

COVER SHEET - AGENDA ITEM #R4

For Commission Meeting: June 20, 2016

“TechSmart Evaluation Services Contract Amendment with
Pacific Research & Evaluation (PRE)”

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the MHCRC approve the contract amendment with Pacific Research & Evaluation.

Background

As discussed at the May MHCRC meeting, PSU Center for Student Success is no longer retaining the personnel to conduct the student level data analysis necessary for the TechSmart Initiative evaluation plan. After researching whether or not the student data non-disclosure agreement with the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) could be transferred to a private firm and talking with the school districts, staff determined that the most viable option for this part of the evaluation work was to amend the existing evaluation contract with Pacific Research & Evaluation (PRE).

As part of the amendment, staff and PRE have also addressed a question raised at the May meeting about access to data sets for possible future secondary research conducted by a firm or institution other than PRE. The contract amendment includes language that allows for this possibility while adhering to all agreements and laws pertaining to protection of a student’s information. (See Section 3 of the attached contract amendment.)

Attachment: PRE Contract Amendment

Prepared by: Julie S. Omelchuck
June 13, 2016

**CONTRACT AMENDMENT
FOR
Evaluation Services for MHCRC Grants in Public Education**

Pacific Research and Evaluation, LLC, ("Consultant"), and the Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission, (the "Commission") have an existing contract for the provision of services. Consultant and the Commission have agreed upon terms for amending the contract ("Contract Amendment"). Now, therefore, the parties agree to the following terms:

1. Additional work is necessary as described in the Scope of Work and Budget identified in Attachment 1 to this Contract Amendment.
2. Additional compensation is necessary in an amount not to exceed \$37,000; for a total contract amount of \$134,000.
3. Section 10 of the contract is amended to include the following additional language:

De-identified data sets of student or other data arising under this contract shall be made available to the Commission, upon prior written request, in order to conduct secondary data analysis, in accordance with federal and state laws and subject to any limitations under the Consultant's data sharing agreements with the school districts and the Oregon Department of Education.

All other terms and conditions of the contract shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

This Contract Amendment may be signed in two (2) or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same contract amendment.

The parties agree the Commission and Consultant may conduct this transaction by electronic means, including the use of electronic signatures.

PACIFIC RESEARCH & EVALUATION, LLC

BY: _____

Date: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Mt. HOOD CABLE REGULATORY COMMISSION

By: _____
Carol Studenmund, MHCRC Chair

Date: _____

Approved as to Form:

By: _____
MHCRC Legal Counsel

Date: _____

Scope of Work and Budget for TechSmart Student Outcome Analysis

Consultant shall analyze student-level data collected from the Oregon Department of Education, and other assessment data as provided by school districts related to each district's MHCRC grant-funded projects, and include findings in evaluation reports, for the following key research questions:

PHASE 1:

- Are student academic outcomes greater among students in schools funded by MHCRC compared to previous cohorts, and students in schools in Multnomah County not funded by MHCRC? (Hypothesis: Student achievement outcomes are greater for students in schools funded by MHCRC).
 - PRE will create comparison groups historically and in real time for DDS and PR in 2016 and determine which method(s) are ideal for moving forward.
- Does the impact of the MHCRC grant investment on student outcomes vary by student characteristics after one year, and each subsequent year? (Hypothesis: Student achievement outcomes is greatest for at-risk student subgroups (i.e., students not on track to meet academic standards)).

PHASE 2:

- To what extent is the relationship between teachers implementation of instructional practices (as a result of the MHCRC grant investment) associated with greater student academic outcomes? (Hypothesis: There is a positive correlation between teacher implementation of instructional practices and student academic outcomes).
- Does the impact of the MHCRC grant investment on student outcomes vary by teacher level of integration and teacher skill level controlling for student characteristics, after one year, and each subsequent year? (Hypothesis: Technological integration by teachers influences the relationship between exposure to the MHCRC grant investment and student outcomes).

Additional Hypotheses for future analysis:

- What are the average trajectories of students exposed to TSI on annual assessment measures (reading, math, and English language learners' annual progress) over four to six years, and how do they compare to the average trajectories of students in baseline and comparison cohorts? (Hypothesis: Longitudinal data show sustained and/or ongoing progress in student achievement outcomes).
 - PRE will use a real time comparison group for this analysis rather than historical due to the change in the state assessment.
- To what extent do these trajectories vary by student characteristics? (Hypothesis: The rate of student growth in one or more student achievement outcome is greatest for at-risk student subgroups).

Tasks/Budget

Task	Cost
Phase 1	
IRB and Data Sharing Agreements with School Districts	\$1000
Data Cleaning for Historical Comparison Cohorts (D0 & PK0)	\$5000
Data Cleaning/Prep Concurrent Comparison Groups (PSM)	\$5000
Reporting by subgroups for treatment and both (concurrent and historical) comparison groups	\$5000
Total Phase 1:	\$16,000
Phase 2 (through June 2017)	
IRB Renewal	\$500
Request to ODE for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical Comparison Cohort Data for P0 and R0 (12/13-15/16) • Treatment group data for R1 (15/16), and D2 (15/16) and PK2 (15/16) • Concurrent Comparison Group Data for Reynolds Y1 (15/16), and DDS D Y2 and Parkrose Y2 (15/16) 	\$1000
Request to Districts for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical Comparison Cohort Data for P0 and R0 (12/13-15/16) • Treatment group data for R1 (15/16), and D2 (15/16) and PK2 (15/16) • Concurrent Comparison Group Data for Reynolds Y1 (15/16), and DDS D Y2 and Parkrose Y2 (15/16) 	\$1000
Data Cleaning for Historical Comparison Cohorts (P0 & R0), Treatment Group (R1, PK1, PK2, D1, D2)	\$5000
Data Cleaning/Prep Concurrent Comparison Groups (Propensity Score Matching)	\$5000
Reporting by subgroups for treatment and both (concurrent and historical) comparison groups	\$8500
Total Phase 2:	\$21,000