

Study Number (SN)	0057-00
Title	Early Childhood Care and Education collection: Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative (ECCE), 2008 – 2011
Depositor	Tallaght West Childhood Development Initiative
Publisher	Irish Social Science Data Archive (ISSDA)
URL	www.issda.ie/ecce
Publication Date	2017
Version	1
Type	Dataset
Suggested citation	<p>Tallaght West Childhood Development Initiative. (2017). <i>Early Childhood Care and Education collection: Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative (ECCE), 2008 – 2011.</i> [data collection]. Version 1. Irish Social Science Data Archive. SN: 0057-00.</p> <p>www.issda.ie/ecce</p>

Early Childhood Care and Education

User Guide (v1), July 2017

Early Childhood Care and Education (version 1) was prepared in July 2017 by the Children's Research Network as part of the Prevention and Early Intervention Research Initiative (2017).

<http://www.childrensresearchnetwork.org>

Contents

1. Introduction to the User Guide.....	3
2. Background of study	3
2.1. Programme aims:.....	3
2.2. Funding:	3
2.3. Evaluator:.....	4
2.4. Ethical approval for evaluation:.....	4
3. Programme delivery.....	4
3.1. Target population:	4
3.2. Programme design:.....	4
3.3. Dates of programme delivery:	6
3.4. Recruitment and sampling:.....	6
4. Programme evaluation	6
4.1. Evaluation design:	6
4.2. Randomisation:	6
4.3. Respondents:	7
4.4. Field work:.....	8
4.5. Sample size:.....	8
4.6. Sample size over time:	9

5. The archived ECCE collection	10
5.1. File structure	10
5.2. ECCE Child Assessments:.....	10
5.3. ECCE Parent Interviews:.....	11
5.4. ECCE Service Assessments:	11
5.5. Structure of archived collection.....	11
5.6. Variable naming convention:	12
5.7. Missing cases in the archived file:.....	13
5.8. Missing data:	13
6. Advisory note from data creators.....	14
7. Recommended data citation.....	14
8. References	15
Appendix A: Information and consent forms	16
A1. General consent form.....	16
A2. Information letter for parents (2013).....	17
A3. Information letter for control group parents	18
A4. Ethical extension request to archive data from ECCE	19
Appendix B: Publications	20
Appendix C: Standardised instruments – full title and citations	21

List of tables

Table 1: Data collection schedule	8
Table 2: Early Years settings per cohort and evaluation condition	8
Table 3: Sample size of children for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2	9
Table 4: Contents of each cohort folder	11
Table 5: Non-response codes for categorical variables	13
Table 6. Components of recommended data citation	14

1. Introduction to the User Guide

This User Guide provides an overview of the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) Programme and evaluation, specifically the objectives and methodology of the evaluation and the resulting structure of the archived data. The User Guide should be used as a reference tool, and users of the archived data should refer to the report *Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative* (Hayes et al., 2013) for more detailed information on the research and results. This User Guide was prepared by the Children's Research Network as part of the Prevention and Early Intervention Research Initiative (2017) and accompanies the deposition of the experimental (quantitative) component of ECCE study in the Irish Social Science Data Archive in July 2017.

More information on the Early Years programme and the Early Childhood Care and Education evaluation report can be found at:

<http://www.twcdi.ie/>

<http://www.twcdi.ie/research-policy/evaluation-reports/>

More on the Prevention and Early Intervention Research Initiative can be found at:

<http://www.childrensresearchnetwork.org>

<http://www.childrensresearchnetwork.org/knowledge/collection/prevention-and-early-intervention>

2. Background of study

2.1. Programme aims: The Early Years Programme was a 2-year programme targeted at children and their families in Tallaght West. Following the publication of the 2004 needs analysis (*How are Our Kids?*, CDI, 2004), the Childhood Development Initiative (CDI) developed a 10-year strategy, which sought to act on three specific aims:

1. to develop new services to support children and families;
2. to encourage better integration of education, social care and health provision;
3. to promote community change initiatives to improve the physical and social fabrics of the neighbourhoods in which children live, play and learn.

The Early Years Programme was designed to support and target all families in Tallaght West, including those whose children may face barriers to educational achievement and well-being.

