

A Case Study of the Chemung County

School Readiness Project:

Origins of a Comprehensive Education

Initiative for 0-5 Year Olds

AERI

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
RESEARCH INITIATIVE

TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

**A Case Study of the Chemung County *School Readiness Project*:
Origins of a Comprehensive Education Initiative for 0-5 Year Olds**

By

Madhabi Chatterji

Jennifer Mata

A. Brooks Bowden

Assessment and Evaluation Research Initiative,

Teachers College, Columbia University

July, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Purpose.....	7
What is “Comprehensive” Early Childhood Education?	10
Case Study Methods.....	13
Case Study Results: A Historical Narrative.....	17
Triangulation of Interview Data.....	29
Conclusions.....	35
References.....	37
Appendices.....	41

**A Case Study of the Chemung County *School Readiness Project*: Origins of a
Comprehensive Education Initiative for 0-5 Year Olds**

ABSTRACT

This case study takes an in-depth look at how the Chemung County *School Readiness Project* originated, how it was given shape, and factors that are sustaining it through the second year of implementation. The study employs a systematic analysis of key informant interviews, triangulated against state and U.S. census data on county demographics, extant literature sources, and documentary evidence from selected websites. Findings show that the SRP was established within a span of 18 months. It arose from cumulative concerns of a small group of long-time residents regarding statistics on young children and families suggesting high levels of risk. The solution was a comprehensive and cohesive system of care for 0-5 year olds as a foundation for school readiness. Added factors that contributed to the emergence of the SRP included the dedicated work of a small group of leaders and a few fortuitous events. Results show the top-ranked factors that are making the project “work”. Along with a historical timeline, the perceived successes and barriers to implementing the collaborative, are documented. Future studies and utility of results for project replication are discussed in conclusion.

A Case Study of the Chemung County *School Readiness Project*: A Comprehensive Education Initiative for 0-5 Year Olds

Introduction

This study forms a part of the *School Readiness Project* (SRP), a “comprehensive education” project targeting the birth-kindergarten entry population at Chemung County in New York. The SRP provides an array of social support services to children and families in the county through a multi-agency partnership. The project became organized as a fully-functioning, community collaborative in 2006.

Early planning documents of the SRP indicate that one of its main aims was to significantly increase literacy levels in entering kindergartners in the county. Subsequently, the project foci broadened to encompass an array of comprehensive services, including parent education, maternal and child healthcare, along with early childhood education and advocacy for higher quality child care in the county. Dissemination of SRP services formally began in the 2007-08 academic year.

Purposes

The SRP case study takes an in-depth look at how the project originated in Chemung County, how it was given shape, and factors that are sustaining it through the second year of implementation. As the project completes its second year, the study records anticipated impacts, early successes, and fears surrounding the future of the SRP from the perspectives of interviewees. To contextualize and triangulate the interview findings, the study presents data on demographic trends in the larger community that run parallel to the evolution of the SRP. To make conclusions, it cross-references the literature on “comprehensive education” and child development.

Guiding Objectives

The broad objectives of the SRP case study were to:

- Trace the origins of the SRP collaborative, portraying local conceptions of the purposes for the project, and community problems that spurred local action;
- Identify key players in the SRP initiative and document how specific roles became defined for different players;
- Identify a historical timeline and inter-connect the sequence of events that were crucial to triggering actions that led to the SRP;
- Describe how resources were located to start and organize the project, and working arrangements that evolved to sustain it; and
- Document the anticipated impacts, successes, anxieties or perceived barriers to project implementation and continuity from key informant perspectives.

Rationale for a Case Study

A *case study* is a form of field research that focuses on a single, bounded entity as the unit of analysis. The entity can be an organization or a community. Case studies collect and integrate different kinds of data into one whole to gain a deeper understanding of the entity (see for example, Lipset, Trow & Coleman, 1956). Multiple data sources, both qualitative and quantitative, may be useful for this purpose. The “bounded case” (Stake, 2000) in the present study is the Chemung County SRP.

Our rationale for conducting a case study was stakeholder-driven. It arose from locally-expressed needs to document how the project came about, what makes it work, as well as to report on the rare or unique aspects of the SRP. Stakeholders believed that a historical documentary examining the origins and the changing status of the SRP could add to the

knowledge-base on how community-driven and large scale education efforts arise at the grass-roots level. In their view, such information could be potentially useful for project replication at other sites.

The SRP's Larger Research and Evaluation Plan

The case study is a part of a multi-year research and evaluation effort that is under way on the SRP at Chemung County. The long-term plan was arrived at by consensus among SRP leaders, various stakeholders, and a university-based team that includes the authors of this report. The evaluation research is sponsored by the Community Foundation of Elmira/Corning and Finger Lakes area. Sponsors, key community stakeholders (including SRP leaders, providers, school districts, families and children in the community) and outside clients of the evaluation are acknowledged in the introductory pages of this report. Appendix A provides details of the long-term research and evaluation plan.

Our approach to providing evaluation services to the SRP teams has been “participant-oriented”. Various labels have been used to describe this approach, including responsive evaluation (Stake, 1967), utilization-focused evaluation (Patton, 1997), stakeholder-based evaluation (Byrk, 1983; Mark & Shotland, 1985), or participatory evaluation (Cousins & Earl, 1995). Participant-oriented approaches involve partnerships between local decision makers and trained evaluation researchers, so as to maximally enhance local utility and meaningfulness of results. Ongoing discussions over a 2-3 year period and cross-learning between the university-based research team and local SRP leaders and stakeholders informed the case study. Decisions on questions, research design, and data-gathering methods were shared in advance with stakeholders to ensure comfort and full understandings of the process.

What is “Comprehensive” Early Childhood Education?

Broadly defined, *comprehensive education* involves providing care to young children using environmental supports and resources from their families, homes, and larger communities and neighborhoods. The goal is to better prepare children for later successes in school and life by improving their overall well-being. Access and exposure to an array of suitable opportunities from the earliest years is viewed as key to building the necessary “capital” in children, regardless of circumstances of birth. An advocacy movement has thus developed that combines early childhood education and child care under a comprehensive label called “educare” (Cladwell, 1989, p. 404). The approach emphasizes continuity of supports from the earliest years, giving universal and open access to all children and their families in a community (Cohen, 1996; Cremin, 1975; Goodson, Layzer, St. Pierre, Bernstein & Lopez, 2000; Gordon & Rebell, 2007; Phillips & Zigler, 1987).

Legislated social programs reflecting the idea of comprehensive education date back to federal government initiatives from the 1960s in the form of the Head Start program. Along with early education components, Head Start programs combine services in parent education and child nutrition. Similar federal legislation focusing on comprehensive early childhood services came about with the Comprehensive Child Development Act in 1971 and the Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP) begun in 1988.

The CCDP has contributed significantly to the theory and practice of “comprehensive education” as we find it today. Until its development, most programs focused on children and parents separately, providing services in a disjointed fashion (St. Pierre, Layzer, Goodman, & Bernstein, 1997). According to the *U.S. Administration for Children and Families* website, the

CCDP aimed to bring child and family services together under a common framework with the following objectives:

- to intervene as early as possible in children’s lives;
- to involve the entire family;
- to ensure the delivery of comprehensive social services to address the intellectual, social-emotional, and physical needs of infants and young children in the household;
- to ensure the delivery of services to enhance parents’ ability to contribute to the overall development of their children and achieve economic and social self-sufficiency;
- to ensure continuous services until children enter elementary school at the kindergarten or first grade level.

