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Goal of Title I Act of 1965:

“Employ imaginative thinking and new approaches to meet the educational needs of poor children.”
Goal

“The Child-Parent Education Centers are designed to reach the child and parent early, develop language skills and self-confidence, and to demonstrate that these children, if given a chance, can meet successfully all the demands of today’s technological, urban society.” (Sullivan, 1968)
CPC History

First preschool program funded by Title I (1967)

Original P-3 program, providing integrative services

District 8 Supt. Lorraine Sullivan developed program with much local collaboration
Timeline

- **1966**: General Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools asked Dr. Lorraine Sullivan to report on ways to improve attendance.
- **1967**: CPC centers were implemented in four sites.
- **1970s**: 25 CPCs were in operation.
- **1977**: Funding of school-age component through State of IL.
- **1985**: Start of Chicago Longitudinal Study.
- **2011**: 10 CPCs in operation.
- **2012**: CPC expansion to 30 sites in IL and MN.
- **2015**: Pay for Success Chicago expansion, 3 new centers.
CPC Stages

First generation showed impacts of early enrichment and parent involvement.

Second generation established a structure of an effective P-3 system in a high poverty context.

Third generation is focused on the generalizability and sustainability of a contemporary model of reform.
CPC P-3 in 2017

A School Reform Model that provides Comprehensive and Continuous System of Services from Preschool to 3rd grade to Support Child, Family, and School Well-Being.

Developed at Univ. of Minnesota in collaboration with Districts
CPC Districts and Sites

Saint Paul Public Schools
Rochester Public Schools
Families First MN/Head Start
Chicago Public Schools
Unit 5 District (Normal, IL)
Evanston-Skokie School District
Madison Metropolitan School District
Midwest CPC

- Collaborative Leadership
- Aligned Curriculum
- Continuity and Stability

Effective Learning Experiences
Professional Development
Parent Involvement & Engagement

Early Ed
PK
1-3

Achievement
Well-Being
## Core Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collab. Leadership</th>
<th>HT, PRT, SCR with Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Learning</td>
<td>Small classes, inst. balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curric. Alignment</td>
<td>Plan completed, integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>Plan completed, assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development</td>
<td>Site facilitation, modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity &amp; Stability</td>
<td>80%+ yearly continuity plus instructional supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Structure

Leadership Team
(HT, PRT, SCR)

Principal

AP
Liaison-Curric. Liaison-P.I.

Core Services

Site Support & Mentors

Parent Advisory

Pre-K 17/2
K 25/2
1st 25/2
2nd 25/2
3rd 25/2

Child Well-Being
Achievement Performance Parent Involvement

Child-staff ratio

Leadership Team
(HT, PRT, SCR)

Principal
1. Unique Blend of Enrichment & Family Support
CPC Preschool and Reading

Ages: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15

Test Scores: .62, .46, .46, .43, .28, .32, .27, .27, .25, .30, .25

Control
Prek
Nat. Norm
Parent Involvement and Engagement

“It’s all about the relationship. Without it, families will not open up about their real needs. Families need someone they can go to when in crisis, and I am happy that I can be available to point them in the right direction to find the assistance they need.”

Beth Kelley, School-Community Representative, McLean County Unit 5 School District

“School-home involvement gives the parents an active part in their child’s academic life, in addition to helping with or supervising regular school homework. This involvement goes beyond that and includes time spent with the child reading for pleasure, conversations while watching TV, playing games, and being out and about in the community.”

Sonja Griffin, Mentor, Chicago Public Schools
# Family Engagement, PI log data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average number of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>1.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal, IL</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*denotes significant differences (*p* < .01).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Any CPC</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Norm, (4+ scales)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-emot.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adjusted for baseline differences. Readiness norm is from Teaching Strategies GOLD, Spring 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Full-Day CPC</th>
<th>Part-Day CPC</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met Norm,</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Attendance</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adjusted for baseline differences. 982 children are from the same 11 schools offering full-day Prek. Readiness norm is from Teaching Strategies GOLD, Spring 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fall to Spring</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>8 to 21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Number of children was 192 (CPC) and 87 (control). Adjusted for differences in child/family demographics and baseline performance.
2. P-3 Continuity Improves Learning
Reading Advantage of CPC

Test Scores

Ages

CPC P+K
CPC Pk-3
Nat. Norm

CPC P+K
CPC Pk-3
Nat. Norm
## Age 35 Ed Attainment, P-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA and above</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA and above</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA+/credential</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>6.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Program group, 4-6 years, Comparison, 0-3 years. Rates are adjusted.
Age 35 Annual Income, P-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15,592+</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>9.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,415+</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>8.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Quartile</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>10.4*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Average annual wages from ages 30-35 from administrative records and self-reports on the age 35 survey all in 2015 dollars. Rates are adjusted.
3. High Return on Investment
CPC Return per Dollar Invested

- Preschool: $10.83
- School-age: $3.97
- P-3 program: $8.72

Net Present Value $2015
"I propose working with states to make high-quality preschool available to every child in America. Every dollar we invest in high-quality early education can save more than seven dollars later on – by boosting graduation rates, reducing teen pregnancy, even reducing violent crime.”

