

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

*Check only one box per Program Office instructions.*

**Annual Performance Report**     **Final Performance Report**

**General Information**

1. PR/Award #: **S349A060037**

*(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification.)*

2. NCES ID #:

*(See Instructions.)*

3. Project Title: Ready to Learn Providence

*(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)*

4. Grantee Name*(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.)*: The Providence Plan

5. Grantee Address *(See Instructions.)*: 56 Pine Street  
Suite 3B

City: Providence State: RI Zip:02903 Zip+4:

6. Project Director:

First Name

Last Name

Title

Joyce

Butler

Phone #:

Fax #:

Email Address:

(401)490-9960

(401)490-9959

JBUTLER@PROVPLAN.ORG

**Reporting Period Information** *(See instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period:                      From: 9/1/2006      To: 10/30/2007      (mm/dd/yyyy)

**Budget Expenditures** *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)*

8. Budget Expenditures

	<b>Federal Grant Funds</b>	<b>Non-Federal Funds (Match/Cost Share)</b>
a. Previous Budget Period...	0.00	0.00
b. Current Reporting Period	630,669.00	557,586.00
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	0.00	0.00

**Indirect Cost Information** *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)*

## 9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant?  Yes  
 No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?  Yes  
 No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:  
 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 7/1/2006 To: 6/30/2007  
 (mm/dd/yyyy)  
 Approving Federal agency:  ED  Other (Please Specify)  
 Type of Rate (For Final Performance Reports Only):  Provisional  Final  Other  
 (Please Specify)
- d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that
- Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?  
 Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

**Human Subjects (See instructions.)**

10. Annual Certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval?  Yes  No  N/A

**Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)**

## 11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart?  Yes  No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Name of Authorized Representative: Patrick McGuigan	Title: Executive Director
Signature:	Date:

**Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Executive Summary Attachment:**

Title : Executive Summary  
 File : R:\R2LP\Programs\Projects\ECEPD2007\Fall 2007 Reporting\Executive Summary.pdf

## **Executive Summary**

### **2006 ECEPD Annual Performance Report: The Providence Plan**

Ready to Learn Providence, a program of The Providence Plan, has made significant progress during the first year of the ECEPD grant given the ambitious set of goals we set forth in the grant proposal. As the following report will reveal, the first year of implementation has been both gratifying and challenging. A major challenge in the first several months resulted from several months of delays in the Institutional Review Board process. We learned a lot about IRB in the process and made every effort to adjust our implementation plans to support a rigorous experimental design. As we moved to full implementation, it has been gratifying to witness the commitment of hundreds of participants who come weekly to Ready to Learn Providence to take part in the ECEPD-sponsored professional development program. This report documents our experiences in three distinct phases of project development, "Start-up Phase," "Fidelity Phase" and "Full Implementation Phase."

#### **Start-Up Phase (October 2006 to December 2006)**

During the Start-up Phase we hired staff, issued subcontracts, met with the Department and our former subcontracting external evaluators from the Education Alliance at Brown University (now DSRobinson & Associates) to modify the design of the evaluation. We also analyzed and revised our implementation plans on the basis of the revised evaluation design and resubmitted them to the Department and negotiated with our community partners regarding their involvement in the modified program.

#### **Fidelity Phase (January 2007 – June 2007)**

The Fidelity Phase afforded us the opportunity to conduct a random control pilot with 20 Head Start classrooms from four Head Start sites in Providence. R2LP's external evaluator, the Education Alliance at Brown University, randomized the 20 classes into 10 treatment and 10 control classrooms. Ten teachers and five teacher assistants from the treatment group participated in an accelerated professional development intervention that began in February 2007. All fifteen participants completed two college-level courses, *HeadsUp! Reading* and *Early Literacy Curriculum* over a four-month period of time. Participants also received four visits from highly qualified mentors and the supportive services of accompanying AmeriCorps members. Combined, *HeadsUp Reading* and *Early Literacy Curriculum* represented 75 hours of research-based professional development in the areas of early literacy, curriculum and assessment.

Significant delays in IRB approval by Brown University postponed the onset of data collection by the Education Alliance until March 2007. Given that the second round of assessment had to occur just six weeks later, prior to Head Start's closure for the summer, the usefulness of the data collected was significantly compromised. Nonetheless, all but the post-PPVT data was collected to meet GPRA requirements. R2LP collected evidence, as well including evaluation forms, mentor summary logs, and classroom observations. Based on their own evaluations and mentor assessments of the participating ECEs, the intervention was felt to have a positive impact on ECEs' understanding of early language and literacy. Even under the pressure of an accelerated timeframe and the considerable delays in data collection resulting from obtaining IRB approval, R2LP is confident the classes made a difference for the teachers and the children.

During the Fidelity Phase, we also began the recruitment necessary to support the Full Implementation. R2LP recruited teaching staff from 27 child care programs and over 120 family child care providers in Providence, Pawtucket and Central Falls to participate in the project.

### **Full Implementation Phase (July 2007 to June 2009)**

This APR addresses the start-up of Full Implementation – the period from July to October 2007.

Recruitment of ECEs continued throughout the summer as we faced the impact of state budget cuts to child care voted upon by the Rhode Island General Assembly in June of 2007. Cuts in eligibility for state child care subsidies eliminated over 1,900 children from the regulated child care system. The largest share of preschool children affected by the cuts were residents of the city of Providence.

R2LP also made the decision to end the contract for external evaluation with the Education Alliance at Brown University when it expired at the end of August 2007. These matters were discussed with USDOE representatives during the July 2007 ECEPD site visit. At that time, the new evaluator, DSRobinson & Associates, supplied the Department with copies of the Evaluation Design. Given the limitations of data collected during the Fidelity Phase, the accelerated intervention, and the abbreviated time frame between data collection points; R2LP agreed to recruit 10 additional classrooms to ensure that the experiment, under the auspices of the new external evaluator maintained sufficient power.

In September, we provided DSRobinson & Associates with the names of staff members from 87 classrooms in Head Start centers and community based programs and 133 family child care providers for randomization to treatment and control groups. The evaluator submitted materials and received IRB approval from Simmons College in September 2007 and data collection got underway. Full implementation of the professional development began in September 2007. Nine sections of *Heads!Up Reading* involving 145 participants are now underway.

### **Conclusion**

We continue to be driven by the Ready to Learn Providence vision that “*all children in Providence will enter school healthy and ready to learn.*” While we are aware that we will face additional challenges in year two, the commitment of our community partners and the participating ECEs motivates us to work tirelessly together on behalf of the children and families of Providence.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **S349A060037**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**1. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
 Preschool-aged children will attain the necessary early language cognitive and pre-reading skills to enter kindergarten prepared for continued learning, including the age appropriate development of oral language and alphabet knowledge.

<b>1.1. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percent of preschool-age children participating in ECPED programs who achieve *significant learning gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III  *Defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points between pre- and post-test	GPRA	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

<b>1.2. Performance Measure</b>	<b>Measure Type</b>	<b>Quantitative Data</b>					
The percent of preschool-age children participating in ECEPD programs who demonstrate *age-appropriate oral language skills as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III.  *Defined as a standard score of 85 or higher  Age-eligibility was calculated based on the date of September 1, 2006 minus the child's birth date to estimate outcomes for those children 4 years of age and 5 years of age in the fall of 2007. The total sample size of those defined as age-eligible was 146. [R2LP communication dated 10-25-07 confirmed that evaluators were to report only GPRA data for those children deemed age-eligible as per GPRA instructions.]  Tx = Treatment Group; C = Control Group  Total Number Age-Eligible	GPRA	<b>Target</b>			<b>Actual Performance Data</b>		
		<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Raw Number</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
			/			/	

Children

Tx = 67

C = 79

Ratio

Tx = 28/67

C = 36/79

Percent

Tx = 42%

C = 46%

1.3. Performance Measure

Measure Type

Quantitative Data

The number of letters ECPED children can identify as measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask.

GPRA

Target

Actual Performance Data

Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
	/			/	

The total sample size of those children defined as age-eligible (est. 5 years in fall 07) was 146 during the initial assessment period. At the final assessment period - due to attrition - there was one less child in the treatment group and three less children in the control group.\*

Tx = Treatment Group; C = Control Group

Total Number Age-Eligible Children

Tx = 66

C = 76

Ratio

Tx = 66/66

C = 76/76

Percent

Tx = 13.5 (52%)

C = 11.0 (42%)

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)  
See Explanation of Progress for Project Objective 2

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **S349A060037**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

**2 . Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.  
Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood instruction and child development and learning, including establishing literacy-rich classrooms.

2.1. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
The ECEPD teacher's average score on each of the three (3) ELLCO subtests after the professional development intervention 1) Literacy Environment Checklist, 2) the Classroom Observation, and 3) Literacy Activities Rating Scale  LITERACY ENVIRONMENT CHECKLIST SCORE (41 points possible)  The percent of teachers scoring at or above 21.57(NEQRC/LEEP average)  Tx = Treatment Group; C = Control Group  Total Number of Teachers  Tx = 10  C = 10  Total [MEAN-post] Score for All Teachers  Tx = 23.2  C = 19.6  Percent [Above NEQRC/LEEP Indicator 21.57]  Tx = 6/10 (60%)  C = 4/10 (40%)	GPRA						

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)  
Year 1 Evaluation

The final Year 1 report for the implementation study and impact of the intervention during the fidelity period (February - June 2007) will be submitted under separate cover to the program as well as the USDOE as planned.

Data for this research study were collected at two time periods during the initial and abbreviated period of implementation - the fidelity cohort (refer to prior communications and the final detailed evaluation plan for rationale). As planned, the initial data collection took place immediately following Brown University IRB approval which coincided with the completion of the HeadsUp! Reading (HUR) course, which comprises the first half of R2LP's ECEPD intervention.\* The delay in conducting data collection was necessitated by the time required for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to include human subjects in this research as required by federal law. Therefore, no opportunity was provided for the collection of pretest data to establish a baseline for the participants and the children they serve because program implementation began prior to the receipt of IRB approval.

However, the delay in IRB approval resulted in the benefit of additional analysis possibilities in which to examine treatment contrasts. Because the initial data collection occurred as the HUR course was completed and the design is a randomized control trial (RCT), we were able to analyze implementation results following each discrete half of the intervention model: The HeadsUp! Reading course component and the Early Childhood Curriculum course component.

Effectiveness and Added-Value

The first or initial assessment was conducted at the end of the implementation of HeadsUp! Reading (the first course and component of R2LP's proposed ECEPD intervention) but prior to the Early Childhood Curriculum course (the second component of R2LP's proposed ECEPD program). Therefore, the initial assessment is a post-test for this component of the intervention. Because participants were randomly assigned, an assumption is that the treatment and control group participants would be equivalent at baseline. That assumption is tested and other demographic and exogenous variables are included in an analytic model to control for differences in initial status to more accurately estimate the effectiveness of this period of the intervention. In addition, the initial assessment is a pretest for the second course-component of R2LP's ECEPD intervention, the Early Childhood Curriculum course.

Therefore, data collected via the final test administered at the end of the implementation - fidelity cohort - period is used to evaluate the added-value for participants in the second course component in relationship to any impacts observed following the first course component. The results from the final test administration are also compared to those from the initial test administration to determine the impact the intervention has had on participants receiving the entire intervention.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **S349A060037**

**SECTION A - Project Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

- 3. Project Objective**  Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.
- 3a. To provide a research-based professional development intervention to 288 early childhood educators (ECEs) with a level of depth, dosage, and duration needed to transform teaching practice in the areas of early literacy, social and emotional development, curriculum, and assessment.
- 3b. To close ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness by increasing the capacity of culturally and linguistically isolated ECEs who serve children from high-need neighborhoods in the city.
- 3c. To change the school readiness status and developmental trajectory of children as evidenced by their performance on formal school readiness assessments taken during the kindergarten year.

