

Scope of Services
Evaluating Supplemental Educational Service Providers in Hawaii
(August 15, 2005 – August 21, 2006)

I. Purpose of Evaluation

The evaluation will assess the performance of vendors who provide tutoring under the DOE's Supplemental Educational Services (SES) program for the academic year 2005-2006, and tentatively for academic years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. Due to the complexity, novelty, and scope of the SES program, a phased-in, three-year process to develop an evaluation plan is proposed. The first three years will be devoted to developing a final Evaluation Plan while also meeting the DOE's requirements to evaluate the performance of service providers. In the first 3 years, service providers will be evaluated with an "Interim Evaluation Plan". The Interim Evaluation Plan insures that the minimum evaluation requirements are met in Year 1 (2005-2006), and allows for refinements, revisions, and possible expansion of the evaluation design in Years 2 and 3. A final Evaluation Plan will be in place at the beginning of Year 4.

II. Program Outcomes

The goal of the SES program is to increase the academic proficiency of eligible students by providing additional academic instruction outside of the regular school day. In the final Evaluation Plan, the effectiveness of service providers will be assessed along three dimensions:

1. **Effectiveness.** Did the provider increase student achievement in reading or mathematics?
2. **Customer Satisfaction.** Are parents and schools who received SES satisfied?
3. **Service Delivery.** Did the provider comply with applicable federal and state laws and regulations, and contractual procedures and requirements associated with the delivery of SES?

III. Interim Evaluation Plan

An Interim Evaluation Plan will be developed in conjunction with the DOE Special Program Management Section. The plan will include goals and

objectives, measurable outcomes, methodology, data analysis, report writing and dissemination, and a projected time frame for accomplishing the evaluation. The evaluation plan will address constraints and limitations in the design (e.g., maturation effects, providers servicing small numbers of students, lack of testing in schools with School Improvement Year 2 status) and measures that can be taken to address them.

In the first year of the evaluation, the first of the three components, increasing student achievement, is of primary importance and will be the focus of the evaluation. Attempts to measure Customer Satisfaction and Service Delivery will be exploratory and pilot tested in Year 1, and more fully developed and measured in Years 2 and 3.

IV. Feedback from Service Providers

To the extent possible, the evaluators intend to engage service providers and other stakeholders in a collaborative and participatory evaluation process. Once a draft Preliminary Evaluation Plan is developed, providers will be given an opportunity to comment, offer suggestions, and raise questions about the Plan. A draft of the Plan will be shared with service providers in mid-to-late August, prior to its implementation. The draft Plan will be distributed to providers electronically to solicit their feedback, comments, and buy-in. The Plan will also be shared with providers at a stakeholders meeting on September 22.

V. Methodology for the Interim Evaluation Plan

A. Effectiveness (Did the provider increase student achievement in reading or mathematics?)

This evaluation question will be addressed by comparing pre- and post-test scores of students who received SES with students who did not receive such services. The analyses will be performed separately for each service provider, stratified by grade level and by subject area (i.e., math or reading). The assumption behind this analysis is that if tutoring is effective, there should be a greater difference in test scores for tutored as opposed to non-tutored (but eligible) students. While both tutored and untutored students are expected to improve over time, the extent of improvement for SES students should be greater, thereby resulting in a smaller gap between pre- and post-test scores for those receiving tutoring. This analysis should indicate the extent to which tutoring by a service provider has bridged the gap in achievement between SES students and non-SES students.

Scores from the Hawaii State Assessment (H.S.A.) test will provide the basis for calculating improvements in academic achievement. The H.S.A. is a standardized tests administered annually in spring by the Hawaii Department of Education. Test scores which most closely correspond to the onset of tutoring will form the basis for the pre-test; test scores which most closely follow the cessation of tutoring will be the post-test measure.

The evaluation will rely on data provided by the DOE. For each student at a low-performing school, data on the following variables will be required: school, student identifying no., student priority ranking, eligibility for SES, whether SES was received, service provider, type of standardized test, onset of tutoring, end date of tutoring, number of tutoring contact hours, subject area for tutoring, date and test score of each quarterly test, and demographic variables yet to be determined (e.g., gender, ethnicity).

B. Customer Satisfaction (Are parents and schools who received SES satisfied?)

In the first year of the evaluation, measuring customer satisfaction will be pilot tested in order to build towards a more comprehensive approach in Years 2 and 3. A small number of parents will be surveyed to assess satisfaction levels with provider services. A brief survey will be developed by the evaluation team and mailed to parents or legal guardians of children who received tutoring. Similarly, in Years 2 and 3, surveys or interviews with complex area and other school staff and administrators will be developed and piloted tested.

At the end of Year 3, the final Evaluation Plan will incorporate a systematic and comprehensive approach to assessing customer satisfaction from parents, and representatives of the school system.

C. Service Delivery (Did the provider comply with applicable federal and state laws and regulations, and contractual procedures and requirements associated with the delivery of SES?)

Each provider will be required to complete a self-administered checklist on an annual basis. Items include instructor qualifications, communication methods and frequency with parents and schools on student progress, compliance with contractual obligations with DOE and agreements with parents and schools. The information provided by the vendors will be monitored and reviewed by the evaluators for any anomalies. However, since this aspect of the evaluation is

exploratory in the first year, the information will not be used in the formal assessment of providers in Year 1.

To assess Service Delivery, other sources of data, including site visits and document review, will be used. To the extent possible, site visits will be made with each provider to learn more about their tutoring program and to address any questions they may have about the evaluation. Documents pertaining to the vendor's services will also be obtained from the vendor and reviewed (brochures, agreements with students/parents, written communication and progress reports to parents, etc.).

VI. Multiple Criteria

Given multiple criteria for assessing the performance of each provider (i.e., Effectiveness, Customer Satisfaction, Service Delivery), the evaluators will propose a system that DOE decision-makers could utilize to assess the performance of each service provider in Years 2 and 3 and in the final Evaluation Plan.

In the first year of the evaluation, however, the sole criterion for assessing provider performance will be improvement in test scores from the DOE-approved achievement tests. Deciding what constitutes improvement will be determined in conjunction with DOE personnel and the evaluators. In the second and third years, data from two other measures, Customer Satisfaction and Service Delivery, will be incorporated in the assessment of provider performance.

VII. Reports and Deliverables For Year 1

A. Survey Instruments. Drafts of assessment instruments for parents, school officials, and service providers will be shared with DOE for input, revisions, and approval by August 31, 2005.

B. Draft Interim Evaluation Plan. A draft of the Interim Evaluation Plan will be prepared for DOE's input by August 31. Following DOE's review, and with their assistance, the plan will be shared with service providers for feedback and comments.

C. Final Interim Evaluation Plan. Approved by the DOE by September 30, 2005.

D. Draft of Evaluation Report. A draft of the evaluation report will be shared with DOE by July 21, 2006.

E. Final Evaluation Report. Based on input from the DOE, the final evaluation report will be modified and presented in final form by August 21, 2006.

VIII. Budget Request and Justification

A budget of \$36,000 is requested for the first year of the evaluation, with budgets for Year 2 and Year 3 to be negotiated at a later date. The budget request includes salaries (with fringe benefits) and consulting fees (no fringe benefits) for three team members. Three one-day inter-island trips are scheduled for site visits (one trip to Maui, Kauai, and Hawaii island). Local mileage is budgeted at \$80, supplies at \$66, and indirect funds at \$1,217 (3.5%).