Comprehensive early childhood services are guided by the logic that early interventions will alter children’s later outcomes, thus improving their potential to succeed in life. The empirical research consistently shows that the earliest years have a long-lasting impact on child development (Brooks-Gunn, 2003). The term *outcome* refers to the expected results of some organized or informal events that happen earlier. Outcomes of a child’s early experiences from the time of birth through school entry may thus be manifested via cognitive and non-cognitive indicators of child readiness for schooling (Chatterji, Iyengar & Koh, 2009).

The Chemung County SRP as a “Comprehensive Education” Initiative

Consistent with the literature just discussed, the Chemung County SRP has characteristics that parallel a “comprehensive education” project. It is meant to be systemic and community-wide in configuration. The collaborative of services includes the following:

- an infant birth registry
- nurse home visitations
- comprehensive health and developmental screenings and referral services for child/mother
- parent/family counseling and education programs
- pediatric health care services, and
- child care, preschool, and early childhood education.

The SRP collaboration is overseen and managed by the Community Foundation of Elmira, Corning and the Finger Lakes area. The SRP targets every child from birth to kindergarten entry at Chemung County, as its “primary” target population. Parents and caregivers of children are the “secondary” targets. Service providers in different agencies and community programs, including school-based programs, are the “tertiary” populations. We now turn to details of the methods and results of the case study on how the Chemung County SRP evolved.

Case Study Methods

Definition of the Case and Overall Design

The *case* in the present study is the Chemung County SRP as a whole. It includes all individuals who have had specific roles and functions in the project, the service providers/programs currently participating in the project, school districts with which the SRP articulates its efforts, and the SRP target populations.

The historical accounting methods in the case study draw on techniques from historiography and qualitative research methodology (Best & Kahn, 2000; Creswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Maxwell, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2006). The steps

involved gathering data from multiple sources, analyzing themes, and establishing cause-event chains using internal and external criticism, cross-validation and triangulation.

Emergent Design

The present case study, focusing mainly on the early stages of the project, may be considered the first in a series that could follow the development of the SRP in the Chemung community over time. Subsequent studies with expanded designs and data sources could be guided by questions stimulated by the results of the present analysis, or by new and different project issues or community concerns that arise along the way.

Data Sources

We used three main data sources for the present case study. The core part of the data-gathering relies on *key informant* interviews. Key informants are individuals expected to have specific kinds of knowledge about particular aspects of a project or program (Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey, 2003). For our study, we selected 8 individuals from a larger list of 18 potential interviewees, forwarded to us by the SRP's sponsors. The selection was broadly representative of the SRP steering committee and child readiness council, as follows: leaders known to be the originators of the SRP (an ex-school district official, an early childhood program leader, and CIDS founder and leader), the SRP steering committee Chair who now heads the foundation (sponsor) and is coordinating the project, the Chair of the foundation's board of trustees, an early childhood program manager/leader, a university liaison, and the current school district superintendent of Elmira.

We complemented the interview data with extant documentary data sources that gave us statistics on demographic, employment, and educational trends in Chemung County over a seven year period (2000-2006). The statistical data were obtained from the U.S. Census and state and

county Departments of Education, or Health and Human Services. Added information was extracted from relevant web-sites and one e-mail communication (with permission).

The social and community statistics concurrent with the initiation of the SRP added context and helped us triangulate the interview findings, shedding light on the reasons for which the project was started. We corroborated our theme-based inferences from the interviews against relevant sources from the theoretical literature on comprehensive education and other information.

Data-gathering and Analysis

The interview protocol consisted of a common set of open-ended questions consistent with our case study objectives. We employed a systematic elicitation technique with a semi-structured interview to gather responses from interviewees (Ryan & Benard, 2000). We gathered the interview data via in-person or telephone interviews (Appendix B.1-B.4).

The interviews were audio-taped with permission of all interviewees. Each interview began with a comfort-building period. Probes were used, as needed, to clarify responses or delve into particular responses in greater depth.

Once gathered, the audio-taped data were transcribed verbatim and the content was verified by e-mail using an individualized, “member checking” procedure. We then applied a paragraph-by-paragraph coding procedure to extract themes and sub-themes from the interview text. For this, we conducted a grounded theory analysis, letting the text data generate the themes and sub-themes.

To derive a historical timeline for the project, we clustered the extracted themes and sub-themes under “Who”, “What”, “When”, “Where”, “Why” and “How” categories (Appendix B.3). We collated the frequency with which each theme/sub-theme arose in the data, and

corroborated themes across interviewees to cross-validate findings. The results were then organized in a chronology, with representative quotes to add nuance and meaning to the main thematic findings (Appendix B.3-B.4). Findings were then connected to tell a story.

Prior to doing the analysis, we established consistency in our coding procedures through an inter-coder agreement analysis. Two independent coders analyzed the first transcribed interview. This sub-study showed generally close levels of match between coders. Issues that arose were resolved through discussion (Appendix B.3).

Cross-validation and Triangulation

By and large, we were able to cross-validate the main themes generated from coded text across multiple interviewees. Corroboration of evidence across the three data sources helped us identify convergent themes. Details are indicated with the results.

Other Methodological Details

Added details on our methods are given in Appendices B.1-B.4. Specifically, Appendix B.1-B.2 provides the interview questions followed by procedures for collecting and analyzing data. B.3-B.4 provide an excerpt of an interview transcript, with results of coded text by two coders, and the outcomes of the inter-coder agreement analysis for deriving themes. Results of the case analysis follow.

Case Study Results

Organization of the Results

We connect the threads of the SRP story by staying as close as possible to the raw and summarized data (Tables 1-5, Boxes 1-5). The tables present the summarized with respect to key themes, tying them to the general objectives of the study (Tables 1-5). The themes are rank-ordered based on the level of consensus among the 8 interviewees. The empirical sources for the extracted themes in different tables are shown in selections of representative quotes taken from different interviewees (Boxes 1-5). Lastly, we contextualize and triangulate the key findings by citing corresponding community statistics and literature sources in a concluding discussion. Interviewee sources for themes incorporated in the narrative are identified as I1-I8.

Beginnings of the Chemung County *School Readiness Project*

Origins. The Chemung County SRP arose from persistent and shared concerns of a small group of community members regarding negative trends in the local population. Community statistics showed low levels of literacy in young children, high rates of school dropouts, and generally depressed data on economic indicators. In the minds of many who worked with children and families (I3, I4, I7), some of the statistics pointed to a high need for immediate and early intervention with young children and their families. This, in their view, would forestall later complications and be a better investment in the long run (I4).

Three friends who were long-standing residents and leaders in the community were particularly troubled. They had talked about their concerns for years and were now ready to make a difference through concerted action (I1, I2, I3). Soon, this small circle was joined by a rapidly expanding group of similarly concerned individuals from in and around the county (I4, I5, I6, I7, I8). Members in this initial group not only shared the same concerns; they all wanted to

change things for the better. Within a span of approximately 18 months (Spring 2005-Summer, 2006), they joined forces, concentrated their energies and ideas, and got the SRP off the ground.

[Please see Table 1 and Boxes 1-2.]

A Compelling Rationale and a Mission. The data had looked bad enough to the core group to spur them to action. Based on a recent administration of a diagnostic pre-literacy test, about 40% five year old children at Chemung were starting school unprepared to read and learn. Outside the large numbers of high school dropouts, teen mothers in the county were also increasing. Distressed families with higher levels of poverty and abuse were on the rise. Marginalized and minority families gave further cause for concern, as the services they needed were not reaching them. What was needed was a program with universal access (I4, I3).