3.1. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Projects will offer an increasing number of hours of high-quality professional development to early childhood educators. High-quality professional development is ongoing, intensive, classroom-focused, and based on scientific research on early childhood cognitive and social development, including the age-appropriate development of oral language, phonological awareness, print awareness, alphabet knowledge, and numeracy skills, and on effective pedagogy for young children. High-quality professional development also includes instruction in the effective administration of age-appropriate assessments of young children and the use of assessment results.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	
3.2. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Early childhood educators who work in early childhood programs serving low-income children will participate in greater numbers and in increasing hours, in high-quality professional development.	PRGM	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/		/		
3.3. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					

<p>Early childhood educators will demonstrate increased knowledge and understanding of effective strategies to support school readiness based on scientific research on cognitive and social development in early childhood and effective pedagogy for young children, and in the effective administration of age-appropriate assessments of young children and the use of assessment results.</p>	<p>PRGM</p>	<p><b>Target</b></p>			<p><b>Actual Performance Data</b></p>		
		<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>	<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>
			/			/	
<p>3.4. Performance Measure</p>							
<p>Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning domains, including using a content-rich curriculum and activities that promote the age-appropriate development of oral language, age-appropriate social and emotional behavior, phonological awareness, print awareness, alphabet knowledge, and numeracy skills. (At a minimum, grantees are expected for GPRA reporting purposes to measure this indicator by improvement in the average score on the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO). Grantees may use additional methods of measuring progress for this measure as well.) Early childhood educators also will more frequently participate in the effective administration of age-appropriate assessments of young children and the use of assessment results.</p>	<p>Measure Type PRGM</p>	<p><b>Quantitative Data</b></p>					
		<p><b>Target</b></p>			<p><b>Actual Performance Data</b></p>		
		<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>	<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>
			/			/	
<p>3.5. Performance Measure</p>							
<p>Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language, literacy, and numeracy skills. (At a minimum, to measure language skills, grantees are expected for GPRA reporting purposes to</p>	<p>Measure Type PRGM</p>	<p><b>Quantitative Data</b></p>					
		<p><b>Target</b></p>			<p><b>Actual Performance Data</b></p>		
		<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>	<p><b>Raw Number</b></p>	<p><b>Ratio</b></p>	<p><b>%</b></p>
			/			/	

use the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Receptive (PPVT-III); and to measure literacy skills using the PALS Pre-K, Upper Case Alphabet Knowledge subtask. Grantees may use additional measures for measuring progress on this indicator as well.

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)  
ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This APR is organized to follow the order of the five ECEPD Indicators established by the Department. Within each indicator we include those R2LP Project Performance Measures (see Section C for attached document entitled Revised Management Plan) that specifically relate to the Indicator. We have also included any background information that may be necessary to support the Department's understanding of our progress to date.

As this is the first APR, the report covers the period from October 2006 to October 2007. Within this timeframe, we have also divided the narrative into three distinct phases of the ECEPD project development. The three phases are referred to as the "Start-up Phase," the "Fidelity Phase" and the "Full Implementation Phase." Naturally, some management activities (e.g. recruitment of participants, hiring of facilitators and mentors) have crossed these phases. Even so, we felt the use of phases would support the reader's understanding of our progress in implementation.

The Start-up Phase relates to the period from October 2006 to December 2006. During the Start-up Phase we hired staff, issued subcontracts, met with the Department and our former subcontracting external evaluators from the Education Alliance at Brown University (now DS Robinson & Associates) to modify the design of the evaluation. We also analyzed and revised our implementation plans on the basis of the new evaluation design, resubmitted them to the Department and negotiated with our community partners regarding their involvement in the modified program.

The Fidelity Phase covers the period from January 2007 to June 2007. During the Fidelity Phase we organized and piloted our modified professional development program with a subset of Head Start teachers referred to as the "Fidelity Cohort." The GPRA data submitted with this report relate specifically to the Fidelity Phase of the implementation.

The Full Implementation Phase covers the period from July 2007 to June 2009. This APR addresses the start up of Full Implementation - the period from July 2007 to October 2007. During this phase we recruited and provided the external evaluator with the complete list of participants for random assignment to treatment and control groups; recruited, interviewed and hired a full complement of facilitators and mentors responsible to conduct the nine sections of classes offered; refined the HeadsUp! Reading course based on feedback from the Fidelity Cohort; reviewed and revised the data collection tools to be utilized by mentors and facilitators; developed the facilitator and mentor training materials in conjunction with Wheelock College; assigned facilitators and mentors to teams; oriented and trained the mentors on the delivery of HeadsUp! Reading, on conducting mentor visits, and on the use of the data collection tools; oriented and trained AmeriCorps members to support the work of mentors and participating teaching staff; oriented Providence Public Library staff to the project; assigned all treatment group teachers and family child care providers to either day or evening class sections, all in preparation for full implementation of the professional development intervention which began in September 2007.

Performance Measure 3.1

Projects will offer an increasing number of hours of high-quality professional development to early childhood educators. High-quality professional development is ongoing, intensive, classroom-focused, and based on scientific research on early childhood cognitive and social development, including the age-appropriate development of oral language, phonological awareness, print awareness, alphabet knowledge, and numeracy skills, and on effective pedagogy for young children. High-quality professional development also includes instruction in the effective administration of age-appropriate assessment of young children and the use of assessment results.

START-UP PHASE (October to December 2006)

At the evaluation meeting held in late November 2006 at the USDOE ECEPD grantees meeting in Washington, DC, Ready to Learn Providence worked with the Department consultant, Dr. Michael Kamil, and our external evaluators from the Education Alliance at Brown University to modify our professional development intervention to support a more rigorous

external evaluation. Following the meeting, R2LP analyzed the feasibility of the suggested modifications as they related to the budget and the timeline for implementation. Among the most significant considerations impacting R2LP's management of the intervention was a recommendation to drop the first course in a series of three that had been proposed, namely Mind in the Making. It was recommended that we drop Mind in the Making as a required course and shift it to an optional course. We determined to do so because GPRA reporting focused on children's early literacy skill development and Mind in the Making focused on children's social and emotional development. By making the Mind in the Making course optional, we would be better able to supply the Department with the necessary GPRA data and allow us to collect more relevant baseline data for the evaluation. Despite the reduction, two courses continue to represent a level of intervention that met R2LP's own criteria for offering programming with significant depth, dosage and duration.

A positive consequence of reducing the number of required courses to two, (HeadsUp! Reading and Early Literacy Curriculum) is that R2LP had the potential, should the existing budget allow for it, to involve more participants and in turn support a more powerful evaluation model. The Providence Plan and R2LP staff reanalyzed the ECEPD budget to test the feasibility of involving more than the 200 participants originally proposed. R2LP also examined ways to expand the pool of potential participants beyond Providence. Based on child care licensing data obtained from the RI Department of Children, Youth and Families and a review of family income data in bordering towns and cities, R2LP analyzed the potential to expand the recruitment efforts. Based on our analysis, R2LP determined that two cities in the Greater Providence area, Central Falls and Pawtucket RI, also met the Department's absolute priority and would allow us to expand the pool of potential sites we recruited to the project. While this increased the level of effort related to recruitment, R2LP determined that it was feasible to do so within the existing budget, with one caveat. R2LP had already secured significant resources for the now optional Mind in the Making course from the United Way of RI. These resources were included as part of our ECEPD match. In subsequent discussions with USDOE, it was agreed that R2LP could continue to count funding for Mind in the Making as a legitimate source of ECEPD match. Thus, R2LP was able to increase the number of participants from the 200 that was originally proposed to 288.

The decision to make Mind in the Making optional also moved up the timeline for the development and delivery of the Early Literacy Curriculum for Young Children course. R2LP originally planned to develop the course over the summer and fall of 2007 for implementation in January of 2008. In order to accommodate the revised plan, R2LP agreed to develop a pilot course for the fidelity phase by March 2007. Developing the course a year ahead of schedule presented us with several challenges. We had to design the course simultaneously to implementing it. We also needed to work with our higher education partners to ensure that participants would get credit for a class that had yet to be approved by their curriculum review committees. On the plus side, we had the benefit of collecting feedback from the teachers participating in the pilot course which could be incorporated into a refined course before full implementation in January 2008.

A revised evaluation plan was submitted to the Department in December 2006 and R2LP immediately began carrying out plans for implementing the Fidelity Phase.

#### FIDELITY PHASE (January to June 2007)

**R2LP OBJECTIVE:** To provide a research-based professional development intervention to 288 early childhood educators (ECEs) with a level of depth, dosage and duration needed to transform teaching practice in the areas of early literacy, social and emotional development, curriculum and assessment.

During the Fidelity Phase, R2LP piloted and implemented the professional development program in a highly accelerated timeframe. R2LP recruited teachers to take two college courses during one 15- week semester which required them to attend classes two afternoons each week. R2LP had already cultivated a healthy partnership with Providence Head Start under the leadership of its former executive director and education manager. Both Head Start leaders fully committed the agency's participation in the ECEPD grant and recognized the long-term benefits to the children, teachers and the early care and education field as a whole. They agreed to rearrange schedules and to release teaching staff on agency time to attend the college courses and made all the necessary arrangements on our behalf. We are indebted to both of them for their unwavering support and flexibility during this challenging phase of recruitment and implementation.

Teachers from 20 Head Start classrooms operating on a half-day basis were randomly selected by the evaluator to participate in the Fidelity Phase. Full-day classrooms were excluded from this phase as R2LP and Head Start leadership agreed that attending classes twice a week within the accelerated timeframe would be unduly burdensome for teachers in full day classrooms and difficult for the agency to arrange. Of the 20 half-day Head Start classrooms selected by random assignment, 10 classrooms served as treatment classrooms and 10 served as control classrooms.

In the meantime, by January 2007 our external evaluator, the Education Alliance at Brown University, had begun to experience what would become a considerable delay of three months in obtaining IRB approval. R2LP had requested and anticipated the opportunity to review those portions of the written IRB materials it was permissible for the Education Alliance to share, prior to their submission. We specifically requested the opportunity to review those sections in which the Education Alliance described R2LP as an organization, described R2LP's plans for the implementation of professional

development, and the parent and participant consent forms.

While R2LP understood that the Education Alliance had responsibility for relaying information regarding their participation in the evaluation to participants and parents, R2LP staff was already actively engaged in the process of recruiting participants. R2LP staff needed to be clear about these matters and ensure consistency as both R2LP and the Education Alliance spoke with members of the R2LP community. The director of Head Start had also requested that R2LP provide her with the opportunity to see the consent forms to ensure that the parent consent forms were accessible to the literacy levels and languages spoken by Head Start parents. The Head Start Board of Directors had unanimously agreed to participate in the research but were naturally cautious about the participation of children in the study. R2LP and the Head Start director had reassured the Board that the external research component would be carried out with sensitivity.

In a related matter, R2LP had previous experience reviewing the Education Alliance's revisions to the ECEPD project's Evaluation Design. This process had required that R2LP provide the Education Alliance with dozens of edits in the sections that related to professional development implementation as well as in the number of participants used by the Alliance in calculating the evaluation formulae. R2LP wanted to review the IRB documents to ensure they accurately reflected the commitments we had made for implementation. The Education Alliance did not supply R2LP with copies of any sections of the IRB materials prior to their submission in January.

Following the January IRB meeting, the Education Alliance informed R2LP that the Brown IRB had requested revisions to the consent forms. R2LP requested and the Education Alliance agreed to provide copies of the revised consent forms to R2LP for review a few days prior to their resubmission to the IRB. The Education Alliance resubmitted the documents to meet the IRB deadline but did not provide R2LP the opportunity to review them. The Education Alliance later sent the consent forms to R2LP via email indicating that "we (the Education Alliance) are not allowed . . .to (have R2LP's) input on these documents, period."

R2LP reviewed the consent forms and notified the Education Alliance about our specific concerns, most notably the readability of the parental consent forms. In a follow up phone conversation with the Principal Investigator for the evaluation, R2LP was told that Director of the Human Research Protections Office (HRPO) was too busy to meet and that the Education Alliance would handle all matters related to the IRB. She stated that once materials were submitted, revisions were not possible before the IRB met. She also threatened that R2LP's involvement had the potential to derail the project. R2LP's project director reiterated that she had requested the opportunity for advance review in order to ensure that the parent consent forms were sensitive to the literacy levels of parents and did not undermine the confidence of the Head Start director regarding participation in the research study.

The R2LP director made the decision to contact the Director of HRPO at Brown directly by phone. The HRPO director stated that the delays in IRB approval were due to a "lack of detail and clarity in the original protocol for risk/benefit determination." She also noted that R2LP had the right to have input on the IRB consent forms. R2LP requested that the HRPO director convey this information to the Education Alliance.

The Education Alliance subsequently met with R2LP to review the forms. Only a few business days remained before the February IRB meeting. The Education Alliance indicated that staff of the Alliance had no time to make further changes before the IRB meeting. R2LP volunteered to review Brown's IRB protocols and revise the parental consent form for review by the Education Alliance in time for the February IRB meeting. R2LP modified the language to meet the literacy levels of Head Start parents and arranged a meeting with the Head Start director for her review. With one minor revision, the Education Alliance agreed that the new form met the Brown IRB guidelines. The Education Alliance then modified the remaining consent materials to reflect both R2LP staff and the Head Start director's input. The HRPO officer agreed to include the revised forms in the Education Alliance's revised IRB package for review at the February IRB meeting.

Matters unrelated to the consent forms were raised at the February IRB meeting and final IRB approval was postponed until the March 15 meeting. The Education Alliance notified R2LP that they were confident of gaining IRB approval at the March meeting. IRB approval was granted on March 15. While data collection got underway immediately thereafter, it was already seven weeks into the implementation period.

