

SUMMER READING PROGRAM STUDY

OMB Clearance Request—Part A

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

February 2009

PREPARED FOR:

Institute of Education Sciences
United States Department of Education
Contract No. ED-06-CO-0017

PREPARED BY:

Regional Educational Laboratory—Southwest
Edvance Research, Inc.
9901 IH-10 West, Suite 700
San Antonio, Texas 78230
(210) 558-1902
(210) 558-1075 (fax)

CONTENTS

Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission: Section A	4
A. Justification.....	4
1. Circumstances Making Collection of Information Necessary.....	4
Rationale.....	6
Overview of the Study Design.....	7
Overview of Data Collection Plan.....	8
Recruitment.....	9
Collection Activities Requiring OMB Clearance.....	10
Baseline Data.....	11
Student Background Data Request.....	11
Pretest Scores.....	11
Parent Consent Forms.....	11
Student Interest Survey.....	11
Outcomes.....	12
Postcard Data.....	12
Post-test Scores.....	12
Timeline of Data Collection Plan.....	12
2. Purposes and Uses of the Data.....	12
3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden.....	13
4. Efforts to Identify Duplication.....	14
5. Methods to Minimize Burden on Small Entities.....	14
6. Consequences of Not Collecting the Data.....	14
7. Special Circumstances.....	15
8. Federal Register Comments and Persons Consulted Outside the Agency.....	15
9. Payment or Gifts.....	15
10. Assurances of Confidentiality.....	16
11. Justification of Sensitive Questions.....	16
12. Estimates of Hour Burden.....	17
District.....	17
Parents and Students.....	17
13. Estimate of Cost Burden to Respondents.....	19
14. Estimate of Annual Cost to the Federal Government.....	19
15. Program Changes or Adjustments.....	20
16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results.....	20
17. Approval to Not Display OMB Expiration Date.....	21
18. Explanation of Exceptions.....	21
References	22

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1. Potential Districts for the Summer Reading Program.....8
Exhibit 2. Data Collection Instruments and Schedule..... 11
Exhibit 3. Technical Working Group Members..... 14
Exhibit 4a. District Hour Burden Estimates.....16
Exhibit 4b. Parent and Student Hour Burden Estimates.....17
Exhibit 5. Estimated Annualized Costs..... 18

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION: SECTION A

A. JUSTIFICATION

Summer learning loss, when students' reading achievement decreases over the summer, is particularly prominent with economically disadvantaged students (Cooper, Nye, Charlton, Lindsay, & Greathouse, 1996; Alexander, Entwistle, & Olson, 2007). (Generally, economically disadvantaged students are students who qualify for free or reduced priced lunches). One of the greatest differences between students in this group and students from higher-income families is their access to reading material. Research indicates that access to books, particularly ones that match a student's reading level and interests will increase the amount of reading that student does.

The transition between learning to read and reading to learn generally occurs between third- and fourth-grade. It is especially important to help students who are struggling to read at this important point. This study will provide 8 books to economically disadvantaged, struggling readers in the treatment group in the summer after their third-grade year.

All research activities referred to in this document, including data collection by Regional Educational Laboratories, are authorized by H.R. 3801 The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (Part D, Section 174). (See Appendix C.)

1. Circumstances Making Collection of Information Necessary

The percentage of economically disadvantaged students attending public schools has continued to increase in the Southwest Region. Whereas in 2000, New Mexico and Louisiana were the only two states in which a majority of their public school students were from economically disadvantaged families, in 2006, all of the Southwest Region states, except for Oklahoma, have a majority of their public school students residing in economically disadvantaged families (Arkansas: 53%; Louisiana: 84%; New Mexico: 62%; Texas: 56%). Research has demonstrated that economically disadvantaged students are especially vulnerable to suffering from summer learning losses (Cooper, Nye, Charlton, Lindsay, & Greathouse, 1996; Alexander, Entwistle, & Olson, 2007). More specifically, any academic gains that occurred during the school year may not persist across the summer and into the next school year (Alexander et al., 2007). This loss has been linked to widening

achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged and middle-income students. English language learners (ELL) may be particularly vulnerable to summer learning loss (Mraz & Rasinski, 2007). This is of particular concern in the Southwest region because 12.6% of the students in the region are ELLs (United States Department of Education, 2004-2005).

