

**Early Childhood Best Practices Project:  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC)  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
U.S. Department of Education**

---

**Supporting Statement for Paperwork Reduction Act Submission  
Part A**

**Project Officer:**

Erica Shephard  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 3E212  
LBJ Federal Building  
Washington, DC 20202-6200  
Telephone: (202) 205-3871  
[erica.shephard@ed.gov](mailto:erica.shephard@ed.gov)

## CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	2
PART A: STUDY JUSTIFICATION.....	22
A.1 Circumstances That Make Collection of Data Necessary.....	22
A.2 Purposes and Uses of the Data.....	23
A.3 Use of Improved Information Technology to Reduce Burden.....	24
A.4 Efforts to Identify and Avoid Duplication.....	24
A.5 Efforts to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses or Other Entities.....	25
A.6 Consequences if the Information Is Not Collected or Is Collected Less Frequently.....	25
A.7 Special Circumstances Requiring Collection of Information in a Manner Inconsistent With Section 1320.5(d) (2) of the Federal Regulations.....	25
A.8 Federal Register Comments and Persons Consulted Outside of the Agency.....	26
A.9 Payment to Respondents.....	26
A.10 Assurance of Confidentiality Provided to Respondents.....	26
A.11 Justification for Questions of a Sensitive Nature.....	28
A.12 Estimate of Information Collection Burden.....	28
A.13 Estimate of Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents.....	28
A.14 Estimates of Annualized Costs.....	28
A.15 Change in Annual Reporting Burden.....	29
A.16 Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results.....	29
A.17 Approval to Not Display the OMB Expiration Date.....	29
A.18 Exceptions to Item 19 of OMB Form 83-I.....	30

## APPENDIX

### Site Coordinator Interview

#### INTRODUCTION

The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education (ED) is requesting Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance for the design and instruments for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (21<sup>st</sup> CCLC) Early Childhood Best Practices Project. Synergy Enterprises, Inc. (SEI), working with Children’s Institute, Inc., is conducting case studies of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs serving young children. These case studies focus on the implementation of programming for students in prekindergarten through grade 3 and on the providers’ key challenges and successes when implementing services. Particular attention will be given to key indicators of quality programming, including curricula, staffing, structures, and policies that support student safety and well-being. Observational data will be collected to provide information on indicators of quality in early childhood settings. The study is informed by the evidence base of literature on effective early childhood programs. ED’s contractors, SEI and Children’s Institute, will collect observational and interview data to describe program practices in a sample of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLCs serving young children in prekindergarten through grade 3. Findings from these case studies do not provide a nationally representative picture of the implementation of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs for young children. However, findings may be used to inform discussions about program strengths and weaknesses in serving young children, as well as future research and evaluation efforts.

The introduction to the supporting statement provides a brief description of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program, followed by a description of the study questions and design. The remaining sections of this document respond to specific instructions of the OMB for the preparation of the supporting statement, including a

justification for the study and statistical methods the evaluation will employ. The appendix contains the Site Coordinator Interview form.

### **Overview of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Program**

The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program is authorized under Title IV, Part B, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The program provides before- and afterschool academic enrichment opportunities for children attending low-performing schools to help them meet local and state academic standards in subjects such as reading and mathematics. Individual 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs may also provide youth development activities, drug and violence prevention, technology education, art and music activities, character education, counseling, and recreation to enhance the program's academic components. Under the current legislation, 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs focus services on students who attend schools that have been identified as being in need of improvement under NCLB. The changes prompted by NCLB bring the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs closer to schools and students who need additional services, and they tighten the connection between developmentally appropriate afterschool programs and academic enrichment.

