**% Occasionally**	**% Not at all**	**% Don't Know**
1. Tutors communicated with teachers regarding progress of their student(s).		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Tutors communicated with parents/guardians regarding their child's progress.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tutors showed their lesson plans or materials used for tutoring to the homeroom/subject teacher of each child they worked with.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. The provider aligned the supplemental services with the state academic content and achievement standards.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. The provider integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. The provider adapted the supplemental services to each school's curriculum.		0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7. The provider offered instruction to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.		0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Provider satisfaction with:	**% Highly Satisfied**	**% Satisfied**	**% Dissatisfied**	**% Highly Dissatisfied**	**% Don't Know**
8. Student attendance	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
9. Student attitudes (e.g., cooperation, motivation)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. The ease of developing lessons aligned with the district or school curriculum	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Parent cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Teacher cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Principal/Site Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. District SES coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15. State SES Coordinator cooperation/involvement	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16. Success at raising student achievement to desired levels	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
What was the most positive outcome or aspect of your work this year?					
Working with teachers and principals successfully.					
What was the most negative aspect or area in need of improvement regarding your work this year?					
Decrease in number of students served.					

Table TA-100: University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - District Coordinator Report

University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - District Coordinator Report				
First Submission Date:	Jun 8, 2011			
Last Submission Date:	Jun 8, 2011			
Total number of respondents:	1			

How often did the provider...	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	
1. Communicate with you during the school year?	0.0	100.0	0.0	
2. Collaborate with you to set goals for student growth?	0.0	100.0	0.0	

	% Frequently	% Occasionally	% Not at all	% Don't Know
3. Communicate with teachers during the year?	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
4. Communicate with parents during the year?	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
5. Meet the obligations for conducting tutoring sessions?	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The provider...	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
6. Adapted the tutoring services to this school's curriculum.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Integrated the tutoring services with classroom learning activities.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
8. Aligned their services with state and local standards.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Offered services to Special Education and ELL students.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Complied with applicable federal NCLB laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Complied with applicable state and local (health, safety, civil rights) laws.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Overall provider assessment:	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	% Don't Know
12. I believe the services offered by this provider positively impacted student achievement.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Overall, I am satisfied with this provider's services.	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table TA-101: University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - Principal/Site Coordinator Report

No principals/site coordinators in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-102: University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - Teacher Report

No teachers in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.

Table TA-103: University of Alabama Heroes Center for Community-Based Partnership - Parent Report

No parents in the state of Alabama chose to complete a survey about their experience working with this provider during the 2010-2011 school year.