It was not that good quality child care, health or family services were absent in the community. It was simply that the existing framework of child care, social and human services for families was piece-meal and disjointed (I2, I6). Too many families and children were thus left out or inadequately served (I3, I4).

The problem was viewed as multi-faceted (Table 1, bottom panel, Box 1). A comprehensive solution was thus needed (Table 1, top panel, Box 1). Child literacy development had to be a main thrust (I5, I4), but it was not enough. More equitable and universal access was also an interest (I4). A study to track children's developmental trends was deemed necessary (I1). The largest consensus was reached on a comprehensive system of care that led to school readiness in children. [Please see Table 1 and Boxes 1-2.]

Table 1.

Themes on Origins of the Chemung County *School Readiness Project*: Conceptions of Project Purposes and Community Problems that Led to Project

Objective 1	Frequency (#) of Coded Instances*	Sub-Themes	Rank Order**	Cross-validation (# agreements)
<i>1.1 Conceptions of “What” the project is about:</i>	62	1.1.1 Developing “school readiness” holistically in “0-5” year old population	1	7
		1.1.2 Providing a “comprehensive” “system” of social and human services for all families and children with an “ecological approach”	2	5
		1.1.3 Providing better quality of “early child care” and “education”	3	3
		1.1.4 Improving children’s “literacy”	3	3
		1.1.5 Reaching under-served and minority populations, with more “universal” distribution of resources and services	3	3
		1.1.6 Promoting “economic development” and “work-force” development (in the long-run)	6	2
<i>1.2 Conceptions of “Why” the project was initiated and community problems that spurred local action</i>	56??	1.2.1 Risk indicators in community rising with perception of “public policy failure”-- “40% children not ready” on pre-literacy assessment, high school dropout rate, single mothers and “distressed” families	1	8
		1.2.2 Disjointed social and human services in community showing need for coherence; past efforts not cohesive	2	2
		1.2.3 Families “in need” not getting or availing services and interventions	2	2
		1.2.4 Interest in a long-term study of Chemung children	2	2
		1.2.5 Urge to make a difference in the community	5	0 (1 mention)

Note:

*The frequencies reflect the total number of mentions of a theme or sub-theme based on coded text from all 8 interviews.

**The rank order is based on the cross-validation rate, or number of interviewees who mentioned the same theme or sub-theme, out of a maximum of 8.

Box 1.

Representative Quotes: A Comprehensive System of Care Leading to School Readiness

What is the purpose and mission of the SRP?

“...it really was around the idea of a village raising a child.. (with)a sort of a system, if you will, that just says ‘ We’re here to support kids and families and we’re not gonna let you fail’ ...”(I1, p.7 and p.11 of interview)

“...we took a more ecological approach that said, look, we want to look at the whole child.....in order to do that you have to look at many dimensions...which is family, which is environment, the social environment..... And so we put together a process that allowed us to assess what was going on in their lives.....to get the services that were needed” (I4, p.1 of interview).

“ ...a goal in getting kids better prepared for school and provide comprehensive services at preschool and earlier level...” (I2, p.2 of interview)

“..we cannot guarantee equality....but we can guarantee equivalence of opportunity, and I think...that’s the promise of our.. [project]”(p. 8)...[To] “find some way to coordinate the work of several social service[s] and human service[s] into that interest” (p.1 of interview).

“School readiness is kind of a general---it’s a rubric, you know, around which...a lot of other players in the community could rally support..” (I7, p.2 of interview)

“An integral part of the improvement of our school district was, you know, school readiness; ... kids being able to come to school able to compete with other kids who had—been read to, had trips to the library, you know, just had all those experiences and opportunities.” (I8, p.1 of interview).

[We wanted to] “..look at the issue of school readiness, literacy, and ultimately economic development...with this particular collaborative..” and “ they envisioned a comprehensive set of services for families with children under five...”(I5, p.1 of interview).

An Evolving Vision. Two of the friends who were the originators had already retired from senior positions affiliated with the local Child Care Council and a major school district. Nevertheless, their commitment to improving the lives of children and the community at large had not died (I1, I2). The third friend founded the C.I.D.S agency which has run an infant registry and home visiting nurses program for Chemung families since the 1970s. He knew and understood the needs of the community well. He also strongly believed that an all-round, “ecological approach” to providing early care and interventions to every child soon after their birth (not simply to mothers or children with diagnosed needs), would be the appropriate solution (I3). A vision had evolved in bits and pieces over a 20-30 year period in the minds of the three

friends. What was missing was a pro-active implementation plan for a comprehensive system of care.

Box 2.

Representative Quotes: A Community at Risk with Inadequately Distributed Services

Why was the SRP started?

“...we looked at the data.....[on] a diagnostic indicator of basic early literacy skills---use of literacy skills—and the number of kids entering our kindergartens who weren’t competing...meaning that they didn’t have the early literacy kinds of foundation....”(I8, p.2 of interview)

“everything else was a symptom of a problem, and the problem was quality early childhood program support, and if we tackled that then the symptoms of it – unemployment, teen pregnancy, juvenile arrest – would all subside....” (I8).

“ Wow, that 40% is going to cripple us if we don’t address it.”—reference to 2005 pre-literacy data on kindergarten population (I5, p.2 of interview)

“ ... many kids were coming from very distressed homes in terms of economics and social cohesion... high incidence of child abuse and maltreatment.....high incidence of substance abuse....high incidence of domestic violence..” (I2, p.3 of interview)

“ deal with...so many of ..poor health, ..poor dental health, the high incidence of abuse.” (I4. p. 3 of interview).

“..the real gap..[is at] zero to five, and unless we close it then, we’re gonna spend dollars in remediation to very little effect.” (I4, p. 2 of interview)

“..the problem is that...the very children who needed the service most were not availing themselves, the families were not availing themselves of the service..” (I3, p. 2 of interview)

“..throughout the years....different agencies and different funding sources tried little pieces here and there, but we never had a comprehensive program.” (I6, p. 2 of interview).

Serendipity and a Strategic Plan. A new superintendent joined the community around January-February, 2005. He was responsible for leading the largest school district in the county. Fortuitously, according to one friend (I2), he came with a strong background, interest, and experience in community-based programs for birth-kindergarten populations that linked with schools. His entry into the county led to a serendipitous association with one of the friends who was invited to “show him around” (I8, I1). Informal interactions soon drifted to focused conversations about the community and risk levels among children (Box 2). Later, serendipity

also played a part in bringing in a large sum of money that was dedicated to initiating the SRP (I1).

The result of those early conversations were far-reaching for the SRP. They led to a *strategic plan* with a focus on *school readiness* (I8). It was a plan that wide circle of people in the community could relate to and support, including the county government officials, leaders of a community funding organization, and a range of service providers (I5, I6, I7). The plan suggested an organizational framework and alliances among established agencies and committed individuals who could provide necessary services to families and children. These community members and agencies became significant players as the project moved from an idea to a collaborative operation (I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, I6, I7, I8).

In sum, a consensus was reached that the project would focus on *school readiness* in the 0-5 year-old population, with a “ready child” defined in the broadest sense. The means to achieving that end was to be a *comprehensive system of care for all families and children*, inclusive of those that had been previously marginalized or under-served (see Table 1, Box 1). An SRP “database” would be instituted to monitor service provision (I3).

Key Players and Emergent Roles. A year after the project started, roles and responsibilities fell into place within the SRP collaborative and organizational framework. Depending on their roles, different players had joined the project at different times. To start and continue the SRP, six “key roles” emerged. These are defined below based on the case data . [Please see Table 2, Box 3.)