Given the program's focus on providing children with additional academic enrichment opportunities that support their success in the school day, the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program plans to conduct these case studies to gain insights from efforts of these programs that can assist the U.S. Department of Education, states, and other 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs in improving implementation of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC for young children. A myriad of rigorous research studies about high-quality early childhood programs suggest that there are specific practices and strategies that promote a positive setting for young children (Burchinal et al. 2010; Early et al. 2007; Loeb et al. 2004; Love et al. 2003; National Institute of Child Health and Development [NICHD] Early Child Care Research Network [ECCRN] 2002; Ramey 2000; Reynolds et al. 2002). These studies suggest that high-quality programs do the following:

- Provide well-trained staff and optimum staff-to-child ratios within the program.
- Promote positive relationships among all children, staff, and families.
- Implement a curriculum that is developmentally and linguistically appropriate, is culturally sensitive, and promotes learning and development.
- Regularly assess children's learning and development to inform decision making and program improvement.
- Involve families and recognize their role in their children's development and learning.
- Establish relationships and use community resources to support program goals.
- React with sensitivity to the economic and logistical needs and circumstances of families when providing services.
- Include children of diverse social and economic characteristics, and include children with disabilities.

- Provide continuity with programs in elementary grades.
- Ensure a safe and healthy environment.
- Support procedures to ensure that participating children and families have access to comprehensive nutrition, health, and social services.
- Have effective governance structures, competent and knowledgeable leadership, and well-functioning administrative policies to support stable staffing and professional development.

Such practices have been examined in multiple studies, most notably the series of studies conducted as part of the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development (SECCYD; NICHD ECCRN 2002). These practices have also been examined in relation to child outcomes in experimental studies of model programs (e.g., Abecedarian Project, Ramey 2000; Perry Preschool Project, Weikart 1998) and evaluations of large-scale early childhood interventions (Chicago Child Parent Centers, Reynolds et al. 2002). Structural indicators of quality, such as caregiver education, have been investigated consistently with mixed results (e.g., Early et al. 2007; Loeb et al. 2004). Additionally, process indicators, such as the quality of teacher-child interaction and quality of instruction, have been examined in more recent studies and found to be robust predictors of child outcomes in specific domains (e.g., Burchinal et al. 2010).

There is a large body of research on early childhood environments, with many studies using observational measures of the environment such as the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (Harms, Clifford, and Cryer 1998). These measures assess process features as the interactions between adults and children, interactions between peers, availability of materials, and opportunities for cognitive stimulation. Such characteristics have been related to positive child outcomes such as better language, cognitive, and social skills (Love et al. 2003; Peisner-Feinberg et al. 2001). Further, a connection has been established between some structural characteristics and indicators of process quality. For example, the NICHD early child care study documented that lower staff-to-child ratios were linked with caregivers who were more stimulating and responsive to children's needs (NICHD ECCRN 1996, 2002), and that caregivers were more responsive and less controlling when group sizes were small (NICHD ECCRN, 2000a, 2000b).

Another process feature pertains to the content to which children are exposed while they attend early childhood programs. The current policy focus on school readiness has spearheaded the use of evidence-based practices in early childhood settings; such practices may be targeted interventions to promote one area of functioning (e.g., literacy interventions, Whitehurst et al. 1999) or more generalized curricula (e.g., HighScope, Schweinhart et al. 2005). Therefore, most early childhood education settings rely on some form of curricular resource to guide the content that is provided and the strategies that teachers employ with children. Although the evidence is limited, research suggests that early childhood teachers often have difficulty integrating academic content (e.g., preliteracy, numeracy) into children's experiences and often do not follow the curriculum with fidelity (Hamre and Pianta 2007; Lieber et al. 2009). Early childhood programs that emphasize curricular content tend to have better child outcomes, particularly regarding cognition and language (Lieber et al. 2009; Schweinhart et al. 2005, Love et al. 2006).

