At the request of the Board of Education, this report summarizes the Supplemental Educational Services (SES) provided to students in Program Improvement schools as a part of the district implementation of the federal No Child Left Behind Act, reviews student participation since the inception of the program to date and discusses national policy trends.

OVERVIEW

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 requires that all schools receiving Title I funding make adequate yearly progress in raising student achievement as defined by the State. Schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress are placed in Program Improvement Status.

The Act requires that school districts provide school choice options to parents whose students attend Program Improvement (PI) schools. The NCLB Act also requires that school districts provide supplemental educational services beyond the regular school day to provide extra academic assistance to students attending schools in Program Improvement year two. The goal of SES is to increase academic achievement particularly in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics. When a district does not have sufficient fiscal capacity available to provide supplemental educational services to all eligible students, the law directs that priority be extended to the lowest-achieving students in those schools from low income families. Per federal regulations, service providers must have a demonstrated record of effectiveness, be approved by the California Department of Education and be selected by the students’ parents or guardians. The San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) has complied with these requirements by offering both school choice and supplemental educational service options to parents of students in district PI schools since it began to implement NCLB in September 2002.

BACKGROUND

SES Students and Providers

The San Diego Unified School District began offering supplemental educational services to students in 22 district schools in November of 2002 with the district serving as the primary provider. It is estimated that more than 12,000 students received some kind of extended-day services including tutoring provided by the district and/or SES during this time. Approximately 10% of all eligible students have received SES tutoring services since the program began. This is consistent with other districts surveyed nationally with participation rates ranging between 10 to 20% of all eligible students. Prior to 2005-2006 students participating in extended day tutoring of any kind were counted together in one combined group. A total of 2,390 students received SES either from the district as a provider or other non-district providers in 2005-2006. This represents a true count of the number of eligible students receiving only supplemental educational services. SES were provided for 1,090 students from 27 schools by 20 outside providers and the district served as a provider for 1,300 students at 19 school sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Total Students Served</th>
<th>Non-District Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>4,373*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>5,112*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>4,530*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total count of all students receiving after-school tutoring from any source
** List of providers and number of students being served by each – Attachment A
For the 2006-2007 school year, 35 district schools are designated as “Program Improvement Year 2 and beyond” under NCLB. Approximately 22,395 students will be eligible for services based on their free and reduced lunch eligibility. The CDE has certified 107 outside providers to provide services for SDUSD students and the district has contracted with 37. NCLB allows parents the sole authority and responsibility to register their student to participate in SES. The district can not recommend or assign students to participate in any program. As permitted by the law, the district was eligible and chose to serve as an SES provider from 2002 to 2006. Although the district remains eligible to provide SES, because it continues to make AYP and is not designated as Program Improvement, the district will not serve as a SES provider for the 2006-2007 school year.

For the 2006-2007 school year, parents of eligible students received an application for services via the U.S. mail along with a booklet describing all of the approved local tutoring organizations and services available. Three provider fairs were held in the community in September and October to give parents an opportunity to obtain detailed information on tutoring services. The registration deadline was extended twice, ending in November, allowing more time for parents to receive information and return the application. As of December, 2,274 students (10% of the total eligible students) were enrolled in the SES Free Tutoring Program. A second semester enrollment process will be implemented in January, making free tutoring available to those low income students who are not performing well after a semester of instruction.

In September 2006, the Board of Education approved the appointment of a new administrative position, Program Manager, Supplemental Educational Services, to oversee the district SES program. The functions of this position include the direct administration of SES services with state approved providers, marketing the program, and monitoring program quality and compliance. According to the program manager, future plans and goals for the program include, increase the percentage of student participants in the program, empower parents to make informed choices, and monitoring the quality of tutorial services. District staff has indicated they will continue to monitor SES programs and conduct site visits to the extent permissible under the law. Small monitoring teams of retired principals or certificated people will be trained and scheduled to visit provider sites. Their role will be to verify student information, student enrollment, student attendance, Individual Achievement Plans, staff clearance, health and safety reports, student Progress Reports, and pre and post assessments. Identifying an effective method to conduct a parent questionnaire will be discussed.