- Visionary leaders: The visionaries were the long-standing and committed members of the community (the three friends). They had discussed and developed the concept

informally over many years. Now, they served as the catalysts for moving the larger vision into reality.

- Funding and governing agency: A local foundation played a main role as the funding and organizational leader. Once a plan was submitted and approved by the board, the foundation committed to project and provided the necessary governance and management supports to make the SRP work.
- Established service agencies and provider organizations: Service providers and agencies played a key role to jump-start the implementation of SRP. They were already established providers and experts in providing human, social, health and child care services. Their existing organizational capacity was needed to add strength to the new collaborative.
- Friends in high places: A key role was played by influential project advocates. The SRP needed politically connected leaders of the community as project advocates. They brought in the added support and money from the county and state levels.
- Strategic action-taker and planner: To be viable, the SRP concept needed an action-plan. The role of a strategic planner became a critical one in moving the project from a vision to a plan. In the SRP's history, this role was played by the new school district superintendent in the county.
- Donors: A main role was played by donors and funding sources, including a serendipitous gift-giver from the local community, who donated a large sum of money that was dedicated to the SRP. Other donors included state and local agencies.
- University Liaisons: Local universities played a supporting role to the SRP. They provided research and/or evaluation resources and services to the project's leadership.

Table 2.

Themes on Key Players in the Chemung County *School Readiness Project* and Roles that Emerged

Study Objective 2	Frequency (#) of Coded Instances*	Sub-Themes	Rank Order	Cross-validation (# agreements)
<i>2.0 Conceptions on “Who” helped the project come about and roles they have played or now play</i>	99	2.1 Visionary leaders, committed to community, and working on idea for 20-30 years	1	7
		2.2 Funding and governing agency in the community, committed to project	1	7
		2.3 Established service agencies and provider organizations with informed and expert staff—the “capacity” existed but needed to be pooled	3	6
		2.4 Friends in high places—political connections in the county government and NY state	4	5
		2.5 Strategic action-taker and planner	5	3
		2.6 Donor(s) who dedicated large sums	5	3
		2.7 University liaisons as research and/or evaluation resources	5	3

Note:

*The frequencies reflect the total number of mentions of a theme or sub-theme based on coded text from all 8 interviews.

**The rank order is based on cross-validation, and shows number of interviewees who mentioned the same theme or sub-theme, out of a maximum of 8.

Historical Timeline. While the concept was talked about over a period of 20-30 years (I1-I3, I6), and tried out at different times in different ways (I5), it was now re-configured as a cohesive system of care. The core group’s consensus suggests the following timeline for the establishment of the SRP (see Table 3, Box 3):

- Discussions begin: Spring, 2005 (February)
- Action planning: Spring-Summer, 2005
- Visit with county executive for concept approval: Fall, 2005
- Submission of proposal and funding approval from Community Foundation: Spring, 2006
- Implementation begins: Fall 2006

Table 3.

Themes on Timeline and Sequence of *School Readiness Project* Events that Triggered Project

Study Objective 3	Frequency (#) of Coded Instances*	Sub-Themes	Rank Order	Cross-validation (# agreements)
<i>3.0 Conceptions of “When” the concept emerged and timeline for initiation of project</i>	35	3.1 Timeline mentions for SRP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussions begin: Spring, 2005 (February) - Visit with county executive for concept approval: Fall, 2005 - Funding approval and commitment from Community Foundation: Spring, 2006 - Implementation begins: Fall 2006 	1	7
		3.2 Concept emerged and developed over 30+ years through discussions of SRP collaborators who held leadership positions in key agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1970s with the establishment of the Comprehensive Interdisciplinary Developmental Services and Infant Registry - 1980s with ongoing discussions among leaders in Child Care Council and local school districts 	2	1

Note:

*The frequencies reflect the total number of mentions of a theme or sub-theme based on coded text from all 8 interviews.

**The rank order is based on cross-validation, and shows number of interviewees who mentioned the same theme or sub-theme, out of a maximum of 8.

How the SRP Took Shape and What Makes it Work. The SRP came together through establishment of partnerships and collaborations among existing agencies, and by pooling resources (in terms of both money and people) from different sources, according to the key informants. The existing capacity and expertise in provider organizations gave a strong foundation to the project. A good deal of advocacy efforts were needed to make the project happen. And, luck played a role in getting needed funds and bringing about the right (needed) associations at the right time. The highest levels of consensus among key informants surrounding

what makes the project work is the shared belief and investment of all the partners in the vision of the SRP. [Data summaries and quotes are shown in Table 4 and Boxes 3-4].

Box 3.

Representative Quotes: Key Roles and Historical Timeline

Who played a part in making it happen and when did major events occur?

...“it really came out of many years of work between I’d say EW, JS, DK, that group...really going back 30 years” (I5, p.1 of interview)

“..asked (DK) to spearhead a much more formalized task force around the idea of school readiness. That’s where this particular project was born.” (I5, p.2 of interview)

“..as colleagues..(EW) and I through the years talked about the kinds of issues that we identified in that early childhood population. And we were searching to find ways to do things better..” (I3, p. 7 of interview)

“..the Community Foundation.. (C.H)’s on the board of the foundation.....also a lawyer ...is on the SUNY board. He is a leader in our community that people respect.” (I6, p.4 of interview)

“ (C.H) got behind it with the strength of his knowledge, and of other funding, and other political connections you need..” (I3, p. 8)

“ Elmira got a new superintendent and he was so full of energy, so full of “ How can we make things better for our children and out community?...”(I 6, p.1-2). “... I served on the steering committee and was a member of the early childhood workgroup..” (I 6, p.1-2)

“..Child Care Council ...study in 2005...publicizing (results of pre-litracy test) in that February, March timeframe...lo and behold, a new superintendent was hired in April....in June, he was putting together a strategic plan for his Board..”(p. 3, I1)

“We met with the Community Foundation in November/December of 2005 and I think we received approval from them around January, 2006.” (I2, p. 4 of interview)

“The (Community Foundation) board is the governing structure. The Steering Committee does the planning..Then the workgroup developed plans for these areas. So you’ve got all these people involved.” ” (p. 10, I2).

“The Child Care Council is...expert in all areas of child care. ...the nurses have a huge store of information about early childhood development...CIDS helps us all. (I2, p. 7 of transcript)

Anticipated Impacts, Perceived Successes, and Anxieties. Even at this early stage, the key informants viewed their community-wide collaboration as “exemplary”. Descriptions emphasized that it is the “people” who make it work, because they are “good’ and “committed”. Leaders expressed eagerness to see if the SRP model works in the long run in improving lives of

children and the community—an anticipated project impact. They expressed the hope the project will receive national attention. Anxieties and fears surrounding the project were relatively few in number (7) and centered around working through “rough spots” and possible conflicts among agencies, and the potential for future funding cuts. [Please see Table 5.]

Table 4.

Themes on How the Chemung County *School Readiness Project* was Shaped: Factors that Helped Organize the Project and Make it Work

Objective 4	Frequency (#) of Coded Instances*	Sub-Themes	Rank Order	Cross-validation (# agreements)
<i>4.1 Conceptions of “How” the project took shape</i>	110	4.1.1 Establishing alliances, collaborations and partnerships	1	7
		4.1.2 Pooling resources from multiple sources (Private Donors, Foundation, NY State, Agencies)	1	7
		4.1.3 Advocacy and support from politically influential people and leaders	3	5
		4.1.4 Serendipity and luck in obtaining resources, making associations, getting the “right” people	3	5
<i>4.2 Conceptions of “What makes it work”</i>		4.2.1 Belief and investment in vision, common interest	1	7
		4.2.2 Existing capacity and expertise in participating organizations	2	4
		4.2.3 Knowledge about the community and friendships	3	2
		4.2.4 Committed people who trust each other	3	2
		4.2.5 Governance and management structure	3	2
		4.2.6 Strategic plan	3	2
		4.2.7 Public relations, quality standards, research liaisons	7	1 (<i>mention each</i>)

Note: * The frequencies are based on coded text from all 8 interviews and include all sub-themes.