There are a number of courses of action that can be taken to prevent or counteract this summer learning loss ranging from providing reading material to students to intensive reading instruction. The current study focuses on providing students with books that match their reading level and are in their areas of interest. Many districts in the Southwest Region are already assigning students a Lexile^{TM1} measure based on state-mandated and other standardized tests. Therefore, a study that uses Lexile measures to select books of appropriate difficulty will yield results that are understandable, applicable to these districts, and able to be implemented with existing measures (if positive results are found). The Lexile measure for a student can be matched to the Lexile measure of a book to ensure that the students are reading text at an appropriate level of difficulty. Independent of this study, a number of these districts are either planning or beginning to implement a Lexile-based summer reading program. Thus, a randomized control trial evaluation study of a Lexile-based voluntary summer reading program for economically disadvantaged students may be a particularly effective method to determine whether such a low-cost intervention curtails summer learning loss among students in the Southwest Region. Students will be randomly assigned to either a treatment group (students who receive books during the summer of 2009) or control group.

In order to select books that are interesting to the students, we will collect information using a Student Interest Survey which will include a number of topics. More detail on the Student Interest Survey can be found under Baseline Data in the following Overview of Data Collection Plan section. A copy of the Student Interest Survey is attached to this submission. The student respondents will check which topics are of interest.

To investigate more thoroughly the utility of this program, the students will be asked, via postcards, about their reading activity during the summer months. This information will be collected only for the treatment group using the Monitoring Postcard sent to the student on a weekly basis for eight consecutive weeks. The information from the postcards will be used only to provide descriptive information about the treatment group and will not be used for analyzing treatment vs. control impacts for the main research question. Since these

¹ The Lexile Framework[®] for Reading is a psychometric system for matching readers with texts of appropriate difficulty (Lennon & Burdick, 2004). A Lexile measure is the numeric representation of an individual's reading ability or a text's readability (or difficulty), followed by an "L" (for Lexile). The Lexile scale is a developmental scale for reading that ranges from below 0L for emerging readers and beginning texts to above 1700L for advanced readers and texts.

postcards are sent to students in the treatment group approximately once a week for eight weeks to encourage students to read each week, the Monitoring Postcards will not be mailed to the students in the control group who did not receive eight books during the treatment summer as part of this study. At the end of the summer, students will be asked about their participation in any summer learning programs (e.g., summer school). This information will be collected for all students (treatment and control groups) using the Final Postcard and will provide descriptive information about students' summer reading activities.

All research activities referred to in this document, including data collection by Regional Educational Laboratories, are authorized by H.R. 3801 The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (Part D, Section 174). (See Appendix C.)

Rationale

In his meta-analysis of 39 studies of summer learning loss, Cooper observed that summer vacation had . . .

. . . greater negative effects on the reading skills of lower-income students. In fact, middle-class students appeared to gain on grade-equivalent reading recognition tests over summer, while lower-class students lost on them. . . . The negative effect of summer did increase with increases in students' grade levels (Cooper, et al., 1996, p. 265).

Cooper suggested that this widening gap could be mitigated if summer programs addressed two literacy conditions typically lacking for economically disadvantaged students: 1) the opportunity and environment over the summer to practice their reading skills; and 2) access to the kinds of reading material they are intrinsically motivated to read for pleasure.

Researchers have built upon Cooper's conclusions in designing voluntary summer reading studies focused not only on getting resources into the hands of economically disadvantaged students, but on getting the *right* resources. Students spend more time reading and show reading achievement gains when they participate in choosing their own resources (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2008), and when the resources are matched to both their interests and reading ability (Kim, 2006). Considered against the national decline in leisure reading across all income levels (National Endowment for the Arts, 2007), these successful approaches merit continued study toward the goal of larger scale summer reading programs that combine student choice and targeted ability.