2.2. Funding: During the period of the ECCE evaluation (2008 – 2011) the programme was jointly funded by the Department of Children and Youth Affairs (DCYA) and The Atlantic Philanthropies as

part of the Prevention and Early Intervention Programme (PEIP). The archiving of the research data from the ECCE evaluation was carried out as part of the Children’s Research Network Prevention and Early Intervention Research Initiative (2016 – 2018) and was funded by the Atlantic Philanthropies.

2.3. Evaluator: The evaluation was conducted by the CDI Evaluation team at the Centre for Social and Educational Research at the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT) and the Institute of Education at the University of London. The Principal Investigators were Professor Nóirín Hayes at DIT and Professor Iram Siraj-Blatchford at the University of London. The Lead Researcher was Siobhán Keegan at DIT.

2.4. Ethical approval for evaluation: Ethical approval for the ECCE study was granted to the CDI Evaluation team in October 2008 by the Ethics Committee at the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT). Additional ethical approval for the archiving of an anonymised version of the quantitative data was requested from the Ethics Committee at DIT in December 2009 (see Appendix A for ethics documentation).

3. Programme delivery

3.1. Target population: The Early Years Programme targeted children aged 2 years 6 months to 4 years living in the four communities of Tallaght West, and their parents/carers.

3.2. Programme design: The following supports were provided to Early Years services that participated in the Early Years Programme (the intervention group).

1. *Training in Highscope curriculum:* Early Years practitioners were trained in the delivery of the HighScope curriculum and the Síolta framework (non-mandatory)
2. *Practitioner to child ratio of 1:5:* Early Years services had an extra Early Years practitioner to allow a Practitioner to child ratio of 1:5, which is more favourable than the national comparison of 1:6 or higher for a similar service
3. *Longer working week:* In practice, practitioners operated a key worker system and worked a 37-hour week, which, being longer than typical childcare working weeks, allowed for curriculum and daily planning, individualised record-keeping and home visit time;
4. *Establishment of parent/carer facilitator role:* The PCF was a staff member (not included in the above ratio) designated to working with parents. The PCF role was designed to support learning between the home and Early Years environments and to create better working relationships between parents and children.

Early Years services that participated in the Early Years Programme (the intervention group) provided the following supports to children and their parents that attended their service:

1. *Low-cost, flexible and broad-based curriculum*: Over the course of 2 years parents had access to a low-cost, flexible and broad-based curriculum operating within the principles of HighScope for 4 hours 15 minutes per day (cost to parents was €5 per week);
2. *Practitioner FETAC Level 5 qualification in childcare or equivalent*: It was required that senior childcare practitioners had a degree-level qualification or equivalent in early childhood care and education, while the childcare workers were required to have at least a FETAC Level 5 qualification in childcare or equivalent;
3. *Access to a dedicated speech and language therapist*: Children were referred to a designated intervention speech and language therapist (whose caseload consisted of intervention children only), as required, and the therapist held assessment and therapy sessions in the Early Years services;
4. *Access to other services if required*: Children were also referred to psychological, primary health and social service professionals as necessary and these referral processes were supported by networks developed by the delivering agency, supported by CDI;
5. *Home visits by PCF / practitioner*: Early Years practitioners engaged in home visits (target of 4 per year) with families as a means of bridging the Early Years service-home learning gap. The aim of these home visits by the PCF and key Early Years practitioners was to develop a relationship with parents, and to provide information for parents on topics such as education, services or extra supports;
6. *Parents Plus Community Course*: This parent education programme was to support parents in the positive parenting of their children, with a focus on enhancing children's early learning and development;
7. *Observation of child by practitioner*: Observation of children's learning enabled practitioners to develop child-centred follow-up work plans in collaboration with parents during home visits;
8. *Other health provisions*: Nutritious food, physical play and recreation opportunities, as well as specialist primary healthcare support in the areas of dental hygiene and psychological assessment was provided;
9. *Summer programme*: In order to bridge the gap in provision in the summer months, children were offered a summer programme in the month of July, which was less formally structured and offered opportunities for parent involvement, day trips and sustained outdoor activities;

10. *Liaison with schools by practitioner:* Early Years practitioners also aimed to aid transition between school and Early Years services by liaising with receiving schools and preparing children for the transition to school.

