

SECTION A: JUSTIFICATION

1. Necessity of Data Collection and Legislative Authority

Authority for the ECEPD Evaluation is provided in Public Law 107-110, Section 9601 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (see Appendix VI).

2. Purpose of the Information Collected

The Evaluation of the Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program has three primary purposes:

- Describe and analyze the strategies ECEPD projects are using to deliver professional development for early childhood educators
- Synthesize the outcomes of ECEPD projects related to the five achievement indicators specified for the ECEPD Program
- Identify promising practices in professional development for early childhood educators

The audience for this evaluation includes the following:

- Congress, which monitors progress toward legislated goals for the ECEPD Program
- ED staff who analyze program implementation and participant outcomes and who monitor program progress toward GPRA indicators and ECEPD achievement indicators
- ECEPD grantees who may use the data for program improvement and for developing new professional development initiatives for early childhood educators
- Researchers who study professional development for early childhood educators or kindergarten teachers
- Policymakers who invest in professional development initiatives for early childhood educators
- Practitioners who are interested in strategies to improve the quality of professional development for early childhood educators

3. Use of Improved Technology

Electronic mail will be used to facilitate quick and convenient communication between the research team and interview respondents for scheduling and confirming interviews. When possible, Project Directors and other project staff completing information forms for the evaluation will be encouraged to submit materials via electronic mail.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

The data collected in the evaluation are not available from other sources. Child Trends will summarize existing data and information about each ECEPD project and will only ask questions of staff to clarify information that has already been provided or to gather new information not available in other documents or reports.

5. Burden on Small Business Organizations

No small businesses will be asked to participate in the data collection.

6. Consequences of Less Frequent Data Collection

The Evaluation of the Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program will assist ED in reporting on progress toward ECEPD achievement indicators. Without engaging in this data collection effort, ED would be limited in its ability to characterize the effectiveness of the program.

7. Special Circumstances

No special circumstances apply.

8. Outside Consultants

The interview protocols were developed at Child Trends by a team lead by Dr. Martha Zaslow. Drs. Kathryn Tout and Tamara Halle of Child Trends acted as Project Manager and Task Leader, respectively, for this study. Comments, guidance, and technical assistance were obtained from a variety of sources, including members of the Technical Working Group and Dr. Jodi Sandfort, Associate Professor at the Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota and a consultant on this evaluation.

Technical Work Group. In developing the study design for this evaluation, ED is drawing on the expertise of a TWG that provides a diverse range of experiences and perspectives. The members of this group include the following:

- Kimberly Boller (Mathematica Policy Research)
- Peg Griffin (University of California San Diego)
- Janice Im (Zero to Three)

- Craig Ramey (Georgetown University)
- Sharon Ramey (Georgetown University)
- Kyle Snow (RTI International)
- Marsha Sonnenberg (Fort Worth Independent School District)
- Carol Vukelich (University of Delaware)

This group met formally on June 29, 2006, to provide feedback and guidance on the study design and data-collection instruments. If necessary, the group will meet again via teleconference during the data analysis and reporting phase of the study.

Other opportunities for public comment. After a 60-day comment period, a copy of the publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice soliciting comments, a summary of the public comments in response to the notice, and a description of the actions taken in response to the comments will be provided.

9. Explanation of Providing Payment or Gifts to Respondents

No payment or gift of any kind will be provided to respondents.

10. Assurance of Confidentiality

In the introductory letter and in initial telephone contacts, respondents will be advised that their responses will remain anonymous when results are reported. Child Trends will use the following language: *Responses to this data collection will be used only for analytical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific project or individual. We will not provide information that identifies you or your project to anyone outside the study team, except as required by law.* Child Trends will limit the use of direct quotes, but when direct quotes are used in summary documents or the final report, Child Trends will use either generic titles, such as "one Project Director..." or pseudonyms. Respondents will be made aware that disguising the identity of programs completely when reporting findings may not be possible. The number of projects included in the study small (N = 18), and many of their project activities are unique. Thus, it may be possible to make reasonably accurate guesses about which programs are being described in qualitative description of the projects in the final report.

11. Sensitive Questions

None of the questions in the Project Directors Interview or In-Depth Interviews cover topics commonly considered private or sensitive(for example, religious beliefs or sexual practices).

12. Estimates of Hour Burden

Exhibit III shows the time burden estimates by type of data collection instrument.