Box 4.

Representative Quotes: How was the SRP shaped and What makes it work?

“..We need(ed) to collaborate....we don’t need to agree on everything, but at least we need a similar approach..... The agencies needed.. to trust each other...We learn from each other...(I2, p. 9-10)..we have a solid base for collaboration...(with) past experience. ..we know how to make it work (I2, p.13)

“the Foundation already had money for this...HS money ..(and) committed over two million dollars— matched by four million dollars from..the state of New York.” (I4, p.7 of interview).

“A genuine interest and concern about health and welfare of children in the community. That seems to be the thing that is consistent with the players.” (I3, p.21 of interview)

“(there is) common interest....We haven’t asked them to reinvent themselves completely....everybody has a role and feels they are a valued part of the collaboration.” (I1, p. 12 of interview)

“one of the nice things about living in the community is that we know where the resources are, and who cares, and who does what well.” (I4).

....(serendipitously) “the third part of the key connections came almost simultaneously. The local community foundation had basically ended up with a very large sum of money that was donated. They were in the process, in their particular board room, of talking about sponsoring a project with significant community impact.” (I1).

Table 5.

Themes on Anticipated Impacts, Implementation Anxieties/Fears, and Unanswered Questions related to the Chemung County *School Readiness Project*

<i>Study Objective 5</i>	<i>Frequency (#) of Coded Instances*</i>	<i>Sub-Themes</i>	<i>Rank Order</i>	<i>Cross-validation across interviewees (# out of 8)</i>
<i>5.1 Expected “Impacts” and Current Successes</i>		5.1.1 Already “exemplary” and successful collaboration among agencies	1	4
		5.1.2 (Down the road) the “ecological” model works and makes a difference in children and the community—results have “national implications”	1	4
		5.1.3 Parent buy-in and better parent education	3	2
		5.1.4 Increased achievement of children, and long-term study showing such data	3	2
<i>5.2 Anxieties and Fears about Implementation or Outcomes</i>		5.2.1 Problem-solving through turf wars, conflicts and agency incompatibilities, as “we are human”	1	3
		5.2.3 Funding cuts down the road	2	0 (1 mention)
		5.2.4 Lack of communication among players or reluctance to communicate openly	2	0 (1 mention)

Triangulation of Interview Data:

Community Statistics, Extant Literature, and Documentary Support

Do community statistics concur with key informants’ assessments of community risk when the Chemung County SRP was started? Several of the risk factors cited in the interview data were triangulated with data trends reported by the U.S. Census Bureau and New York State.

In 2000, Chemung County, New York, was estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau to have a population of 91,070. By the time the SRP was beginning to form in 2006, the population in

Chemung County had dropped to 88,641. Approximately 20% of that population were school-aged children, with 6% under the age of 5.

School Enrollment Drops. For children below age 5, school enrollment rates dropped from 2000 to 2006 (consistent with the population change). The percent of the population under 5 years old enrolled in preschool dropped from 25% in 2000 to 21% in 2006. Kindergarten enrollments dropped, as well. In 2000, 6% of the children from ages 5 to 19 were enrolled in kindergarten. In 2006, this proportion dropped to 4%. It is also helpful to note that all enrollment rates listed are lower than the approximations for New York State. The enrollment drops likely parallel mobility and migratory trends in the population, known to be associated with depressed economic opportunities.

Rise on Poverty Indicators. All the three school districts in Chemung County, Elmira City School District, Elmira Heights Central School District, Horseheads Central School District, experienced an increase in the percent of students receiving free or reduced price lunch from 2000 to 2006. Free or reduced price lunch is an indicator of poverty as this service is tied to economic needs of families. In Elmira, the increase was from 40% to 57%. In Elmira Heights, the increase was from 27% to 40%. In Horseheads, it increased from 19% to 27% (NYSDE website, 2001-2008).

Rise in Single Mothers and Families in Poverty. The Census data show single mother families increased from 12% to 16% between 2000-2006. Note that this rate contrasts with the State's stable estimate of 12% from 2000 to 2006. On poverty based on Census data, Chemung County had 9% of families living below the threshold of poverty in 2000, while in 2006 the estimate was 12%. This increase is in opposition to the decreasing poverty trend found in New York State (from 12% to 11% in 2006).

The increased family poverty rate is further shown by the income estimations for the County. Families in New York State making less than \$50,000 per year decreased by 11% from 2000 to 2006. However, the percentage of families earning less than \$50,000 per year in Chemung County decreased by 5%. The median family income in Chemung County in 2006 was \$48,185, whereas the median income in the State was \$62,138.

Is there literature support for the definitions of “risk”, comprehensive education and early care, as found in the interview data?

The individual assessments of local conditions given by key informants are broadly consistent with definitions of risk found in the theoretical and empirical literature on child development, early childhood, and education in general. “At-risk” children are identified as those of an ethnic minority population, from non-English speaking homes or communities, living in poverty, and having only one parent at home (Levin, 1996). Lower levels of maternal education and possible the under utilization of public services contribute to the “at-risk” status of school going children (West, Denton, & Germino-Hausken, 2000). When compared to their prepared counterparts, children who begin kindergarten unprepared have been found to perform more poorly in school all the way through high school, to be more likely to have children themselves as teenagers, to experience depression, to be unemployed as adults, and to have a criminal record (Baydar, Brooks-Gunn, & Furstenberg, 1993; Rouse, Brooks-Gunn, & McLanahan, 2005).

To what extent do the SRP’s publicity efforts concur with key themes extracted on the project’s mission from our interview analysis? To establish convergent validity, we examined the SRP website: <http://www.chemungschoolreadiness.com> and were able to triangulate the main

interview themes on school readiness, whole child development and a comprehensive system of care from the following excerpts.

- [The mission is to unify] “our community's rich offering of early childhood services into one cohesive system, [working] in harmony to help and encourage all adults to give young children (age 0-5) the kinds of experiences that lay the groundwork for learning”
- [The SRP aims to be] “a ground-breaking new early childhood system designed to help more of Chemung County’s children start Kindergarten with a solid foundation for learning”.
- [To develop children] “primed to be successful learners throughout their school years”.

Is a collaborative of community services (the proposed answer to Chemung County’s problem) supported by the literature and existing county infrastructure?

Gordon and Rebell (2007) hold that out of-school, supplementary community and educational resources serve as important builders of social capital in a child and can be influential in better preparing “at-risk” children for kindergarten and later schooling. In their view, “comprehensive educational programming” is an important way to compensate for inequitable distributions of wealth and social capital at birth (Gordon & Rebell, 2007).

Outside the health, social and human services that form a part of the SRP collaborative, Chemung County provides many publicly funded cultural services for families and children in the community such as libraries, museums, outdoor centers, a theater, and holds a County Fair. Early education services are offered through preschools, Headstart programs, and three public school districts (Elmira City School District, Elmira Heights Central School District, and

Horseheads Central School District). Health services are offered through clinics, private practices and hospitals.