Building on this research, scholars and practitioners have established benchmarks to use for understanding quality in early childhood programs. For example, the National Institute for Early

Education Research (Barnett, Lamy, and Jung 2005; Epstein 2009) has delineated the following quality standards for state prekindergarten programs: (1) comprehensive early learning standards; (2) teacher having at least a bachelor's degree; (3) teacher having specialized prekindergarten training; (4) assistant teacher having a Child Development Associate (CDA) certification or the equivalent; (5) class size of 20 or lower; (6) staff-to-child ratio of 1:10 or better; (7) vision, hearing, and health screenings; (8) provision of at least one meal per day; and (9) systematic monitoring of the program, including one site visit.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has a long history of facilitating improved quality in early childhood settings. Much of this work has been summarized in the publication *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs* (Bredekamp and Copple 1997). In it, NAEYC proffers guidelines that address process factors, such as positive interactions between a limited number of consistent caregivers and children, opportunities for children to experience positive social relationships with peers, individualized approaches to meet each child's developmental needs, child-initiated activities, and providers who facilitate the process of learning (Huffman and Speer 2000; NAEYC 1997; Stipek 2004).

Taken together, the findings summarized here argue for the facilitation of optimal experiences for children in the early years, particularly those children whose development may be hindered by exposure to risk factors such as poverty. In its publications designed to improve early childhood education and intervention, NAEYC has built on a wealth of evidence and identified a set of indicators that have been robustly linked to child outcomes in a variety of studies. High-quality early childhood settings possess specific structural and process characteristics, including small group size, a low staff-to-child ratio, positive teacher-child interactions, developmentally appropriate environments, and an evidence-based curriculum that addresses young children's school readiness. Given the potential benefits to children, every early childhood environment should strive to meet these quality criteria. Thus, these aspects of quality are critical to the proposed study and to any study of early childhood programs and contexts.

### **Overview of Study Design**

Because of the increasingly critical need to provide afterschool academic and nonacademic support for children and youth, there is increased interest in questions related to the quality of afterschool early childhood services funded with federal resources. In response, this study will evaluate program quality.

Three main questions will guide the study:

1. How are 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs implementing services for children in prekindergarten through grade 3, with an emphasis on children in prekindergarten and kindergarten? What are the principal strategies, models, and practices implemented?
2. What are the key challenges and successes faced by providers when implementing services for children in preschool through grade 3?
3. How do programs vary in quality as measured by valid and reliable observation tools?

Sites will be selected randomly, but stratified to reflect a proportional representation of five characteristics: region, locale, size, years of operation, and type of center. Please see the sample selection procedure in Part B.1 and B.2 for more detail.

Sites will be contacted via e-mail, and this e-mail will be followed up by a phone call to sites that either indicate they would like to participate or do no reply. The e-mails will provide information about the study and what is entailed in participation, reminding recipients that their participation is voluntary. The follow-up calls will reiterate this information and provide potential participants with the opportunity to ask further questions about what is entailed in participation. The phone calls will also provide an opportunity to schedule the site visits.

Data collection will consist of program observations using valid and reliable observation tools, and an interview with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site coordinator or the person who leads activities at the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC site/center. Site visit teams will conduct 40 site visits between March 2011 (pending OMB and Institutional Review Board [IRB] approval) and November 2011. Site visitors will conduct personal, semi-structured interviews with the site coordinator at each site. The purpose of this interview is to gather in-depth information about a site's program implementation—i.e., its practices, strategies, and models. Data gathered from these interviews will also highlight any particular successes or challenges sites have faced in implementing programs for young children.

The two observation tools to be used are the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale–Revised (ECERS–R) and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System Pre-K (CLASS). The ECERS–R is a reliable and valid tool that is used to assess the quality dimensions of prekindergarten and kindergarten classrooms, ranging from facility space and materials to programming and interpersonal features. It has the added benefit of assessing how provisions are made for children with disabilities, as well as how the materials and staff promote the acceptance of diversity. The CLASS was chosen to supplement the ECERS–R and will provide further detail on the interpersonal interactions among staff and students and the quality of instruction provided to students. The CLASS has an explicit focus on instruction and the intent of instruction, which cannot be adequately captured by using the ECERS–R alone. There are versions for both preschool and kindergarten classrooms, with a common metric across both versions so comparisons can be made. The CLASS is widely used to assess process measures in the classroom environment.