(President Obama)
4. Broad Reach & Impacts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Impacts: Prek</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Comp</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile arrest</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>-8.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child maltreat.</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-7.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS completion</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>8.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony arrest</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>-4.9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>-4.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insur.</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>10.1%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child-Parent Center Structure

Child-Parent Center
Preschool/Kindergarten
(Wing or Building)

Principal

Elementary School
Grades 1 to 3

Head Teacher

Curriculum/Parent Liaison

Outreach Services

Parent Component

Curriculum Component

Health Services

Parent Component

Curriculum Component

School-Wide Services

Outreach Services
- Parent Resource Teacher
- Parent Room Activities
- Classroom Volunteering
- Home Support

Parent Component
- Language Focus
  - Class Sizes 17/2
  - Balance of Activ.
  - Whole-Child Prof. Develop.

Curriculum Component
- Health Screening
  - Nursing Services
  - Free + Reduced-Price meals

Health Services
- Parent Room Activities
- Classroom Volunteering
- School Activities
- Home Support

Parent Component
- Class Sizes 25/2
- Teacher Aides
- Instructional Materials
- Individualized Instruction
- Inservice Training

School-Wide Services
- Health Services
  - School-Community Representative
  - Resource Mobilization

Age 3 To Age 9
5. Feasible Scaling
Key Principles

1. Shared Ownership

2. Committed Resources

3. Progress Monitoring for Improvement
Child-Parent Centers

The Child-Parent Center preschool to 3rd grade (CPC P-3) model is a school reform effort currently in three Midwestern states. The program aims to strengthen overall well-being and achievement of preschool through elementary school-aged children from low-income families.

Who's involved in running a CPC P-3 site? Learn more here.

CPC P-3 ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES
CPC P-3 Progress Monitoring Tools

Classroom Activities Report (CAR)
Classroom Learning Activities Checklist (CLAC)
Parent Involvement Logs
Curriculum Alignment Plan (Annual)
Parent Involvement Plan (Annual)
PD Review
Home-School Agreement
## Classroom Learning Activities Checklist (CLAC) Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 (PK)</th>
<th>Year 2 (K)</th>
<th>Year 3 (1\textsuperscript{st})*</th>
<th>Year 4 (2\textsuperscript{nd})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Comparison of Effect Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Midwest CPC</th>
<th>CLS CPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Dosage</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Inv.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. School readiness skills measured by TS-Gold /PALS/ISEL in MCPC and ITBS Composite in CLS. Parent involvement is school participation. Dosage is higher vs. lower.
Effect Sizes for PreK Class Sizes, Chicago, Total Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 17 vs 20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 17 vs 22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. School readiness skills measured by TS-Gold Total Score adjusted for baseline characteristics, fall score, and full-day prek. N = 2630.
Fidelity Assessment in Midwest CPC Expansion

Sangyoo Lee, Adelaide Nelson, Allyson Candee, Arthur Reynolds
University of Minnesota
Fidelity Process

Ratings for each element include the following:

- Observations
- Interviews
- Site visits
- Administrative records
- Plans

Scaling for each element and by year is 1 to 5, with 5 being excellent—high levels of fidelity.
Fidelity Measurement

Scoring matched to available evidence with the program requirements (32 for 6 elements)

Good reliability

Scoring rubric modified over time

Became more explicit by element and requirements
Collaborative Leadership Team

Promote a shared vision and positive climate for learning, manage implement of elements, foster communication among teachers, students, and parents.

Requirement 1 (of 4): Under the direction of the Head Teacher, the site Leadership Team meets regularly. Team members in the same job position at neighboring CPCs also meet regularly.

Each are scored from 1 (no meetings) to 5 (frequent meetings).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fidelity Averages Across Years by Element</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Learning Experiences</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership Team</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned Curriculum</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity and Stability</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations between CLT Fidelity and Other Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPC Element</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Learning</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned Curriculum</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity and Stability</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Fidelity Ratings were aggregated across Years 1 to 5.
Implications

1. Monitoring fidelity is key to scaling evidence-based programs.

2. Training and technical assistance is an important component.

3. Linking fidelity to outcomes identifies most impactful elements.
Overall Summary

CPC program is unique and has a distinguished history of effectiveness

Among the most effective social programs

Program scaling is feasible and early evidence shows initial positive impacts
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