

## **Revisiting A Statewide Evaluation of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Programming: Lessons Learned and Changes Made – Year 2 Evaluation**

**M. Williams, P. Finney, L. Amwake, J. Manweiler, A. Poole**

### **Study Overview**

In 2011, the SERVE Center at UNCG was contracted to conduct the external evaluation for a statewide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) program for a second consecutive year. The study information and design remains unchanged from the previous year:

- Evaluated the performance of SES providers on the basis of three weighted criteria:
  - Student Attendance (25%),
  - Parental Satisfaction (25%) and
  - Student Achievement (50%).
- Providers assessed via a 3-step process; each SES Provider was assigned an overall composite score based on the three evaluation criteria identified.
  1. Each Provider was assigned a rating based on a state-provided rubric and the corresponding Provider data for each criteria.
  2. Overall composite score was assigned for each Provider by calculating a weighted average across the rubric scores for each of the three evaluation criteria.
  3. Overall composite rubric scores were then converted to a percentage. The Provider must achieve a minimum rating of 75% to continue with a status of “Good Standing.” A rating of less than 75% results in a Provider status of “Probationary.”

### **Summary of Methodology**

The data collection and analysis process is presented below for each evaluation criteria: Parent Satisfaction, Student Attendance, and Student Achievement.

- **Parent Satisfaction (25%)**
  - Survey administration: SERVE → SES Provider → Student → Parent/Guardian → Student → Provider → SERVE.
  - Scale scores created. Scale score means ranged from 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 4 (“Strongly Agree”).
  - 2.5 the cutoff to determine satisfied versus dissatisfied.
  - Providers who had more than 25% of parents dissatisfied = “Below Standards.”
- **Student Attendance (25%)**
  - Submitted via template provided by SERVE.
  - Defined as program hours offered/attended.
  - Compared individual Provider attendance rate to the overall rate across all providers. Standard deviation was also calculated across all Provider average attendance rates.
  - Overall mean and standard deviation across Providers are used to determine upper and lower bounds for meeting standards.
  - Providers who fall below the lower bound = “Below Standards.”
- **Student Achievement (50%)**
  - Each SES Provider site identified its own pre and post measures of assessment for student achievement.
  - Submitted via template provided by SERVE.
  - Students were only included in this analysis if they had a score on both the pretest and the posttest, and if they had an attendance rate of at least 50% of Provider offered sessions.
  - Effect sizes calculated to analyze change in student achievement from time one (“pre”) to time two (“post”).

- **Student Achievement (50%)—Cont'd.**

- Methodological strategy for measuring student achievement informed by IES WWC standards. Effect size benchmarks used as a guide for determining a program's success.
- Effect sizes were classified based on WWC evidence standards, which state that an effect size of at least .25 "will be taken as a qualified positive effect even though they may not reach statistical significance in a given study."
- Providers with effect sizes that fall below .25 = "Below Standards."

## **Lessons Learned, Changes Made in Year 2, & Outcomes**

### **1. Lesson Learned:** Improve communications with SES providers.

- **Changes Made:** All communication regarding the SES evaluation, including timelines and deliverables, went directly to SES Providers; participated in state-hosted Provider workshops to present the evaluation process.
- **Outcome:** Streamlined the communication process and improved Provider understanding and responsiveness.

### **2. Lesson Learned:** Standardize how measures of student academic achievement and attendance are collected.

- **Changes Made:** In cases where Providers chose multiple measures of achievement, they were asked to select only one to submit data on for evaluation purposes; providers instructed to ensure all achievement data were submitted on the same scale.
- **Outcome:** Simplified the entire data cleaning and analysis process, reducing the time it took by almost half; increased the validity of conclusions drawn from the data.

### **3. Lesson Learned:** Simplify procedures for filling out parent surveys.

- **Changes Made:** Rather than asking parents to identify their child's Provider, Provider names were pre-printed on the actual survey itself; provided submittal envelopes that parents could seal and initial prior to turning their survey back in to the Provider.
- **Outcome:** Increased response rate (up 3% from the previous year); did not have to throw out any data due to incorrect or non-identification of the Provider (over 2,500 surveys had to be thrown out in the previous year)

### **4. Lesson Learned:** Streamline the process of shipping materials to and from Providers.

- **Changes Made:** Rather than communicating via a third party district contact, all evaluation materials were sent directly to each Provider, customized based on their enrollment number and program start and end dates.
- **Outcome:** Better able to assure the timeliness of delivery and encourage/support increased Provider participation in the evaluation process.

### **For more information contact:**

Melissa R. Williams  
Evaluation Specialist  
SERVE Center at UNCG  
P. O. Box 5367  
Greensboro, NC 27435  
mwilliam@serve.org