R2LP had postponed implementation as long as possible; however, by February 2007, could no longer delay the implementation and deliver the full complement of coursework before the participating teachers were laid off by Head Start for the summer. The external evaluator would also be assessing the fidelity of R2LP's implementation and things had to get underway. The professional development implementation officially began in February 2007.

We offered the two courses during the Fidelity Phase - HeadsUp! Reading and Early Literacy Curriculum. R2LP had originally proposed to offer Early Literacy Curriculum for the first time in January of 2008 to allow sufficient time to fully develop and refine a new college course and get it approved through the higher education system. Thanks to the tireless efforts of the R2LP professional development team assigned to the Fidelity Phase of implementation and with the support of our partners at the Community College of Rhode Island and Wheelock College, R2LP was able to develop and launch the

pilot course to meet the March 2007 timetable.

Other modifications to the implementation plan became necessary during the Fidelity Phase. Original plans called for a total of six mentor visits per participant, three visits by R2LP mentors during each of the two courses, spanning a nine month period. Given the accelerated timetable and need for the external evaluators to be present in classrooms to collect pre- and post-evaluation data, it was agreed that conducting six mentor visits was both unrealistic and burdensome for participating teachers. R2LP reduced the number of mentor visits from six to three which were conducted during the Fidelity Phase. At the request of the participants, a fourth mentor visit was conducted in the fall of 2007 when Head Start teachers returned to their classrooms after summer layoffs.

The GPRA data supplied within this report relates directly to the treatment and control classrooms that were part of the fidelity cohort. All children in participating classrooms attended Head Start on a part day basis (four hours).

**R2LP MILESTONE:** All project staff, facilitators, instructors, and mentors will take part in activities to ensure fidelity of intervention and refine their leadership skills.

The professional development team working directly with the Fidelity Cohort not only delivered the pilot program, they garner regular feedback from participants throughout the semester that allowed us to gather information that would inform future program modifications. The highly skilled team included Stephanie Enos, Tania Quezada and Terri Coustan. Ms. Enos served as the lead facilitator. She has a M.Ed. in Curriculum Development, is the former R2LP Director of Professional Development and has over 15 years experience in the field of early care and education. Ms. Quezada is R2LP's Director of Community Learning and she co-facilitated the courses with Ms. Enos. Ms. Quezada has led R2LP's efforts to bring HeadsUp! Reading to over 400 early care and education providers in the city over the past four years. Terri Coustan served as a mentor. Ms. Coustan has an MS in Early Childhood Education and worked for more than 10 years with a highly diverse population of refugees through the International Institute of RI. Ms. Coustan also attended all classes to become better acquainted with members of the fidelity cohort and to help us gather information necessary to refine the programming that would inform the facilitator and mentor training program to be held in the summer of 2007. All three members of the team shared the responsibility for mentoring the small group of ECEs in the fidelity cohort.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** 288 ECEs will participate in two core courses for young children consisting of up to 90 hours of classroom-based intervention.

In the Fidelity Phase of the project, the 15 ECEs completed two core courses, HeadsUp! Reading and Early Literacy Curriculum over a four month period from February 2007 through May of 2007. Their employer, Providence Head Start, allowed them to attend classes at Ready to Learn Providence on Monday and Friday afternoons for 15 weeks during their regular work hours. Given the accelerated nature of the fidelity cohort, the other demands on the time of participating Head Start teachers and the intensity of attending classes twice a week, we reduced the total hours of instruction from 90 to 75 (37.5 hours per course). The participants, teachers from 10 Head Start classrooms and assistants from five of those classrooms, had diverse educational backgrounds: four had a high school diploma or less, six had some college coursework, seven had Associate Degrees and three had Bachelor Degrees. They ranged in age from 23 to 57 with an average age of 43. All but one spoke English as a first language. All training was conducted in English as all participating ECEs were fluent in English.

As noted earlier, the first time R2LP was to deliver Early Literacy Curriculum was in January of 2008. The decision to implement a fidelity cohort, a full-scale accelerated version of the project, necessitated the delivery of Early Literacy Curriculum a full year earlier than planned. R2LP staff members, together with faculty from Wheelock College and the Community College of Rhode Island, designed the course collaboratively, working diligently and conscientiously to create the course despite the abbreviated timeline. Our pilot course began with an overview of the objectives and research underpinnings of OWL utilizing the Rhode Island Early Learning Standards as the framework for developing a comprehensive, preschool curriculum.

The OWL curriculum is currently available only in English, and during the fidelity cohort, all of our participants were English speaking. During year two of the project, R2LP will have completed translation of critical concepts and resources into Spanish as a component of delivering this course. We will also augment the high-quality children's books that are part of OWL with bilingual books of similar genres and quality. This approach will also promote English-language acquisition by ECEs and the children they serve.

The 15 participants in the fidelity cohort completed course evaluations for both HeadsUp! Reading and Early Literacy Curriculum. All 15 rated the overall quality of HeadsUp! Reading as either excellent or good and all 15 rated the overall quality of the Early Literacy Curriculum course as excellent. Summary reports of the evaluation forms were provided to our Program Officer, Rosemary Fennell, during the monitoring visit in July of 2007. The following are direct quotes taken from final evaluation forms: "I've learned new teaching strategies and that print awareness is very important for my children to

succeed"; "I have learned how important it is to have books and writing materials in all the areas of my classroom"; "I have learned the importance of adding reading materials in all the centers. Placing literacy materials in block and dramatic play has sparked interest to read and pre-write for students who were not interested in books and writing before."

**R2LP MILESTONE:** Mentors will conduct six site visits of three hours in length during the two-course intervention, do observations and co-create strategies to support participant learning.

Three mentor visits per participant were conducted from February to May 2007. Participants were given the option of having a fourth visit in September 2007 when Head Start reopened; all fifteen participants requested the fourth visit. We were unable to complete all six visits due to the abbreviated time period (four months as compared with nine). Multiple visits by external evaluators to collect pre and post data were also occurring during this accelerated time frame. Three mentors conducted the visits: Stephanie Enos, Terri Coustan and Tania Quezada. In addition to mentoring, Stephanie Enos and Tania Quezada co-facilitated the two courses, HeadsUp! Reading and Early Literacy Curriculum and Terri Coustan, the mentor, attended all of the classes playing a supportive role. To guide the mentor visits, R2LP developed materials based upon the research-based content and skills identified in HeadsUp! Reading, the Dickinson and Schikendanz curriculum Opening the World of Learning (OWL) and the mentoring approach in the ACYF publication Putting the PRO in Protege. Additionally, R2LP adapted the observation tool contained in the NAEYC publication, Learning to Read and Write as a literacy checklist. This tool allowed mentors to reference the teachings of HeadsUp! Reading as a framework for each mentoring visit.

During the fidelity cohort, the mentors were utilizing the mentoring observation tools simultaneous to their development, allowing for constant revision and modification as mentors learned more about their role and how they could best support the ECEs. The fidelity cohort afforded us the opportunity to test out the tools; by the end of the pilot, we had a much better understanding of how the tools could both support the mentor visits as well as inform our understanding of what had transpired during the visits for planning and evaluation purposes. We learned that the open-ended nature of the tool that we utilized during the Fidelity Phase did not adequately capture the focused nature of the early literacy intervention. We spent the summer revising the mentor tool so that we now have a coding mechanism built into the form that allows us to capture the information that we need.

All 15 participants in the Fidelity Phase rated their learning experiences with their mentor as good or excellent. The following comments are taken from the final mentor evaluation forms in response to the question, "What was most successful about the mentoring visits?": "The encouragement and guidance of my mentor. It was nice to have someone who I can go to for questions and comments"; "How to set up my classroom; how important print awareness is"; "My mentor brought to light both my strengths and weaknesses in a positive way."

Fidelity cohort participants continue to feel connected to their mentors as evidenced by this email received by a mentor from a Head Start teacher in September 2007: "We are only 5 days into having children and already my kids are enthusiastic about reading and books. I actually have all 20 children asking for a 2nd and 3rd story at group time. We have already talked about authors and they actually ask who the author is before I even say the title. They are really into the books that the author has placed their picture in. What an INSPIRATION!!!! Come visit....would love to see you my mentor."

**R2LP MILESTONE:** 288 ECEs will each receive 10 visits from trained AmeriCorps members who will deliver library and other resources based on mentor-devised strategies.

Each participant received three visits from a trained AmeriCorps member who delivered library materials and supported the mentor/ECE relationship. Again, multiple visits by our external evaluator were occurring simultaneously to mentor and AmeriCorps visits during an accelerated timeframe. We intentionally limited AmeriCorps site visits to reduce the burden on participating teachers and children. While mentors and ECEs were meeting, AmeriCorps members read to children and implemented small-group literacy activities. They also ensured that teachers had library cards and brought books and other resources from the library to the classrooms. Time constraints during the fidelity period did not allow for more than three visits; however, during Full Implementation of the project, each participant will receive 10 visits from an AmeriCorps member.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** 288 ECEs will participate in an average of 20 hours of R2LP Club and other leadership and professional activities during the course of the project.

Two sections of Mind the Making, an optional course for all ECEs in the project, were offered at one of our partnering Head Start Centers. Twenty-six Head Start Staff members completed this 36 hour class on children's social and emotional development. The course has 12 Modules, which include: 1) Teachers Make a Difference; 2) Relationships are Essential; 3) How Learning Begins; 4) Social, Emotional and Intellectual Together; 5) Building Confidence and Competence; 6) Understanding Temperament; 7) Learning to Read Other's Thoughts and Feelings; 8) Encouraging Curiosity and Problem Solving; 9) Using Language to Make Meaning of Experience; 10) Memory and Learning; 11) Stress and Learning; 12) Creating Communities of Learners. The Community College of Rhode Island offers three college credits for the completion

of Mind in the Making. Because the R2LP Club is specifically for family child care providers, our fidelity cohort participants, all Head Start teachers, did not partake in any club activities.

#### FULL IMPLEMENTATION PHASE (July 2007 to October 2007)

**R2LP OBJECTIVE:** To provide a research-based professional development intervention to 288 early childhood educators (ECEs) with a level of depth, dosage and duration needed to transform teaching practice in the areas of early literacy, social and emotional development, curriculum and assessment.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** All project staff, facilitators, instructors, and mentors will take part in activities to ensure fidelity of intervention and refine their leadership skills.

The R2LP course facilitators and mentors are a group of well-educated ECEs and literacy specialists that represent diverse cultures, language backgrounds and professional experience. We received over 120 applications and interviewed 40 candidates for these positions; of these, 19 individuals are currently working as course facilitators and mentors. Training began in July of 2007 with an intensive week of orientation to Ready to Learn Providence, HeadsUp! Reading and mentoring materials including Putting the Pro in Protege: A Guide to Mentoring in Head Start and Early Head Start. Rosemary Fennell and Dr. Michael Kamil spoke briefly with the facilitation/mentoring teams during the July 2007 site visit. Training continues monthly in three-hour sessions and is devoted to strengthening observation and communication skills, extending literacy knowledge, problem-solving and analysis of challenges. Additionally, half of the ECEPD mentors and facilitators also attend an optional three hour session each month as part of a graduate program in leadership being offered by R2LP in collaboration with Wheelock College. Each term, a Wheelock College course that is related to mentoring and leadership is offered for mentors and conducted as a course in applied research on mentoring practice. Graduate credits can be applied to an MA in Leadership or to a specialized mentor certificate from Wheelock College.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** 288 ECEs will participate in two core courses for young children consisting of up to 90 hours of classroom-based intervention.

As noted earlier, in the Fidelity Phase, 15 ECEs had already completed the required coursework before Full Implementation began. At the onset of the Full Implementation Phase, a total of 145 teachers started classes in September of 2007, bringing the grand total number of ECEs participating in the professional development to 160. The remaining 130 ECEs are part of the control group and will take classes beginning in September of 2008.

Of the original 145 members who began classes in September 2007, 134 ECEs remain enrolled in HeadsUp! Reading as of October 31, 2007 (see Indicator Two for details regarding the impact on the project of recent state budget cuts.) Of these, 50 are Head Start teachers and assistant teachers, 33 are educators in community-based child care programs and 51 are family child care providers. HeadsUp! Reading classes meet once per week for three hours for 15 weeks; the Early Literacy Curriculum course will begin in January 2008 and each class section will follow the same day or evening schedule. Fifty-one participants are taking classes during their work day thanks to special arrangements with their employer; 83 people are attending classes in the evenings on their own time.

All participants are taking two core courses: HeadsUp! Reading and Early Literacy Curriculum. HeadsUp! Reading is a nationally-recognized distance learning course that equips ECEs with the latest research on how young children learn to read and write. Through the course, ECEs learn how to engage children in early literacy activities and how to create high-quality classroom environments. The video-based program serves to maintain the fidelity of the programming and cultivates a common knowledge base across participant groups. On-site facilitators enhance the experience, providing a local context, answering questions, and reinforcing the curriculum. The course features faculty led by Sue Bredekamp, Ph.D. and guest speakers such as David Dickinson, Ph.D., Susan Neuman, Ph.D., William H. Teale, Ph.D., and other key leaders in the field of early childhood education.