3.3. **Dates of programme delivery:** This intervention was delivered in two waves, each lasting two years. Cohort 1 began in September 2008 and ceased in August 2010. Cohort 2 began in September 2009 and ceased in August 2011.

3.4. **Recruitment and sampling:** Early Years services in Tallaght West applied to deliver the Early Years Programme through the submission of an Expression of Interest form. Applicants were informed that delivery of the programme would be subject to a randomisation process.

4. Programme evaluation

4.1. **Evaluation design:** The evaluation of the Early Years intervention included a quantitative assessment of the programme and a qualitative assessment of the implementation ‘process’¹. The evaluation was designed to determine how the Early Years Programme met the three aims of CDI (see 1.1. above).

4.2. **Randomisation:** Early Years services in Tallaght West were randomly allocated to either an intervention or a control group after being matched in pairs to balance important prognostic factors at baseline, namely:

- Early Years practitioner qualifications
- setting capacity
- staff : child ratio

Services that were assigned to the control condition delivered their Early Years programmes as usual. After the evaluation was complete practitioners in these services were offered the opportunity to receive the same, or equal, level of training as those in intervention services and some received funding towards the provision of extra child spaces.

¹ Qualitative data is not included in the archived collection due to ethical restrictions on the sharing of this data

4.3. Respondents: The analysis focused both on service-level outcomes and child-level outcomes, with the child outcomes being used to make inferences about the Early Years service. The archived collection therefore consists of three respondent groups:

1. *Child assessments:* Child-level data collection consisted of both one-to-one child assessments and key worker ratings of children's social and behavioural development. Child assessments were carried out by trained fieldworkers (or the lead researcher) who visited the Early Years services by prior arrangement at three time points (baseline, mid-phase and end phase) over the course of the two years. In cases where children had left the Early Years services for primary school or a new Early Years service, these assessments either happened in the home or in the new educational setting. One-to-one assessments took place in the child's usual Early Years service room at a child-sized table at which individual children and the fieldworker sat side by side. Assessment on the 5 BAS subscales took approximately 20 minutes per child and 4-5 children were assessed per day. Therefore, a fieldworker usually carried out assessments over at least three consecutive days in the same Early Years service. Children's key workers were asked to fill out the social and behavioural questionnaire on the children in their key groups and these completed questionnaires were collected by fieldworkers on the last day of child assessment.
2. *Parent interviews:* Parents participated in a parent interview to coincide with their child's entry to the Early Years service (baseline), which included questions on family structure, ethnicity, parental education and employment, as well as the parent-level instruments of Parental Stress Scale, Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Home Learning Environment Index. These interviews were conducted one-to-one with a trained fieldworker either in the Early Years services or in the home. 27 parents opted to complete the interview over the telephone. Parents were then re-interviewed two years later (end phase) and were asked questions about their experience of their child attending an Early Years service, in addition to re-administration of the same three instruments that had been administered at baseline.
3. *Service assessments:* Early Years service quality assessments occurred to coincide roughly with child assessments, i.e. at the beginning of the Early Years service year (baseline), after the first year (mid-phase) and after the second year (end phase). The ECERS-E was administered at all three points in time, but due to the more structural nature of the ECERS-R, it was decided to implement this only at the beginning of the Early Years service year and two years later given that the majority of items it contained were less likely to change over short periods of time.

4.4. Field work: Table 1 below details the data collection schedule for each cohort.

Table 1: Data collection schedule

	Baseline (beginning of the Early Years service year)	Mid-phase (end of the first year of service provision)	End-phase (end of the second year of service provision)
Cohort 1	October or early November 2008	May 2009	May 2010
Cohort 2	October or early November 2009	May 2010	May 2011

4.5. Sample size: Five services delivered the intervention during the Cohort 1 phase (2008 – 2010) and a further four new services delivered it during the Cohort 2 phase (2009 – 2011). One service from the Cohort 1 phase opened an extra room with new Early Years practitioners during the Cohort 2 phase, therefore one service participated in both waves of intervention delivery and evaluation. The number of children assessed at baseline was 311, which was over 100 less than the planned figure of 440. Table 2 lists the Early Years settings (anonymised as Setting A, Setting B etc.), the cohort and condition to which they were assigned.

