

References

- Akerlund, K. M. (2000). Prevention program sustainability: The state's perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*, 353-362.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). Ladder of citizen participation. *American Institute of Planners Journal, 35*, 216-224.
- Bauman, L. J., Stein, R. E., & Ireys, H. T. (1991). Reinventing fidelity: The transfer of technology among settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 19*, 619-639.
- Bartunek, J. M., & Betters-Read, B. L. (1987). The stages of organizational creation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*, 287-303.
- Bernier, J. R., Nelson, G., & Kissin, A. (2004). *Walpole Island Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Blakely, C. H., Mayer, J. P., Gottschalk, R. G., Schmitt, N., Davidson, W. S., Roitman, D. B., & Emshoff, J. G. (1987). The fidelity-adaptation debate: Implications for the implementation of public sector social programs. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*, 253-268.
- Blum, A., & Ragab, I., (1985). Developmental stages of neighbourhood organizations. *Social Policy, 15*, 21-28.
- Bond, M. A., & Keys, C. B. (1993). Empowerment, diversity, and collaboration: Promoting synergy on community boards. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*, 37-57.
- Cameron, G., & Cadell, S. (1999). Fostering empowering participation in prevention programs for disadvantaged children and families: Lessons from ten demonstration sites. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 18(1)*, 105-121.
- Cameron, G., Hayward, K., & Mamatis, D. (1992). Mutual Aid and Child Welfare: The parent mutual aid organizations in child welfare demonstration project. Waterloo, ON: Centre for Social Welfare Studies, Family of Social Work, Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Cameron, G., Hayward, K., McKenzie, A., Hancock, K., & Jeffery, H. (1999). *Partnerships and programs: Service-provider involvement in Better Beginnings, Better Futures*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit: Technical Report.
- Cameron, G., Peirson, L., & Pancer, S.M. (1984). Resident participation in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures prevention project: Part I - Factors that facilitate and hinder involvement. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13(2)*, 213-227.

References

- Cameron, G., & Vanderwoerd, J. (1997). *Values, process and commitment: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project Organization and Management*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit: Technical Report.
- Campbell, F. A., Ramey, C. T., Pungello, E. P., Sparling, J., & Miller-Johnson, S. (2002). Early childhood education: Young adult outcomes from the Abecedarian Project. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*, 42-57.
- Chamberland, C., Dallaire, N., Lindsay, J., Hébert, J., Fréchette, L., Beaudoin, G. & Cameron, S. (1998). Les conditions de réussite en prévention/promotion en enfance-famille-jeunesse: Une question de justification et de faisabilité. *Revue Canadienne de Santé Mentale Communautaire, 17(1)*, 37-59.
- Cherniss, C. (1997). Teacher empowerment, consultation and the creation of new programs in school. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 8*, 135-152.
- Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (revised edition). New York: Academic Press.
- Comer, J. P. (1976). Improving the quality of continuity of relationship in two inner-city schools. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 15*, 535-545.
- Coulman, L. (2004). *The impact of the development of a community centre on community and agency partners - The Shelldale Community Centre: A snapshot*. Guelph Onward Willow Better Beginnings: Unpublished report.
- Dariotis, J. K., Duncan, L. G., & Bumbarger, B. K. (2004, May). *Program sustainability: An exploration of the new frontier in prevention science*. Poster presentation at the 12th Annual Meeting of the Society for Prevention Research conference, Québec City, Québec.
- Doherty, G. (1997). *Zero to Six: The basis for school readiness*. Human Resources Development Canada. Ottawa: R-97-8E.
- Durlak, J. A. (Ed.). (1998a). Program implementation in preventive trials [Special issue]. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 17(2)*.
- Durlak, J. A. (1998b). Why program implementation is important. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 17*, 5-18.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In D. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 701-778). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Elias, M. J., & Kamarinos, P. (2003, August). *Sustainability of school-based preventive, social-emotional programs: A model site study*. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

References

- Foster-Fishman, P. G., & Keys, C. B. (1997). The person/environment dynamics of employee empowerment: An organizational culture analysis. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*, 345-369.
- Gager, P. J., & Elias, M. J. (1997). Implementing prevention programs in high-risk environments: Application of the resiliency paradigm. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67*, 363-373.
- Gresham, F. M., & Elliott, S. N. (1990). *Social skills rating system manual*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.
- Hall G. E., & Loucks, S.F. (1978). *Innovation configurations: Analyzing the adaptations of configurations*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Handy, C. (1995). *The age of paradox*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hayward, K. (2004). *Kingston Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Hayward, K. (2004). *Ottawa Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Hayward, K., & Kissin, A. (2004). *Regent Park Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Hayward, K. (2004). *Sudbury Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Hodgson, S. (1984). Efficient and effective human services: Some assumptions about why and how to involve community residents. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 3*(1), 27-38.
- Janus, M. (2004). *Psychometric properties of the Early Development Instrument (EDI): A teacher-completed measure of childrens readiness to learn at school in kindergarten*. McMaster University, ON: Offord Centre for Child Studies.
- Janus, M., & Offord, D. R. (2000). Reporting on readiness to learn in Canada. ISUMA *Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 1*, 71-75.
- Johnson, D. B., Malone, P. J., & Hightower, A. D. (1997). Barriers to primary prevention efforts in the schools: Are we the biggest obstacle to the transfer of knowledge? *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 6*, 81-90.
- Jones, B., & Silva, J. (1991). Problem solving, community building, and systems interaction: An integrated practice model for community development. *Journal of the Community Development Society, 22*, 1-21.