In examining the websites and brochures of the main providers, we found consistency in the informant interview data and the website information on the longevity, scope of services and target populations, for the key SRP provider organizations. Chemung programs have been active and offering their services to county residents for decades, but predominantly operated as independent entities until the SRP was established.

(1) CIDS offers a gamut of services through their various programs. For example, the Prenatal Early Infancy Program (PEIP) provides maternal and child health services to prenatal and postnatal at risk women 19 and younger in first pregnancy. Other programs, like the Infant Registry, enroll infants in a screening and assessment program in order to detect and/or prevent developmental problems. The Early Childhood Services Team performs screenings of preschool-aged children, collects their medical, family and developmental histories, provides brief counseling to parents, refers the children for appropriate remediation and reevaluation, keeping track of development until the children enter school

http://chemung.ny.networkofcare.org/mh/resource/agencydetail.cfm?pid=ComprehensiveInterdisciplinaryDevelopmentalServicesCIDS_207_2_0).

(2) Other programs, like the Home Based Crisis Intervention Program (HBCI), provide in-home intensive services to children of ages 5-17, to target children at imminent risk of inpatient psychiatric hospitalization. The Family Life Development Center program provides information, education, and support relevant to today's changing families. The Healthy Families program assists new parents through a range of services from teaching about child development to assisting in accessing resources relevant to their strengths and needs

http://chemung.ny.networkofcare.org/mh/resource/agencydetail.cfm?pid=ComprehensiveInterdisciplinaryDevelopmentalServicesCIDS_207_2_0).

(3) Nurse home visitors support the health and welfare of infants, toddlers, and families through quarterly visits. They provide both skill-building and parent education curricula, offering a wide range of counseling on topics from nutrition to literacy. In addition, they provide referrals to appropriate service providers.

http://chemung.ny.networkofcare.org/mh/resource/agencydetail.cfm?pid=ComprehensiveInterdisciplinaryDevelopmentalServicesCIDS_207_2_0).

(4) The Chemung County Child Care Council (5C's) is another agency which houses programs that contribute to the community's welfare. 5C's is a community resource that nurtures children's growth, and aims to contribute to the community's economic productivity

<http://www.chemchildcare.com/>). Their main goal is to provide education and advocacy for quality child care, providing information and referrals regarding affordability, accessibility and availability of quality child care in the county.

(5) The Economic Opportunity Program (EOP)/Child Development Head Start Program existing in the county since 1965 (<http://www.cseop.org/Default.htm>), offers, through their Head Start program, an opportunity to build a "real and lasting foundation that supports children and families towards independence" (website: <http://www.cseop.org/headstart/headstrt.htm>).

(6) Lastly, the Southern Tier Pediatrics group provides children with medical services throughout Chemung County, facilitating better access to quality health care. This group practice of physicians and nurse practitioners is dedicated to the "provision of pediatric care and wellness services" (website: <http://www.stpeds.net/>), specializing in all aspects of pediatric care including infant, child and adolescent medicine.

What endogenous changes confirmed some of the expressed fears about implementation barriers of SRP? Although the anxieties expressed by interviewees were few in number, the economic downturn of 2008-09 affected the SRP on the monetary front. National economic factors affected implementation of externally-funded projects like the SRP (called endogenous variables in the evaluation sciences). Its status in April, 2009 was expressed in this e-mail from the head of the Community Foundation to the principal investigator of the university-based evaluation team:

SRP has been fatally wounded by the NYS budget cuts, specifically the COPS funding. After a thorough and persistent advocacy effort in Albany, we have entered "shut down" mode with the vast majority of services ending on April 30. There is a glimmer of hope that the federal stimulus package may have trickle-down effect - saving SRP and several jobs along the way - but we have no news on that front.

Subsequently we learned that they were “cautiously hopeful” at the Foundation. In the summer, 2009, the project appeared to have been somewhat restored again.

Conclusions

The story of the Chemung County SRP is about a convergence of good intentions, good people, good providers, good associations and good luck. The founders of the SRP were driven by a desire to reduce the documented numbers of children who were at risk for potential failure in school and beyond. They also sought to make a difference in the community at large. The visionaries were community members who had been living and participating in the county for over thirty years and had strong grasp of what the county needed. As the group expanded, other committed players and service providers joined in with commitment, resources, expertise and

influence. They were connected to people in positions of power both in and outside the county, and could leverage their years of work and experience to lobby the right people in the right offices. Thus, they were taken seriously by funding agencies, state officials and others. Factors sustaining the effort to date are the strength of the collaboration, resources, common interests and commitment to the cause.

Can the project be replicated based on what was learned so far? Although it may be early yet, the information on project development, definitions, key roles, and triggering actions (Tables 2-4), could be useful for those considering comprehensive care programs. The barriers and facilitators documented (Table 5), may also be helpful in the planning phases.

Limitations

Our case study looks only at the first two years of the life of the Chemung County SRP. The data rely mainly on key informant interviews, cross-validated and triangulated where possible, with other data sources. Case study data are not generalizable beyond the individual case examined. However, to the extent that the themes from the study can be validated across multiple and similar case studies, results may be generalized.

Future research should look more deeply at sustainability and potential for replication, focusing on challenges, changes and how the partnership tackles issues that emerge during county-wide implementation of the SRP. Other data sources (such as minutes of the meetings, interviews of service providers/staff and parents) should be used to properly document the history of the SRP. It may also be pertinent to look at the success of this initiative in the eyes of representative stakeholders, including the original key informant group, after five years.

References

- Baydar, N., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Furstenberg, F. (1993). Early warning signs of functional illiteracy: Predictors in childhood adolescence. *Child Development*, 64, 815-829.
- Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. (2003). *Research in education* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: A Pearson Education Company.
- Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Do you believe in magic?: What we can expect from early childhood intervention programs. *Social Policy Report*, 17(1), 3-14.
- Byrk, A. S. (Ed.). (1983). *Stakeholder-based evaluation*. New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Caldwell, B.M. (1989). A comprehensive model for integrating child care and early childhood education *Teachers College Record, Columbia University*, 90(3), 1-11.
- Chatterji, M., Iyengar, R., & Koh, N. (2009). Logic models as tools for studying comprehensive education constructs. In E. W. Gordon and H. Varenne (Eds.). *Theoretical perspectives on comprehensive education: The way forward (Volume 2)*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Cohen, A. (1996). A brief history of federal financing for child care in the United States. *The Future of Children: Brookings Institute* 6(2), 26-40.
- Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (Eds). (1995). *Participatory evaluation in education*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cremin, L. (1975). Public education and the education of the public. *Teachers College Record*, 77, 1-12.
- Goodson, B.D., Layzer, J.I., St. Pierre, R.G., Bernstein, L.S., & Lopez, M. (2000). Effectiveness of a comprehensive, five year family support program for low-income children and their families: Findings from the comprehensive child development program *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 15(1), 5-39.
- Gordon, E.W. & Rebell, M.A. (2007). Toward a comprehensive system of education for all children. *Teachers College Record*, 109(7), 1836-1843.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y, S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers.