The proposed randomized control trial will focus on students who are a) economically disadvantaged, b) struggling readers, and c) in the summer between their third- and fourth-grade years. Students will be identified as economically disadvantaged by their free or reduced lunch status. Only students who are identified as

economically disadvantaged will be invited to participate in this study. For the purpose of this study, we will identify struggling readers as students whose Lexile measure is at or below 590L. A 590L measure for a grade 3 reader is at the 50th percentile of grade 3 readers based on linking studies conducted with the Lexile Framework (MetaMetrics, 2008). These students will be selected by their school and/or district based on their Lexile measure from their TAKS spring 2009 administration. The district will distribute parent consent forms to the parents of the identified students. Only students whose parents or guardians have granted active consent will participate in this study.

We have targeted students in the summer between third and fourth grade for a number of reasons. The most important reason is that students of this age have typically mastered the ability to decode words providing the foundation for reading skills to flourish (Chall, 1983). Yet, for many, this is a new and relatively unpolished skill. Other reasons for selecting these students are logistical and will enhance the rate of return for parental consent forms as well as increase the amount of time for data analysis and write-up of this study.

Overview of the Study Design

As previously mentioned, the proposed randomized control trial will focus on students who are economically disadvantaged, struggling readers, in the summer between their third- and fourth-grade years. This study has eight basic steps, a) select districts, b) obtain Lexile measures from TAKS spring administration, c) select students based on Lexile measures and enrollment in free- or reduced-priced lunch, d) distribute consent forms, e) randomly assign students to treatment or control group, f) distribute books to the treatment group, g) send 9 postcards to the treatment group and one to the control group, and h) obtain Lexile measure from the SRI in the early fall. Note that an additional step, not included in the study, but included in the parental consent, is that the summer after the study is completed (the summer after the students' fourth-grade year), the control group will receive their eight books.

Given the desired Minimum Detectable Effect Size (MDES; Bloom, 2005) between 0.10 and 0.13, it has been determined that a sample of 1,896 total students (948 in each condition) will yield adequate statistical power. The sample will be drawn from up to three districts in Texas and will consist of economically disadvantaged, third-grade students who are struggling readers.

The study will begin as soon as OMB approval is received and the district recruitment activities are complete. The struggling readers will then be identified with the analysis of the results of the district's standardized test (e.g., TAKS). Third grade struggling readers who receive free or reduced price lunches will be included in this study. Half of them will be assigned (randomly) to the control group and the other half to the

treatment group. The treatment group will receive eight books selected based on their reading level (as determined by their Lexile measure) and their areas of interest (as determined by their responses on the Student Interest Survey). Post-test Lexile measures for all students (i.e., both the treatment and control group) will be collected via a standardized district assessment (e.g., SRI, TAKS) after summer 2009 (i.e., their 4th grade year). As a benefit for participating in the study, the control group will receive eight books selected for them using the same selection method after the completion of the post-test.

Providing books does not guarantee that students will read them. Therefore, for descriptive purposes it is useful to ask about the number of books each student read during the summer. The students who received the books (i.e., the treatment group) will receive a brief survey in postcard format for eight consecutive weeks during the summer asking about their reading, and a different postcard at the end of the summer that asks not only about their reading, but also about their participation in summer learning programs (e.g., summer school). The students who did not receive books during the course of this study (i.e., the control group) will only receive the postcard at the end of the summer. All postcards will be mailed to the students in envelopes and will be pre-printed with the students unique study identifier. So, the students' names will not be on the postcards in the general mail.

Overview of Data Collection Plan

This section describes the full set of data collection instruments. The data collections for the Voluntary Summer Reading Program serve four broad purposes:

- **Recruitment**, to identify schools that will participate in the study;
- **Documenting the intervention**, to verify the fidelity of the participation of the students in the Summer Reading Program (i.e., the number of provided books they read);
- **Assembling contextual data**, to help understand the results:
 - data to describe the sample so that differential outcomes for groups might be elucidated;
 - data to compare treatment and control schools, teachers, and students prior to the implementation (i.e. to assess how well randomization has balanced the samples);
 - covariates (control variables) that can be included in analyses to reduce unexplained variance;
 - variables that may interact with the treatment.
- **Measuring the outcome**, assessment scores.

