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Educare

- Formation of Educare and the Bounce Learning Network
- Public/Private partnerships
- Future growth of the Network
Educare  
A coast-to-coast network

- Operational Schools
  - CHICAGO
  - OMAHA (2)
  - MILWAUKEE
  - TULSA (2)
  - DENVER
  - MIAMI-DADE
  - OKLAHOMA CITY
  - SEATTLE
  - KANSAS CITY
  - MAINE
  - PHOENIX*
  * Under construction

- Schools Under Development
  - NEW ORLEANS
  - CALIFORNIA
  - WEST DUPAGE, IL
  - WASHINGTON, DC
  - LINCOLN, NE
  - TULSA
  - BALTIMORE, MD

As of August 2010
Core Features of the Educare Model

- Small Class Size
- Staff Qualifications/ Ongoing PD
- Continuity of Care
- Early Oral Language and Literacy
- Social Emotional Development
- Problem Solving and Numeracy
- Starting Early
- Research Based
- Family Support Services
- Interdisciplinary Approach
- Reflective Supervision and Practice
- Integrating the Arts
Implementation Study Purposes

• **For internal stakeholders:** Program improvement, site-specific technical assistance, and answering site-specific questions

• **For external stakeholders:** Document implementation of core features, showcase high quality, contribute to literature on enhancing child outcomes, and provide data and a place for advocacy
Implementation Study: Who Are We?

- Local evaluators at 11 sites (in 2010-11) with a central evaluation coordination site at FPG
- National advisory board for the Implementation Study
- Local program leaders and funders
- Technical assistance staff at the Ounce of Prevention Fund
# Overview of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of data</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Why Collect?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Questionnaire</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Demographics, beliefs, practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Interview</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Demographics, beliefs, activities, involvement, risk factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Rating Scales: ITERS-R or ECERS-R CLASS</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Classroom activities, language, interactions, overall quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Communication Indicator</td>
<td>F, W, S</td>
<td>Child language and cognitive status and change over time; maintenance of Spanish language (for ELLs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley, PLS-4 for Spanish PPVT-4 (+ PLS-4 for Spanish)</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALS</td>
<td>EHS: at 36 mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken</td>
<td>HS: F &amp; S of 1st HS yr + S of 2nd yr F &amp; S of yr before K Spring before K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ratings: DECA-IT &amp; DECA</td>
<td>F &amp; S each year</td>
<td>Children’s social-emotional competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child Demographics, 2009

• **Gender:**
  51% Boys, 49% Girls

• **Race/Ethnicity**
  29% Hispanic (any race)
  56% Black
  7% White
  8% Biracial or Other

• **Primary Caregiver Education**
  19% < HS
  20% HS/GED
  24% some college
  14% HS plus technical training
  10% AA
  7% BA
Language Most Heard at Home (%)
Distribution of ECERS-R Total Scores, 2008 & 2009

- 2008, N=38
- 2009, N=48
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Components</th>
<th>Current IS Measures</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Class Size/Good ratio</td>
<td>ERS Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Staff Qualifications/PD</td>
<td>Staff Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Early</td>
<td>Age of entry/retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of Care</td>
<td>Class history tables, primary caregiver tracked</td>
<td>Gathered 2x year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Language/Literacy</td>
<td>CLASS; ERS Language scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Emotional Dev.</td>
<td>CLASS; ERS Interactions scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving/Numeracy</td>
<td>CLASS; Two ERS items: math, reasoning</td>
<td>No specific math obs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Based</td>
<td>Staff Questionnaire</td>
<td>Data use by staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>Parent Interview</td>
<td>Parent report only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need a measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Supervision</td>
<td>Staff Questionnaire</td>
<td>How often, not quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating the Arts</td>
<td>Two ERS Items: art, music</td>
<td>Two items only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation-Stage Alignment Challenges

• Replication was not a goal initially

• Educare Schools are at different stages of implementation depending upon the date they joined the Network

• Staff at Educare Schools come together as part of the Bounce Learning Network; therefore learning and innovation are part of the model
Measurement Challenges

• Finding measures that serve multiple purposes: fidelity, instructional planning, data for program improvement, comparison to national samples

• The ECE field’s challenge of measuring professional development and coaching processes
Future Opportunities

• Further examination of local innovations and adaptations

• Greater cultural diversity as model expands

• Explore effects of individual components

• More *competence* measures of fidelity needed