- Levin, H. (1996). Economics of school reform for at risk students. In Hanushek, E., and Jorgenson, D. (Eds.), *Improving America's schools: The role of incentives* (pp.225-240). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Lipset, S.M., Trow, M., & Coleman, J. (1956). *Union democracy: The inside politics of the international typographical union*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Mark, M. M. & Shotland, R. L. (1985). Stakeholder-based evaluation and value judgments: The role of perceived power and legitimacy in the selection of stakeholder groups. *Evaluation Review*, 9, 605-626.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE .
- New York State Department of Education. (2001-2008). *New York state district school report card comprehensive information report and school accountability report*. Retrieved October 15, 2008, from the New York State Department of Education web site: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov>
- Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Phillips, D., & Zigler, E. (1987). The checkered history of federal child care regulations. *Review of Research in Education*, 14, 3-41.
- Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rouse, C., Brooks-Gunn, J., & McLanahan, S. (2005). Introducing the issue. *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 5-14.
- Ryan, G.W., & Bernard, R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- St. Pierre, R.G., Layzer, J.I., Goodson, B.D., & Bernstein, L.S. (1997). *The effectiveness of comprehensive, case management interventions: Findings from the national evaluation of the comprehensive child development program*. Washington, DC: Abt Associates Inc.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 68, 523-540.

- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000-2006). *American community survey 2000*. Retrieved October 15, 2008, from the U.S. Census Bureau web site: <http://factfinder.census.gov/>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1996). *Head start research comprehensive child development program*. Retrieved March 19, 2009 from the Administration for Children & Families web site:
www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/hs/comp_develop/index.html
- West, J., Denton, K., & Germino-Hausken, E. (2000). *America's kindergarteners: Findings from the early childhood longitudinal study, kindergarten class of 1998-99, fall 1998* (NCES 2000-070). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Yin, R.K. (2006). Mixed methods research: Are the methods genuinely integrates or merely parallel? *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 41-47.

APPENDICES A-B

Appendix A

Long-Term Research and Evaluation Plan of the Chemung County School Readiness Project (SRP)

Study	General Aims	Timeline
I. SRP Baseline Study	Aimed at describing readiness profiles of the 2007-08 cohort of entering kindergartners Chemung County on comprehensive indicators of school readiness, identifying correlates of readiness levels, and testing the underlying theory and logic of the SRP.	2007-2009
II. A Case Study of the Chemung County School Readiness Project	Aimed at documenting how the comprehensive early childhood education initiative started and was sustained in the community.	2007-2009
III. Long-term Impact Study	Aimed at examining the long-term impact of the SRP based on a follow-up of the 2007-08 <i>Birth Cohort</i> at Chemung County, using comprehensive indicators of school readiness	2012-13
IV. Short-term 'mini-studies' or formative evaluations of the SRP	Aimed at monitoring the implementation of new and continuing service provider initiatives that form a part of the Chemung SRP collaborative (<i>Note:</i> A formative evaluation protocol and tools manual will be provided to facilitate the short-term, local studies.)	2009-2012 (ongoing, periodic)

Note:

This five year research agenda was set in consultation with the SRP lead group and the Campaign for Educational Equity in March, 2007, following yearlong planning meetings, discussions and evaluation capacity-building workshops held during 2006-07. The SRP studies were undertaken by a university-based team from the Assessment and Evaluation Research Initiative (AERI) at Teachers College, Columbia University, led by the director. Biographical information on team members who participated in the present study is attached to the end of the report.

Appendix B.1 Historical Accounting Methods

Interview Protocol and Guiding Questions

Guiding Question	Question Category	Interview Protocol -Questions		
1.- How was the Chemung County SRP Collaborative started and what were the problems being looked at? How were the community needs (which gave rise to the SRP) defined?	History-Origin of Ideas	1. How did the Chemung County collaborative originate?		
		2. Where did the idea come from? Who were the idea generators?		
		3. What were the problems being addressed?		
		4. How did the School Readiness Project (SRP) emerge? Why School Readiness and not other county issues?		
		5. When was it decided that the SRP should take place? At which point in the process?		
	Finances-Sponsorship	12. How were the funds for SRP attained?		
		13. Who sponsored it? What was/is the resource pool?		
		2.- How did the community collaboration emerge as a solution strategy?	Partnership-Collaboration	6. How was the partnership and collaboration among programs conceived and envisioned to work throughout the county?
				7. Who convinced the agencies/programs to participate?
				8. Was there an initiating agency? Who was it?
				9. How has the partnership and collaboration among programs worked so far in the county?
				10. How do you understand the role of the partnership and collaboration among program and agencies in the SRP?
				11. How were/are people informed and asked to participate in the SRP?
3.- What are the key factors that make the SRP work and what are the impacts?	Future Impact-Intentions			14. What is the vision of the impact the SRP will have in the county?
				15. How has this vision been shared throughout the county?
				16. What are the expected goals to be achieved with the SRP?
				17. If you had to choose one key element that has made this initiative work, what would that be?

Appendix B.2

Excerpt of Interview Transcript

Interviewer: Okay. Great. My first questions have to do with how the Chemung County Collaborative Initiative originated, where the idea came from, who were the idea generators, what were the problems that were being looked at?

Interviewee 1: The Child Care Council in the county had done, actually, a study in 2005, which had been basically taking a look at trying to figure out, “How do we begin to generate support for childcare,” if you will, within the county. The purpose of the study was to demonstrate that child care is clearly an economic – a strong part of the economy, the local county economy.

We had been publicizing all of the results in that February, March timeframe, had met with the local newspaper editorial board and had begun to generate some publicity. We were trying to get the notion of quality early care, and education on the governmental agenda; if that’s the right way to say it.

Then, lo-and-behold, a new superintendent, here in Elmira, was hired that that April. He came from Maryland – from Washington, specifically; Washington, D.C. It happened that I was selected by the School District to give him a ride around. We know that unpredictable things happen; mostly just drive the man around and show him what the place – what the district looked like.

Needless to say, we must’ve spent about four or five hours in the car talking about all the stuff that goes with education, and early childhood was definitely a part of that.

Anyway, bottom line was, in June of that year – two or so, three months later, approximately, he was putting together a strategic plan for his Board of Education, and he said, “Among the things that we did back in Maryland was to really look at school readiness, and I would love to have –” he called me, and he said, “I remember our conversation well, I would like very much to have you pull together a group of people that you think are appropriate, from the bigger community, and put together a plan for how you would address the zero to five population of kids that would be coming into the school district.” From there, I basically called the people – a pretty multi-cultural – I’m sorry, a multi-strength kind of group, from the standpoint of representing the local providers, obviously, the Director of the Child Care Council, the C.I.D.S Program, which you know about at this point in time, the healthcare community, in the form of a pediatrician, and also a person who worked in Community Outreach for one of the hospitals. We had representatives from the local psychiatric center, EOP and Family Services. Ellen Wohl was our chief historian.

Appendix B.3 Coding and Data Analysis Steps

- (1) Coding of interview transcripts:
 - Searching for “key words/themes in context” to establish codes. Sentences used as text units for analysis, and key words were identified in sentences uttered and recorded verbatim from interviews.
- (2) Establishing cause-event chains and a historical timeline:
 - Determining general categories and clustering themes from the sentence-by-sentence codes, and placing coded text in the “who”, “what”, “when” and “where” categories grounded in the data; inferences were made as to the “how” and “why” of events by cross-connecting themes within and across interviewees.
- (3) Cross-validation of key findings:
 - Looking at codes and themes across all eight interviewee transcripts, as well as code confirmation within each of the interviewee transcripts.
- (4) Narrative interpretation:
 - Linking the categories to establish relationships among them, connecting statements and events within a context into a coherent whole, and generating a connected story.
- (5) Triangulation: Gathering support from literature and documentary/quantitative community indicators.

Results of Coding Interview Transcripts and Verifying Coding Consistency

In order to verify coding consistency, we conducted inter-coder checks with two coders for one of the interviews, finding that our analysis of this transcript was almost exactly the same.