To address these objectives the study will collect data from parents and students and will collect data about the students from the school districts.

Recruitment

A systematic approach to recruitment will be used which was proven to be successful in two previous RCT recruitment efforts initiated by REL Southwest. Those efforts include the following (and are explained in more detail in the paragraphs below):

- Identify districts that match study criteria.
- Send communication describing the study to identified district superintendents.
- Participate in meetings with interested districts.
- Collect district letters of intent to participate.
- Select district(s) that best fits study criteria.

REL Southwest used the Common Core of Data (CCD) website, which utilizes publicly available datasets to describe characteristics of schools and districts, to identify Texas districts with student enrollments of 25,000 or greater. Texas was selected as the target state, as *all* schools and districts administer the TAKS test, which allows for the identification of a Lexile measure for each student. (*Note: We did not use the districts' free/reduced lunch percentage at this stage in the process, as it is not representative of the grade level used for the study.*) Based on the CCD results, the 42 districts in the following table (Exhibit 1) were a match.

Exhibit 1. Potential Districts for the Summer Reading Program

Aldine ISD	El Paso ISD	Mesquite ISD
Alief ISD	Fort Bend ISD	North East ISD
Amarillo ISD	Fort Worth ISD	Northside ISD
Arlington ISD	Garland ISD	Pasadena ISD
Austin ISD	Houston ISD	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD
Brownsville ISD	Humble ISD	Plano ISD
Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD	Irving ISD	Richardson ISD
Clear Creek ISD	Katy ISD	Round Rock ISD
Conroe ISD	Keller ISD	San Antonio ISD
Corpus Christi ISD	Killeen ISD	Socorro ISD
Cypress-Fairbanks ISD	Klein ISD	Spring ISD
Dallas ISD	Lewisville ISD	Spring Branch ISD

Ector County ISD	Lubbock ISD	United ISD
Edinburg CISD	Mansfield ISD	Ysleta ISD

Some districts (within the 42 matched districts) are already aware of REL Southwest research projects through REL Outreach and Dissemination activities and have expressed a strong interest in participating in REL Southwest studies. We will email a letter and recruitment flyer (see Appendix B) to the 42 district superintendents (or assistant superintendents where superintendents are not available) in order to communicate with them about the study. We will also follow up with districts by telephone as needed.. Once a district has expressed interest in the study, we will work with that district to schedule a meeting —either face-to-face or via conference call —to further discuss the study with key district stakeholders. We will request that interested districts provide a letter of intent to participate (see Appendix B), which must be signed by the appropriate district-level administrator (such as the Superintendent, Research Director, etc.). We will select up to three districts that qualify for the Summer Reading Program and have provided REL Southwest with written permission to participate in the RCT.

Collection Activities Requiring OMB Clearance

The only data collection activities requiring OMB Clearance for this study are the Parent Consent Form, Student Background Data Request, Student Interest Surveys, Monitoring Postcards and the Final Postcards. All these survey instruments are described in the following sections Baseline Data and Outcomes.

Baseline Data

Student Background Data Request

Student data will be provided to us from the district to aid in selection of the students for this study. A Student Background Data Request will be sent to all participating schools which will include a student identifier (so no names or other confidential information is required about the student) and whether the student receives free or reduced price lunch. At the same time, student demographic data will also be provided by the district so that we can include descriptive information with the results.

Pretest Scores

Scores from the district spring standardized testing, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) prior to summer 2009, will be provided to us by the district(s) for the students who qualify for the study based on their free or reduced lunch classification. This data will help in the selection of students since this study will only include students who are struggling readers (as evidenced by their TAKS scores).

Parent Consent Forms

Parent Consent Forms will be sent to the parents of each student eligible for participation in this study. The form will inform the parents about the requirements, benefits, and details of this study. Participating districts will identify a school liaison to distribute consent forms to eligible students. The identified school liaison will also encourage eligible students to return parent consent forms to the school liaison. The school liaison will be responsible for mailing the parent consent form to REL Southwest.

