

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Utah State Board of Education

FROM: Diana Suddreth
Director, Teaching and Learning

DATE: June 9 - 10, 2016

ACTION: Evaluation and Training Institute Contract Amendment

Background:

As part of 53a-17A-167, the Board currently contracts with the Evaluation and Training Institute to conduct the independent evaluation of the early reading intervention software program for students in grades K-3. In the 2015 Legislative Session, a one-time \$3 million appropriation was provided to expand the program in FY16. As such, the number of students and vendors engaged in the evaluation has increased. With the changes to the program, the evaluation has grown in scope and additional monies are needed to cover the additional responsibilities. As the \$3 million was reauthorized in the May 2016 Special Session of the Legislature, the FY17 contract will need to be amended, as well.

Board Strategic Plan:

The requested contract amendment will ensure that the maximum amount of students are able to access the program to enhance student opportunities for quality learning.

Anticipated Action:

The Finance Committee will review the evidence that necessitates a contract amendment for Evaluation and Training Institute's independent evaluation of the early reading software program and make recommendations to the Board for approving the amendment for FY16 (and FY17, if needed).

Contact: Jennifer Thronsen, 801-538-7893
Diana Suddreth, 801-538-7739
Scott Jones, 801-538-7550

ETI Contract Amendment



Prepared by the
Utah State Office of Education
June 9 - 10, 2016

Jennifer Thronsen, Coordinator Literacy
Jennifer.thronsen@schools.utah.gov

Diana Suddreth, Director Teaching and Learning
Diana.Suddreth@schools.utah.gov

Rich Nye, Acting Deputy Superintendent
Rich.Nye@schools.utah.gov

ETI Contract Amendment 53a-17A-167: Early Reading Intervention Software

Background

During the 2015 Legislative Session, the early reading intervention software program was allotted an additional \$3 million in one-time funds to expand the program. With the additional funds, the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) increased the number of software vendors available to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) from five to eight and the number of students to be served by the program by about 30,000 students. In addition, a new DIBELS vendor, V-Port, was contracted with as a state vendor for the data collection for DIBELS. The expansion of vendors, students, and data systems require additional evaluation efforts that go beyond the original scope of work. These changes will require added work from ETI to manage data collection, prepare the data for analyses, analyze the data, and to report on the findings. This document identifies the specific areas that will be affected by the changes in the scope of work, and proposes a budget increase based on the additional work to be performed.

Project Management

ETI works with each vendor individually to kick-off the project each year and explain ETI's expectations, finalize the project contacts, and convey the key evaluation deadlines. ETI also fields questions from vendors on an ongoing basis, and facilitates a review process for finalizing ETI's data request. Adding new vendors' will require additional meetings to describe the evaluation and ETI's needs, and to facilitate the data transfer process. In addition, ETI will need to work with the new vendors to learn what types of data are available through their unique software.

Mid-year Data Review

To ensure that the vendor data contains correct State Student IDs (SSIDs), ETI collects student data at mid-year to review for quality assurance purposes. This process includes a thorough review of each vendor's data, and an individual report is generated for each vendor with pertinent information on their progress. ETI also reviews the SSIDs in the DIBELS data in order increase the SSID accuracy of the IDs in the student outcome data, and creates a report of the results for AMPLIFY and V-port. The time ETI spends on the mid-year data review increases exponentially with the addition of each new vendor and DIBELS database.

The mid-year review process was also used to refine and revise the list of participating LEAs using each vendor. This included reviewing the LEAs in the vendor's data and comparing it to the list of participating LEAs provided by the USOE. ETI followed up with vendors to clarify any discrepancies and revised the list of participating LEAs as necessary.

In addition, ETI reviews the sample of data by vendor and grade, while taking into consideration the outcome data available through AMPLIFY and V-port, to determine any potential problems with the size of the sample prior to the end-of-year data transfer. This process helps us to determine if additional DIBELS data is needed to create a representative sample for each vendor. As districts are provided with more options for inputting their DIBELS Next data, ETI will accrue more time coordinating the data transfers, cleaning the different data files, and reviewing the files to ensure that SSIDs are correct and merge with the vendor's data.

Data Processing

ETI spends several hours reviewing each vendor's data file for potential errors before merging the files to create our master data file. This process includes running frequencies on the variables to look for missing data, reviewing the ID structure, the number of cases in the data file, the variable names for consistency across vendors, among other steps. Adding new vendors to collect schools DIBELS Next data will also add to ETI's workload in this area.

The time spent on data processing will also increase with the multiple data files we receive of DIBELS Next data. Each of these files will need to be updated to make sure their formatting is consistent before the data can be merged. In addition, ETI may need to create a codebook or variable descriptions in order to bridge any differences in variable names between the different data sources. If the data is sent to us in a particularly unwieldy format it will take longer for us to organize the data. For example, when we requested DIBELS Next data from districts that did not use AMPLIFY for 2014-2015 one district provided us with separate variable names for each grade, which required ETI to use formulas to create a master data file that could be merged to other data sources.

Statistical Analyses

ETI runs program-wide and vendor-specific analyses. Once the data set is completely merged, the level of effort for program-wide analyses will not change. The level of effort for vendor-specific analyses will be increased by about 40%. The increase is due to running multiple statistical models for the new vendors. On average we are running between 40-50 hours of analysis work for the vendor specific models. If we add approximately 40% to the level of effort, we will be increasing the time to about 56-66 hours of work.

Reporting

The additional vendors that were added will not affect the written results of the program-wide analyses; however, ETI will have more data to summarize in the vendor-specific findings, and each vendor will require a written narrative for their results.

Budget Modification Request

The original budget was \$75,000 fee for service to conduct the evaluation. We are requesting a budget increase of \$28,000 for the increased scope of work (a breakdown of costs is below). The total new yearly fee for service cost would be \$103,000.

Additional Costs

Task	Cost
Project Management	\$6,000
Data Processing	\$9,000
Statistical Analyses	\$11,000
Reporting	\$2,000
Total	\$28,000

Action Requested

In response to the changes to the program, we request the board to approve the contract amendment to increase the amount from \$75,000 to \$103,000. This would be for the FY16 contract period, as well as for FY17 due to the continued financial increase appropriated in the special session.