Table 2: Early Years settings per cohort and evaluation condition

Setting	Condition	Cohort	Period dates	Number of cases at BL	Total number at BL per cohort
Setting A	Intervention	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	17	96
Setting B	Intervention	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	23	
Setting C	Intervention	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	30	
Setting D	Intervention	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	13	
Setting E	Intervention	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	13	
Setting F	Control	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	10	79
Setting G	Control	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	23	
Setting H	Control	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	34	
Setting I	Control	Cohort 1	2008 – 2010	12	
Setting J	Intervention	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	19	85
Setting K	Intervention	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	15	
Setting L	Intervention	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	21	
Setting M	Intervention	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	20	
Setting N	Intervention	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	10	

Setting O	Control	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	24	84
Setting P	Control	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	17	
Setting Q	Control	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	10	
Setting R	Control	Cohort 2	2009 – 2011	33	

4.6. Sample size over time: Table 3 shows the sample size for each cohort. In Cohort 1, there was a follow-up rate of 91% of the original baseline sample. All late entry intervention children in Cohort 1 were assessed at the end-phase stage. The follow-up rate for the Cohort 1 control group was 72% and 90% for the late entry children. The total follow-up rate from baseline to end phase for original Cohort 2 children was 89% for the intervention group and 76% for the control group. The better follow-up rate in the intervention group compared to the control group is most likely due to the fact that intervention group children were signed up to a 2-year programme, therefore most were still attending the same Early Years service at the end-phase stage as they had been at the baseline stage. In the control group, children tended to move on to another school or Early Years service after one year (since they were not signed up to a 2-year programme), therefore being more dispersed at the end phase, they were harder to access for assessment purposes.

Table 3: Sample size of children for Cohort 1 (September 2008 to August 2010) and Cohort 2 (September 2009 to August 2011).

		Baseline (Oct/Nov 2008)	Mid-phase (May 2009)	End-phase (May 2010)
Cohort 1	Intervention group	77	78	70
	Control group	75	72	54
	Late entry Intervention group	0	20	20
	Late entry Control group	0	11	10
Cohort 2		Baseline (Oct/Nov 2009)	Mid-phase (May 2010)	End-phase (May 2011)
	Intervention group	83	76	74
	Control group	76	69	58

	Late entry Intervention group	0	3	8
	Late entry Control group	0	2	0
TOTAL		311	331	294

Adapted from Hayes et al., 2013, pg. 9 Table 1.1: Number of children assessed at baseline, mid-phase and end-phase stages

5. The archived ECCE collection

5.1. File structure

Data from the quantitative assessment of the Early Years programme are included in the archived collection. The archived data collection is split into three folders according to the three respondent groups:

- (1) ECCE Child Assessments
- (2) ECCE Parent Interviews
- (3) ECCE Service Assessments

5.2. ECCE Child Assessments: The child assessments commence with descriptive variables, including the unique identifier per respondent (allows individual child to be tracked across the three data collection waves), evaluation condition (whether child is in intervention or control group), sex of child, childcare setting (allows child data to be mapped to service assessment data), session timing in childcare (child attended Early Years setting for whole day or part of day), and child age variables. The following instruments were used to assess child participants in both intervention and control groups:

- British Ability Scales 2nd Edition (BAS II; Elliot et al, 1996): specifically the Block Building, Verbal Comprehension, Picture Similarity, Naming Vocabulary, Early Number Concepts subscales
- Lower letter recognition (Clay, 2002 and 2006) used at end phase only
- Rhyme and Alliteration (Bryant and Bradley, 1985) used at end phase only
- Adaptive Social Behaviour Inventory (ASBI; Hogan et al, 1992)
- Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman, 1997) Hyperactivity subscale only
- Child Social Behaviour Questionnaire (CSBQ) which is comprised of 30 items from the ASBI and 5 items from the SDQ. For more on the CSBQ please refer to Sylva et al., 2004.