Student Interest Survey

The Parent Consent Form will also include a Student Interest Survey that will be returned at the same time as the Parent Consent Form. This survey allows the students to select the subject areas about which they most enjoy reading. There are 20 subject areas from which to select. The student's interest areas will be used in conjunction with the student's TAKS score to determine the exact books that the student will receive as part of this study. Students will only be included in this study if they have returned a completed Student Interest Survey since matching the books to the students' interests is critical for this program. (Note that this is in addition to granted/active consent, inclusion in free-or reduced-priced lunch, and a Lexile-measure from their spring TAKS administration that classifies them as a struggling reader.) The assignment of books will be done by a computer program that randomly selects books for each student from a pool of books that matches student Lexile scores and selected interest areas.

Implementation

Postcard Data

Data about the treatment group's reading will be collected on a weekly basis via a Monitoring Postcard (a brief survey in postcard format) each week for eight weeks. In addition, information about all students' (both treatment and control groups) summer reading and their inclusion in summer school programs will be collected at the end of the summer via the Final Postcard. The information about the number of books the students read

and the information about how many students attended summer school will be reported descriptively, but will not be used for analyzing treatment vs. control impacts for the main research question.

The postcards will be pre-addressed and pre-stamped so they will be easy to return. They will be mailed to the students in envelopes and will include a unique identifier but no name.

Outcomes

Post-test Scores

Scores from the Scholastic Reading Inventory(SRI) in the fall 2009 will be provided to us by the district for the students who were in this study. This data, along with the spring TAKS administration scores in their third-grade year, will be used in the analyses of this study.

Timeline of Data Collection Plan

This request is for the collection of student interest data and administration of postcards that are included as attachments with this package. The data collections and their timing in the study are displayed in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2. Data Collection Instruments and Schedule

Data Collection Instrument	Early Summer 2009	Mid-Summer 2009	Late Summer 2009
Student Interest Survey (treatment and control groups)	x		
Monitoring Postcard (one postcard/week for eight weeks —treatment group)		x	
Final Postcard (treatment and control groups)			x

2. Purposes and Uses of the Data

The voluntary Summer Reading Program is designed to evaluate the utility of providing economically disadvantaged, struggling readers in third-grade with high-interest, ability-targeted books to read over the summer. Thus, the primary research question is whether students who read over the summer months will have less summer learning loss than their peers who do not read, do not have access to reading materials, or reported reading less. It is not enough to provide the books to the students; data must be collected regarding whether the students read the books.

The collected data will be used by IES and its subcontractors to study the effects of providing books for summer reading as previously stated. Student achievement data that has been collected in the district's standardized and previously scheduled testing window will be used to evaluate the effect of the book dissemination on summer learning loss. In addition, student-level demographic data will be collected to enhance the estimation of the potential effect and the interpretation of the study results. The study results will assist states and districts as they choose interventions to prevent summer learning loss. This evidence will be of immediate interest and import for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners because of the importance of addressing summer learning loss.

3. Use of Technology to Reduce Burden

We will use information technologies to maximize the efficiency and completeness of the information gathered for this evaluation to minimize the burden on respondents whenever possible. Initial recruitment at the district level will begin with electronic searches of existing data sources to identify eligible districts. Study staff will use email as much as possible to gain district approval for school recruitment. Additionally, the Student Background Data Request will be managed by email as much as possible, so that school or district staff can provide us with student data in electronic format if their systems permit. Study staff will use email for all correspondences with the school relating to study implementation. Since there are only a small number of districts (up to three) we will not set up a data delivery or electronic record system.

The Student Interest Survey will not involve technology because the need to collect parent consent requires paper versions of the consent form and these two documents need to be collected at the same time to ensure enough time is allowed for book selection and shipment.

The postcards will not involve technology since it is unlikely that most of these students have access to email at home.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

There has not been much research done in this area. Kim (2006, 2007) researched summer reading programs but not with just economically disadvantaged students, with just third-graders, or with struggling readers. Regardless of the direction of the results, this study will be a welcome addition to the field.

5. Methods to Minimize Burden on Small Entities

To minimize burden on small entities such as the school in this study, the school will only be asked to distribute parent consent forms and to encourage student participation. Districts will be providing existing data whenever possible (i.e., in all areas of this study except the postcard data collection).