References

- Juras, J., Mackin, J. R., Curtis, S. E., & Foster-Fishman P. G. (1997). Key concepts of community psychology: Implications for consulting in education and human services settings. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 8*, 111-134.
- Kagan, S. L. (1992). Readiness past, present, and future: Shaping the agenda. *Young Children, (November)*, 48-53.
- Kaye, G. (1990). A community organizer's perspective in citizen participation research and the research practitioner partnership. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*, 151-157.
- Kloos, B., McCoy, J., Stewart, E., Thomas, E. R., Wiley, A., Good, T. L., Hunt, G. D., Moore, T., & Rappaport, J. (1997). Bridging the gap: A community-based, open-systems approach to school and neighborhood consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 8*, 175-196.
- Knoke, D., & Burke P. J. (1980). *Log-Linear Models*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kress, J. S., Cimring, B. R., & Elias, M. J. (1997). Community psychology consultation and the transition to institutional ownership and operation of intervention. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 8*, 231-253.
- Kretzmann, J. P. & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out*. Chicago, IL: ACTA Publications.
- La Paro, K., Pianta, R. C. (2000). Predicting children's competence in the early school years: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research, 70(4)*, 443-484.
- Lauzon, C., Kissin, A., & Nelson, G. (2004). *Cornwall Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit Technical Report.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (Ed.). (1985). *Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lynch, K. B., Geller, S. R., Hunt, D. R., Galano, J., & Dubas, J. S. (1998). Successful program development using implementation evaluation. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 17*, 51-64.
- Maton, K. I., & Salem, D. A. (1995). Organizational characteristics of empowering community settings: A multiple case study approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 631-656.
- Mayer, J. P., & Davidson, W. S. II. (2000). Dissemination of innovation as social change. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 421-438). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

- McLennan, J. (2004, May). *CAPC, a federal early childhood initiative: What's the evidence?* Poster presentation at the 12th Annual Meeting of the Society for Prevention Research conference, Québec City, Québec.
- M'Timkulu, D. (1982). Primary prevention, mutual support systems, and neighbourhood development. In H. Campfens (Ed.), *Rethinking community development in a changing society: Issues, concepts, and cases*. Selected papers and proceedings from the Ontario Community Development Society conference, Geneva Park, Lake Couchiching.
- Nelson, G., Amio, J., Prilleltensky, I., & Nickels, P. (2000). Partnerships for implementing school and community prevention programs. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 11*, 121-145.
- Nelson, G., Kissin, S., & Palijan, S. (2004). *Guelph Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Nelson, G., Pancer, S. M., Hayward, K., & Kelly, R. (2004). Partnerships and participation of community residents in health promotion and prevention: Experiences of the Highfield Community Enrichment Project (Better Beginnings, Better Futures). *Journal of Health Psychology, 9*, 205-219.
- Nelson, G., Prilleltensky, I., & MacGillivray, H. (2001). Building value-based partnerships: Toward solidarity with oppressed groups. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 29*, 649-677.
- Offord, D., & Lipman, E. (1996). Emotional and behavioural problems. . In Human Resources Development Canada / Statistics Canada (Eds.), *Growing up in Canada: National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth*, (pp. 119-126). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Olds, D. L. (1988). The Prenatal/Early Infancy Project. In R. H. Price, E. L. Cowen, R. P. Lorion, & J. Ramos-McKay (Eds.), *Fourteen ounces of prevention: A casebook for practitioners* (pp. 9-23). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Olds, D. L., Eckenrode, J., Henderson, C. R., Kitzman, H., Powers, J., Cole, R., Sidora, K., Morris, P., Pettitt, L. M., & Luckey, D. (1997). Long-term effects of home visitation on maternal life course, child abuse and neglect, and children's arrests: Fifteen year follow-up of a randomized trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 278*, 637-643.
- Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services (1990). *Call for proposals for Better Beginnings, Better Futures*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.
- Pancer, S. M., & Cameron, G. (1994). Resident participation in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures prevention project: Part I - The impacts of involvement. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13*(2), 197-211.

References

- Pancer, S. M. & Nelson, G. (1990). Community-based approaches to health promotion: Guidelines for community mobilization. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education, 10*, 91-111.
- Pancer, S. M., & Nelson, G. (2004). *Highfield Better Beginnings, Better Futures: Project summary*. Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Research Coordination Unit: Technical report.
- Pancer, S. M., & Westhues, A. (1989). A developmental stage approach to program planning and evaluation. *Evaluation Review, 13*, 56-77.
- Peirson, L., & Prilleltensky, I. (1994). Understanding school change to facilitate prevention: A study of change in a secondary school. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13*(2), 127-144.
- Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management (2001). *Leading in a time of change: A conversation with Peter F. Drucker and Peter M. Senge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peters, R. DeV., Arnold, R., Petrunka, K., Angus, D. E., Brophy, K., Burke, S. O., Cameron, G., Evers, S., Herry, Y., Levesque, D., Pancer, S. M., Roberts-Fiati, G., Towson, S., & Warren, W. K. (2000). *Developing capacity and competence in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures communities: Short-term findings report*. Kingston, Ontario: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit Technical Report.
- Peters, R. DeV., Petrunka, K., Angus, D. E., Arnold, R., Bélanger, J-M., Boyce, W., Brophy, K., Burke, S. O., Craig, W., Currie, A., Evers, S., Herry, Y., Irving, L. G., Khan, S., Kocher, P., Mamatis, D., Nelson, G., Pancer, M., Russell, C. C., and Towson, S. (2004). *Do Better Beginnings Lead to Better Futures? Three-Year Follow-up Outcomes for Grade 6 Children and Their Families*. Kingston, ON: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Research Coordination Unit Technical Report.
- Powell, B., & Nelson, G. (1997). The cultivation of neighbourhood centers: A lifecycle model. *Journal of the Community Development Society, 28*, 25-42.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2000). Value-based leadership in organizations: Balancing values, interests, and power among citizens, workers, and leaders. *Ethics and Behavior, 10*, 139-158.
- Quinn, R. E., & Cameron, K. (1983). Organizational lifecycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: Some preliminary evidence. *Management Science, 29*, 33-51.
- Racino, J. A. (1991). Organizations in community living: Supporting people with disabilities. *Journal of Mental Health Administration, 18*, 51-59.
- Rae-Grant, N. I., & Russell, C. C. (1989). *Better Beginnings, Better Futures: An integrated model of primary prevention of emotional and behavioural problems*. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