5.3. ECCE Parent Interviews: The parent interviews commence with descriptive variables, including the unique identifier per respondent (allows parent interview data to be mapped to child assessment data), evaluation condition (whether child is in intervention or control group), childcare setting (allows parent interview data to be mapped to service assessment data), session timing in childcare (child attended Early Years setting for whole day or part of day), and child age variables. This next section of variables provide household demographics including ethnicity, primary and secondary language spoken at home, number of family members at home, age of parents, parents' highest level of education, parent relationship status, and child's medical conditions – all of these demographic variables have been anonymised during the preparation of the data for archiving to reduce the potential for identifying individuals in the dataset. The following instruments were used in the parent/care-giver completed survey in both intervention and control groups:

- The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman, 1997)
- The Parent Stress Scale (PSS; Berry and Jones, 1995)
- Items adapted from the Home Learning Environment Index (HLE; Melhuish et al, 2001)

5.4. ECCE Service Assessments: The following instruments were used to assess the Early Years services in both intervention and control groups:

- Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale – Revised edition (ECERS-R; Harms et al., 1998)
- Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale – Extension (ECERS-E; Sylva et al., 2006)
- The Arnett Caregiver Interaction Scale (CIS; Arnett, 1989)

5.5. Structure of archived collection

Each of the respondent groups (child, parent; setting) are split into a Cohort 1 (2008 – 2010) folder and a Cohort 2 (2009 – 2011) folder. Each folder contains the components described in Table 4.

Table 4: Contents of each cohort folder

Folder name	Contents
Codebooks	The codebook lists all variables in the archived dataset with some basic frequencies. Variables are listed chronologically as they appear in the archived data file. There is one codebook per data collection wave per cohort. The codebooks were created during the archiving process.
Data	The archived data file for this cohort – there is one data file per data collection wave per cohort.
Surveys	The survey instrument used to gather data for this cohort. Please note, it

	is not possible to share copyright-restricted content via the archive, in particular proprietary survey materials. Restricted survey material should be accessed from the instrument owner. Where survey material cannot be shared via the archive due to copyright restrictions, a citation for the sale is provided in the codebook. A full list of scale citations is included in this document in Appendix C.
--	---

5.6. Variable naming convention:

Variable naming in the ECCE collection follows the preferred format of the wider PEI Research Initiative. Data were prepared in SPSS Statistical Software. Punctuation (mostly apostrophes, commas and quotation marks) was removed from variable labels to prevent formatting errors from occurring when data is used across different software platforms. Labels are limited to 60 character and users should therefore refer to the survey question for the exact wording of the survey question. Users should refer to the codebooks in the archived collection for specific information on individual variables. Variables were named and labelled according to the following format options:

- Variables that were generated by the survey correspond to the question number in the survey, and are labelled to correspond as closely as possible to the original wording of the survey question. Labels are sometimes composed from truncated survey questions due to character restrictions in the software.

Example a:

Variable name	Variable label
RegBedtime	<i>1.1a Does your child have a regular bedtime?</i>

- Variables that were created during data entry and analysis are clearly named and labelled to indicate their content.

Example b:

Variable name	Variable label
Condition	<i>Condition: intervention or control</i>

- Variables that were created during anonymisation are clearly named and labelled to indicate their content.

Example c:

Variable name	Variable label
MotherAge	<i>Age of study child's mother (anonymised)</i>

4. Scale variables, including individual scale items, domain scores and total scores are named with the scale acronym which is capitalised for ease of reference. These acronyms are consistent across all waves to facilitate the user to track specific measures across waves. Where permission has been granted to reproduce the scale contents in the archive, items are labelled so that they correspond as closely as possible to the wording of the survey question. The below example illustrates the first item from the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire which is an openly available instrument.

Example d:

Variable name	Variable label
<i>SDQ_1</i>	<i>2.6. Considerate of other people's feelings (SDQ item 1)</i>

5. Where permission to reproduce instrument content has not been granted, individual items are labelled with the scale title and sequence number. The below example illustrates the first item from the Parenting Stress Scale which cannot be shared via the archive due to copyright restrictions.

Example e:

Variable name	Variable label
<i>PSS_1</i>	<i>2.37. Parenting Stress Scale item 1</i>

5.7. Missing cases in the archived file: All cases are included in the data file for each wave, so that individual wave files can be merged together if required. However, data was not collected for every case at each data collection point and consequently there are a small number of missing cases in each data file.

