



STATE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION
OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES
4200 SURFACE ROAD, COLUMBUS, OH 43228-1395

MANDATORY USE CONTRACT FOR: THE OHIO TEACHER INCENTIVE FUND (OTIF) EVALUATION

CONTRACT NUMBER: CSP0905001

EFFECTIVE DATES: 7/8/11 TO 6/30/14

* Renewal through 6/30/15

The Department of Administrative Services has accepted Proposals submitted in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. CSP0905001 that opened on June 8, 2011. The evaluation of the Proposal responses has been completed. The Offeror listed herein has been determined to be the highest ranking Offeror and has been awarded a Contract for the services listed. The respective Proposal response including, Contract Terms & Conditions, any Proposal amendment, special Contract Terms & Conditions, specifications, pricing schedules and any attachments incorporated by reference and accepted by DAS become a part of this Services Contract.

This Requirements Contract is effective beginning and ending on the dates noted above unless, prior to the expiration date, the Contract is renewed, terminated, or cancelled in accordance with the Contract Terms and Conditions.

This Requirements Contract is available to the Ohio Department of Education as applicable.

The agency is eligible to make purchases of the contracted services in any amount and at any time as determined by the agency. The State makes no representation or guarantee that department will purchase the volume of services as advertised in the Request for Proposal.

Questions regarding this and/or the Services Contract may be directed to:

Janice L. Fitzpatrick, CPPB
janice.fitzpatrick@das.ohio.gov

This Requirements Contract and any Amendments thereto are available from the DAS Web site at the following address:

www.ohio.gov/procure

* To indicate renewal for twelve (12) months, July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

CONTRACT REQUIREMENT SYNOPSIS. This section gives only a summary of the Project requirements and the Contractor's responsibilities.

1. The general Terms and Conditions for the Contract are contained in Attachment Three of the RFP for Project. The Contract consists of:
 - a. The original RFP and any addendums.
 - b. The documents and materials incorporated by reference in the RFP.
 - c. The Contractors' Proposals, as amended, clarified, and accepted by the State.
 - d. The documents and materials incorporated by reference in the Offerors' Proposal and subsequent accepted clarifications.
 - e. Any related amendments issued subsequent to Contract award.
2. The ODE and the Contractor shall notify the DAS, Office of Procurement Services within ten (10) business days in the event of a change in personnel, financial, or contact information.
3. The initial term of the Contract is the period
4. The ODE and the Contractor shall notify the DAS, Office of Procurement Services within ten (10) business days in the event of a change in personnel, financial, or contact information.
5. The Contractor shall provide the DAS Office of Procurement updated insurance forms on an annual basis, or as appropriate when changes go into effect.

MUTUALLY AGREED UPON CLARIFICATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS (to include the renewal negotiations, which concluded on June 13, 2011). This section gives only a summary of the Project Requirements and responsibilities.

1. VALUE-ADDED COMPONENT. The Contractor understands the Value-Added piece of this Contract to encompass a philosophy and methodology summarized as follows:

Value-added assessment is a method used by states and school districts to evaluate teachers' contributions to changes in the annual academic achievement of their students. Created as a teacher evaluation tool in the 1990s by William Sanders, the value-added technique uses students' test scores in previous school years to predict their future scores. Students' actual scores are then compared to their predicted scores - with any observed increases or decreases from the predicted value being attributed to the teacher and the school. The purpose is to isolate teachers' and schools' contributions to student achievement from such external factors as student ability, parental involvement, and socioeconomic status. By aggregating the deviations from predicted test scores across all students associated with a given teacher, value-added models have the potential to determine how much the teacher influenced student achievement when compared with the performance of other teachers within and across schools.

The number of states and districts making use of value-added models to examine instructional effectiveness and inform decisions about teacher retention and compensation has increased in recent years. Nine (9) states currently have a model for measuring student growth, and another 24 are either in the process of developing such a model (12 states) or proposed to develop such a model in the proposal they submitted in 2010 for Race to the Top funding (12 states).

Policymakers and researchers have noted a number of challenges that should be considered when using value-added data. For example, an August 2010 briefing paper by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI, 2010) noted that the value-added approach has "proven to be unstable across statistical models, years, and classes that teachers teach," leading some researchers to "doubt whether the methodology can accurately identify more or less effective teachers." Examples of other practical issues associated with using value-added techniques to systematically assess teachers' performance include:

- a. The difficulty of obtaining previous years' data in districts with a highly mobile student body (especially if a high percentage of students were enrolled in schools outside of the district or state in previous years and/or change schools during the academic year).
- b. The difficulty of using value-added methods for assessing teacher effectiveness for early grades where there are no historical test scores against which current scores can be compared.