The curriculum is based on a synthesis of the research by the National Academy of Science that focuses on reading difficulties in young children. Divided into seven modules: Curriculum, Assessment, Playing, Talking, Reading, Writing, and Learning the Code, the course also focuses on phonological awareness and alphabet knowledge. Each class includes time to view the program, participate in discussions about course content, and review class assignments. R2LP enhances the programming with community partners such as the Providence Public Library children's library staff who register participants for teacher cards that entitle them to special library privileges. The library also introduces ECEs to their collection of Learning and Reading Kits (LARKs), thematic kits of age-appropriate books, manipulatives, and activities that R2LP and the Library have jointly sponsored to support ECEs throughout the city. Higher education representatives also provide participants with information about career development options at both the community college and university levels.

The second course, the Early Literacy Curriculum for Young Children, provides ECEs with hands-on experience in implementing a structured early literacy curriculum with Opening the World of Learning (OWL) as the foundation of the course. Authored by Judy Schickenez and David Dickinson, OWL is a comprehensive early literacy program structured around a pedagogical model that emphasizes curriculum, methodology, and cognitive socialization. Highly structured and based upon early childhood research, OWL promotes the importance of educators in providing children with intentional instruction and places special emphasis on development of English Language Learners.

In the months since the completion of the Early Literacy Curriculum course during the Fidelity Phase, a team of R2LP staff members and consultants have been working to create a course that can be delivered with fidelity across all nine sections. We have designed a facilitator's guide, a participant guide and accompanying power points for all 15 modules of the course to ensure that all ECEs who are participating in the project receive the same course content. Consultants include faculty from Wheelock College and the Community College of Rhode Island. Additionally, Joni Block, a National Faculty Member for Pearson Early Learning Company, the publishers of OWL, has worked with us to ensure that OWL is deeply embedded in the Early Literacy Curriculum course. Ms. Block is an experienced OWL trainer and has worked closely with ECEs in the Charlotte-Mecklenberg School District where OWL was piloted. She currently works for the Brockton School District where OWL is fully integrated into all preschool classrooms. We are also in the process of translating the 15 modules into Spanish. Delivery of the Early Literacy Curriculum course will begin in January of 2008.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** Mentors will conduct six visits of three hours in length during the two-course intervention, do observations and co-create strategies to support participant learning.

During the summer of 2007 we redesigned the data collection tools utilized by mentors so they would both guide the visit as well as reflect it back to us. The redesigned tool, the Mentor Visit Summary, includes a new coding system that allows us to capture the various ways in which mentors utilize their time during each visit. Time can be allocated in the following categories: relationship building, early literacy planning, observation, observation feedback, implementation/demonstration, reflection and other. The tool also serves as a means to document the content covered during each visit using the following categories: alphabet knowledge, concepts of prints, oral language, phonological awareness, vocabulary, writing, books, curriculum/assessment, English language development, environmental print, home connection, and the learning environment. The R2LP Early Literacy Checklist (adapted from a checklist included in the publication Learning to Read and Write) is cross-referenced with these literacy-content codes. While mentors are encouraged to individualize their interactions with ECEs, the codes guide the visits, ensuring that the focus is on early literacy concepts and that there is fidelity of implementation across ECEs. Copies of the Mentor Visit Summary and the R2LP Early Literacy Checklist are attached as PDF files.

As of this reporting period, each of the 134 treatment group participants representing 90 learning environments had received one mentoring visit. During trainings for mentors, we specified that the first visit should focus on building a relationship with the participant, classroom observation, and early literacy planning. R2LP's analysis of the Mentor Visit Summary forms resulting from the first mentor visits confirms that the mentors spent the majority of each visit getting to know their protege (relationship building), observing, and doing early literacy planning. The data show that both the first observation and the early literacy planning during the first mentor visit largely focused on books, environmental print and the learning environment.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** 288 ECEs will each receive 10 visits from trained AmeriCorps members who will deliver library and other resources based on mentor-devised strategies.

During their year of service, AmeriCorps members at R2LP receive extensive training in early childhood education. They all take three college level courses: HeadsUp! Reading, Mind in the Making, and How Ready is Providence? earning them nine portable college credits in addition to the education award that they receive at the end of the year of service. HeadsUp! Reading provides them with the early literacy tools to support and guide them through their visits to early childhood educators. Mind in the Making is a rigorous and comprehensive professional development initiative developed by the Families and Work Institute that connects children's social, emotional and cognitive development. How Ready is Providence? is a course that examines 24 indicators of child well-being in the city of Providence. With these three courses as a foundation, AmeriCorps members are well equipped to support the interaction between participants and mentors. As of this reporting period, each of the 134 treatment group participants representing 90 learning environments had received at least one visit by an AmeriCorps member.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** 288 ECEs will participate in an average of 20 hours of R2LP Club and other leadership and professional activities during the course of the project.

Mind in the Making, was offered at one of our partnering child care centers, The Salvation Army, in the fall of 2007. Seventeen ECEs completed the course. The R2LP Club, open to all family child care providers who have either completed

or are currently enrolled in HeadsUp! Reading, are organizing a series of professional development workshops for late 2007 and 2008. Sponsored by R2LP, the club is working in partnership with Recycling for Rhode Island Education (RRIE) to support family child care providers in becoming leaders and facilitators of curriculum workshops in Spanish on behalf of their peers. RRIE is a women-initiated and operated non-profit educational and environmental organization. Its vision is to encourage self-discovery by active participation in teaching and learning through creative experiences. RRIE has as its mission to encourage preservation of the environment by diverting clean non-toxic reusable excess inventory from the business community to educators and community organizations.

#### Performance Measure 3.2

#### BACKGROUND AND START-UP PHASE (October to December 2006)

Of the projected 288 early childhood educators who will participate in the project over the three year period, 168 will represent center based programs and 120 will represent family child care providers. To gain a better appreciation for why we have chosen this distribution for our project, it helps to know a little more about the early care and education landscape in Providence.

When welfare reform was enacted, Rhode Island responded with a progressive child care entitlement program. The policy helped support families as they made the transition from welfare to work and stimulated unprecedented growth of the regulated child care market. While the number of child care slots in center-based programs remained relatively stable, the number of family child care homes in Providence (now 723), particularly those operated by Spanish-speakers (570), rose by 40%.

Over the past decade, the number of Latino families in Providence with young children has nearly doubled. While some Spanish-speaking ECEs have joined center-based programs during this time, most work in family child care homes where language is not a barrier and Latino culture is fully embraced. Economics and convenience have also played a role. One quarter of Latino families in the city lack access to a vehicle, thus making the home-based provider on the block a convenient choice.

According to R2LP's How Ready is Providence? report, there are an estimated 6,000 children under age five in the city who participate in regulated early care and education. More than half (54%) are served in home-based facilities of which 78% have a Spanish-speaking ECE. Thirty-five percent of children are in center-based programs, 9% are served by Head Start, and 2% are enrolled in public pre-k programs. In planning our ECEPD model, R2LP has purposefully designed an intervention that targets ECEs in the settings where children are presently served.

#### FIDELITY PHASE (January to June 2007)

Because implementation could not begin until January of 2007, the Department of Education approved a Fidelity Phase of the professional development intervention that would allow us to test our implementation plan including the design and refinement of our mentoring tools and evaluation materials. The participants in the Fidelity Cohort completed an accelerated version of the professional development program, attending courses (HeadsUp! Reading, followed by Early Literacy Curriculum) twice weekly for a four month period as opposed to once a week over nine months. Given the accelerated intervention, they received four mentoring visits (as opposed to six) and the supportive services of AmeriCorps members. During the fidelity cohort, participants were all Head Start teachers and teacher assistants, as our agreement with Head Start allowed for staff members to attend classes during their work day. Twenty Head Start classrooms were randomly selected to participate in the fidelity cohort; 10 were assigned to treatment and 10 to control. All of the teachers from the treatment classes and five of the assistants were granted permission by Head Start to attend classes at R2LP twice a week for a 15-week period from February through May 2007. Participants represented three of the eight Head Start centers in our community; all worked in part-day morning programs.

#### FULL IMPLEMENTATION PHASE (July 2007 to October 2007)

In years two and three of the intervention, participants will include teachers and teacher assistants from 48 Head Start classrooms from the seven Head Start centers that serve the Providence/Blackstone Valley community. Despite significant change in leadership and administration at Head Start, we have a commitment from the current interim management company, Community Development Institute (CDI) that they will honor the terms of the partnership established by R2LP and the previous Executive Director and Board of Directors allowing for the participation of every Head Start teacher and assistant teacher. By the end of year three, 116 teachers and assistant teachers from Head Start will be served by the project. This is the first time that Head Start has given all of their teaching staff the opportunity to take classes during their work day

and demonstrates a rigorous effort to prioritize early language and literacy curriculum and instruction.

A priority for year one was the recruitment of early childhood educators from community based centers and family child care providers who would participate in years two and three of the project. The random control experimental design necessitated the up-front recruitment of all participants so that half could be assigned to treatment and the other half assigned to "delayed treatment." From February through August 2007, the Director of Professional Development met with Center Directors and/or staff members from 24 center-based programs located in Providence, all of which serve low-income children and meet USDOE absolute priority guidelines. The project was explained initially to the Center Director; staff members were then invited to attend an information session where they viewed a power point presentation about the initiative and received written materials regarding the professional development and the research study. Similarly, R2LP hosted a series of information sessions for family child care providers. Utilizing data from the RI Department of Human Services and the RI Department of Children Youth and Families, we recruited family child care providers serving children from the poorest neighborhoods in the city of Providence and held a series of evening sessions during which we explained the professional development and the research study.

In June 2007, the Rhode Island General Assembly passed a state budget that reduced the eligibility criteria for subsidized childcare from 225% of poverty to 185%, effectively eliminating over 1,900 children (approximately 40% of whom live in Providence) under the age of five from the subsidy system. While the cuts would not go into effect until September, the impact was immediate. Two large YMCA programs closed. Directors prepared for a potentially significant drop in enrollment come September 2007. In a survey conducted by R2LP before the cuts went into effect, 19 center directors responded to questions regarding the perceived impact. A copy of this report was given to the USDOE during the July 2007 site visit. All but one of the center directors said the proposed cuts would have a negative, even devastating, financial impact on their centers and agencies. In cases where the center is part of a larger agency, most said there would be a negative impact on other services as well. Layoffs of staff would be almost inevitable, most said, and quality might decline due to limited resources. Many of the staff at child-care centers rely on subsidies for their own children; without which they could no longer afford to work. Directors seemed acutely aware of the spiraling impact the proposed cuts would have on their centers, employees and the quality of programming.

For family child care providers, the impact is equally devastating. The providers who responded to the survey believed the proposed cuts would have a negative impact on them, their businesses, their livelihood and the well-being of their own families. Many, in fact, said the cuts could force them to close their programs. Those with larger businesses feared that cuts would force them to lay off assistants or reduce their wages. The quality of their services, many noted, would suffer.

Faced with the potential loss of well over 750 children from the regulated child care industry in Providence alone and recognizing how this could undermine our ability to recruit the even larger population of 288 providers we had committed to recruit, R2LP expanded eligibility to participate in our ECEPD program to early childhood educators, both center-based and family providers working in two adjacent cities demographically similar to Providence - Pawtucket and Central Falls. Both cities meet the USDOE's absolute priority. Information sessions were conducted for the staff at the six largest child care programs and for family child care providers in these two communities. We also redoubled our recruitment efforts and attempted to over-recruit both center based program staff and family child care providers.

Our evaluation design calls for the participation of 120 family providers and center-based early childhood educators from 84 classrooms. By the end of August, a total of 170 family providers attended one of 10 information sessions hosted at R2LP and 133 providers signed up to participate in the project. All providers were screened in advance via telephone to ensure that they were serving preschool aged children. By the end of the summer of 2007, the majority of providers who were not signed up for participation in the project were ineligible to do so as they no longer had preschool age children in their care.

On the center-based side, R2LP intentionally recruited more classrooms than the 84 called for in the evaluation design. Altogether we recruited a total of 97 classrooms. In our original design, data from the 20 classrooms involved in the fidelity cohort was to be included in the final study; however, given the accelerated nature of the fidelity cohort and the lack of reliable and valid data due to the IRB delays which resulted in a six-week interval between pre- and post-testing, we recruited sufficient classrooms to keep the data from the fidelity cohort separate from the main study. By the end of August, we were able to submit to our external evaluator, DSRobinson & Associates, the names of staff members from 87 classrooms in Head Start centers and community based programs and 133 family child care providers. Forty-four classrooms and 67 family providers were randomly assigned to the treatment group and 43 classrooms/66 family providers were randomly assigned to the control group.