References

- Reinharz, S. (1984). Alternative settings and social change. In K. Heller, R. H. Price, S. Reinharz, S. Riger, & A. Wandersman, *Psychology and community change: Challenges of the future*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2002). Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title I Chicago Child-Parent Centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(4), 267-303.
- Riger, S. (1984). Vehicles for empowerment: The case of feminist movement organizations. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*, 99-117.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. (2004). School transition and school readiness: An outcome of early childhood development. In R. E. Tremblay, R. G. Barr, & R. DeV. Peters (Eds.), *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development. Available at <http://www.excellence-earlychildhood.ca/documents/Rimm-KaufmanANGxp.pdf>.
- Rosenthal, R. and Rosnow, R. L. (1985). *Contrast Analysis: Focused Comparisons in the Analysis of Variance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothschild-Whitt, J. (1976). Conditions facilitating participatory-democratic organization. *Sociological Inquiry, 46*(2), 75-86.
- Rush, B., & Ogborne, A. (1991). Program logic models: Expanding their role and structure for program planning and evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 6*, 93-105.
- Rutman, L. (1984). Planning an evaluation study. In L. Rutman (Ed.), *Evaluation research methods: A basic guide* (pp. 15-37). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Sarason, S. B. (1972). *The creation of settings and the future societies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sarason, S. B. (1982). *The culture of the school and the problem of change* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schorr, L. B. (1988). Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage. New York: Anchor.
- Schorr, L. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America*. New York: Doubleday.
- Schweinhart, L. J., Barnes, H. V., Weikart, D. P., Barnett, W. S., & Epstein, A. S. (1993). Significant benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27. *Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 10*, Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

References

- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and science of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, C., Roth, G., & Smith, B. (1999). *The dance of change*. New York: Currency/Doubleday.
- Statistics Canada, & Human Resources Development Canada. (1995). *National Longitudinal Survey of Children: Overview of survey instruments from 1994-95 data collection cycle I*. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 9502. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry.
- Toronto Board of Education (1990). ABC Kindergarten Teacher Observation Rating System. Toronto, Ontario: Toronto Board of Education.
- Wandersman, A. & Giamartino, G. (1980). Community and individual differences as influences on initial participation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 8, 217-228.
- Weber, M. (1946). Politics as a vocation. In H. Girth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weissberg, R. P. (1990). Fidelity and adaptation: Combining the best of both perspectives. In P. Tolan, C. Keys, F. Chertok, & L. Jason (Eds.), *Researching community psychology: Issues of theory and methods* (pp. 186-189). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Willms, J. D. (Ed.) (2002). *Vulnerable children*. Edmonton, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.
- Zins, J. E., Elias, M. J., Greenberg, M. T., & Pruetz, M. K. (Eds.). (2000a). Implementation of prevention programs [special issue]. *Journal of Educational and Psychology Consultation*, 11(1).
- Zins, J. E., Elias, M. J., Greenberg, M. T., & Pruetz, M. K. (Eds.). (2000b). Measurement of quality of implementation of prevention programs [special issue]. *Journal of Educational and Psychology Consultation*, 11(2).

Appendix A

Information Letters and Consent Forms

for Participants from Better Beginnings Sites

INFORMATION LETTER TO PROJECT MANAGERS REGARDING SITE VISITS

Hello,

As you may already be aware, researchers will be visiting your site in the near future to collect information for a report on the sustainability of Better Beginnings, Better Futures. The purpose of this research is to understand how the program sites of Better Beginnings, Better Futures have changed over the years - from the start of the project to the present day. The study will look at the experiences of volunteers, staff, and service-provider partners who have been actively involved in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures' program sites. This research is being conducted by Dr. Geoffrey Nelson and Dr. Mark Pancer, Professors of Psychology at Wilfrid Laurier University, Karen Hayward, an independent social research consultant, and Alexei Kissin, a Masters student in the Community Psychology program at Wilfrid Laurier University.

In order to gather data for this report we are proposing a two-day site visit to your program to:

- conduct focus groups with each of the following groups: community residents who have been involved in your program, direct service staff, and key service-provider partners;
- conduct an interview with you;
- visit one or more of the program activities at your site and;
- read through any program documents that may provide additional information about the program and how it has changed throughout the years.

We are hoping that you can help us in coordinating the visit, to ensure that everything goes smoothly. First, we would like you to select a date for the two-day visit that falls between December, 2003 and March, 2004. Secondly, we would appreciate it if you could recruit participants for the focus groups and distribute information letters and consent forms to these potential participants prior to our site visit. Lastly, we would like you to provide us with copies of any current program documents that you believe could provide us with further information about how your program has changed throughout the years, and how it is currently operating.

A member of our research team will contact you by phone in the upcoming weeks to arrange a time for the two-day visit to your program. He/She will also be able to answer any initial questions or concerns you may have about the research process. We look forward to meeting with all of you and listening to your valuable experiences and opinions.

Sincerely,

**INFORMATION LETTER FOR RESIDENT VOLUNTEERS,
STAFF, AND KEY-SERVICE PROVIDERS**

The Life Cycle of Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations:
From Planning to Sustainability

Dear Prospective Participant:

Our names are Geoffrey Nelson and Mark Pancer, and we are Professors of Psychology at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario and Principal Investigators of a research study entitled: "The Life Cycle of Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations: From Planning to Sustainability." We are asking you to participate in this research study which is being conducted by the two of us, Karen Hayward, an independent social research consultant and former Better Beginnings' Site Researcher, and Alexei Kissin, a Masters student in the Community Psychology program at Wilfrid Laurier University. The purpose of this research is to understand how the project sites of Better Beginnings, Better Futures have changed from the start of the project to the present day. The study will look at the experiences of volunteers, employees, and service-provider partners who have been actively involved in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures' sites. In particular, we will be studying how the organizations have changed or remained the same with respect to resident participation, the program model, the involvement of service-providers, and project organization and management.

Your participation in this study would consist of taking part in a focus group, which will contain between 3 and 10 participants. A focus group is a type of group discussion where people give responses to a set of questions and then discuss these responses together. The questions you will be asked at this focus group are related to changes in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures project since 1998. This focus group will be facilitated by two researchers from our research team. The focus group session will be recorded to tape on a voice recorder. It will take about 2 hours with a break taking place after about 1 hour. We have attached a copy of the interview questions that will be asked during the interview. Please note that your participation in this research is purely voluntary, and that if you choose not to participate that this will not in any way affect your relationship with the project or your participation in any project activities or programs. You are under absolutely no obligation to participate in this research.