- c. Value-added scores can be more sensitive to teacher effects for some subjects (e.g., mathematics) than other (e.g., reading and writing).
- d. Some students may show gains in a given year as a result of specialized instruction received from a tutor or teacher aide.
- e. Annual gains in knowledge may be difficult to detect for advanced students that consistently score in the highest percentile on standardized state tests.
- f. Increases or decreases in test scores in any given year reflect the changing characteristics of students assigned to a particular teacher over time.

There are also general concerns that the use of test-based teacher evaluation systems can have unintended and negative impacts - e.g., encouraging teachers to narrow the focus of their instruction to topics and skills covered by the assessments, creating disincentives for teacher collaboration.

In light of these methodological and policy challenges, it is important that studies of the federally funded Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) explore the best ways to utilize value-added techniques in teacher compensation systems. As such, OTIF is poised to make a contribution to this vital issue by including value-added measurement techniques in its program design. Ohio already has considerable experience using value-added student growth models to inform the school improvement process.

In 2003, Ohio replaced the temporary growth measure in its accountability system with the Education Value-Added Assessment System Multivariate Response Model (or EVAAS MRM) which is the most comprehensive reporting package of multivariate, longitudinal mixed effects models. This model is also known as a layered model because it relies on the covariance across time within subjects and students and the covariance across subjects within time and students to control for student heterogeneity. Particularly, "with this model, all data for each student is utilized, over multiple grades and subjects, allowing for the entire covariance structure of the test data to be exploited increasing the reliability of the estimates, thus providing for the theoretically best prediction of the true classroom effects" (Sanders, 2006).

An important advantage of EVAAS MRM is that the model deals with missing data without explicitly imputing values for the missing test scores - that is, it uses the correlation between current and previous scores in the non-missing data to estimate a mean for the previous and current scores as if there were no missing data. Since all data for each student are included in the estimation process, it provides better correlation estimates; therefore, the model provides better estimates of means and gains (Wright et al., 2010). In simulations, Wright (2004) found that the longitudinal and complex model such as EVAAS MRM are more likely than simple models to minimize the bias in estimating score gain and that accuracy increased with sample size. Similarly, Lockwood and McCaffrey (2007) found that the model mitigates errors associated with missing data and the estimates of model can be approximately unbiased. Further, the same researchers noted that the "ability of the mixed model approach to perform well simultaneously for a number of parameters that grows as the number of test scores grows is particularly relevant for estimating individual teacher effects" (Lockwood and McCaffrey, 2007).

Since the model estimates academic growth as a gain in test scores, it requires appropriately scales scores. For Ohio, this is achieved by using the Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) based on the statewide distribution of scale scores in a selected base year (for Ohio, the base year is currently 2007) (SAS, 2010).

ODE's partner for the value-added component, Battelle for Kids (BFK), has considerable experience helping LEAs (both nationwide and in Ohio) make use of student growth data as a diagnostic school-improvement tool. BFK will be responsible for obtaining student and teacher data and calculating the value-added scores for individual teachers. The ODE shall ensure that BFK provides the Contractor with the teacher-level value-added data for academic years from 2009-10 to 2013-14.

BFK and Ohio have also launched a three (3) year pilot initiative to enable high schools to benefit from providing value-added information to administrators, teachers and counselors. This work shall build upon BFK's recently published *Selecting Growth Measures: A Guide for Educational Leaders* (BFK, 2011). This comprehensive guide is designed to help administrators and educators make informed decisions about how and when to make use of student growth measures. It is worth noting that the guide includes a discussion of potential methods for addressing many of the issues described above regarding the challenges associated with the use of value-added models (e.g., student mobility, measurement error and uncertainty). Many of the recommendations BFK outlines in the Guide for maximizing the use of value-added data have been incorporated into the ODE model. For example, teachers and principals will receive training and be encouraged to make use of student growth data to identify inform decisions about curriculum and instructional strategies. In addition, ODE will use alternative strategies to obtain rigorous and accessible value-added data in subjects and grades not covered by statewide assessments (e.g., through the use of student scores on pre-tests, end-of-course exams, proficiency tests, reading and literacy assessments for students in early grades).