6. Consequences of Not Collecting the Data

There is very little research and even less random control trial research in the areas of summer learning loss and voluntary summer reading programs, let alone the two important and interesting areas together. This study that combines these with information about the students' reading level and interests will yield results that could lead to a low cost solution to help prevent or decrease summer learning loss. While the results of this study will be about these particular, economically disadvantaged, third-grade, struggling readers, this study will provide the groundwork for studies about different types of students.

Following are consequences of not collecting the data for this study.

The Student Interest Survey data is collected once and is included in this study to match the students' interests to the books that are provided for summer reading. Providing students books that are interesting to them will increase the likelihood they read the books and experience reading growth. Therefore, it is critical that the Student Interest Survey be included in this study.

Brief surveys in postcard format are included in this study to collect information on the level of implementation of the Voluntary Summer Reading Program. The information from the postcards will provide descriptive information on whether or not the students received the books. These postcards are sent to students in the treatment group approximately once a week for eight weeks to encourage the students to read each week. Additionally, it will be easier for students to remember what they read (and thus increase the quality of this fidelity check) if they are asked once each week rather than just at the end of the summer.

7. Special Circumstances

There are no special circumstances relating to this collection.

8. Federal Register Comments and Persons Consulted Outside the Agency

The notice for the full study data collection was announced in the Federal Register on January 2, 2009, page 101, volume 74-3. To date, no public comments have been received.

To assist with development, the voluntary Summer Reading Program staff has drawn on the experience and expertise of a network of outside experts. The consultants and their affiliations are listed in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit 3. Technical Working Group Members

Technical Working Group Members	
<i>Expert</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Dr. Roger Bybee	Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS)
Dr. David Chard	University of Oregon
Dr. David Francis	University of Houston
Dr. Jeremy Kilpatrick	University of Georgia
Dr. David Myers	American Institutes for Research

To date, the project advisors and Technical Working Group members have convened twice—in November 2007 and April 2009—to review the study and REL Southwest received additional feedback from Dr. Myers over the summer of 2008 on the study design. Additional meetings will be scheduled throughout the life of the project, as deemed appropriate. Project staff will also use individual outside experts for consultation on an as-needed basis.

9. Payment or Gifts

No incentives will be provided. The eight books that all participating students will receive as part of the study could be seen as incentive to participate, but the dissemination of these books is the backbone of this research. All postcards will be pre-addressed and pre-stamped to keep returning them as simple as possible.

10. Assurances of Confidentiality

REL Southwest follows the confidentiality and data protection requirements of IES (The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183). REL Southwest will protect the confidentiality of all information collected for the study and will use it for research purposes only. No information that identifies any study participant will be released. Information from participating institutions and respondents will be presented at aggregate levels in reports. Information on respondents will be linked to their institution but not to any individually identifiable information. No individually identifiable information will be maintained by the study team. All institution-level identifiable information will be kept in secured locations and identifiers will be destroyed as soon as they are no longer required. All data collection activities in the study will be conducted in full compliance with the Department of Education regulations to maintain the confidentiality of data obtained on private persons and to protect the

rights and welfare of human research subjects. Data collection activities will also be conducted in compliance with other federal regulations including The Privacy Act of 1974, P.L. 93-579, 5 USC 522 a; the “Buckley Amendment,” Family Educational Right to Privacy Act of 1974, 20 USC 1232 g; The Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 522; 41 CFR Part 1-1; 45 CFR Part 5b; and, as appropriate, the Federal common rule or ED’s final regulations on the protection of human research participants.

REL Southwest obtains signed NCEE Affidavits of Nondisclosure from all employees, subcontractors, and consultants who may have access to this data and submits them to our NCEE COR. Reasonable caution will be exercised in limiting access to data collected only to persons working on the project who have been instructed in the applicable confidentiality requirements for the project. The Project Manager will be responsible for ensuring that all contractor personnel involved in handling data on the project are instructed in these procedures and will comply with these procedures throughout the study. During the course of the study, all necessary information and documents will be kept in physical and electronic files accessible only to project staff under the supervision of the Project Manager. Hard copies of files will be transferred via overnight Federal Express, and will be stored in locked file cabinets when not in use for cleaning and entering purposes. Electronic files with identifying information will be transported via portable storage devices and duplicate copies will be destroyed once files are stored in secure folders. Electronic files with identifying information will not be emailed but can be posted to a secure password and user ID protected website. After the project is completed and de-identified public-access files have been created, the contractors will destroy all identifying information of districts, schools, and individuals, retaining only ID numbers. This will involve destroying both hard and electronic files containing names of participating institutions or persons.