The only risk that we anticipate is that some of the questions may trigger experiences that caused you distress. For example, you may have experienced some conflict or discord as part of your involvement with the project. Please note that we want to make the focus group as comfortable as possible for you. Moreover, you are free to refuse to answer any question without penalty. If you leave the focus group before data collection is completed, your responses will be destroyed and omitted from the transcripts. The results of the research will be published in technical reports and scholarly journals.

You may find the focus group personally beneficial, as you will have an opportunity to share some of your experiences in your own words. Also, the findings of this research may lead to improvements in Better Beginnings, Better Futures, thereby helping to ensure that the project will benefit future generations.

We ask that you bring the attached consent form to the focus group to indicate that you understand the purpose and conditions of participation in the research and agree to participate. The researchers who conduct the focus groups can answer any questions you have before you sign it, and we will clarify with you that your participation is purely voluntary.

Everything you say during the interview will be held in the strictest confidence by the researchers. Your name will not be associated with anything you say and your interview responses will be securely stored in our locked research office at Wilfrid Laurier University. While we will encourage all focus group participants to keep what is said in the focus groups confidential, we cannot guarantee that other participants will adhere to this request.

If you wish, we will provide you with a copy of the transcript of your focus group, which you can review and return to us with your comments. The transcripts will be seen only by the four researchers (Geoff Nelson, Mark Pancer, Karen Hayward, and Alexei Kissin) and the transcriber (Susan Alisat). Please note that the transcriber will keep all information confidential and your name will not be associated in any way with your responses. Finally, once the focus group has been transcribed, the tape with your recorded responses will be erased.

When we have completed the drafts of project site reports, we will make copies available to you and the other focus group participants. You can read over this draft and send us your feedback. We will then make modifications to the drafts based on the feedback from you and others who participated in the research. The final drafts of the project site reports will be available to the sites by August 31, 2004.

If you have questions at any time about the research or the procedures, or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study, you may contact either of us, Dr. Geoffrey Nelson, (519) 884-0710, extension 3314, or Dr. Mark Pancer, (519) 884-0710, extension 3149. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board of Wilfrid Laurier University. If you feel your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, extension 2468.

Sincerely yours,

Geoffrey Nelson, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

Mark Pancer, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

INFORMATION LETTER FOR PROJECT MANAGERS

The Life Cycle of Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations: From Planning to Sustainability

Dear Prospective Participant:

Our names are Geoffrey Nelson and Mark Pancer, and we are Professors of Psychology at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario and Principal Investigators of a research study entitled: "The Life Cycle of Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations: From Planning to Sustainability." We are asking you to participate in this research study which is being conducted the two of us, Karen Hayward (an independent social research consultant), and Alexei Kissin, a Masters student in the Community Psychology program at Wilfrid Laurier University. The purpose of this research is to understand how the project sites of Better Beginnings, Better Futures have changed from the start of the project to the present day. The study will look at the experiences of volunteers, employees, and service-provider partners who have been actively involved in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures' sites. In particular, we will be studying how the organizations have changed or remained the same with respect to resident participation, the program model, the involvement of service-providers, and project organization and management.

Your participation in this study would consist of taking part in a key informant interview. A key informant interview is one in which you have an opportunity to share your perspective on a variety of issues related to the project site. The questions you will be asked at this interview are related to changes in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures project since 1998. This interview will be conducted by two researchers from our research team. The interview will be recorded to tape on a voice recorder. It will take about 1-1.5 hours with a break if you wish. We have attached a copy of the interview questions that will be asked during the interview. Please note that your participation in this research is purely voluntary, and that if you choose not to participate that this will not in any way affect your employment with the project. We anticipate that we will start our site visit with an interview with you. After we have finished all the focus group interviews, we may want to do a brief follow-up interview with you at the end of our visit to clarify any questions that have arisen during our site visit.

The only risk that we anticipate is that some of the questions may trigger experiences that caused you distress. For example, you may have experienced some conflict or discord as part of your involvement with the project. Please note that we want to make the interview as comfortable as possible for you. Moreover, you are free to refuse to answer any question without penalty. If you decide to withdraw your participation before the interview is completed, your responses will be destroyed and will not be transcribed. The results of the research will be published in technical reports and scholarly journals.

You may find the interview personally beneficial, as you will have an opportunity to share some of your experiences in your own words. Also, the findings of this research may lead to

improvements in Better Beginnings, Better Futures, thereby helping to ensure that the project will benefit future generations.

We ask that you bring the attached consent form to the interview to indicate that you understand the purpose and conditions of participation in the research and agree to participate. The researchers who conduct the interview can answer any questions you have before you sign it.

Everything you say during the interview will be held in the strictest confidence. Your name will not be associated with anything you say and your interview responses will be securely stored in our locked research office at Wilfrid Laurier University.

If you wish, we will provide you with a copy of the transcript of your interview, which you can review and return to us with your comments. The transcripts will be seen only by the four researchers (Geoff Nelson, Mark Pancer, Karen Hayward, and Alexei Kissin) and the transcriber (Susan Alisat). Please note that the transcriber will keep all information confidential and your name will not be associated in any way with your responses. Finally, once the interview has been transcribed, the tape with your recorded responses will be erased.

When we have completed the drafts of project site reports, you will receive a copy your site's draft report. You and members of your project's principal decision-making body (e.g., Executive Team, Steering Committee), as well as focus group participants, can read over this draft and send us your feedback. We will then make modifications to the drafts based on the feedback from you and others who participated in the research. The final drafts of the project site reports will be available to the sites by August 31, 2004.

If you have questions at any time about the research or the procedures, or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study, you may contact either of us, Dr. Geoffrey Nelson, (519) 884-0710, extension 3314, or Dr. Mark Pancer, (519) 884-0710, extension 3149. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board of Wilfrid Laurier University. If you feel your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, extension 2468.