Starting with the OTIF's kick-off meeting, the Contractor shall establish a strong collaborative relationship with BFK to fully understand their procedures for obtaining and calculating value-added scores for all participating treatment and comparison schools and their teachers. As such, the Contractor shall work closely with ODE and BFK to make use of available extant data including, but not necessarily limited to: value-added data; student achievement data; student, teacher and school demographic data; teacher recruitment information; and teacher retention data. In addition, working with ODE and BFK, the Contractor shall seek out opportunities to capitalize on respective strengths and responsibilities.

Given the aforementioned complexities of value-added data and the ongoing refinement of the tool for assessing teacher performance, The Contractor agrees to retain two (2) widely recognized experts in this field to serve as technical consultants on the OTIF evaluation. In addition, the Contractor shall continue building its internal capacity on value-added data analysis by establishing relationships with other leaders in the field, hiring staff with specialized expertise, and hosting topic specific seminars on the Contractor's campus.

References:

- Battelle for Kids (2007). *Selecting Growth Measures: A Guide for Education Leaders* (Commissioned by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation). Battelle for Kids, Columbus, Ohio.
- Baker, E., Barton, P., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H., Linn, R., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Shavelson, R., and Shepard, L. (2010). *Problems with the Use of Student Test Scores to Evaluate Teachers*. Economic Policy Institute: Washington, D.C.
- Lockwood, J. R. and McCaffrey, Daniel. F. (2007). Controlling for individual heterogeneity in longitudinal models, with applications to student achievement. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 1, 223-252. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
- McCaffrey, Daniel F., Lockwood, J.R., Koretz , Daniel M., & Hamilton, Laura S. (2003). *Evaluating Value-Added Models for Teacher Accountability*. (Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation). RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
- Ohio Department of Education 2009-2010. *Guide to Understanding Ohio's Accountability System 2009-2010*. Ohio Department of Education.
- SAS. (2010). *Ohio Scale Stabilization Process*. SAS EVAAS Technical Report. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Sanders, W. (2006). *Comparisons Among Various Educational Assessment Value-Added Models*. Paper presented at *The Power of Two—National Value-Added Conference* Hosted by Battelle for Kids. Columbus, Ohio.
- Wright, S. P., White, J. T., Sanders, W. L., and Rivers, J. C. (2010) *SAS EVAAS Statistical Models*. SAS EVAAS Technical Report. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Wright, S. P. (2004). *Advantages of a Multivariate Longitudinal Approach to Educational Value-Added Assessment Without Imputation*. Paper presented at the 2004 National Evaluation Institute. Colorado Springs, Colorado.

2. **COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS.** The Contractor understands that college and career readiness are key goals factored into the overall expected outcomes and expectations of this Program. The Contractor shall keep abreast of how college and career readiness measurements are directed by the final decisions of the State with regard to implementation of the OTIF, the expectations that will be placed on educators, and the data the State has at its disposal. Ohio's TIF proposal to the U.S. Department of Education proposed using ACT college readiness scores and Advanced Placement (AP) data. The ACT in particular is often used to measure college and career readiness of high school juniors and seniors. The number and percentage of Ohio students who take the ACT make this assessment a solid choice for obtaining representative findings.

Should the State decide to use these metrics, the Contractor's plan for evaluation shall parallel that of the Contractor's proposed plan for assessing academic achievement? In brief, the Contractor shall compare ACT College Readiness Scores; AP participation rates; AP success rates; and AP average scores of the participating LEAs with those of a well-matched comparison group. Per the Contractor's original proposal section "Quasi-experiment – Comparison Group by Propensity Score matching pp. 151-152. In keeping with the design scheme proposed for student achievement, The Contractor shall plan on conducting the final analysis during the final year of the evaluation (2014-15) to allow for the maximum amount of annual ACT and AP data to accumulate. The Contractor shall also request and obtain two to three (2 – 3) years of pre-OTIF ACT and AP data (i.e., for school years 2009–10 and 2010–11) to enable time-series analyses. Once these data sets are obtained, a comparable set of analyses shall be conducted using multi-level modeling to control for the effects of intervening variables and separate out the effects attributable to the program. Per the Contractor's original proposal section "Study Design" p. 150.