Unfortunately, this would not be the last of the recruitment related challenges. Nineteen hundred (1,900) children in Rhode Island lost their subsidized child care on September 1, 2007. The impact on our project was immediate. Before our classes even started, seven family child care providers were forced to close their business because they no longer had children to serve, and within the first few weeks of our classes, an additional 10 providers were forced to leave the program as a direct result of the budget cuts. They either closed their business or accepted a second job in the evening, precluding them from attending class. The impact on our partnerships in the community was somewhat less dramatic due to the fact that the great majority of Head Start classrooms were not impacted by declining enrollments; however, our other community partners lost

many children as a direct result of the loss of subsidy dollars. One of our partners saw their enrollment drop from 129 children to 69. As anticipated, a few centers were forced to lay off staff members.

Despite the enormity of the budget cuts, we began nine sections of HeadsUp! Reading classes in late September, six in English and three in Spanish. Three of the English sections take place during the day and serve 45 Head Start participants. The other six sessions, three in English and three in Spanish, meet in the evening hours and serve both family child care providers and staff from community centers. In total, 134 participants are enrolled in HeadsUp! Reading. Of these 86 were enrolled in English classes and 48 enrolled in Spanish classes. Participants in the English classes represent 11 community-based centers, six Head Start centers, and four family child care providers. Forty-seven family providers and one center-based provider are enrolled in the Spanish classes. In the control group, we have staff members from nine community-based programs, seven Head Start sites and 55 family providers.

Before Ready to Learn Providence brought HeadsUp! Reading to our community in 2002, there were no courses in early literacy available at any of the colleges. The Community College of Rhode Island (CCRI) has since introduced an elective course in emergent literacy which is offered only once during an academic year. It is never offered on the Providence campus of CCRI which makes it inaccessible for many Providence-based educators. As a result, ECEs in our community did not have a realistic way to take an early literacy course. Currently, as a result of the efforts of Ready to Learn Providence, over 400 ECEs have already taken HeadsUp! Reading and through the ECEPD grant, an additional 280 will be served. In the spring of 2007, CCRI approved HeadsUp! Reading as a three-credit course. Of the 15 Head Start staff members who took the course during the fidelity cohort, five have received college credit from CCRI towards their Associate Degrees and seven have received credit through the University of Rhode Island towards their Bachelor Degrees. The remaining three individuals already had their Bachelor Degrees, although they had never taken a course in early literacy. They received Professional Development Credit through the Rhode Island Department of Education.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** All participating ECEs will have access to college-level coursework in English or Spanish.

The Community College of Rhode Island is a four-campus institution serving the entire state. It is the only community college in RI. The Department of Human Services serves as the institutional home for Early Childhood Education at CCRI. The Department chair, Jerry Hatfield, has worked closely with Ready to Learn Providence to create and promote opportunities for professional development for Spanish-speaking ECEs who do not possess sufficient English language skills to benefit from coursework in English. In a proposal to his department, Mr. Hatfield wrote, "Given the college's mission and Rhode Island's shifting demographics, it is appropriate now to begin to offer a few introductory-level courses taught in Spanish, linked to ESL courses, thus engaging this population into higher education, while at the same time insuring their fluency in English." Jerry Hatfield shared his plans to submit this proposal with Rosemary Fennell and Dr. Michael Kamil during their July 2007 ECEPD site visit. Additionally, in collaboration with Ready to Learn Providence, CCRI has recently approved an 18-credit certificate program in Early Childhood Education. Three of the required six courses (HeadsUp! Reading, Mind in the Making, and Early Literacy Curriculum) are available in both English and Spanish through Ready to Learn Providence and the ECEPD grant. Jerry Hatfield has visited all nine of our ECEPD sections of HeadsUp! Reading to inform participants about the certificate program. Although the remaining three courses necessary to earn a certificate are currently only offered in English, R2LP is working with CCRI to create a bilingual approach that will allow individuals to begin coursework in Spanish and gradually transition to English.

Ready to Learn Providence is partnering with both CCRI and the University of Rhode Island (URI) to award three college credits for HeadsUp! Reading and the Early Literacy Curriculum course to participants who take the class in either English or Spanish. In year two of the project, we are offering six English sections and three Spanish sections of the two classes with the option of receiving credit at either CCRI or URI. Through their partnership with Ready to Learn Providence, this marks the first time in the history of both CCRI and URI that these institutions are offering college credit for content classes taken in a language other than English.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** All participating ECEs who are English language learners will be given the opportunity to voluntarily participate in "English for ECEs" to support language acquisition efforts.

During the fidelity period, all participating ECEs took their coursework in English. In preparation for year two of the project, we collaborated with the Genesis Center, a highly regarded adult education agency in Providence, and jointly submitted a grant to the Rhode Island Department of Education to fund English language classes for ECEs. We received notification of funding in June of 2007, and in September, ESL classes began for Ready to Learn Providence participants. All Spanish speaking ECEs in the control group were invited to participate, at no cost, in these evening ESL classes. Classes meet twice weekly for a total of five hours per week on Monday and Wednesday evenings. In September, 55 Spanish speaking providers took the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (known as CASAS) at the Genesis Center and based upon the results, they were placed in either beginner, intermediate or advanced classes. Over the three year grant period, all Spanish speaking participants will be given the opportunity to take ESL classes.

R2LP MILESTONE: ECEs who have adult basic education needs and voluntarily agree to do so will participate in "PD Prep" in conjunction with college-level work.

Time constraints during the fidelity cohort precluded this component from actualization; however, during this period, we signed a subcontract with the "Student Success Center" at the Providence campus of the Community College of Rhode Island which has the capacity to meet the adult basic education needs of participants and allows them to access individualized tutorial assistance in reading, writing and study skills. Beginning in year two, all participants will receive information about these support services and course facilitators and mentors will refer students on an as-needed basis. The Success Center, which is open until 8:00 pm every evening and all day on Saturday, will be available to our participants to meet their individual needs.

R2LP MILESTONE: All ECEs will have access to high-quality professional development resources in English and Spanish.

R2LP is offering HeadsUp! Reading and the Early Literacy Curriculum course in both English and Spanish and the mentors of our Spanish-speaking participants are bilingual. HeadsUp! Reading is a nationally recognized distance learning course available in both English and Spanish that equips ECEs with the latest research on how young children learn to read and write. Through the course, ECEs learn how to engage children in literacy activities and how to create high-quality classroom environments. The second course, Early Literacy Curriculum, is a course that provides ECEs with hands-on experience in implementing a structured early literacy curriculum with Opening the World of Learning (OWL) as the foundation of the course. OWL is a comprehensive early literacy program structured around a pedagogical model that emphasizes curriculum, methodology and cognitive socialization. While OWL is currently only available in English, R2LP will translate critical concepts and resources into Spanish as a component of delivering the course. We will also augment the high-quality children's books that are part of OWL with bilingual books of similar genres and quality. All providers will receive a minimum of five high-quality children's books in both English and Spanish and other trade books will be available for borrowing through R2LP and the Providence Public Library. AmeriCorps members also regularly deliver to all participants high-quality children's books in both English and Spanish. This approach will also promote English language acquisition by ECEs and the children they serve. As part of taking both courses, all ECEs will receive a copy of Learning to Read and Write: Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children and the Rhode Island Early Learning Standards, resources that are available in both English and Spanish.

R2LP MILESTONES: All project staff, facilitators, and mentors will participate in activities to ensure the delivery of a culturally appropriate programming; 288 ECEs will participate in a culturally appropriate intervention.

Training for facilitators and mentors began in July of 2007 with an intensive week of orientation to Ready to Learn Providence, HeadsUp! Reading and mentoring materials including Putting the Pro in Protege: A Guide to Mentoring in Head Start and Early Head Start. Training continues monthly in three-hour sessions and is devoted to strengthening observation and communication skills, extending literacy knowledge, problem-solving and analysis of challenges. The project staff, facilitators and mentors are a group of well-educated ECEs and literacy specialists that represent diverse cultures, language backgrounds (eight of the facilitator/mentors are bilingual) and professional experience. Cultural competence is integrated into all aspects of the training. Two R2LP staff members, Tania Quezada and Nazly Guzman, are regional facilitators of Sembrando Semillas, a program of the National Council of La Raza, the largest national Latino civil rights and advocacy organization in the United States. Sembrando Semillas documents best practices that support Latino family values and language in center-based early childhood programs serving Latino children. The program is based on data collected on family values, needs, and desires for the education of the children they served, program best practices, and knowledge and experience in staff development, parent participation, and education and community involvement. The project's Latino Family Values Framework provides indicators of best practices for programs serving Latino children and families and gives examples of how program providers have infused these values and core qualities into their program curriculum. Training institutes and onsite coaching and technical support use the Framework as the basis for designing specific interventions for implementing programs. Ms. Quezada and Ms. Guzman infuse all of our trainings with teachings from Sembrando Semillas and a workshop dedicated exclusively to Sembrando Semillas is planned for 2008.

### Performance Measure 3.3

R2LP MILESTONE: ECEs will effectively implement early literacy activities based on the early literacy practices outlined in HeadsUp! Reading, the Early Literacy Curriculum course based on OWL, and as evidenced by periodic mentor observations.

### BACKGROUND AND START-UP PHASE (October to December 2006)

During this timeframe, R2LP recruited participants for participation in the Fidelity Phase of the implementation - the Head Start teachers on whom we report below. We also drafted the pilot data collection tools to be utilized by mentors that are related to this indicator.

#### FIDELITY PHASE (January to June 2007)

As part of Ready to Learn Providence's internal evaluation of program implementation during the fidelity cohort, participants were asked to complete four anonymous evaluation forms about their involvement in the ECEPD grant. All of the participants in the treatment group completed evaluation forms about both courses. The HeadsUp! Reading evaluations were completed at the conclusion of the course in March 2007. Participants completed evaluations of the Early Literacy Curriculum course at the mid-point of the course in April 2007 and at the end of the course in May 2007. They also completed feedback forms about their overall mentoring support experience in May 2007.

When asked what they gained from Heads Up! Reading, a few general comments on evaluation forms included: "Wonderful ideas that I have used, started to use, or plan on using in the future to improve literacy learning." "I learned new information about strategies to use with preschool children and also how important early literacy skills are." One teacher noted that the course "was just a repeat of what we already know." Some specifically noted that they were now including "more writing tools in the different areas" and had gained a greater awareness "of how I am teaching my children writing."

With the accelerated timeframe for delivery of the courses, R2LP anticipated that there would be some frustration for teachers which was later reflected in this comment "be realistic about our ability to introduce and review two classes a week." Some found the videotaped programming allowed less time for discussion among peers, a highly valued component of the training. They asked for "more discussions with teachers instead of watching movies." Despite the frustration, several teachers commented that they were able to implement "new ideas on what we already use in the classroom," "the sharing of activities from everybody," and "a lot of ideas from other participants in the class."

Many teachers noted that they had changed their teaching as a result of taking HeadsUp! Reading. "My classroom is more print rich and also books are more than just keeping children busy on the rug." "I believe I have become a better teacher because of this class. I have added so much to my literacy curriculum (writing materials in every area, journals, etc.)" Some noted basic changes such as "more aware of ways to expose literacy," "adding more books and writing tools" and adding "more written language around the room, not in just one area."

Teachers began to reflect positively about the impact of the course on the children in their classrooms. "They are writing more and reading books (and) taking care of them." "They love to write - they write everyday in all areas and really enjoy it." "They are showing more interest in books, reading, and writing." "They are kinder to the books and seem to enjoy learning the alphabet, whether its memorizing or phonics." "Enthusiasm to write increased. Interest in books increased. Wanting to tell stories and writing them down."

Many teachers also mentioned the importance of reaching out to families, one in particular noting that "a lot of the info I felt was good to educate parents." Others noted: "I am implementing what I have learned in this first class with the children as well as the parents." Another had begun "talking to fellow teachers and parents and sharing with them the ideas and strategies I have learned in this very helpful class!" A third noted her intention to begin "talking to parents about early literacy."

Twelve of 15 participants elected to take HeadsUp! Reading for college credit. Of these, five received associate-level credit from the Community College of Rhode Island and seven received bachelor-level credit from the University of Rhode Island. The average grade for those taking the course for college credit was a B and was slightly higher for those who earned bachelor-level credit. The remaining three participants, already certified teachers, received professional development certificates.

The Early Literacy Curriculum course got underway in March 2007. At the midpoint in the class 13 participants completed an evaluation form. This course allowed for more hands-on activities and discussion and the enthusiasm for this approach was evident in the evaluation. Asked what they liked best, several teachers noted "HANDS ON ACTIVITIES!!", "classroom discussions," and "peer sharing ideas." At the mid-point teachers reported on their efforts indicating, "I have added more books in areas. I have looked at my children differently, expecting more and getting it." "I find more time to read to the children." "I have created new literacy materials in all areas of my classroom." "My lesson plan book has improved. Just keep pouring out the materials and new teaching methods."