An excerpt from the transcript from interview one (I1) is shown. The tables that follow show the coded findings for Coder 1 and 2 based on an analysis of the text excerpt from one interview (I1).

It is easy to observe how we went from raw text data, to its organization within five major categories (see full Historical Timeline of I1 in Appendix A.4) and then looked for instances in which the coders coincided and where they differed. For example, line one for both coders (C1, C2) indicate that the Child Care Council was mentioned by interviewee one (I1). In this line not only does the coding of the “who” (Child Care Council) category coincide, but the “what” (a study), “when” (2005), “how” (looking for support) and “where” (countywide) categories overlap as well.

Regarding differences found in the analysis of C1 and C2, we see that even though the same raw text data are used, one coder (C1) found more independent instances (10) within the answer to the first set of questions regarding how the initiative was initiated, while C2 found 8. It can also be observed that within the 8 instances found by C2, some combine two instances found by C1.

NOTE: Complete transcripts, coded tables, and analysis of data are available from the Principal Investigator of the study, and will be made available on request, with permission from the Community Foundation of Elmira, Corning and the Finger Lakes area.

Appendix B.4 Results of Coding Procedure—Coder 1

Coder 1: Codes to develop a historical timeline (Interview 1)

#	<i>Who?</i> (Participants/Players)	<i>What?</i> (Aspects of the initiative)	<i>When?</i> (Dates)	<i>How?</i> (Means/Actions)	<i>Where?</i> (Locations)
<i>How was the initiative initiated, where the idea came from, who were the idea generators and what were the problems being looked at?</i>					
1	Child Care Council	Study	2005	Child Support Boost Local Economy	County wide
2		Publicity Governmental Agenda: quality early child care and education.	Feb-March 2005		
3	New Superintendent	Don Keddell selected by school district to show him around.	April 2005		Elmira
4	Group of people (CIDS program, Director of CCC, healthcare community, a pediatrician, a person from the Community Outreach for one hospital, Charlie).	Strategic Plan for School Readiness.	June 2005	Looking at other community models: California, Maryland, North Carolina.	Elmira first, then broaden to the county.
5	Lead by DK, worked on by the steering committee	Original document.	September 2005		
6	Ellen Wohl & Don Keddell County Executive – Tom Santulli and Deputy	Two hour meeting lead to a county interest.		Serendipitous.	County executive's office.
7	Local Community Foundation	Wanted to do something of momentum in the com.		Very large sum of money.	
8	Randi Hewit – Program Officer	Meeting.			Superintendent's office.
9	Local funder (Community Foundation)	Anxious to make an impact.			
10	Don Keddell	"The interest that was taken, sort of institutional interest, along with the dollars and cents to sort of put some money-local money, significant local money, behind the dream."		Convince the board in Elmira that preschool was important.	

Appendix B.4 continued
Results of Coding Procedure—Coder 2

Coder 2: Codes to develop a historical timeline (Interview 1)

#	<i>Who?</i> <i>(Participants/Players)</i>	<i>What?</i> <i>(Aspects of the initiative)</i>	<i>When?</i> <i>(Dates)</i>	<i>How?</i> <i>(Means/Actions)</i>	<i>Where?</i> <i>(Locations)</i>	<i>Coder comments, Inferences/Issues, Queries</i>
<i>How was the initiative initiated, where the idea came from, who were the idea generators and what were the problems being looked at?</i>						
1	Childcare council	Interest in: Study to gain support for early care and education.	2005	Looking for support in local county for childcare council's continuation and role.	Countywide (Chemung)	Appears to be an economic need for childcare council to a collaborative role. Q. were there fears that programs were shutting down??
2	"We" --undefined	<i>Interest in:</i> Publicity—	Since Feb 2005	Need to gain support for "quality" educ. and early child care.	Countywide	"we" is likely childcare council and Don—retired and committed school district leader.
3	New School district supt.	<i>Interest in:</i> Relationship between education and early childhood—stuff that goes on.	April 2005	Getting new community member oriented.	Elmira district	Common concerns shared between old and new leaders—allies committed to same cause.
4	New School dist supt.	<i>Development/action:</i> Strategic Plan for Board of Ed—calling for multi-specialty team to lead; target pop 0-5—agencies CIDS, child care council, health care, community outreach, hospitals, psychiatry.	Jun 2005	School readiness concerns.	Elmira district	Movement from ideas to action in one school district.
5	Multi-specialty group of people	Organized meetings start: Readiness planning meetings.	Summer-fall 2005	School readiness concerns—develops into focus of meetings.	Mainly Elmira	Leadership by multi-specialty group of committed professionals – begins.
6	Don Kedell and Ellen Wolh	Facilitating: Research arm; Goals and objectives; "Action steps"—take to county level.	05-06	School readiness focus of meetings.	Elmira	Action to make countywide.
7	County executive and deputy	Acceptance and affirmation of plan and ideas—encouragement to include all districts— "Show us how" you'll do this.	05-06 -possibly spring 06	Possible political reasons at county level – inclusiveness of all districts.	From Elmira to rest of county (still a recommendation).	County wide spreading of mission begins.
8	Local funder (unspecified)	Seeking to offer support—looking for a marriage to leverage more \$\$.	05-06	Funder (possibly Community Foundation) wanting to make a difference and impact in the county.	Countywide	Idea of a collaboration— multi-agency partnership emerges with participation of a Foundation to get more funding and leverage –the initiative is conceived as one that will make an impact.

CLIENTS AND SPONSORS

This report was prepared for stakeholders of the *School Readiness Project* at Chemung County, New York and Michael Rebell at The Campaign for Educational Equity at Teachers College, Columbia University. *All names are in alphabetical order unless otherwise indicated.* We thank the sponsors of the study.

Community Foundation of Elmira-Corning and the Finger Lakes, Inc.

Randi Hewit (President)
Nancy Van Fleet
Sara E. Palmer
John Sirianni

Board of Trustees- 2007-08

Community Foundation of Elmira-Corning and the Finger Lakes, Inc

Carl Hayden (Chair)
Daniel Burke
Robert Grassi
Frank LaViola
Judith McIntosh
Marie McKee
Christine Meier
Michael Mustico
Richard Niles
John Peck
Randy Reid
Richard Rossettie
Ginger Schirmer
Christine Sharkey
Patricia Thompson
Tony Tripeny
George Welch
Rachel Wood

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the following individuals for their participation and helpful contributions in carrying out different parts of this work. *All names are in alphabetical order unless otherwise indicated.*

Chemung County School Readiness Council Members

Carl Hayden (Chair)
Raymond Bryant
Mary Beth Fiore
Ron Hatch
Joseph Hochreiter
Linda Huffner
Donald Keck
Michael Krusen
Ralph Marino
Nykole Parks
Benjamin Riggs
Thomas Santulli
Theresa Woodworth

Chemung County School Readiness Project (SRP) Steering Committee Members

David Andreine
Bill Brodginski
Stephanie Jelliff
Don Keddell
Paige Kinnaird
Ruth Krusen
Ellen McHugh
Darlene Patrowny
James Schechter
John Shannon
Ellen Wohl

Research Liaisons- Cornell University

John Eckenrode
Charles Izzo

Children's Institute, Rochester, NY

Dirk Hightower
Stas Lotyczewski

SRP Evaluation Team

Radhika Iyengar
Jennifer Mata
Nancy Koh
Alyshia Brooks Bowden
with
Madhabi Chatterji

For further information on the Chemung County evaluation, please contact:

Professor Madhabi Chatterji , Principal Investigator and Director, AERI

at: mb1434@columbia.edu