5.8. Missing data: While participants were encouraged to answer all questions during the interview, there were some instances where a participant either could not provide a response to a question or did not wish to provide a response. Imputed values are not included in the archived dataset so that new users can manage missing data in a manner that best suits their research design. Non-response codes for categorical variables are indicated as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Non-response codes for categorical variables

Value code	Value label
996	Missing

997	Not applicable Don't know
998	Refuse

6. Advisory note from data creators

New users should refer to the British Ability Scale Second Edition (BAS II, NFER-NELSON Publishing Company) handbook and score sheet to make sense of the archived ECCE data that was generated by this instrument. GCA is Global Conceptual Ability which is used to measure cognitive ability (mean of 100, standard deviation of 15). The GCA score is a composite score which focuses on reasoning and conceptual abilities. Users should refer to the BAS handbook when using the GCA score data. BAS materials are current distributed by GL Assessment: <https://www.gl-assessment.co.uk/>

7. Recommended data citation

Users are required to provide a full citation for the data in any new outputs from the archived dataset. The data citation should contain at the very minimum the components shown in Table 6. Please refer to the in-house style of publisher for the format of this citation.

Table 6. Components of recommended data citation

Identifier	Use DOI [<i>if not available use archive reference or serial number</i>]
Creators	Childhood Development Initiative; Nóirín Hayes; Iram Siraj-Blatchford; Centre for Social and Educational Research, Dublin Institute of Technology; Institute of Education, University of London
Title	Early Childhood Care and Education collection: Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative 2008 – 2011
Publisher [distributor]	<i>Choose one of the following:</i> Irish Social Science Data Archive Irish Qualitative Data Archive UK Data Archive
Publication year of data collection	2017
Resource type	Collection

Version	Optional [include the version you are using where multiple versions of archived data collection have been released]
---------	---

Example citation for the full ECCE data collection: Childhood Development Initiative; Nóirín Hayes; Iram Siraj-Blatchford; Centre for Social and Educational Research, Dublin Institute of Technology; Institute of Education, University of London (2017). Early Childhood Care and Education collection: Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative 2008 – 2011. [dataset]. Version 1. Dublin: Irish Social Science Data Archive [distributor]. SN: XXXXX. ucd.ie/issda/xxx

8. References

Nóirín Hayes, Iram Siraj-Blatchford, Siobhán Keegan and Eimear Goulding (2013) *Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative*. Dublin: Childhood Development Initiative (CDI). http://www.twcdi.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CDI-Early_Years_Report_24.01-web-1.pdf

Kathy Sylva, Edward Melhuish, Pam Sammons, Iram Siraj-Blatchford and Brenda Taggart (2004) *The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: Final Report: A Longitudinal Study Funded by the DfES 1997-2004*. <http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/5309/>

Appendix A: Information and consent forms

A1. General consent form

Researchers' Names: PROFESSOR IRAM SIRAJ-BLATCHFORD, PROFESSOR NÓIRÍN HAYES SIOBHÁN KEEGAN	Title: ECCE EVALUATION RESEARCH TEAM
Faculty/School/Department: CENTRE FOR SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (Contact [phone number redacted])	
Title of Study: EVALUATION OF THE EARLY CHILDHOOD CARE AND EDUCATION SERVICE OF TALLAGHT WEST CHILD DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE	
To be completed by the: PARTICIPANT	
Please circle the relevant answer	
• Have you been fully informed/read the information sheets about this study? YES/NO	
• Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study? YES/NO	
• Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions? YES/NO	
• Have you received enough information about this study? YES/NO	
• Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study; • at any time, • without giving a reason for withdrawing, • without affecting your future relationship with the Institute? YES/NO	
• Do you agree to take part in this study the results of which are likely to be published? YES/NO	
• Have you been informed that this consent form and all information you provide shall be kept in the confidence of the researcher? YES/NO	
Name of participant (Block letters): _____	
Signature of participant: _____	
Signature of Researcher: _____	Date: _____

A2. Information letter for parents (2013)



Information Letter for Parents of Children Participating in the Research

This is a valuable piece of research and the research team really hopes that you and your child will take part. The information gathered will be used to see how the preschool services are helping the children to develop and the information will be presented in general rather than focusing on any one child, family or childcare setting.

Children will be given gifts such as colouring pencils as a small thank you for taking part and all parents who agree to participate will be entered into a draw for a €250 supermarket shopping voucher as a token of our appreciation.