It is known that other metrics can and have been used in other states to measure college and career readiness. In the event Ohio may decide to employ one (1) or more of these as part of OTIF or other statewide educational reform initiatives. These include:

- a. High school exit surveys that assess developmental assets.
- b. Course taking patterns with a focus on the proportion of students taking core math, science, and English composition courses and academically rigorous (though not necessarily AP) courses.
- c. Student career interest surveys that assess alignment with regional career opportunities;
- d. College remediation rates of incoming college freshmen; and
- e. Augmented high school transcripts that include assessments of transferable work skills such as communication, teamwork, and problem-solving.

It is understood that each of these alternatives has cost and technical implications that will require careful consideration. A final revised project Work Plan is the first deliverable due for the OTIF project. As part of completing the Work Plan, the Contractor and ODE will convene via conference calls and conduct a half-day meeting to reaffirm mutual understandings of OTIF Project goals and methods. During these deliberations, ODE and the Contractor shall jointly determine the most technically reliable and cost efficient methods for measuring the effects of OTIF on college and career readiness. The Contractor's proposed Project Director for this evaluation shall have a strong background in school-to-career and school-to-college transition programming and evaluation.

The Contractor understands that the state of Ohio is implementing numerous educational initiatives that have relevance to the issue of college and career readiness. For example, House Bill 1 mandates the creation of new high school assessment systems designed to assess 21st century employability skills, such as critical thinking, communication and technology literacy. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers, Ohio is one (1) of 45 States working to create common assessment systems aligned to college and career-ready standards. Ohio is also a recipient of a major Race to the Top grant which requires that assessment systems inform individual student college or career readiness. And in response to the national Data Quality Campaign which seeks to improve the collection, availability, and use of high-quality education data to boost student achievement, Ohio has implemented at least 8 of the 10 proposed elements for building a longitudinal data system. While contemporaneous to OTIF, each of these initiatives is transpiring on its own timeline that may or may not allow the state to capitalize on their developments. However, taken together, Ohio is poised to draw on a broad set of K-12 data that can be used to measure college and career readiness.

One foreseeable modification to the State's original proposal to the U.S. Department of Education proposed by the Contractor is the expansion of the analyses beyond high school to include the middle grades. A growing body of research has documented that how students perform in middle school can be a powerful predictor of how well they are prepared for college (ACT, 2007). Indeed, the 2007 ACT report states that "the level of academic achievement that students attain by 8th grade has a larger impact on their college and career readiness by the time they graduate from high school than anything that happens academically in high school." A set of ACT benchmarks have been created for 8th and 9th grade students (EXPLORE) and 10th grade students (PLAN) that are comparable to those proposed by the state for assessing high school students. The state may choose to use these benchmarks instead of or in addition to those anticipated in the OTIF proposal to the U.S. Department of Education. Given adequate resources, doing so could have the added advantage of informing programmatic activities across a broader range of the academic sequence and provide additional opportunities to leverage financial incentives for middle school teachers.

Reference:

ACT. (2007). *The Forgotten Middle*. Iowa City, IA: Author.

3. CONTINGENCY PLANNING. The Contractor's OTIF evaluation team comprises senior Contractor staff who served on the initial OTIF evaluation. The experience of this team with ODE, OTIF, and the multiple components of the OTIF evaluation is extensive. Should a member of the team become unavailable, other members of the team have the experience and know-how to step into that role until a replacement can be found. Should the need arise to replace a key team member, The Contractor shall look inside its team first to determine if an internal team reconfiguration is the most efficient solution. This solution may require reducing the proposed replacement member's time on the Contractor's other projects, and the Contractor is predisposed to explore this option first. Should this option not be possible, The Contractor shall look for a replacement within its own unit, Education Studies. Education Studies comprises over 50 experienced research professionals, many of whom have extensive experience in mixed methods evaluation and have worked on state department of education projects similar in size and scope to the OTIF evaluation. Should a replacement from within Education Studies not be immediately identified, the Contractor will turn to other internal contractor units, such as Human Services, which has a large pool of senior researchers on staff.

If the determination that a new hire would be the best solution, the Contractor shall utilize the services of its large and effective Human Resources Department to recruit a new hire. In the event the Contractor needs to recruit from outside the Contractor's organization, a suitable replacement shall be identified and in place in no more than one (1) months' time.

Identifying and transitioning new staff members shall be the responsibility of the Contractor's Project Director and a Corporate Officer. In the event the Project Director needs to be replaced, the Contractor's Corporate Office shall immediately assume the role of Project Director until a suitable replacement is found.