Sincerely yours,

Geoffrey Nelson, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

Mark Pancer, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

CONSENT FORM FOR RESIDENT VOLUNTEERS, STAFF, AND SERVICE-PROVIDERS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH STUDY ENTITLED:

The Life Cycle of the Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations:
From Planning to Sustainability

Dr. Geoffrey Nelson and Dr. Mark Pancer, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Karen Hayward, Independent Consultant, Alexei Kissin, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University

I have been informed of the purposes and methods of the above named study and what will be required of me to participate in this study. Furthermore, I understand that:

- I am free to withdraw my participation at any time and to not answer any questions which I do not wish to answer;
- the researchers will provide me with the complete transcript of the focus group, if I wish, which I can review and return to the researchers with my comments;
- the transcript of my focus group will be stored in a locked office to protect my confidentiality;
- my name will not be associated with any quotes;
- the researchers have promised to provide a final site report to the project manager or the key informant, who will share this report with me.

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Signature _____

I have read and understand the information from the informed consent letter. I agree to participate in the focus group for this research.

Yes _____ No _____

I agree to have the focus group tape-recorded.

Yes _____ No _____

I understand that quotes of things that I say may appear in published reports, but only in an anonymous form, so that I cannot be identified as the source of these quotes.

Yes _____ No _____

**CONSENT FORM FOR PROJECT MANAGERS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE
RESEARCH STUDY ENTITLED:**

The Life Cycle of the Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations:
From Planning to Sustainability

Dr. Geoffrey Nelson and Dr. Mark Pancer, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier
University, Karen Hayward, Independent Consultant, Alexei Kissin, Department of Psychology,
Wilfrid Laurier University

I have been informed of the purposes and methods of the above named study and what will be
required of me to participate in this study. Furthermore, I understand that:

- I am free to withdraw my participation at any time and to not answer any questions which
I do not wish to answer;
- the researchers will provide me a complete transcript of the interview, if I wish, which I
can review and return to the researchers with my comments;
- the transcript of my interview will be stored in a locked office to protect my
confidentiality;
- my name will not be associated with any quotes;
- the researchers have promised to provide me with a final site report, which I will share
with other participants in the study.

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Signature _____

I have read and understand the information from the informed consent letter. I agree to
participate in the focus group for this research.

Yes _____ No _____

I agree to have the interview tape-recorded.

Yes _____ No _____

I understand that quotes of things that I say may appear in published reports, but only in an
anonymous form, so that I cannot be identified as the source of these quotes.

Yes _____ No _____

Appendix B
Interview Guides
for Participants from Better Beginnings Sites

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE
BETTER BEGINNINGS SUSTAINABILITY RESEARCH**

Resident Participation

How would you describe resident participation in the project at present?

How has this changed over the last few years (since the end of the “demonstration” phase of the project)?

What kinds of changes have occurred in

- the amount of participation
- the nature or quality of participation
- the characteristics of the residents who participate (e.g., their ethnic background, gender, place of residence)

(For the changes that occurred:) Why do you think these changes occurred?

What are some of the barriers to resident participation in the project right now?

What has the project done to overcome these barriers?

What has the project done to sustain resident participation?

How would you describe the relationships between residents and program staff at present?

What changes, if any, have there been in the relationships that residents have with program staff?
(For changes mentioned:) What do you think produced these changes?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to resident participation?

Program Model

What would you say are the major programs that your project offers or provides?

(Referring to table of programs from the original program model report and program model update:) What programs are you no longer providing? Why were these programs discontinued?

What is the process that happens when you decide to discontinue a program?

What new programs have you added? Where did the idea for these programs come from? Why were these programs added?

What is the process that happens when you decide to add a new program?

When you are designing a new program, what kinds of information do you look for in helping to decide on all the details about the program?

Have the programs that you've kept since the demonstration period changed in any way? (Prompt: for example, in who they're offered to, the kinds of services that are provided, how often and how much of the services are provided)

Did the Better Beginnings research, as reported in the Short-term findings report, or in presentations, have any impact on the programs that you provide?

To what extent was the program model and the program components based on a program logic model or previous research evidence (evidence-based practice approach)? Can you describe any examples of these kinds of programs?

To what extent was the program model and program components based on input from community residents (community development approach)? Can you describe any examples of these kinds of programs?

To what extent is there community ownership of the different program components?

What is the current budget for the different program components?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to the program model?

Project Organization and Management

To what extent has there been turnover in the different staff for the project (e.g., Project Manager, coordinators, direct service staff)?

What impact has this had on the project?

What are some of the reasons for staff leaving the project?

How are key decisions about the project made, and who makes these decisions?

What changes, if any, have there been in the decision-making bodies or structures of the project? What were the reasons for these changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the way decisions are made at the project? What were the reasons for these changes?

What is it like being a staff member on the project? How (if at all) has this changed since the end of the demonstration period?

How would you describe the approach to project management at present?

To what extent is it participatory?

To what extent is it bureaucratic or hierarchical?

Has the approach to project management changed since the end of the demonstration phase? What are the reasons for any changes?

What are the key values that guide the project at this time?

Are these different in any way from the values that guided the project earlier on, during its demonstration phase? What are the reasons for any changes?

How would you describe the organizational climate of the project at this time?

Is this climate different than it was earlier, during the project's demonstration phase? What are the reasons for any changes?

How would you describe the relationship between the project and its host organization at this time?

What changes have here been in the relationship with the host organization? What are the reasons for any changes?

What are the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to project organization and management?

Service-provider involvement

Who are the (non-staff) service providers who are involved in the project at this time?

To what extent has there been turnover in the service-providers who have been involved in the project?

What impact has this had on the project?

What are some of the reasons for service-providers leaving the project?

How are new service-providers chosen to become involved in the project?

How have these new individuals affected the project?

How are (non-staff) service-providers involved in the project?

Has the nature of their involvement changed since the end of the demonstration phase? (If so:) In what way? What are the reasons for any changes?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to service-provider involvement?

The Future

Where do you see the project headed in the future? What is your vision of what the project will look like 5 years from now?

**FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW GUIDE
BETTER BEGINNINGS SUSTAINABILITY RESEARCH**

Resident Participation

How would you describe resident participation in the project at present?

Comment on:

- the amount of participation
- the nature or quality of participation
- the characteristics of the residents who participate (e.g., their ethnic background, gender, place of residence)

What roles do residents currently play in the project? In what activities do residents participate?

What motivates residents to participate in the project?

What are some of the barriers to resident participation in the project right now?

What has the project done to overcome these barriers?

What has the project done to sustain resident participation?

What impacts has resident participation had on: residents themselves? project programs? the community? Describe any negative impacts of participation.

How would you describe the relationships between residents and program staff? service-providers?

Program Model

What would you say are the major programs that your project offers or provides?

What is the process that happens when you decide to discontinue a program?

Where did the idea for these programs come from?

What is the process that happens when you decide to add a new program?

When you are designing a new program, what kinds of information do you look for in helping to decide on all the details about the program?

To what extent was the program model and the program components based on a program logic model or previous research evidence (evidence-based practice approach)? Can you describe any examples of these kinds of programs?

To what extent was the program model and program components based on input from community residents (community development approach)? Can you describe any examples of these kinds of programs?

To what extent is there community ownership of the different program components?

Project Organization and Management

What are the key values that guide the project at this time?

How would you describe the organizational climate of the project at this time?

How would you describe the approach to project management at present?

To what extent is it participatory?

To what extent is it bureaucratic or hierarchical?

What are the main administrative structures for the project?

How are key decisions about the project made, and who makes these decisions?

What is the project approach to staff supervision?

What is it like being a staff member on the project?

How would you describe the relationship between the project and its host organization at this time?

Service-provider Involvement

Who are the (non-staff) service-providers who are involved in the project at this time?

How would you describe service-provider involvement in the project at present?

Comment on:

- the amount of participation
- the nature or quality of participation

What roles do service-providers currently play in the project? In what activities do service-providers participate?

What motivates service-providers to participate in the project?

What are some of the barriers to service-provider involvement in the project right now?

What has the project done to overcome these barriers?

What has the project done to sustain service-provider involvement?

What impacts has service-provider involvement had on: service-providers themselves? project programs? the community? Describe any negative impacts of participation.

The Future

Where do you see the project headed in the future? What is your vision of what the project will look like 5 years from now?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARTICIPANTS FROM BETTER BEGINNINGS SITES

Resident Participation

What changes, if any, have there been in resident participation in the project sites (the norm of 51% resident participation in all project committees, amount of participation, quality or nature of participation, long-standing volunteers vs. residents who are new to the project, the individuals who participate in the sites [new Canadians, specific ethnic groups, women, men, youth]? What are the reasons for any changes?

What has the project done to sustain resident participation and overcome barriers to participation?

Have there been issues regarding the payment of residents (paid vs. volunteer work)?

What changes, if any, have there been in the nature of the relationships that residents have with program staff? other service-providers? What are the reasons for any changes?

Have there been impacts on resident participation resulting from cuts in funding to human services?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to resident participation?

Program Model

What changes, if any, have there been in the program components since the end of the demonstration period (programs dropped, new programs added)? What are the reasons for any changes?

Did the findings from the Short-term Findings Report of the Better Beginnings research have any impacts on changes made in the program components?

To what extent was the program model and the program components based on a program logic model or previous research evidence (evidence-based practice approach)?

To what extent was the program model and the program components based on input from community residents (community development approach)?

To what extent is their community ownership over the different program components?

What is the current budget for the different program components?

Have there been impacts on the program model resulting from cuts in funding to human services?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to the program model?

Project Organization and Management

To what extent has there been turnover in the different staff for the project sites (Project Manager, coordinators, direct service staff)?

What changes, if any, have there been in the governing structures of the project sites? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in decision-making processes in the project sites? What are the reasons for any changes?

What are the experiences of being a staff member in the post-demonstration period (Project Manager, coordinators, direct service staff)?

Have the project sites retained a participatory approach to project management or have they become more bureaucratic and hierarchical like traditional human service organizations? Why?

What changes, if any, have there been in the key values that guide project organization and management? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the nature of resident involvement in project management? service-provider involvement in project management? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the organizational climate of the Better Beginnings sites? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the relationship with the host organization for the project sites? What are the reasons for any changes?

Have there been impacts on project organization and management resulting from cuts in funding to human services?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to project organization and management?

Service-provider Involvement

What changes, if any, have there been in the visions for integration of services in the project sites? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the types of service-providers who have been involved in the Better Beginnings sites since the end of the demonstration period (service-providers no longer with the project, new service-providers)? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the nature of the involvement of service providers in the design of programs? the delivery of programs? What are the reasons for any changes?

What changes, if any, have there been in the roles of service-providers involved in the Better Beginnings project sites? What are the reasons for any changes?

Have there been impacts on service-provider involvement resulting from cuts in funding to human services?

What have been the critical issues in the time since the end of the demonstration period with regard to service-provider involvement?

The Future

Where do you see the project headed in the future? What is your vision of what the project will look like 5 years from now?

Appendix C

Information Letter and Consent Form

for Participants from Comparison Communities

INFORMATION LETTER FOR COMPARISON SITE PARTICIPANTS

Dear Prospective Participant:

Our names are Geoffrey Nelson and Mark Pancer, and we are Professors of Psychology at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario. We are principal investigators of a research study entitled: “The Life Cycle of Better Beginnings, Better Futures’ Organizations: From Planning to Sustainability.” We are asking you to participate in this study which we are conducting along with Karen Hayward, an independent social research consultant and former Better Beginnings’ Site Researcher, and Alexei Kissin, a Masters student in the Community Psychology program at Wilfrid Laurier University. Part of the purpose of this research is to understand the nature of prevention programs, opportunities for resident participation and community development, and service-provider partnerships in the comparison communities for the Better Beginnings, Better Futures research. Exploring these areas will allow for a more detailed comparison between the children in the Better Beginnings communities and children of the same ages in comparison communities that do not have Better Beginnings projects.