Children

- Children will be given an I.D. number at the start of the research and they will be identified by this number rather than by their name from then on. The only people who will have access to child names are the Lead Researcher (Siobhan Keegan) and the fieldworker. Child data will not be stored with names so there will be no way for anyone apart from the Lead Researcher to tell which child data goes with which name
- Information will be gathered on child development at three different points in time-once at the beginning of preschool, once at the end of the first year and once at the end of the second year
- The assessments are designed to be child-friendly and children tend to enjoy them as they are meant to feel like playing a game and they only last about 20 minutes
- Information on children will be gathered by fieldworkers in the preschool setting. The fieldworkers are highly trained to work with children and parents
- Reports on the progress of the research will be completed by the research team regularly and submitted to CDI. CDI will give updates on the results so that parents can be kept informed about the research
- We regret that we cannot give parents their individual child's results. Our fieldworkers are not trained to be clinical or educational psychologists therefore they are not qualified or permitted to report on individual children. If you are concerned about your child, a member of the preschool staff will have ideas about how to get some extra help for them
- The Lead Researcher will also be a point of contact should parents have any additional questions or concerns about the research (see contact details below). Please feel free to call or email me any time.

Parents

- We will gather information through two face-to-face interviews with parents. This will happen at a time and place that suits parents; once at the beginning of their child's preschool and once at the end of the two year programme. The interview lasts only 15 minutes and is about the general experience of parenting young children.
- All information given will be treated as confidential

Thank you for your valued participation

Signed: The Research Team:

Professor Iram Siraj-Blatchford, Professor Nóirín Hayes and Siobhán Keegan

Contact: [contact name and address redacted]

Phone: [phone number redacted]

Email: [email redacted]

A3. Information letter for control group parents



Information Letter for Parents of Children Participating in the Research

This is a valuable piece of research and the research team really hopes that you and your child will take part. The information gathered will be used to see how the preschool services are helping the children to develop and the information will be presented in general rather than focusing on any one child, family or childcare setting.

Children will be given gifts such as colouring pencils as a small thank you for taking part and all parents who agree to participate will be entered into a draw for a €250 supermarket shopping voucher as a token of our appreciation.

Children

- Children will be given an I.D. number at the start of the research and they will be identified by this number rather than by their name from then on. The only people who will have access to child names are the Lead Researcher (Siobhan Keegan) and the fieldworker. Child data will not be stored with names so there will be no way for anyone apart from the Lead Researcher to tell which child data goes with which name
- Information will be gathered on child development at three different points in time-once at the beginning of preschool, once at the end of the first year and once at the end of the second year. If your child moves to primary school after one year, we would still like to keep them in the research and we would like to see them after one year of primary school
- The assessments are designed to be child-friendly and children tend to enjoy them as they are meant to feel like playing a game and they only last about 20 minutes
- Information on children will be gathered by fieldworkers in the preschool setting. The fieldworkers are highly trained to work with children and parents
- Tallaght West CDI will give updates in their newsletter so that parents can be kept informed about the research
- We regret that we cannot give parents their individual child's results. Our fieldworkers are not trained to be clinical or educational psychologists therefore they are not qualified or permitted to report on individual children. If you are concerned about your child, a member of the preschool staff will have ideas about how to get some extra help for them
- The Lead Researcher will also be a point of contact should parents have any additional questions or concerns about the research (see contact details below).Please feel free to call or email me any time.

Parents

- We will gather information through two face-to-face interviews with parents. This will happen at a time and place that suits parents; once at the beginning of their child's preschool and once again after two years have passed. The interview lasts only 15 minutes and is about the general experience of parenting young children.
- All information given will be treated as confidential

Thank you for your valued participation

Signed: The Research Team:

Professor Iram Siraj-Blatchford, Professor Níain Hayes and Siobhán Keegan

Contact: [contact name and address redacted]

Phone: [phone number redacted]

Email: [email redacted]

A4. Ethical extension request to archive data from ECCE

4/12/09

Dear [name redacted],

This letter marks an addition to our original submission for ethical approval granted 21st October, 2008 (ref.38/08). Our funders have requested that we seek additional approval from our Ethics Committee in relation to data archiving as this was never explicitly dealt with in our earlier submission. We hereby request ethical approval for the passing on of anonymised quantitative data about children, families and childcare settings to our funders (Tallaght West Child Development Initiative funded by Atlantic Philanthropies and the Office of the Minister for Children. That information is as outlined and as approved in our previous submission (see attached documentation) and would be passed on upon completion of the research evaluation, which ends in December 2011. The funders intend to archive the anonymised data arising out of the evaluation for the purposes of future research but all participants, children and settings would remain anonymous and unidentified. If such research did go ahead, it would involve the analysis of secondary data.