Exhibit III: Burden Estimates ECEPD Evaluation Instruments

| Data Collection Instrument | Number of respondents | Hour burden |
|--|--|--|
| Burden for Project Directors | 18 | |
| Project Director Interview | (Project Directors in all 18 sites) | 27 (estimate 1.5 hour per report to complete) |
| Project Characteristics Form | (Project Directors in all 18 sites) | 4.5 (estimate 0.25 hours per Project Characteristics Form) |
| Evaluation Description Form | (Project Director in all 18 sites) | 4.5 (estimate 0.25 hours per Evaluation Description Form) |
| Materials Request | (Project Director in 9 sites) | 9 (estimate 1 hour per Materials Request) |
| Total for Project Directors | 18 | 45 |
| Burden for In-Depth Respondents | 45 | |
| In-Depth Project Team Interview | 27 (3 respondents in each of 9 sites) | 40.5 (estimate 1.5 hour to complete) |
| In-Depth Evaluation Team Interview | 18 (2 respondents in each of 9 sites) | 18 (estimate 1 hour to complete) |
| Total for In-Depth Respondents* | 45 | 58.5 |
| Grand Total | 63 | 103.5 |

*Note that there is no overlap between the Project Directors and In-Depth respondents

We estimate that the average hour burden per interview will be about one hour per interview respondent over the duration of the study. Project Directors will spend, on average, 2.5 hours. Other project participants (3 per site) will spend one hour per interview.

Exhibit IV: Cost Burden
ECEPD Evaluation Instruments

| Interview | Number of respondents | Hour burden | Hourly Rate | Monetary burden |
|--|------------------------------|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| Burden for Project Directors | | | | |
| | 18 | | | |
| Project Directors Interview | (18) | 27 (estimate 1.5 hour per interview to complete) | \$60 | \$1,620 |
| Project Characteristics Form | (18) | 4.5 (estimate 0.25 hours per Form) | \$60 | \$270 |
| Evaluation Description Form | (18) | 4.5 (estimate 0.25 hours per Form) | \$60 | \$270 |
| Materials Request | (9) | 9 (estimate 1 hour per Materials Request) | \$60 | \$540 |
| Total for Project Directors | 18 | 36 | \$60 | \$2,700 |
| Burden for In-Depth Respondents | | | | |
| | 45 | | | |
| In-Depth Project Team Interview (9 projects, 3 respondents) | (27) | 40.5 (estimate 1.5 hour to complete) | \$50 | \$2,025 |
| In-Depth Evaluation Team Interview (9 projects, 2 respondents) | (18) | 18 (estimate 1 hour to complete) | \$50 | \$900 |
| Total for In-Depth Respondents* | 45 | 58.5 | \$50 | \$2,925 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 63 | 94.5 | \$55 | \$5,625 |

*Note that there is no overlap between the Project Directors and In-Depth respondents

Exhibit IV shows the annual cost to respondents for the hour burden. We anticipate that the average cost burden per interview respondent will range from a high of \$120 for 2 hours of a Project Director's time to \$75 for 1.5 hours of a Project Team member's time, to \$50 for an hour of an Evaluation Team member's time. Each respondent will be asked to complete only one interview.

13. Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents

There are no start-up costs for this collection.

14. Estimate of Annual Cost Burden to the Federal Government

The total cost for this study to the federal government is expected to be over two years which includes the contract amount of the evaluation, less costs for components of the evaluation not related to this data collection and analysis (literature review, TWG meeting), or approximately \$225,000 annually. The cost includes the following:

- Project management and meetings with the ED COR
- Development of study design
- Development of a notification letter and brochure for distribution to Project Directors prior to the administration of the interview
- Development of interview protocols
- Pilot-testing data collection instruments
- Structured review of ECEPD grantee applications, performance reports, and evaluation reports
- Development of data bases to manage and facilitate data analysis
- Entry of new and extant data
- Data cleaning and coding
- Data analyses
- Development of preliminary and final reports on the findings of the study.

15. Program Changes or Adjustments

This is a new collection.

16. Publication Plan for Results

Results from this study will be produced in one publication that is planned for the Evaluation of the Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program. The Final Report will include a summary of findings from both phases of data collection.

| Deliverable | Due Date |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Final Report | January, 2008 |

17. Display of Expiration Date for OMB Approval

The expiration date for OMB approval will be displayed.

18. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

No exceptions are requested.