In any of these scenarios, ODE shall be notified of the situation as soon as possible and proposed candidates shall be vetted by ODE before the replacement is made. The Contractor ensure a transition period is established to allow for transfer of knowledge among and between current and new team members. In addition, the Contractor's OTIF team shall continue to maintain detailed hard copy and extensive electronic records to facilitate institutional history on the Project and efficient knowledge transfer. While the need to find a replacement team member occurs infrequently, the Contractor's management has anticipated this possibility and has established strategies and responsibilities for dealing rapidly to address this issue.

4. WORK PLAN TIMELINE AND ASSOCIATED PRODUCTION AND DELIVERY DATES. The Work Plan dates have been modified to reflect a July 11, 2011 start date. The Contractor has the willingness and flexibility to make reasonable modifications to the timeline in the event that ODE encounters any delays, required, unanticipated, or otherwise. The timeline for deliverables based on a July 11, 2011 contract award date are as follows:

OTIF Years 2-5 (July 11, 2011-June 30, 2015):

- a. Document the evaluation methodologies for the Ohio TIF project in writing to ODE on or before September 1, 2011. The Contractor shall provide a written evaluation plan for Ohio TIF that details its methodologies for the study. This plan shall build upon the core evaluation presented in this RFP proposal and shall incorporate USDOE grant reporting requirements. The Contractor shall revise its plan based on any new understandings of this emerging program, conversations with ODE and BFK staff, and requests for any clarification that ODE feels need to be addressed. Mutually agreeable modifications to the time line will be made in the event of unanticipated or required delays.

Convene a half-day meeting or conference call with ODE for the purpose of describing the methodologies and obtaining ODE approval. Target date: Mid-August 2011.

The Contractor shall coordinate a meeting with representatives from ODE and BFK shortly after award of the Contract. The primary purpose of the meeting will be to describe its methodologies to ODE and give them an opportunity to ask questions and offer feedback. Moreover, we see the meeting as an opportunity to address several other purposes:

- 1) Reaffirming mutual understanding of the Ohio TIF program.
- 2) Discussing the current status and on-going development of the various Ohio TIF sites.
- 3) Ascertaining what data are being collected from participating districts.
- 4) Discussing the Work Plan for year 2 of the evaluation.
- 5) Determining whether a stakeholder advisory group of district personnel should be established.
- 6) Clarifying issues with regard to achievement analyses, including the manner in which value-added results will be calculated by the State and potential assessment to be used in the early and later grades. Pending approval from ODE of the Contractor's methodologies. The meeting will adjourn with the group sees as the next steps to set the evaluation in motion.

- b. Prepare preliminary year report (including USDOE grant reporting requirements).

The Contractor shall prepare a preliminary report each year and deliver it to ODE on or before November 15 of the respective year(s). The report shall be presented in electronic form and/or hard copy, as requested. The report shall include information on the progress of the Ohio TIF project to date and present annual data on existing compensation systems and teacher/principal effectiveness. The Contractor shall provide appropriate updates, feedback, and ongoing recommendations in the preliminary reports.

Additionally, USDOE grant reporting requirements shall be incorporated into the reports.

Production period and delivery dates:

- 1) Year 2: September 15 to November 15, 2011
- 2) Year 3: September 15 to November 15, 2011
- 3) Year 4: September 15 to November 15, 2011
- 4) Year 5: September 15 to November 15, 2011

- c. Convene a mid-year briefing to OTIF Stakeholders.

The Contractor shall coordinate a meeting with representatives from ODE and BFK shortly after submission of the preliminary report each year to provide timely feedback for formative continuous project improvement. The meeting shall provide an opportunity to discuss the progress of the evaluation and clarify recommendations in the preliminary report. Instead of meeting at ODE in Columbus, ODE might consider piggybacking these briefings on the Annual TIF Grantee Meetings generally held in the spring in the Metro DC area, thereby saving considerable travel costs. Westat applauds the inclusion of this deliverable to increase the utility and application of evaluation findings.

Production period and delivery dates:

- 1) Year 2: January 2 to January 17, 2012
- 2) Year 3: January 2 to January 17, 2013
- 3) Year 4: January 2 to January 17, 2014
- 4) Year 5: January 2 to January 17, 2015

- d. Prepare final year reports and the final, summative report.