Once again, teachers noted the changes they observed in children and across the classroom. A few observations were child-specific. "A child that was writing is now writing more because we have included writing tools in all areas. Also there is a child that spends more time with the books." Most observations were more general. "The children are more interested in writing and learning." "They want to take ideas further. They enjoy reading better." "They are more aware of the alphabet

and site words." "They participate more during discussions, looking at books more. Love to read stories." "They write more in the different areas." "Taking out books for enjoyment and free choice. Writing during play time. Pointing out letters from their own name."

Teachers anticipated the end of the second class and asked for more support going forward. "Have a workshop once in a while to keep current or to continue to stimulate ideas." "I would like to be informed when there are any changes in early literacy." Another asked that R2LP "continue to provide professional development to our program." These and many other suggestions from the Fidelity Cohort participants influenced the Full Implementation Phase of the intervention.

All fifteen participants completed an anonymous final evaluation of the Early Literacy Curriculum course and rated it Excellent. Teacher satisfaction, even under the pressure of the accelerated timeframe, was evident. Teachers identified what they had learned. "I learned how to use literacy in all areas of (the classroom)." "How to implement books into our lesson plan and (curriculum) webbing." "I've learned so many things! From charts to incorporating literacy into every nook in the classroom."

One teacher noted that she had made "drastic changes" while others were more specific and said they were "using journals," "incorporating books" and "literacy based curriculum activities." They also noted that the children were "more aware of print around the classroom," "excited about books" and "wanting to write." "They are enjoying books more . . . using them in different ways." They also noted that children's "language has also improved as well," they "have shown more interest in learning," and they are "becoming more verbal with teachers and peers."

Teachers' end-of-year reflections were not anonymous but recorded by teachers during final presentations by the group. A veteran teacher admitted to being a vocally resistant participant throughout the 15-week course but ultimately found himself won over by his mentor. Dubbing himself "the code" in honor of HeadsUp! Reading, he reflected to his mentor that he "saw the light" and "there is time to implement more literacy-based activities in the classroom; all it takes is better planning." R2LP and Head Start leadership feel that word of mouth going forward among Head Start teachers was likely to be positive.

Other comments relate to early literacy development and its connection to curriculum planning and the involvement of the children. "I've learned to connect curriculum to our community - how books have so much information about our community." "I've learned new teaching strategies and (that) print awareness is very important for my children to succeed." "Reading, talking, asking questions and really listening to them can set the themes for the year. When they (children) have input and invest . . . they feel ownership and pride in their room." Working literacy into all areas of the classroom was a repeated theme. "I have learned the importance of early literacy and how to promote it in my classroom . . . and the importance of providing literacy materials for English language learners." "Placing literacy materials in block and dramatic (play) has sparked interest to read and pre-write for students who were not interested in books or writing."

Twelve of 15 participants elected to take the Early Literacy Curriculum course for college credit. Of these, five received associate-level credit from the Community College of Rhode Island and seven received bachelor-level credit from the University of Rhode Island. The average grade for all participants was a B+. The remaining three participants received professional development certificates.

Mentor observations and accompanying photographs reveal, as noted above, that even the most initially resistant teachers made changes in the literacy environments over the 15-week period. By the third mentor visit, many notable changes were documented. A mentor summary form noted that, "Changes were again noticed and photographed. The printer had recently been installed. The children were able to print out their work on the computer and take it home. The caterpillar theme filled the classroom. There was a word wall with caterpillar vocabulary, a schematic drawing of the life cycle of the butterfly, caterpillar toys in the block building and housekeeping areas, books in all areas, journals written by children (words added to the pictures by teachers), a large cut-out of the caterpillar story and a new bulletin board for the month. Outside children used chalk to draw caterpillars and to write their own names." Mentors also noted the important role AmeriCorps members played in the classroom while mentors and teachers were meeting. "The AmeriCorps member entered the room and had a bag full of books. He asked the children to choose. He read and asked questions about the story. The children predicted what would happen." "The children told the mentor that they see the AmeriCorps member at their library and he is their friend. After outdoor play, the AmeriCorps member returned to the classroom and chose three books to read to the children." Even as the program year drew to a close, teachers continued to express interest in the supportive relationship that had been established between mentors and teachers. "The teacher asked the mentor for help with developing themes for next year. She wanted to work on the curriculum over the summer and wanted ideas about books, poems and props. The mentor agreed to provide some resources. The mentor also suggested that the teacher include her love of poetry and dance in the curriculum for next year. Resources were given to the teacher later in the week."

In just 15 weeks, the Fidelity Cohort teachers had fully committed themselves to the coursework. During this timeframe, teachers had experienced considerable stress when the new, and well respected Executive Director of Providence Head Start resigned due to her serious concerns about the board leadership of the agency. We are grateful to the former and interim leadership for making the partnership with Head Start possible throughout this difficult period and for the intense efforts of those teachers who made up the Fidelity Cohort. They took two courses at a pace that was far from ideal that provided little

time for them to digest and apply their new knowledge. They made a diligent effort to do so nonetheless. Not surprisingly, they recommended that classes get "started early - September" and cover "the course of the year." R2LP had already designed the Full Implementation Phase to run from September to June of each year.

Fourteen teachers also anonymously rated their experience with their mentors. The majority rated their overall quality of their experience with mentors as excellent (12 of 13 rating as excellent). The lowest rating, while still quite high (11 of 14 rating as excellent) fell in the category of "amount of time in your classroom" which reflected the limitations on mentor visits due to the accelerated timeframe. It appears that as teachers got to know the mentors, they also grew to value the time together. By the end of the semester, although they initially perceived the visits as burdensome, all 15 teachers requested a fourth (voluntary) mentor visit in the fall of 2007 when they returned to their classrooms. When asked how the mentor supported their professional growth, teachers expressed their satisfaction. "Her enthusiasm and encouragement has made me feel good about what I was doing and has made me comfortable to expand." "I have been teaching for a long time, and you get into a rut. So it was nice to get some new ideas and suggestions that really work." "Encouraging, supportive," "my mentor has supported my growth" and "has been a good sounding board for my thoughts on our class" typify the responses.

Several Head Start teachers from the Fidelity Cohort voluntarily came back from summer break to assist R2LP in training the new mentors and facilitators by sharing their experience during the Fidelity Phase. They also met independently with USDOE representatives, program officer Rosemary Fennell and Dr. Michael Kamil, during the July 2007 site visit.

By the end of the semester, in order to meet GPRA requirements, the second round of data collection had begun - just six weeks after the first round of data had been collected - leaving very little time for growth on the part of teachers or children. The second round of data collection came just as Head Start was wrapping up the program year and teachers began preparations to close their classrooms for the summer. Many classroom teachers had sent visible evidence of children's work home to parents as they cleaned up for graduation ceremonies. While R2LP encouraged the program to maintain the classroom environments as they were until data collection ended, the impact was evident to mentors as they conducted their final observations in several sites. In spite of the accelerated timeframe and the delays resulting from obtaining IRB approval that impeded data collection, R2LP is confident the professional development made a difference for the teachers and to some degree, to children as well.

#### FULL IMPLEMENTATION PHASE (July 2007 to October 2007)

The first class of the Full Implementation Phase, HeadsUp! Reading is currently underway and is described in significant detail in the previous two indicators. An analysis of the outcomes of this phase of implementation will be included in the next report once sufficient data have been collected and analyzed.

R2LP MILESTONE: ECEs will administer observational checklists to track the oral language and literacy development of young children.

#### FIDELITY PHASE (January to June 2007)

ECEs were introduced to and practiced the use of a checklist from the course text entitled Learning to Read and Write: Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children. Based on the "Taking Stock" checklist included in the text, the modified checklist allowed teachers to get a better sense of the climate they were creating for literacy learning and to gain a preliminary appreciation for the value of assessment. Given the accelerated class schedule and the intense level of assessment that participating children were already experiencing due to IRB related delays (children were assessed using a full battery of instruments twice by the external evaluator with only six weeks between assessments), teachers used the checklist to inform their own planning and for class discussion purposes only.

#### FULL IMPLEMENTATION PHASE (July 2007 to October 2007)

The first class of the Full Implementation Phase, HeadsUp! Reading is currently underway and is described in significant detail in the previous two indicators. As in the fidelity cohort, ECEs will use a modified version of the "Taking Stock" checklist that appears in the course text, Learning to Read and Write: Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children. Additionally, during the Early Literacy Curriculum course, ECEs will learn to do observational assessments using the Language and Literacy Scope of Skills checklist and the Implementation Checklist that are both components of OWL. Based upon the Work Sampling System, Preschool-4 Developmental Guidelines, 4th edition (Dichtelmiller, Jablon, Marsden, Meisels 2004), these checklists provide instructional assessments whose purpose is to document and assess children's skills, knowledge, behavior and accomplishments in the areas of language and literacy on multiple occasions in order to enhance teaching and learning. Both checklists align with the learning goals of the Rhode Island Early Learning Standards which have been adopted by the Rhode Island Department of Education and are required for all programs serving

young children in the state.

#### Preface to Performance Measures 3.4 and 3.5

Reporting on Performance Measures 3.4 and 3.5, which rely on PPVT and PALS child level assessment data and ELLCO classroom observation data collected by R2LP's external evaluator, the Education Alliance at Brown University, are complicated by numerous factors.

R2LP's intervention with the Head Start teachers who made up the Fidelity Cohort began in early February 2007. Data collection by the Education Alliance did not begin until late March, at the midpoint of the intervention and at the conclusion of HeadsUp! Reading, due to delays in obtaining IRB approval. As a result, the ELLCO, PALS and PPVT data do not represent a true, pre-test baseline.

Also as a result of the IRB delays, the period of intervention between pre- and post-testing during the Fidelity Phase was exceedingly abbreviated, in most cases just six weeks. This further complicates analysis in that observed differences by group cannot be expected within such a short time period of intervention.

Reporting on these indicators was prepared by staff in R2LP's Data and Evaluation division using summary data tables provided to R2LP by the Education Alliance. Given the experimental component of the grant, all data were necessarily collected by the Education Alliance as an external evaluator and as such were not provided to R2LP. As of this reporting period, R2LP has not received the written analyses or reports from the Education Alliance that would help us understand the data. In the absence of a full summary report and given that we are not allowed access to raw data for secondary analysis, at this point we are limited in the conclusions that we can draw about the impacts of the R2LP Fidelity Phase of the intervention as measured using ELLCO, PALS and PPVT assessment tools.

#### Performance Measure 3.4

ECEs will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning domains including using a content-rich curriculum and activities that promote the age-appropriate development of oral language, age appropriate social and emotional behavior, phonological awareness, print awareness, alphabet knowledge and numeracy skills (ELLCO and other measures). ECEs also will more frequently participate in the effective administration of age appropriate assessments of young children and the use of assessment results.

**R2LP MILESTONE:** ECEs will show statistically significant gains on ELLCO/CHELLO

Although the sample size of participating classrooms was perhaps too small to conduct parametric tests, mean ELLCO scores were tested between treatment and control classrooms. At baseline, which occurred at the completion of HeadsUp! Reading, the language and literacy environment of treatment classrooms, as measured by the ELLCO Literacy Environment Checklist and the Literacy Activities Rating Scale, appeared significantly greater than the environment of control classrooms. The difference between classrooms on the ELLCO Classroom Observation approached significance, supporting the general conclusion that the language and literacy environment of treatment classrooms appeared stronger at the midpoint of the intervention than control classrooms. At post-test, however, there were no statistically significant differences between treatment and control classrooms on any of the ELLCO scores. At the time of post-test, environmental print and other literacy-related materials in many of the participating classrooms had been dismantled in anticipation of the closure of the program for the summer, perhaps skewing results of environmental assessments. Thus post-test assessment of the literacy environment in treatment classrooms might not represent the true status of these classrooms throughout the duration of the intervention period. This is confounded even further by the abbreviated time period between pre- and post-testing (i.e., six weeks), making it difficult to anticipate profound changes in classroom environments over such a short period of time.

#### Performance Measure 3.5

**R2LP MILESTONE:** Children will show statistically significant gains using the PALS Pre-K and PPVT.

Results from administration of the PPVT-III at baseline (seven weeks into the intervention) indicate no differences between children in treatment and control classrooms in their receptive language skills. This result holds true for the entire sample of children tested at baseline ( $n = 226$ ) and the subgroup of 4-year-olds ( $n = 146$ ). Thus, at the midpoint, approximately seven weeks into the intervention, children's receptive language skills seemed comparable across treatment and control classrooms. Since the PPVT was not administered to children at post-test as the time frame did not meet the instrument guidelines as specified in GPRA, there are no data available for comparing changes in receptive language skills at the end of the

intervention period for all children across time and between children in treatment and control classrooms.