Your participation in this study would consist of taking part in either an individual or group interview (with up to 10 other participants). The questions you will be asked in this interview or focus group deal with the types of prevention programs available for children, opportunities for resident participation and community development, and service-provider partnerships in the comparison communities for the Better Beginnings, Better Futures research. This interview will be conducted by one researcher from our research team and will be recorded to tape on a voice recorder. It will take about 1-2 hours with a break if desired by participants. We have attached a copy of the questions that will be asked during the interview. Please note that your participation in this research is purely voluntary. You are under absolutely no obligation to participate in this research.

The only risk that we anticipate is that some of the questions may trigger experiences that caused you distress. For example, you may have experienced some conflict or discord as part of your involvement in working with others in this community. Please note that we want to make the interview as comfortable as possible for you. Moreover, you are free to refuse to answer any question without penalty. If you decide to terminate the interview before data collection is completed, your responses will be destroyed and omitted and from the transcripts. The results of the research will be published in technical reports and scholarly journals.

You may find the interview personally beneficial, as you will have an opportunity to share some of your experiences in your own words. Also, the findings of this research may lead to improvements in Better Beginnings, Better Futures, thereby helping to ensure that the project will benefit future generations. We ask that you bring the attached consent form to the interview to indicate that you understand the purpose and conditions of participation in the research and agree to participate. The researcher who conducts the interview can answer any questions you

have before you sign it, and he/she will clarify with you that your participation is purely voluntary.

Everything you say during the interview will be held in the strictest confidence by the researchers. Your name will not be associated with anything you say and your interview responses will be securely stored in our locked research office at Wilfrid Laurier University. While we will encourage all participants to keep what is said in the interview confidential, we cannot guarantee that other participants (if you are participating in a focus group) will adhere to this request.

If you wish, we will provide you with a copy of the transcript of your individual or group interview, which you can review and return to us with your comments. The transcripts will be seen only by the four researchers (Geoff Nelson, Mark Pancer, Karen Hayward, and Alexei Kissin) and the transcriber (Susan Alisat). Please note that the transcriber will keep all information confidential and your name will not be associated in any way with your responses. Finally, once the interview has been transcribed, the tape with your recorded responses will be erased.

When we have completed a draft description of prevention programs in the comparison communities, we will make copies available to you and the other interview participants. You can read over this draft and send us your feedback. We will then make modifications to the drafts based on the feedback from you and others who participated in the research. The final drafts of these community descriptions will be available to the sites by August 31, 2004.

If you have questions at any time about the research or the procedures, or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study, you may contact either of us, Dr. Geoffrey Nelson, (519) 884-0710, extension 3314, or Dr. Mark Pancer, (519) 884-0710, extension 3149. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board of Wilfrid Laurier University. If you feel your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, extension 2468.

Sincerely yours,

Geoffrey Nelson, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

Mark Pancer, Ph.D.
Professor of Psychology

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RESEARCH STUDY ENTITLED:

The Life Cycle of the Better Beginnings, Better Futures' Organizations:
From Planning to Sustainability

Dr. Geoffrey Nelson and Dr. Mark Pancer, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Karen Hayward, Independent Consultant, Alexei Kissin, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University

I have been informed of the purposes and methods of the above named study and what will be required of me to participate in this study. Furthermore, I understand that:

- I am free to withdraw my participation at any time and to not answer any questions which I do not wish to answer;
- the researchers will provide me with the complete transcript of the interview or focus group, if I wish, which I can review and return to the researchers with my comments;
- the transcript of the interview or focus group will be stored in a locked office to protect my confidentiality;
- my name will not be associated with any quotes;
- the researchers have promised to provide a description of the comparison community to me if I wish to see it.

Participant's Name _____
(please print)

Participant's Signature _____

Researcher's Signature _____

I have read and understand the information from the informed consent letter. I agree to participate in the interview or focus group for this research.

Yes _____ No _____

I agree to have the interview or focus group tape-recorded.

Yes _____ No _____

I understand that quotes of things that I say may appear in published reports, but only in an anonymous form, so that I cannot be identified as the source of these quotes.

Yes _____ No _____

Appendix D

Interview Guide

for Participants from Comparison Communities

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARTICIPANTS FROM COMPARISON COMMUNITIES

Programs

What programs are there in this school or community that are designed to promote the well-being of children, families and/or their communities, especially with regard to families with children between the ages of birth and four (younger cohort) and four and eight (older cohort) years of age? (List the programs)

(For each program mentioned:) What are the major components or activities of this program?

What are the major goals of this program?

In what way are community residents involved in this program (as participants, volunteers, planners, etc.)?

What are the background characteristics of the residents who participated in this program (as participants, staff, volunteers)?

Who staffs the program, and how are the programs organized?

When did this program begin and what changes have occurred in the program since it started?

How would you describe the organizational structure of this program? (prompt: would you say it is participatory or hierarchical?)

What would you say are the key values that guide this program?

How would you describe the relationship between service-providers or staff involved in this program, and community residents?

Service-Provider Involvement

What partnerships are there in this community among service providers from different organizations and agencies to help address the needs of children, families and/or the community?

What kinds of activities have these partnerships been engaged in? Have any programs or initiative resulted from these partnerships? What are they?

What was the vision for service integration and partnerships among service-providers?

What roles did the different service-providers play with regard to program planning and program delivery?