The language provided in The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Title I, Part E, Section 183 will be included on all Parent Consent Forms and on all postcards. Student name will only be collected on the Parent Consent Form and not on the Student Interest Survey, the Monitoring Postcards, or the Final Postcard.

REL Southwest has developed a robust technical environment, secured by firewalls that limit access to designated network areas, and requires authorized individuals to gain access through a password identification system. In the event that data files containing items identifying individuals must be transmitted between REL Southwest own network system and another location (such as a government agency) encryption with passwords

ensures file security and data integrity. Data from the districts will be transferred electronically to a secure server utilizing a password and unique user identification system.

11. Justification of Sensitive Questions

No questions of a sensitive nature will be included on the Student Interest Survey or on any of the postcards.

12. Estimates of Hour Burden

Exhibits 4a and 4b provide annual hour burden estimates for districts, parents, and students². The total estimated hour burden for the full Summer Reading Program is 531 hours total or 177 burden hours per year for 3 years.

District

Up to three districts will be selected to participate in the study. Each district will be asked to provide student background data. We estimate a 100% response rate for the districts to fulfill the extant student background data request. We expect all participating school districts to approve our data request and provide the requested data. Most of the data being requested from the school districts (gender, race, free/reduced lunch status, ELL status, special education status, state assessment score) should have very little missing data due to NCLB reporting requirements. Based on the average hourly wages (\$40.00/hour) for district personnel, and the estimated completion time (45 hours total) for the district, the burden is estimated to be \$1,800. Based on the average hourly wages (\$40/hour) for district personnel, and the estimated time for communication/meetings (30 hours total) for the district, the burden is estimated to be \$1,200 for a total of \$3,000. Refer to Exhibit 4a for estimated district burden.

² Based on 5 CFR 1320.3(d) we provided a discussion of student achievement measures used in the study in section 1 but do not seek clearance or declare burden for them. The student assessments described do not pose any burden to teachers because the assessments are mandated by the district and/or state.

Exhibit 4a. District Hour Burden Estimates

Task	Number of Respondents	Estimated Response Rate	Time Estimate (in hours)	Total Hours	Hourly Rate	Estimated Monetary Cost of Burden
Student Background Data Request	3	100%	15	45	\$40	\$1,800
Communication & Meetings	3	100%	10	30	\$40	\$1,200

Parents and Students

Parents are listed with the student in the burden estimate as parents are asked to assist their children when completing the Student Interest Survey, the eight Monitoring Postcards, and the Final Postcard. The total number of respondents is 1896 students. Respondents will be randomly selected to be in either the treatment or control group. The treatment and control group will each have 948 students. No costs are associated with the estimated burden for parents and students. Each of the postcards and the interest survey is estimated to take approximately 3 minutes to complete. Based on previous similar research conducted by REL Southwest, we estimate the students will have an 80% response rate to the Student Interest Survey. Based on data collected in other randomized controlled trials completed by REL Southwest, the rate of return of parent consent forms will be approximately 80%. Based on other studies by MetaMetrics (the developer of the Lexile framework) in summer reading, we estimate for the return rate of the postcards from parent/students over the summer is an estimated 80%. Note that the treatment group will receive nine postcards and the control group will receive one postcard. The burden is estimated to cost \$0. Refer to Exhibit 4b for estimated parent and student burden.