The PALS-PreK Uppercase Letter Identification subtask was administered to children in treatment and control classrooms at both baseline and post-test. For both the entire sample of children ( $n = 215$ ) and the subgroup of 4-year-olds ( $n = 142$ ), there were no significant differences in children's uppercase letter identification skills by group (i.e., treatment vs. control) at either baseline or at the conclusion of the intervention period. Given the abbreviated time period between pre- and post-testing (i.e., six weeks), we would not expect changes in children's letter identification skills to change substantially enough to observe differences by group. However, the letter identification skills of children, regardless of group, appeared to increase over the intervention period, since the subtask scores at post-test were consistently higher on average than at baseline for all children. Without access to raw data, R2LP is not able to test the significance of this observed increase in letter identification skills over time.

OMB No.1890 - 0004 Exp.10/31/2007



**U.S. Department of Education  
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)  
Project Status Chart**

PR/Award #: **S349A060037**

**SECTION B - Budget Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Budget Information

File : R:\R2LP\ProgramsProjects\ECEPD2007\Fall 2007 Reporting\Section B - Budget Information.pdf

**SECTION C - Additional Information** (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Title : Additional Information

File : R:\R2LP\ProgramsProjects\ECEPD2007\Fall 2007 Reporting\Additional Information.pdf

## Section B – Budget Information

During the current project reporting period, the Ready to Learn Providence ECEPD project incurred \$1,188,255 in expenses.

As reported in item 8b. of the ED 524B Cover Sheet, \$630,669 of these expenses have been paid with ECEPD Federal grant funds drawn down from GAPS, and \$557,586 of these expenses have been paid with non-ECEPD funds.

During the project reporting period, the cost-match ratio – defined as the percentage of match funds relative to overall project expenses – was 46.92%. While slightly below the “dollar-for-dollar” match that the grantee must ultimately provide by the end of the project, the ratio for the reporting period is close to 50% and far exceeds the statutory guidelines that grantees must provide a minimum of 20% in each program year. In short, we are off to a good start.

The attached tables identify the sources, calculations, amounts, and documentation mechanisms, associated with our non-ECEPD expenses. Each line-item has a document reference number, which refers back to the Project Cost Match Strategy Plan approved by USDOE in December 2006 and reviewed by the ECEPD project officer during a site visit in July 2007.

Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
1	Joyce Butler R2LP Director	Early Learning Opportunities Act	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	ELOA Personnel Costs from September 2006 through February 2007	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$14,829
3	Tania Quezada Coordinator of Community Learning	United Way of Rhode Island and Early Learning Opportunities Act	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	ELOA Personnel Costs from September 2006 through February 2007 and United Way of Rhode Island Personnel Costs from January through June 2007	Personnel	Award Letter from United Way of Rhode Island and Payroll Records	\$55,022
4	Magda Ortiz Project Assistant	Early Learning Opportunities Act	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	ELOA Personnel Costs from September 2006 through February 2007	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$14,316
5	Christine Chiacu-Forsythe Director of Early Reading First	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% Personnel costs for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$16,487
6	Susan Zoll, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% Personnel costs for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$12,567
7	Desiree Manley, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% Personnel costs for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$12,133

Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
8	Jane Myers, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% Personnel costs for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$13,000
9	Bethany Pedersen Carpenter, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% Personnel costs for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$6,513
11	Jackie Jackson, Coordinator of Family Engagement	Annie E. Casey Foundation	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution made through a formula of resources that R2LP will spend on family engagement activities for families are participating in the ECEPD project.	100% of personnel costs for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$17,472
12	Eben Dowell, Information Specialist	RI Department of Health	Matching funds provided to support the development of our needs assessment as stipulated by EDGAR 75.263 and 74.25(e)(1)	100 hours of staff time incurred between January 8 <sup>th</sup> and April 7 <sup>th</sup> 2006	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$2,857
13	Nancy Worthen, Co-Director of R2LP AmeriCorps	RI Service Alliance	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	100% of personnel costs charged to RI Service Alliance for the duration of the project	Personnel	Payroll Records	\$24,370
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL MATCH</b>							<b>\$189,566</b>

Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
14	Joyce Butler R2LP Director	Early Learning Opportunities Act	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	ELOA Fringe Costs from September 2006 through February 2007	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$2,189
16	Tania Quezada Coordinator of Community Learning	United Way of Rhode Island and Early Learning Opportunities	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	ELOA Fringe Costs from September 2006 through February 2007 and United Way of Rhode Island Personnel Costs from January through June 2007	Fringe	Award Letter from United Way of Rhode Island and Payroll Records	\$21,358
17	Magda Ortiz Project Assistant	Early Learning Opportunities Act	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	ELOA Fringe Costs from September 2006 through February 2007	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$10,683
18	Christine Chiacu-Forsythe Director of Early Reading First	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% of fringe costs for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$2,433
19	Susan Zoll, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% of fringe costs for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$1,855
20	Desiree Manley, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% of fringe costs for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$4,172

**Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037**

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
21	Jane Myers, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% of fringe costs for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$3,100
22	Bethany Pedersen Carpenter, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB approved by Early Childhood & Reading Group	20% of fringe costs for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$961
24	Jackie Jackson, Coordinator of Family Engagement	Annie E. Casey Foundation	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution made through a formula of resources that R2LP will spend on family engagement activities for families are participating in the ECEPD project.	100% of fringe costs for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$9,171
25	Eben Dowell, Information Specialist	RI Department of Health	Matching funds provided to support the development of our needs assessment as stipulated by EDGAR 75.263 and 74.25(e)(1)	100 hours of staff time incurred between January 8 <sup>th</sup> and April 7 <sup>th</sup> 2006	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$422
26	Nancy Worthen, Co-Director of R2LP AmeriCorps	RI Service Alliance	Funds provided to support the implementation of the ECEPD grant.	100% of fringe costs charged to RI Service Alliance for the duration of the project	Fringe	Payroll Records	\$8,320
<b>TOTAL FRINGE MATCH</b>							<b>\$64,663</b>

Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
28	Families and Work Institute	United Way of Rhode Island	Matching funds provided to support the development of our needs assessment as stipulated by EDGAR 75.263 and 74.25(e)(1)	Training and Support for Mind In the Making – delivered in 90 day period prior to April 7	Contractual	Contract, Invoices, and Check Register	\$35,000
29	Community College of Rhode Island	The difference between what R2LP pays in college credit and what the full cost of each credit costs	If each provider would to go purchase credit from this institution on the open market, this is the cost they would incur.	The cost of credits from CCRI for the 2007-2008 school year is \$145 per credit, plus a \$17 registration fee. We are paying \$10 per credit with no registration fee. To date, 69 credits have been awarded, with the match factored at 69 credits x \$135 + 306 in registration fees	Contractual	Credit Report Forms for each participating ECE	\$9,621
29a	University of Rhode Island	The difference between what R2LP pays in college credit and what the full cost of each credit costs	If each provider would to go purchase credit from this institution on the open market, this is the cost they would incur.	The cost of credits from URI for the 2007-2008 school year is \$804 for a three-credit class, plus \$95 in fees. We are paying \$125 for a three-year credit class. To date, 21 credits have been awarded, with the match factored at (7 x 804) - (7 x 125) + 97 in fees	Contractual	Credit Reporting forms from URI	\$10,185
10	Jane Yedlin, Early Literacy Coach	Early Reading First 2	Matching funds provided to support the design and implementation of the ECEPD grant. Contribution made through "incidental inclusion" as permitted through non-regulatory guidance of NCLB	20% of contractual costs for the duration of the project	Contractual	Invoices	\$4,907
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTUAL MATCH</b>							<b>\$59,713</b>

Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
35	Internal Project Monitoring	The value of the time that members of the R2LP Professional Development Committee	Matching funds provided to support the internal monitoring of project – a process by which local stakeholders provide guidance and TA for our project.	The number of hours of a R2LP PD Committee meeting (3 hours) x number of attendees to date (85 total) multiplied by \$35 an hour – the average salary and fringe of committee members.	Other	Minutes from Meetings which includes the attendance log	\$8,925
37	AmeriCorps Member Costs	The value of the time that R2LP AmeriCorps members contribute to the ECEPD project. This includes the time they spent making visits, preparing materials, and receiving the training they need to do this work.	The R2LP AmeriCorps program was proposed as an integral component of our ECEPD program model.	<p>Year 1: 8 AmeriCorps members will spend a third of their service hours on this project. This amounts to 3,590 service hours and 2,720 training hours. Multiply the number of hours by \$12 per hour – an average cost of a member hour.</p> <p>Year 2: Ten members will spend half of their service hours on this project and five will spend all of their service hours. This amounts to 6,800 service hours and 3,400 training hours. Multiply the number of hours by \$12 per hour – an average cost of a member hour.</p> <p>Year 3: Ten members will spend half of their service hours on this project and seven will spend all of their service hours. This amounts to 16,320 service hours and 5,780 training hours. Multiply the number of hours by \$12 per hour – an average cost of a member hour.</p>	Other	R2LP AmeriCorps Time Sheets	\$118,920
<b>TOTAL OTHER MATCH</b>							<b>\$127,845</b>

**Year 1 (09/01/06 to 10/30/07) ECEPD Grant Match Documentation for Award #S349A060037**

Document Reference #	Line Item	Source	Rationale	Calculation	Object Class Category	Documentation Plan	9/1/06 - 10/30/07
38	Participant Stipends	The difference between what participants receive as a training stipend and the value of their time based on local data.	Providence teachers are compensated \$25 hour for their participation in PD. We will provide a \$100 stipend for every semester that an ECE participates in relevant coursework, meetings with mentors, and other related PD. Stipends will also be paid to those ECEs who participate in the control group.	\$25 per hour X 15 participants x 72 hours (fidelity pilot) + \$25 x 54 participants x 18 hours (HS Fall Cohort thru 10.30) + \$25 x 86 participants x 18 hours (ECE Fall Cohort thru 10.30)	Stipends	Attendance Logs Prepared by Course Instructors and Certificates provided upon completion	\$115,800
<b>TOTAL STIPEND MATCH</b>							<b>\$115,800</b>

**TOTAL ECEPD MATCH**

**\$557,586**

**TOTAL ECEPD FEDERAL FUNDS**

**\$630,669**

**TOTAL ECEPD EXPENDITURES IN PERIODO DATE (FEDERAL AND MATCH)**

**\$1,188,255**

**RATIO OF MATCH FUNDS TO TOTAL EXPENDITURES**

**46.92%**

## Ready to Learn Providence

### Revised ECEPD Project Performance Measure 1

Objective				
<p>To provide a research-based professional development intervention to 288* early childhood educators (ECEs) with a level of <i>depth, dosage, and duration</i> needed to transform teaching practice in the areas of early literacy, social and emotional development, curriculum, and assessment.</p> <p><i>*Modification: Increased the number of ECEPD participants from 200 to 288 to support the modified evaluation design.</i></p>				
STRATEGIES				
Core Courses	Mentoring	Field Visits	Leadership	Trainers as Leaders
<p><b>Milestone:</b> 288 ECEs will participate in two core courses for young children consisting of up to 90 hours of classroom-based intervention.</p>	<p><b>Milestone:</b> Mentors will conduct six site visits of three hours in length during the two-course intervention, do observations and co-create strategies to support participant learning.</p>	<p><b>Milestone:</b> 288 ECEs will each receive 10 visits from trained AmeriCorps members who will deliver library and other resources based on mentor-devised strategies.</p>	<p><b>Milestone:</b> 288 ECEs will participate in an average of 20 hours of R2LP Club and other leadership and professional activities during the course of the project.</p>	<p><b>Milestone:</b> All project staff, facilitators, instructors, and mentors will take part in activities to ensure fidelity of intervention and refine their leadership skills.</p>
<p><b>Modifications:</b> Evaluation design related. Increased the number of participating ECEs from 200 to 288, reduced the number of required courses from three to two which reduced the hours of required intervention for each participant from 135 to 90.</p>	<p><b>Modifications:</b> Evaluation design related. Reduced the number of mentor visits from nine to six due to dropping one course and the resulting shortened intervention period (reduced from 18 months to 1 academic year), and an increase in the number of participants from 200 to 288.</p>	<p><b>Modifications:</b> Evaluation design related. Reduced the number of field visits by AmeriCorps members to 5 field visits per course session (semester) for a total of 10 per participant due to dropping one course and the resulting shortened intervention period (reduced from original 18 months to 1 academic year), and an increase in the number of participants from 200 to 288.</p>	<p><b>Modifications:</b> Evaluation design related. Reduced the number of hours of leadership activities to 20 due to dropping one course and the resulting shortened intervention period (reduced from 18 months to 1 academic year), and an increase in the number of participants from 200 to 288.</p> <p>Added R2LP Club leaders to the responsibility section below.</p>	<p><b>Modifications:</b> None to the milestone.</p> <p>Shift in responsibility section below to a subcontract directly with Wheelock College rather than use of independent consultants.</p>
<p><b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff, facilitators, CCRI, and consultants</p>	<p><b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff and on-site mentors</p>	<p><b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff, on-site mentors, public librarians, and R2LP AmeriCorps members</p>	<p><b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff, CCRI, R2LP club leaders and other professional organizations</p>	<p><b>Responsibility:</b> Project Staff, Wheelock College</p>