At least two trained observers will spend approximately 2 days at each site to administer the ECERS–R and the CLASS. These observers will use the ECERS–R and the CLASS on different days. Observers will be paired at least 20 percent of the time to allow monitoring of inter-rater reliability and scoring accuracy. All observers will meet established standards in the use of all instruments and must maintain minimum levels of inter-rater reliability ( $\geq .85$ ) on the instruments.

It is possible that additional activities for prekindergarten and kindergarten children will occur in more than one classroom. The observers will gather data in up to two classrooms for the purpose of the analysis. If more than two classrooms serve children in the targeted age group, then two classrooms will be randomly selected from the total number available for observation. Each observer has had training in education, as well as experience with early education and/or school systems and with qualitative data collection.

## **PART A: STUDY JUSTIFICATION**

### **A.1 Circumstances That Make Collection of Data Necessary**

The proposed information collection will be conducted as part of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC is a formula grant program funded through CFDA 84.287 by ED. It is authorized under Title IV, Part B, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs serve children from preschool through grade 12. The 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funding supports academic enrichment opportunities during nonschool hours, particularly for students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools. Funding is awarded to state education agencies (SEAs) through formula grants (noncompetitive awards based on a predetermined formula) and then allocated by SEAs to eligible entities through statewide competitions. Funded programs provide academic enrichment and other youth development activities to help students meet local and state academic standards in subjects such as reading and math.

In the past few decades, implementing high-quality preventive interventions during the early childhood years has emerged as a key strategy for attenuating the effects of detrimental early experiences (e.g., poverty) on child outcomes. These interventions run the gamut of child/family programs from home visitation to early childhood education. A preponderance of research suggests that participation in a high-quality early childhood program has the potential to promote children's development across domains and across the early childhood years (Barnett, Lamy, and Jung 2005; Campbell et al. 2002; Early et al. 2006; Early et al. 2007; Epstein 2009; Lambert, Abbot-Shim, and Sibley 2006; Love et al. 2003; Love et al. 2006; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network 2004; Peisner-Feinberg et al. 2001; Pianta 1999; Pianta et al. 2005; Schweinhart et al. 2005; Vandell 2004; Whitehurst et al. 1999; Zaslow et al. 2006). High-quality early learning settings possess specific structural and process characteristics, including small group size, a low staff-to-child ratio, positive teacher-child interactions, developmentally appropriate environments, and an evidence-based curriculum that addresses young children's school readiness (National Association for the Education of Young Children 1997). Given the potential benefits to children, every early learning environment, including 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program environments, should strive to meet these quality criteria.

There have been no previous research or evaluation studies of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs for young children in prekindergarten through grade 3. This study will provide ED and SEA liaisons with some implementation data about a small set of grantees and allow them to (a) identify technical assistance needs in early learning programming and (b) plan for future evaluation and research studies. This exploratory study is a first step in assessing how 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs may implement high-quality early learning program elements. The findings will inform future efforts to identify best practices in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs for young children.

This study for which OMB clearance is requested is the first program quality study of early childhood best practices in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs. Because the program represents a substantial investment in providing academic and developmental enrichment, and because of the overall magnitude of the federal investment in before- and afterschool programming, this study is a first step toward understanding the quality of early childhood programming in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLCs.

## **A.2 Purposes and Uses of the Data**

ED will use the data from this study in the following ways:

- To understand the implementation of services for children in prekindergarten through grade 3
- To determine challenges and successes faced by 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC practitioners who are providing these services

- To understand the potential variation in program quality across these programs, using valid and reliable observation tools for early childhood settings

The likely audience for this evaluation includes ED, SEA coordinators, practitioners, and researchers/evaluators supporting 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs for the early childhood population. Findings from these case studies do not provide a nationally representative picture of the implementation of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs for young children, but can be used to inform discussions about the programs' strengths and weaknesses as well as future research and evaluation efforts.