Per the SES Program Manager, the SES Free Tutoring Program will be publicized to more audiences and through different venues (i.e., school sites, newsletters, websites, flyers, radio, TV) in the upcoming year. More Providers Fairs will be offered to parents in different locations throughout the district. The enrollment process will begin in May 2007 for the next school year. Actual tutoring will start early in September for the 2007-2008 school year.

**Funding Source**

NCLB establishes a joint funding mechanism for choice related transportation and supplemental educational services. Per the provisions of No Child Left Behind, SES is supported by the district’s annual Title I entitlement from the Federal government. From these funds, approximately 20% of the district’s annual entitlement is budgeted for NCLB Program Improvement School Choice (PISC) and Supplemental Educational Services. Fifteen percent of this allocation is directed to student transportation under Program Improvement School Choice. The remaining 5% is reserved for supplemental educational services from state approved third party providers. The district pays providers directly per a district-provider contract at hourly rates agreed upon between the state and the provider not to exceed $1,500 per student, per school year.

**Parent-Provider Contract**

The law states that the school district shall develop in consultation with parents (and the provider chosen by parents), a statement of specific achievement goals for the student, how the student’s progress will be measured and
a timetable for improving achievement that, in the case of a student with disabilities, is consistent with the students Individual Education Plan (IEP). The achievement goals must be consistent with the student’s individualized education program in the case of students with disabilities. The law also requires that providers collaborate with the student’s classroom teacher in designing achievement goals.

**Federal, State and Local SES Program Monitoring and Evaluation**

Monitors in the United States Department of Education review SES at the state level and sometimes in local districts. They conduct audits of districts such as the audit conducted of the San Diego Unified School District and provide assistance through written guidance and technical assistance.

The California Department of Education (CDE) provides independent oversight of SES through the Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR), a process through which the district’s implementation of SES and other Title I programs is reviewed. The CDE reviews SES provider applications to assess each provider’s record of effectiveness and program design. Upon satisfactory review the CDE certifies SES providers for the state. Due in part to increased oversight by the USDE, the CDE is now asking for specific information from providers including student achievement data based on California Standards Test (CST) scores.

The district role in oversight is limited to certain compliance regulations. Districts can not evaluate the effectiveness of provider services. They can only determine if the required plans were developed, if the required number of hours were documented and submitted and confirm that the organization has been certified by the State. The district is in the process of evaluating pre and post CST scores to determine any impact for students utilizing supplemental educational services. Although it will be possible to review test scores, it will be difficult to identify what specific strategy impacted a student’s CST score most – improved in classroom instruction, extended day learning opportunities, or other factors.

**State Review and Federal Audit**

In February 2005, a consortium of community based SES providers called Neighborhood Fundraising Network, Inc. submitted a document to the district entitled “SES Provider Concerns/Conflicts with LEA Contract Performance.” This document outlined a number of perceived non-compliance issues, listed complaints against the district and suggested remedies. District staff conducted several meetings with representatives from this organization along with other non-district providers in an attempt to resolve concerns. As a result of the local complaint and the increased federal scrutiny of SES, the district was notified by the California Department of Education (CDE) in April 2005 that the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) had requested information on the district administration of SES.

The USDE Office of Inspector General notified the district in October 2005 that it would conduct an audit of the districts SES program administration. The Final Audit Report issued in March 2006 contained one finding. Individual Student Agreements did not contain the elements required by law and were not provided for all students who received SES. The audit findings have been addressed and the final audit responses have been submitted to the CDE. In June 2006 the district certified that student learning plans for all students receiving SES in the 2005-2006 school year contained the required elements. A review of attendance sheets and payroll concluded that the district performed the services for which it expended Title I funds. Also during this time, the CDE was asked by the USDE to conduct a detailed evaluation and analysis for each of the 20 largest school districts in California to determine whether public school choice and SES have been fully implemented for the 2006-2007 school year. After a full review, the CDE concluded that each of the districts, including San Diego Unified, had adequate procedures in place for appropriate and timely parent notifications and implementation of SES. The California Department of Education is now in the process of fully developing a monitoring and evaluation process for SES. The state has directed each provider to submit an “SES Providers’ End-of-Fiscal-Year Report.” The CDE has extended the October 1, 2006 deadline for the submission of this report to March 1, 2007. This report will contain achievement
data for each student enrolled in the district using SES, including their Math and English Language scores, and the frequency of progress reports to parents.