## Revised ECEPD Project Performance Measure 2

Objective				
To change the school readiness status and developmental trajectory of children as evidenced by their performance on formal school readiness assessments taken during the kindergarten year. <i>No changes.</i>				
STRATEGIES				
EXTERNAL			INFORMAL/AUTHENTIC	
Child	Environmental	ECEs	Child	ECEs
<b>Milestone:</b> Children will show statistically significant gains using the PALS Pre-K and PPVT.	<b>Milestone:</b> ECEs will show statistically significant gains on ELLCO/CHELLO.	<b>No longer a Milestone:</b> ECEs will show statistically significant gains on Arnett Scale.	<b>Milestone:</b> ECEs will administer observational checklists to track the oral language and literacy development of children.	<b>Milestone:</b> ECEs will effectively implement early literacy activities based on the early literacy practices outlined in <i>HeadsUp! Reading</i> and <i>Early Literacy Curriculum</i> based on <i>OWL</i> and as evidenced by periodic mentor observations.
<b>Modifications</b> None	<b>Modifications</b> None	<b>Modifications</b> Evaluation design related. Arnett is no longer a valid measure of the intended impact of the professional development due to elimination of <i>Mind in the Making</i> as a required course which focused on children's social and emotional development.	<b>Modifications</b> Rather than the Troll, participants will use observational checklists that are customized by R2LP to support the content of the <i>Early Literacy Curriculum</i> course and the use of the <i>OWL</i> curriculum.	<b>Modifications</b> Budget related. Unable to purchase a copy of the complete <i>OWL</i> kit for every classroom and family child care home within the budget provided as number of participants was increased significantly. No volume discount was available from the publisher. Reducing the timeframe of intervention to one year from 18 months also reduced level of support participants would have for full implementation of <i>OWL</i> . R2LP will continue to use <i>OWL</i> as the basis of the Early Literacy Curriculum course, will provide reference copies of <i>OWL</i> for all nine course sections and purchase key components of the curriculum and books for every participant. <i>OWL</i> early literacy practices continue to form the basis of instruction of the <i>Early Literacy Curriculum</i> course.
<b>Responsibility:</b> DSRobinson & Associates (replacing former evaluator- Education Alliance at Brown University)			<b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff, facilitator, ECEs, mentors, and consultants	

### Revised ECEPD Project Performance Measure 3

Objective					
To close ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness by increasing the capacity of culturally and linguistically isolated ECEs who serve children from high-need neighborhoods in the city.					
STRATEGIES					
BUILDING ECE CAPACITY				CULTURAL COMPETENCY	
<b>Milestone:</b> All participating ECEs will have access to college-level coursework in English or Spanish.	<b>Milestone:</b> All participating ECEs who are English language learners will be given the opportunity to voluntarily participate in <i>English for ECEs</i> to support language acquisition efforts.	<b>Milestone:</b> ECEs who have adult basic education needs and voluntarily agree to do so will participate in <i>PD Prep</i> in conjunction with college-level work.	<b>Milestone:</b> All ECEs will have access to high-quality professional development resources in English and Spanish.	<b>Milestone:</b> 288 ECEs will participate in a culturally appropriate intervention.	<b>Milestone:</b> All project staff, facilitators, and mentors will participate in activities to ensure the delivery of culturally appropriate programming.
<b>Modifications</b> None	<b>Modifications</b> Recruiting additional participants to attend two college courses with the added requirement that ECEs who are English language learners attend English classes was not feasible. The majority of ECEs in this category work in family child care homes as long as 10 hours per day. English language classes are now voluntary and available to participants at any point in time during the project implementation. Classes are being conducted in partnership with the Genesis Center.  Responsibility now includes the Genesis Center.	<b>Modifications</b> Recruiting additional participants to attend two college courses and also require those with adult basic education needs to attend adult education classes at the same time was not feasible. The majority of participants have full time jobs and family responsibilities. Participation in adult education classes is now voluntary and is available to participants at any point in time during the project implementation.	<b>Modifications</b> None	<b>Modifications</b> Increase in the number of ECEs from 200 to 288 to reflect the change in the evaluation design.	<b>Modifications</b> Change "instructors" to facilitators for consistency.  Add Wheelock College in Responsibility and drop O'Donnell as consultant due to elimination of <i>Mind in the Making</i> as a required course.
<b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff and CCRI	<b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff and the Genesis Center	<b>Responsibility:</b> Project Staff and CCRI	<b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff and Library	<b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff, CCRI, and consultants	<b>Responsibility:</b> Project staff and Wheelock College

**Mentor Visit**



Participant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of visit: \_\_\_\_\_

Mentor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Start time: \_\_\_\_\_ End time: \_\_\_\_\_

AC Member Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Visit Number: HUR 1 2 3 Other  
(circle one) ELC 1 2 3 Other

Center Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Primary language(s) spoken: \_\_\_\_\_

Children present: # of boys \_\_\_\_ # of girls \_\_\_\_

Other adults present (please describe): \_\_\_\_\_

Other notable conditions: \_\_\_\_\_

**Visit Summary**

[Large shaded area for writing the visit summary]

**AmeriCorps Summary**

Today, the AmeriCorps member...

- Not present
- Read to children
- Prepared/implemented literacy activities
- Played with children (e.g. outdoor play)
- Interacted with children in learning areas
- Brought library resources (*specify*):
  - Teacher card
  - LARK
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Coding Summary**

Indicate time spent (*in total minutes*) on the line provided and list any associated content codes from your notes and observations.

Mentor code	Content codes
Early Literacy Planning (ELP) _____	
Implement/Demonstrate (I/D) _____	
Observation (OB) _____	
Observation Feedback (OBF) _____	
Reflection (REF) _____	

**Notable Changes**

**Next Steps / Action Plan**

[Large shaded area for writing next steps and action plan]

Mentor code	Notes
Relationship Building (RB) _____	
Other (OTH) _____	

Next AmeriCorps visit (*date and time*): \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_

Next Mentor visit (*date and time*): \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_



# Ready to Learn Providence

## Early Literacy Checklist: *HeadsUp! Reading*



Mentor \_\_\_\_\_

Date of visit 1 \_\_\_\_\_

Participant \_\_\_\_\_

Date of visit 2 \_\_\_\_\_

Center Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date of visit 3 \_\_\_\_\_

A. The Power and Pleasure of Literacy Books + (B)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
A.1 Read daily to children		C/A (B)				
A.2 Engage children in selecting favorite books and participating actively in storytime		B				
A.3 Find ways to encourage parents to read to their children at home		HC (B)				
A.4 Link books and reading experiences with engaging activities that stretch children's learning		C/A (B)				
A.5 Show children the many ways that reading and writing can be used in daily activities		LE (WR)				
A.6 Include literacy props and materials in dramatic play areas		LE (C/A)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

B. The Literate Environment Learning Environment + (LE)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
B.1 Put labels, captions, and other print in places where they serve a purpose		EP (LE)				
B.2 Create inviting places for children to read with their friends or on their own		LE				
B.3 Include a wide variety of books and print materials that affirm children's cultures and linguistic backgrounds		B (ELD / HC)				
B.4 Place books where children can easily reach them		LE (B)				
B.5 Display books on open shelves to pique children's interest in reading		LE (B)				
B.6 Rotate and refresh literacy materials in dramatic play areas to keep children's interest and imaginations lively		LE (B / C/A)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

Codes and Definitions - Please code each box for every visit.	
<input type="radio"/> <b>O Observed</b> (I saw it.)  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO Not Observed</b> (I looked for it, but I didn't see it.)	<input type="radio"/> <b>D Discussed</b> (I made the choice to discuss this particular item with the participant. It could be something that had been observed or not.)  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>N/A Not Applicable</b> (I was not looking for this indicator during this visit.)

C. Language Development Oral Language (OL)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
C.1 Respond to what children do and say by building on their ideas and language		OL (V)				
C.2 Include new words in your conversations with children		V (OL)				
C.3 Name objects and actions, giving children a brief explanation where necessary		V (OL)				
C.4 Engage children in language games, rhymes, and riddles		OL (PA)				
C.5 Encourage dramatic play and sometimes join in to introduce new possibilities		OL (LE)				
C.6 Create opportunities for children to engage in interactive activities in small groups		C/A (LE)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

D. Building Knowledge and Comprehension Mixture of codes		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
D.1 Give children many opportunities to explore and manipulate objects		LE (C/A)				
D.2 Read and make available information books and other nonfiction		B (LE)				
D.3 Introduce new vocabulary and concepts before going on special field trips		V (C/A)				
D.4 Debrief and discuss with children what they have learned after a field trip or other special activity		C/A (OL)				
D.5 Ensure that there are abundant opportunities for children to share and assimilate knowledge through play		C/A				
D.6 Ask children questions and respond to their questions		OL				
D.7 Identify and explain new words across the curriculum		V				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

**Codes and Definitions - Please code each box for every visit.**

**O Observed** (I saw it.)

**D Discussed** (I made the choice to discuss this particular item with the participant. It could be something that had been observed or not.)

**NO Not Observed** (I looked for it, but I didn't see it.)

**N/A Not Applicable** (I was not looking for this indicator during this visit.)

E. Knowledge of Print Concepts of Print (CP)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
E.1 Show children that we read print moving from left to right and top to bottom		CP				
E.2 Identify the features of a book, such as the author and title		CP				
E.3 Point to words, labels, and letters and read or name them		CP (AK)				
E.4 Help children to recognize and write their names		CP (WR)				
E.5 Draw attention to uppercase and lowercase letters, punctuation, and other print features		CP (AK)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

F. Types of Text Curriculum / Assessment + (C/A)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
F.1 Read and reread stories to give children a chance to become very familiar with them		C/A				
F.2 Encourage children to retell or reenact stories in their own words		C/A (OL)				
F.3 Engage children in dramatic play and acting out favorite stories		C/A (OL)				
F.4 Find meaningful ways to introduce children to a range of writing forms and genres		C/A (WR)				
F.5 Help children to write in different ways for different purposes		WR (C/A)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

Codes and Definitions - Please code each box for every visit.	
<input type="radio"/> <b>O Observed</b> (I saw it.)	<input type="radio"/> <b>D Discussed</b> (I made the choice to discuss this particular item with the participant. It could be something that had been observed or not.)
<input type="radio"/> <b>NO Not Observed</b> (I looked for it, but I didn't see it.)	<input type="radio"/> <b>N/A Not Applicable</b> (I was not looking for this indicator during this visit.)

G. Phonological Awareness Phonological Awareness (PA)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
G.1 Draw children's attention to the sounds they hear in words		PA (OL)				
G.2 Play a variety of games that emphasize rhyming and beginning sounds		PA (OL)				
G.3 Read and reread stories that have predictable sound patterns		PA (B)				
G.4 Provide children with time to write on their own each day		WR (LE)				
G.5 Sing, rhyme, and clap out the syllables of songs and chants		PA (OL)				
G.6 Build word walls of words with similar sound patterns		PA (AK)				
G.7 Use daily classroom routines to talk about words and songs		PA (LE)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

H. Letters and Words Writing * (WR)		Codes	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Goals / Objectives for this area...
H.1 Read alphabet books and help children identify letters		AK (B)				
H.2 Write and display children's names and other words of particular interest		WR (EP)				
H.3 Involve children in writing activities		WR (C/A)				
H.4 Demonstrate the writing process through shared writing activities		WR (C/A)				
H.5 Make paper, pencils, and markers easily accessible		LE (WR)				
H.6 Encourage children to try to spell words out independently as they write		WR (PA / AK)				
H.7 Give specific help in learning letter/sound patterns		PA (AK)				
H.8 Help children to learn new words		V				
H.9 Help children acquire a basic sight vocabulary		EP (AK)				
Comments	Visit 1	Visit 2			Visit 3	

Adapted by R2LP from *Learning to Read and Write, Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children*, by Susan B. Newman, Carol Copple, and Sue Bredekamp

Codes and Definitions - Please code each box for every visit.	
<input type="radio"/> <b>O Observed</b> (I saw it.)	<input type="radio"/> <b>D Discussed</b> (I made the choice to discuss this particular item with the participant. It could be something that had been observed or not.)
<input type="radio"/> <b>NO Not Observed</b> (I looked for it, but I didn't see it.)	<input type="radio"/> <b>N/A Not Applicable</b> (I was not looking for this indicator during this visit.)