Data collection activities are designed to yield valuable information about the quality of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs, practitioners' needs, and priorities for program improvement. This section describes the data requiring clearance by the OMB as part of this study. The information collected will be used to inform program policy and technical assistance in the coming years.

Exhibit 1 lists each of the instruments, along with the mode of administration, content, time needed, and estimated timeline for administration.

**Exhibit 1. Data Collection Instruments** (see appendix)

<b>Instrument/ Respondent Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mode of Administration</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
Site Coordinator Interview	40	Audiotaped and transcribed by research team	Description of high-quality program; policies and procedures in place; interactions with children; communication with families and community; school alignment; assisting children with special needs, professional development	1 hour	Late Spring/Fall 2011
Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) & Classroom Assessment Scoring System Pre-K (CLASS)  <i>(Copies will be provided upon OMB's request. Please note that copies of these instruments are not included as appendixes because they are copyrighted and do not contribute to burden estimates.)</i>	40 sites (up to 2 classrooms per center)	Observation	The ECERS-R is a reliable and valid tool that can be used to assess the classroom environment, from facility space and materials to programming and interpersonal features. It has the added benefit of assessing how provisions are made for children with disabilities as well as how the materials and staff promote the acceptance of diversity. The CLASS was chosen to supplement the ECERS-R and provide further detail on the interpersonal interactions among staff and students. There are versions for both preschool and kindergarten students, and there is a common metric across both versions so that scores can be compared. It is widely used to assess process measures in the classroom environment.	2 hours	Late Spring/Fall 2011



### **A.3 Use of Improved Information Technology to Reduce Burden**

The collection of information does not include the use of electronic or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

### **A.4 Efforts to Identify and Avoid Duplication**

While a number of studies address quality in 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programming in the elementary grades (including Dynarski et al. 2003, 2004, and Penuel and McGhee 2010), there are no existing implementation or case study data on the programs' youngest students—those in prekindergarten through grade 3. Currently no other sources exist that would enable us to understand the practices, needs, and concerns of a sample of site coordinators in the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC community.

### **A.5 Efforts to Minimize Burden on Small Businesses or Other Entities**

No small businesses are impacted by the data collection in this project.

### **A.6 Consequences if the Information Is Not Collected or Is Collected Less Frequently**

In the absence of the site coordinator interview, it would be difficult for ED to effectively determine the level of program quality, the needs of the practitioners, and the concerns of such a broad spectrum of early childhood afterschool practitioners. Failure to collect this information will prevent Congress and ED from obtaining implementation data for the early childhood population within a federal program that spends more than \$1 billion each year to support the academic enrichment of children who attend low-performing schools.

### **A.7 Special Circumstances Requiring Collection of Information in a Manner Inconsistent With Section 1320.5(d)(2) of the Federal Regulations**

There are no special circumstances requiring deviation from these guidelines.

## **A.8 Federal Register Comments and Persons Consulted Outside of the Agency**

The 60-day notice of proposed information collection request was made on July 22, 2010, in the Federal Register, Volume 75, No. 140, p. 42725. The 30-day notice of submission for OMB review was submitted on September 22, 2010, in the Federal Register, Volume 75, No. 183, p. 57741.

Those persons consulted outside the agency include the contractor, Synergy Enterprises, Inc., and its subcontractor, Children’s Institute. In addition, members of a technical working group were consulted. The technical working group comprises survey design experts, early childhood experts, and leaders from the federally funded 21<sup>st</sup> CCLCs. Its members are listed below.

