

January 27, 2017

**Memorandum**

To: Rebecca B. Garland, Deputy State Superintendent

From: Donna R. Brown, Director  
Federal Program Monitoring and Support Division

Subject: Intent to Contract  
Requisition No. RQ20174410  
(Required for Service Contracts Greater Than \$5,000)



Important Information: Approval of this Memorandum of Intent to Contract is required prior to initiating the contract process. It does not constitute a contract, nor does it imply that a contract will be approved. In that regard, please note that no contractor work can begin until a contract has been approved and signed by both parties. Signed contracts will be returned to the listed DPI Contract Contact Person by the DPI Purchasing and Contracts Section.

Instructions: The questions/information in this memorandum must be completed, and the appropriate approvals obtained prior to initiating a Request for Proposal (RFP) or any contract paperwork, including amendments. All appropriate requested questions and information must be answered and completed, or the form will be returned. If approved, the original memorandum will be forwarded to the Purchase and Contracts Section, and a copy will be returned to the division. If not approved, the original memorandum will be returned to the division.

1. Please complete the following information (If you will use competitive bidding, please insert a short name for the RFP or other bid instrument in the place for Contractor Name; for example: RFP for Parking Services, and do not complete the contract amount or contract dates.)

**Contractor Name: The SERVE Center at UNCG**  
**Contract Amount (if this request amends the amount, please enter the amended amount): \$98,700**  
**Contract Dates: March 14, 2017 – March 15, 2018**  
**DPI Contract Contact Person and Telephone Number:**  
**Donna R. Brown (919) 807-3957**

2. Is this a contract amendment? No  
(Note: If the amendment is for a date extension only, do not answer questions #3 through #12) No.
3. Why are you initiating a contract?

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) has contracted with SERVE Center at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to conduct an evaluation of the state 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) Program for three consecutive years. In SERVE Center's 2014 evaluation report to NCDPI, student outcomes data were merged to allow statistical analyses of student achievement for students who participated in Cohort 9 funded 21<sup>st</sup> CCLCs. Subsequently, the 2015 evaluation report focused on Cohorts 10 and 11—SERVE collected survey data from various stakeholders (Program Directors, Site Coordinators, principals) and again conducted statistical analyses of student achievement data. Cohort 10 students are those who participated in centers that received their first year of funding in 2013-14. Cohort 11 students are those who participated in centers that received their first year of funding in 2014-15. This proposed 2017-18 scope of work is for an evaluation of the NCDPI 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program for the 2016-17 academic year and is a continuation of the evaluation work SERVE Center completed in previous reports on Cohorts 9, 10 and 11. That is, the work proposed here builds on prior evaluation reports and represents the fourth year of SERVE Center's evaluation reporting on the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program (i.e., on students participating in the 2016-17 academic year in Cohort 10 and 11 funded programs).

SERVE Center proposes evaluation activities for 2017-18 under three goals described below.

*Goal 1: SERVE will provide assistance to NCDPI in refining the annual subgrantee self-assessment of program quality instrument and student enrollment, attendance, and achievement reporting processes.*

In support of subgrantee annual reporting on students served and self-assessment of program quality, SERVE will:

- Pilot, with 8-10 Cohort 10 and 11 grantees in the summer of 2017, a second revision to the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Annual Program Progress Summary, a reporting form which is an annual requirement of grantees each August. The goal of this second pilot is to gather feedback on the new form (revised once since the 2016 pilot) so that it can be further refined and provided to new Cohort 12 subgrantees at initial selection and funding. We will work in coordination with the NCDPI 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC monitoring team staff in finalizing these revisions and in updating the website and annual calendar for grantees so that they understand all reporting requirements.
- Develop an online version of the self-assessment for program quality instrument for grantees to use in assessing program quality (revised from the NCCAP).
- Work with DPI to plan the Cohort 12 roll out of the required annual reporting process and voluntary self-assessment instrument for Cohort 12 grantees in the fall of 2017.