Exhibit 4b. Parent and Student Hour Burden Estimates

Task Parent /Student	Number of Respondents	Estimated Response Rate	Number of Admin.	Number of Total Responses	Time Estimate (in hours)	Total Hours	Hourly Rate	Est. Monetary Cost of Burden
Student Interest Survey (treatment and control students)	1,896	80%	1	1,517	0.05	75.85	\$0	\$0
1st Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
2nd Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
3rd Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
4th Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
5th Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
6th Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
7th Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
8th Monitoring Postcard (treatment students only)	948	80%	1	758	0.05	37.9	\$0	\$0
Final Postcard (treatment and control students)	1,896	80%	1	1517	0.05	75.85	\$0	\$0
Total	1896*		10	9,098	.05	455.00	0	0

* This is an unduplicated count for respondents.

13. Estimate of Cost Burden to Respondents

There is no start up costs to respondents.

14. Estimate of Annual Cost to the Federal Government

Exhibit 5 displays the estimated total annual cost to the federal government. Estimated expenditures include study planning (study design and study material development) and recruitment preparation (recruitment planning and development of recruitment material). Project costs for year two include continuation of site recruitment and

management activities, management of the distribution and collection of Parent Consent Forms and Student Interest Surveys, summer books for students, postcards, and initiation of data analysis. Year three, costs are associated with completion of data collection, data clean up, data analysis, and final product development. The average annual cost for this study is \$324,000 for three years.

Exhibit 5. Estimated Annualized Costs

Study Year (dates)	Total Study Costs per Year
Year 1 (01/01/2008–12/31/2008)	\$ 60,000
Year 2 (01/01/2009–12/31/2009)	\$482,000
Year 3 (01/01/2010–12/31/2010)	\$430,000
Total	\$972,000

15. Program Changes or Adjustments

There is a program change of 177 annual burden hours since this is a new collection.

16. Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results

Data collection will be conducted over the summer of 2009. Once the participating districts have completed their assessments in the fall of 2009, data analysis will begin. Data analysis will be completed by winter 2009-2010. This study will result in a final report, which will be submitted to IES after internal and TWG review by March 2011. The final report will include results of analyses outlined under the Estimation Procedures/Analysis Methods heading of Part B.

A dissemination plan will be created in coordination with the REL Southwest Marketing Department. Multiple products will be created and various dissemination channels will be utilized dependent on the relevant target audience identified for each product. A product announcement will be developed prior to the start of the study and periodic interim research bulletins will be created and distributed throughout the life of the study.

Members of the study team may, in coordination with REL Southwest Marketing and per any relevant IES guidelines, submit articles to peer-reviewed journals, though specific results of the current study will first have to be disseminated to IES.

Members of the study team may submit proposals for conference presentations subject to appropriate IES guidelines and contract restrictions. Presentations of preliminary data may be made at national scholarly conferences pending approval by REL Southwest, and following REL Southwest contract guidelines.

17. Approval to Not Display OMB Expiration Date

All data collection instruments will include the OMB expiration date.

18. Explanation of Exceptions

No exceptions are being requested for this program.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, K. L., Entwistle, D. R., and Olson, L. S. (2007). Lasting consequences of the summer learning gap. *American Sociological Review*, 72, 167-180.
- Allington, R., and McGill-Franzen, A. (2008). Got books? *Educational Leadership*, 65 (7), 20-24.
- Bloom, H.S. (2005). Randomizing groups to evaluate place-based programs. In H.S. Bloom (Ed.), *Learning more from social experiments: Evolving analytic approaches* (pp. 4-1-4-90). Sage Foundation.
- Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., and Greathouse, S. (1996). The effects of summer vacation on achievement test scores: A narrative and meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 227-268.
- Kim, J. S., (2006). Effects of a voluntary summer reading intervention on reading achievement: Results from a randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28 No4, 335-354.
- Lennon, C., & Burdick, H. (2004). The Lexile Framework as an approach for reading measurement and success. A white paper from The Lexile Framework for Reading. Durham, NC: MetaMetrics, Inc.
- Mraz, M. and Rasinski, T. V. (2007). Summer reading loss. *International Reading Association*, doi:10.1598/RT.60.8.9, 784-789.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (2007). *To read or not to read: A question of national consequence*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- United States Department of Education. Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. *Common Core of Data: Public School Universe, 2004-2005* [Data File]. Available from National Center for Education Statistics website, <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>