Therefore we,

- a. request ethical approval to pass anonymised quantitative data on children, families and childcare settings to Tallaght West Child Development Initiative once the evaluation ends
- b. request ethical approval for Tallaght West Child Development Initiative to archive that anonymised data for the purposes of future research.

I would appreciate it if this letter was considered in addition to the submissions previously made in relation to this evaluation and I look forward to hearing from you (either for more clarification or for the decision of the committee in relation to this matter).

Yours sincerely,

Siobhan Keegan (Lead Researcher)
[contact details redacted]

*On behalf of the CDI Evaluation team, centre for Social and Educational Research
(Professor Iram Siraj-Blatchford, Professor Nóirín Hayes and Siobhán Keegan)*

Appendix B: Publications

Nóirín Hayes, Iram Siraj-Blatchford, Siobhán Keegan and Eimear Goulding (2013) *Evaluation of the Early Years Programme of the Childhood Development Initiative*. Dublin: Childhood Development Initiative (CDI). http://www.twcdi.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CDI-Early_Years_Report_24.01-web-1.pdf

Tallaght West Childhood Development Initiative (2013) Early Years Programme Evaluation Policy Brief Dublin: Childhood Development Initiative (CDI). <http://www.dit.ie/cser/publications/>

Hayes, N., Keegan, S., & Goulding, E. (2012) Speech and Language Therapy Service Evaluation Policy Brief. Dublin: Childhood Development Initiative (CDI). <http://www.dit.ie/cser/publications/>

Hayes, N., Keegan, S., & Goulding, E. (2012) Speech and Language Therapy Service Evaluation Report Dublin: Childhood Development Initiative (CDI). <http://www.dit.ie/cser/publications/>

Appendix C: Standardised instruments – full title and citation

Instrument acronym	Full title of instrument	Instrument citation
BASII	British Ability Scales 2nd Edition	Elliot, C.D., Smith, P. and McCullough, K. (1996) The British Ability Scales II. Windsor, Berkshire: NFER Nelson.
(none)	Letter Identification	Clay, M.M. (2002) An observation survey of early literacy achievement. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
(none)	Rhyme and Alliteration	Bryant, P.E., MacLean, M., Bradley, L.L. and Crossland, J. (1990) 'Rhyme and alliteration, phoneme detection, and learning to read', <i>Developmental Psychology</i> , Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 429-38.
ASBI	Adaptive Social Behaviour Inventory	Hogan, A.E., Scott, K.G. and Bauer, C.R. (1992) 'The Adaptive Social Behavior Inventory (ASBI): A new assessment of social competence in high-risk three-year-olds', <i>Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment</i> , Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 230-39.
CSBQ	Child Social Behaviour Questionnaire	Sylva, K., Melhuish, E.C., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2004) <i>The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: Final Report</i> . London: Department for Education and Skills/Institute of Education, University of London.
SDQ	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire	Goodman, R., Ford, T., Simmons, H., Gatward, R. and Meltzer, H. (2000) 'Using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) to screen for child psychiatric disorders in a community sample', <i>British Journal of Psychiatry</i> , Vol. 177, pp. 534-39.

PSS	Parent Stress Scale	Berry, J.O. and Jones, W.H. (1995) 'The parental stress scale: Initial psychometric evidence', Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 463-72.
HLE	Home Learning Environment Index	Melhuish, E., Sylva, K., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2001) Technical Paper 7 – The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: Social/behavioural and cognitive development at 3-4 years in relation to family background. London: Department for Education and Skills/Institute of Education, University of London.
ECERS-R	Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale – Revised edition	Harms, T., Clifford, R.M. and Cryer, D. (1998) Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised. New York: Teachers College Press.
ECERS-E	Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale – Extension	Sylva, K., Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2006) Assessing quality in the Early Years Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales Extension (ECERS-E) four curricular subscales. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
CIS	The Arnett Caregiver Interaction Scale	Arnett, J. (1989) 'Caregivers in day-care centers: Does training matter?', Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 541-52.