*Goal 2: SERVE will collect data from Program Directors and support subgrantee data collection from others to inform program planning and improvement (formative evaluation).*

In support of formative evaluation to inform program improvement, SERVE will:

- Conduct an online survey of Program Directors in May 2017 on key aspects of their programs' operations for the academic year (2016-17).
- Identify/adapt/provide high-quality samples of parent and student satisfaction surveys on the NCDPI website that grantees can access and use for gathering feedback on their programs.

*Goal 3: SERVE will provide an overall statewide report of student participation in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Cohort 10 and 11 programs for 2016-17 including analyses of student participation, attendance, and achievement.*

In support of statewide reporting on performance measures, SERVE will:

- Develop a 2016-17 statewide summary report of student participation, program attendance, and achievement. Specifically, we will explore the variability in end-of-grade (EOG) test score gains from spring of 2016 to spring 2017 for grades 4-8 students served in Cohort 10 and 11 funded grantees/centers. We will obtain two years (spring of 2016 and 2017) of student level EOG test data from NCDPI for students who participated in Cohort 10 and 11 centers in 2016-17. We will conduct analyses and report on statewide 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC performance measures as required by GPRA.
- Provide various assistance as needed in developing or refining statewide indicators of performance (GPRA measures).

4. How does the contract add value to the teaching/learning process?  
NCDPI will use the results of the study to implement program improvements to ensure that all 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs are highly effective in terms of enabling students to meet State and local standards in core academic subject areas.
5. Is the service unique and not repetitive with agency activity or other contracts? Please state why this service cannot be performed within the resources of the agency.

Each SEA receiving Title IV, Part B funds is required under federal statute (ESEA) to periodically evaluate 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs to determine their effectiveness on increasing student achievement. No other area of the agency provides oversight for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program.

6. What is the impact, if you do not contract for these services?

Evaluation services require specialized skill sets involving expertise in research and statistics. If the services are not completed through the contract, the SEA will be out of compliance with both federal law and SBE policy as there are no internal resources to support it.

7. If this contract is being paid with grant money, does the grant require the contracted services? Please describe the grant references to these contracted services, and give a synopsis of the grant. No
8. Will you use competitive bidding (e.g., RFP?) If yes, skip the remaining questions # 9 through # 12.  
No.
9. Are you using an IT Supplemental Staffing Convenience Contract or other type of convenience contract? If yes, please skip question # 10 and complete questions # 11 and # 12.
10. Do you plan to request sole sourcing for this contract? If yes, please complete and attach the required sole source justification memorandum. Sole sourcing is warranted whenever only one acceptable source can be found; sole sourcing should never be the first consideration. (**Important:** The approval of the DPI Section Chief for Purchasing and Contracts, and approval by the Division of Purchasing and Contracts or ITS Procurement Services is required for sole sourced contracts.)
11. Have you contracted with this vendor previously for related services? If yes, please list all contracts with this vendor during the last twelve months.  
Yes – RQ19269607
12. How did you calculate the cost (e.g., what is the cost per hour and number of hours?) If the cost per hour is above the DPI maximum for that type of service per the New Service Contract Policies, please attach the required written permission granted by the Deputy Superintendent.  
Attached budget description demonstrates all cost calculations.
13. Is this contract for information technology services?  
No.
14. If this is a personal service contract request, is the vendor/contractor a retiree?  
\_\_\_\_\_Yes     No

If answer is yes, is individual a member of:

\_\_\_\_\_ TSERS (Teachers & State Employees Retirement System)

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please Explain) \_\_\_\_\_

Budget Code: 0801-532150-133033256630

Signed: Rose B. Page  
Budget Representative

Date: 2/1/17

Approved: Yes  No

Signed: Rebecca Garland  
Supt./Deputy Supt./Appropriate CFO/CAO/CIO

Date: 2/1/17

**For Technology Contracts Only:**

Approved: Yes  No

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chief Information Officer

Date: \_\_\_\_\_