### **Technical Working Group Members**

**(1) Janet Fischel, Ph.D.**

Clinical Psychologist  
Stony Brook University

**(2) Jerry West, Ph.D.**

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.  
Washington, DC

**(3) Lorraine Thoreson, M.A.**

Michigan Department of Education  
Lansing, Michigan

**(4) Martina Thompson, Ph.D.**

Director of Early Childhood Education  
Topeka School District  
Topeka, Kansas

**(5) Cynthia Wise Galvan, Ph.D.**

Program Coordinator  
Mercedes Independent School District  
Mercedes, Texas

**(6) Margarita Calderon, Ph.D.**

Professor Emeritus  
Johns Hopkins University

**(7) Janese Kerr-Daniels, Ph.D.**

Towson University  
Towson, Maryland

**(8) Dre’ Knox, M.A.**

Indiana Department of Education  
Indianapolis, Indiana

**(9) Betty Jean Mertens, M.A.**

Teacher Supervisor and Educator  
Three Rivers Special Services  
Kennebec, South Dakota

## **A.9 Payment to Respondents**

There will be no incentive payment to respondents.

## **A.10 Assurance of Confidentiality Provided to Respondents**

We have established a set of standards and procedures to safeguard the confidentiality of participants and the security of data as they are collected, processed, stored, and reported. ED’s contractors will follow procedures for assuring and maintaining confidentiality. The following safeguards are routinely employed to carry out confidentiality assurances:

- ED’s contractors, including SEI and Children’s Institute, have current Ethical Principles in Research Projects (EPRP) or Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP) certification. All persons associated with this project at both SEI and Children’s Institute have signed agreements or have written policies regarding confidentiality. These agreements affirm each individual’s understanding of the importance of maintaining data security and confidentiality and of abiding by the management and technical procedures that implement these policies.
- All data, including both paper files and computerized files, will be kept in secure areas. Paper files will be stored in locked storage areas with limited access on a need-to-know basis. Computerized files will be managed via password control systems to restrict access and to physically secure the source files, which will be located on secure servers in other locations.
- Merged data sources will have identification data stripped from the individual records or will be encoded to preclude overt identification of individuals.
- All reports, tables, and printed materials will be limited to presentation of aggregated numbers.
- Compilations of individualized data will not be provided to participating individuals or agencies.
- Confidentiality agreements will be executed with any participating research subcontractors and consultants who must obtain access to detailed data files.

Based on the contractor’s discussion with Western Institutional Review Board (the IRB that will review the study), the study will be considered minimal risk because the participants are not children or vulnerable subjects, the study instruments do not request disclosure of sensitive information, no subjects will be videotaped, and all subjects will be de-identified in any subsequent reporting. For the entire study, only adults will be interviewed. Obtaining informed consent for participation in interviews will consist of reviewing the confidentiality statement with the subject prior to the interview, as well as reviewing with the subject the informational text provided in the instructions for the interviewer on the second page of the Site Coordinator Interview form. Subjects will thus be notified that their participation is voluntary, will be informed of what is entailed in their participation, and will be made aware of their right to cease participation at any time. Once these are explained, consent is then assumed by their participation in the interview.

The Site Coordinator Interview form will include text indicating that individuals’ responses will not be shared with the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program staff and that their responses will be reported only as part of aggregate statistics across all participants. The data collection plan will be explained to all site coordinators in written materials provided in advance of the data collection or site observation, and a representative of the project will be available to answer any questions. At the beginning of the site coordinator interview, the interviewer will review the contents of the consent form with the site coordinator; if he or she does not understand it, a member of the research team will explain it and note the explanation on the consent form.

The Site Coordinator Interview form will include the following text regarding confidentiality:

*“The research team will not share any information you share with us, and we will not share with you the information that other staff members give us. Only the research team will be able to see the information you give them, and nothing will ever be said about*

*you as an individual. Information about you will be combined with information about everybody else in the study.”*

Responses to data collection will be used only for descriptive and/or statistical purposes.

**A.11 Justification for Questions of a Sensitive Nature**

We have not included any questions or topics of a sensitive nature on the interview protocol.

**A.12 Estimate of Information Collection Burden**

Exhibit 2 shows that the estimated annual/total respondent burden for this data collection is 80 hours. The Site Coordinator Interview and preparation for Site Observation are estimated to each take 1 hour for each of the 40 sites. The observation itself should not be disruptive to the normal operation of the programs; however there is an associated burden with scheduling, arrival, set-up, and conclusion of the observation.