**POLICY DISCUSSION**

The provision of supplemental educational services supports the district goal to accelerate gains in student achievement. The Board has a policy in place supporting supplemental educational services since 2002 (F-9600 District Policies, San Diego City Schools.) After-school tutoring programs and extended-day programs funded from other state and federal sources have been part of the district instructional program for many years. Currently, the district provides after school mathematics and reading tutoring programs for all elementary schools in Program Improvement for 2 or more years and all district middle and junior high schools for a total of 46 schools. All senior high schools offer California High School Exit Exam Prep and core course “D or F” make-up classes. In addition, the district provides administrative support for approximately 12 schools that have indicated an interest in site funding their own tutoring program. These programs are funded through a combination of state funds directed towards the improvement of math and literacy skills.

As policy makers, the Board of Education can consider ways to support the provision of supplemental educational services and maximize the benefit of these funds allocated to improve student achievement.

**District Implementation Issues**

The NCLB Non-Regulatory Guidance issued in 2005 clarifies a number of ways districts and states can implement SES. Although districts can not recommend specific providers to parents, teachers and principals can encourage parents to enroll their children in SES. Teachers and principals can provide information and serve as a resource to assist parents in obtaining the help their students need. Districts can allow SES providers to operate in school buildings giving parents and students direct access to programs. The district has already begun to institute the practice of a second semester registration. Registration should be as convenient as possible for parents and ongoing registration can be offered throughout the year depending on service provider availability. The Learning Contract and Student Achievement Plan for eligible district students can include strategies for using SES. The district could also choose to become an SES provider again, targeting children with disabilities and children with limited English proficiency. Per regulatory guidance, the provision of supplemental educational services can be targeted more specifically if the determination is made that these services would be more effective if concentrated in the lowest performing schools at particular grades. Student eligibility for services can be based on a cut-off score on a school-by-school basis or for all schools. The district could decide to fund more supplemental educational services in neighborhood schools versus school choice transportation, although it is important to note - parents can not choose both, they can choose either transportation to new school or supplemental educational services.

**State Implementation Issues**

Under NCLB the state is ultimately responsible for monitoring SES providers. The California Department of Education is currently in the process of developing and implementing standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services offered by supplemental educational services providers. Under NCLB, the state is directed to withdraw approval from providers that fail for two consecutive years to increase the academic proficiency of students served by the providers. For example, in the state of North Carolina, if a significant number of students make less than one year of growth as measured by the state's end-of-grade/course tests, the service provider is notified. If students do not show appropriate growth in the next year, the service provider is dropped from the state's approved provider list. States can develop a uniform contract for service providers and establish program design criteria.
NCLB Reauthorization

In anticipation of the upcoming reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act scheduled to occur in 2008, the U.S. Department of Education, congress and education agencies have been evaluating the effectiveness of NCLB including the provision of Supplemental Educational Services. Although the provisions of NCLB regarding highly trained teachers and the calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress will receive the most attention in the reauthorization debate, the SES program is expected to continue to be funded and implemented. Two main themes are emerging from the policy discussions and position papers on the provision of supplemental educational services.

Increased flexibility for school districts in oversight and quality control must be built into the SES program. For example, school districts should have the flexibility to effectively target funds by limiting the options of public school choice and supplemental educational services only to those students within the sub-group that failed to meet their AYP targets in the same subject for two or more years—not all students in the school. With the availability of a statewide assessment tool, local districts can take a more active role in contracting with providers to meet the needs of targeted groups of students. The law could be amended to allow states to set a cap on the hourly rate providers can charge for services thus assuring a certain number of students will be served for a minimum number of hours. It has also been suggested that districts be allowed to bid contracts with SES providers, similar to the way districts bid other services, in order to serve more students and maximize funding.

Increased funding is needed at both the state and local level to ensure SES program quality control.
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