The Contractor shall prepare a final report each year and deliver it to ODE on or before June 10 of that year. The report shall be presented in electronic form and/or hard copy, as requested. The report shall include information on the progress of the Ohio TIF project and, in Year 2, baseline data on existing compensation systems and teacher/principal effectiveness. Each report shall address research questions, from a formative and summative standpoint, in the six (6) areas identified by ODE:

- 1) Implementation.
- 2) Impact on teacher effectiveness and behavior.
- 3) Impact on student achievement.
- 4) Impact on administrative behavior and school/LEA processes.
- 5) Sustainability.
- 6) Best practices.

Each report shall build on the themes of previous years, and shall be more summative in later years. The report shall provide information to enable ODE and participating school districts to use data for implementation and continuous program improvement.

Additionally, USDOE grant reporting requirements shall be incorporated into the reports. The final report shall include summative aspects focusing on the impact of the Ohio TIF project and address questions of sustainability and replicability of the models that have been developed and tested. It shall provide analysis of the OTIF's goals, as well as recommendations for improvement and feasibility and/or guidance for scaling the models to other districts.

Production period and delivery dates:

- 1) Year 2: April 1 to June 10, 2012
- 2) Year 3: April 1 to June 10, 2013
- 3) Year 4: April 1 to June 10, 2014
- 4) Year 5: April 1 to June 10, 2015

- e. Provide a report of deliverables to the ODE.

The Contractor shall provide the ODE with a quarterly report of the deliverables in both electronic and hard copy. Reports shall comply with all TIF reporting requirements and timelines.

Target delivery dates:

- 1) Year 2: October 15, 2011; January 15, 2012; April 15, 2012; July 15, 2012
- 2) Year 3: October 15, 2012; January 15, 2013; April 15, 2013; July 15, 2013
- 3) Year 4: October 15, 2013; January 15, 2014; April 15, 2014; July 15, 2014
- 4) Year 5: October 15, 2014; January 15, 2015; April 15, 2015; June 30, 2015

- f. Prepare a year-end utilization report.

Each year, the Contractor shall provide a utilization report to the Department of Administrative Services Office of Procurement Services. The report shall summarize highlights of the respective reporting year requirements.

Target delivery dates:

- 1) Year 2: August 15, 2012
- 2) Year 3: August 15, 2013
- 3) Year 4: August 15, 2014
- 4) Year 5: August 15, 2015

COST SUMMARY FORM

TITLE: THE OHIO TEACHER INCENTIVE FUND (OTIF) EVALUATION
 RFP NUMBER: CSP0905001
 UNSPSC CATEGORY CODE: 80101500

OAKS Item ID: 4627

DELIVERABLES	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Project Plan	\$ 50,000			
Preliminary Annual Report	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Final Annual Report	\$120,000	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$135,000
USDOE Reporting Requirements	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
NOT TO EXCEED TOTAL FISCAL YEAR COST	\$285,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
NOT TO EXCEED TOTAL PROJECT FOUR-YEAR COST	\$1,035,000			

The Cost Summary reflects a four (4) year Plan, in one (1) year increments.
 The Not-to Exceed Total Project Cost is the sum of the respective year's not-to-exceed cost, and includes fiscal years 2012 – 2015.
 All Costs are in U.S. Dollars.
 The State will not be responsible for any costs not identified.
 There will be no additional reimbursement for travel or other related expenses.

CONTRACTOR INDEX

CONTRACTOR AND TERMS:

Vendor ID: 86429
 Westat, Inc.
 1600 Research Blvd.
 Rockville, MD 20850

CONTRACT NO.: CSP0905001-1 (06/30/15) *

TERMS: Net 30 Days

CONTRACTOR'S CONTACT:

Dr. Joy Frechtling

Telephone: (301) 517-4006
 FAX: (301) 517-4134
 e-mail: FRECHTJ1@westat.com

PAYMENT ADDRESS:

Westat, Inc.
 1600 Research Blvd.
 Rockville, MD 20850

*Indicates renewal.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS

Amendment Number	Effective Date	Description
2	7/1/15	To advise that Contract No. CSP905001 will not be renewed beyond the current expiration date of June 30, 2015. Thereafter, agency shall procure their needs for these supplies/services in accordance with Ohio Revised Code Section 125.05.T
1	7/1/14	To indicate mutual agreement for renewal for 12 months effective July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.