*Exhibit 2. Estimated Annual Respondent Burden*

<b>Data Collection Activity</b>	<b>Hour Burden per Respondent (in hours)</b>	<b>Annual/Total Possible Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Annual/Total Possible Hour Burden (in hours)</b>
Site Coordinator Interview	1.0	40	40
Site Observations Preparation	1.0	40	40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>

The estimated annual/total hour/cost burden for all data collection is presented in Exhibit 3.

*Exhibit 3. Respondent Cost Burden Estimate*

<b>Data Collection Activity</b>	<b>Annual/Total Possible Respondents</b>	<b>Annual/Total Possible Hour Burden</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Annual/Total Cost Burden</b>
Site Coordinator Interview	40	40	\$22.00	\$880.00
Site Observation Preparation	40	40	\$22.00	\$880.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>\$22.00</b>	<b>\$1760.00</b>

**A.13 Estimate of Total Annual Cost Burden to Respondents**

The proposed data collection does not impose a financial burden on respondents, nor will respondents incur any expense other than the time spent participating.

**A.14 Estimates of Annualized Costs**

The estimated cost to the federal government of conducting these data collection activities is based on the government’s contracted cost of the data collection and related study activities along with the personnel cost of government employees involved in oversight and/or analysis. For the data

collection activities for which OMB approval is currently being requested, the overall cost to the government is \$624,221. This includes activities of the prime contractor and subcontractors to develop the instruments, recruit participants, and collect and analyze the data. This 3-year project will encompass the planning, preparation, analysis, and reporting tasks. This estimate includes the required labor and associated administrative costs. This estimate also includes the preparation, training, travel, and logistical costs for the site visit teams to visit 40 sites. The site visit team will include at least two staff members, and they will be on-site for at least 2 days.

#### A.15 Change in Annual Reporting Burden

This request is for new information collection. There is a program change of 40 responses and 80 hours.

#### A.16 Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results

ED will conduct the study according to the schedule shown in Exhibit 4. Three reports will be prepared for the purpose of this study. The first report is a **Preliminary Briefing** of findings based on the first half of the site visits. The purpose of this briefing is to share recommendations for any necessary changes to the project after half of the site visits are completed. The second report is an **Implementation Report for Practitioners** highlighting the findings from all 40 site visits, along with data summarized from site coordinator interviews. The purpose of this report is to describe (1) how programs are implementing services, (2) the key challenges and successes faced by providers when implementing services, and (3) how programs vary in quality indicators as measured by valid and reliable observation tools for early childhood settings. Data from the site coordinator interview will be used to provide a descriptive picture of the range of sites currently serving young children. Finally, an **Implementation Guide for Practitioners** will be developed based on this study's findings and other findings from the larger body of rigorous, scientifically based early childhood research. An abbreviated version of the Implementation Guide will be designed and disseminated broadly across the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC community.

*Exhibit 4. Plans for Tabulation and Publication of Results*

<b>Conduct Case Studies</b>	
In-depth Case Studies begin	3-4 weeks after OMB clearance
In-depth Case Studies end	Approximately November 15, 2011
<b>Prepare Reports</b>	
First draft Preliminary Briefing	July 2011
Revised draft Preliminary Briefing	September 2011
First draft Implementation Report for Practitioners	February 2012
Revised draft Implementation Report for Practitioners	April 2012
First draft Implementation Guide for Practitioners	June 2012
Revised draft Implementation Guide for Practitioners	September 2012

#### A.17 Approval to Not Display the OMB Expiration Date

The OMB number and expiration date will be displayed at the top of the cover page or first Web page for each instrument used in the study. This information will also be printed on all correspondence to

participants.

**A.18 Exceptions to Item 19 of OMB Form 83-I**

No exceptions are requested.