Appendix E

**Description of Programs at the
Younger and Older Child Sites**

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

GUELPH	
<i>Child-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Parent-Infant Group (Well Baby Day)	Parents participated in various activities aimed at promoting the health and wellness of mother and child. They also traded clothing and baby equipment, participated in food demonstrations, learned to make baby food, and socialized with other parents. Currently, this program is a thriving group of approximately 20 moms and babies. Participants take home a “good food” bag consisting of three types of fruits or vegetables each week. Sibling care was also provided.
2. Toddler Day	Parents with toddlers participated in various activities aimed at promoting the health and wellness of mother and child. Currently there are approximately 15 moms and toddlers who participate. Sibling care was also provided.
3. Toy and Book Lending Library	Originally this was the Infant Equipment and Toy Lending Library program that fell under the family-focused component of project programming. In the middle year, the name of this program was changed to Toy and Book Lending and placed under the Child-Focused Activities component. This program now lends books and toys. New parents are taught how to play and read with their babies and are given encouragement to do these activities. Family visitors take books as well as toys to families that they visit.
4. Parent and Child Drop-In	There are 42 children registered in this program. The program is offered once per week.
5. Kindergarten Readiness	A group for preschool children who will attend kindergarten in the fall. Currently, the program is offered three afternoons a week. Thirty children and 3 parent volunteers attend each session.
6. Books for Birthdays	Provided books to children who attend the project, a day care centre or a school on their birthdays. Program is offered through donations.
7. Parent Run Drop-In	Program is for children aged birth to 5 years. The program is currently offered once per week.
8. Day Camps	No information provided.
<i>Youth programs* (externally funded)</i>	Provided programming for children beyond the project’s mandated age cohort. This programming is financed by external funding.
1. Seasonal Camps	These camps included the March Break camp and the Christmas camp.
2. After School Activities	These activities included drama, sports, gymnastics, cooking club, music, crafts, Girls’/Boys’ clubs (variety changes each season). Currently there are ten to twelve programs offered per week after school and early evening.
3. Teen Drop-in	Recreational activities for teens aged 13 to 18 years old. Also included leadership development activities. The program is primarily driven by the teens themselves.
4. Junior RAP	Recreational activities for children 8-12 years old.
5. Breakfast Club	Provided breakfast for children 5 to 12 years old. Older children and parents help prepare and serve the food. Currently, there are approximately 90 children registered in the Breakfast Club. On average, 65 children attend daily.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

GUELPH (continued)	
6. Stay in School project	A project that was integrated with other programs (does not indicate which programs) and eventually the entire project. Its aim was to reduce risks associated with early school exit (i.e., dropping out). This is not a specific program, but a goal of the school aged program.
7. Youth Group/Leadership	Recreational activities for after school for children 9 to 12 years old.
8. Recreational Activities (e.g., Karate)	Karate classes were held for children and adults. Included leadership training and a potluck supper for parents and friend of children who participate.
9. Summer Camp	A summer camp for children 5 to 12 years old. It included recreational activities and snacks. Multicultural appreciation is stressed.
<i>Family-Focused Programs</i>	
1. New and Expectant Parent Group (externally funded)	A discussion group facilitated by the family support worker and the community nurse. Topics of these discussions addressed issues important to new or expectant parents. Parents also shared their experiential knowledge with other parents. Home visitors accompanied some parents and their children to and from the programs' location and familiarized them with it. They also provided childcare to participating parents' children, although parents were welcome to bring their children to the program. So far, only mothers were attending this program. Currently offered in partnership with Canadian Pre-natal program (CPNP) and facilitated by the Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Health Unit.
2. Home Visitors Program	Home visitors made visits to families with infants with the goal of strengthening the families' abilities to meet its practical needs. The staff members also linked families to programs and services offered by the project and other agencies. Some of the activities they engaged in at family homes were playing with the children, helping with chores, and providing material resources. They also help families get to the project's programs. There are three family visitors and a Family Visiting Program Coordinator providing support to 30 families. Two thirds of the families are new Canadians.
3. Spirits in the Wind	A women's group facilitated by Guelph-Wellington Women in Crisis for women who have experienced violence in their lives.
4. Community Economic Development	Community cooks provide catering for in-house events or for partner agencies. Neighbourhood community members developed practical skills through providing concrete services (i.e. cleaning, maintenance tasks)
5. Respite Care	Child care provided in the children's homes or during times of parental stress or medical emergencies. Three child care providers work in this program. They are trained and supported by project staff. Currently, only offered occasionally on a need basis.
6. Ban Viet (Circle of Friends)	Vietnamese parents with children under four have weekly group activities such as crafts, outings, guest speakers, and demonstrations on parenting and health issues. Children are cared for by child care program.
7. Friends Circle	Chinese parents with young children are taught basic English, go on outings, and have celebrations and guest speakers, and demonstrations on cultural, parenting, and health issues. They also learn advocacy skills or advocate themselves (the report was not clear about this activity). Children are cared for by child care program.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

GUELPH (continued)	
8. South Asian Women's Group	Afghani, Pakistani, Indian, Bangladeshi women participated in activities, speakers, demonstrations and social time. Child care provided by program.
9. Parent Workshops	A variety of workshops were made available to parents that provided parenting guidance.
10. Employment Training Program	Residents participated in workshops related to employment readiness and skills, including interpersonal communication, organizing skills, use of office equipment and procedures. Trainees in the program work at the reception desks and replace staff as cleaners and child care providers.
11. Daily Bread box and Weekend Market	Surplus food is collected from community stores and distributed to various locations in the neighbourhood.
12. Leadership Training	Increased leadership ability in residents, particularly those in formal roles (i.e., chairing a meeting, conflict resolution, reading a financial statement, minute taking etc).
13. Clothing Room	Clothing collected from stores. Clothing and donations were distributed to families in the neighbourhood and to other families in need. Reaching the later was sometimes done by donating clothes to the Red Cross.
14. Emergency Food Supplies	Provided food packages to residents upon request in an emergency. There have been approximately 35 packages per month given out.
15. ESL Classes	English as a second language is offered in partnership with the Upper Grand District School Board two nights per week (basic level).
16. Other Supports Outside of Planned Programs	Included such supports as taxi fare, short term child care, loans for families who could not afford counselling fees, emergency food supplies, clothing exchange, infant supplies, primary health services through the Guelph Community Health Centre, interpretation services, transportation, and household chore support.
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Circle of Words	A weekly creative writing group in partnership with Action Read.
2. Newsletter Committee	Residents created and distributed a newsletter to the neighbourhood. In the sustainability phase, the newsletter was adapted to a more simplified, two-page format with information only.
3. Community BBQ	Barbecues aimed to attract families of children attending Shelldale school and/or the project so that parents can meet teachers and/or project staff. There are several neighbourhood picnics offered, as well as the Shelldale annual picnic.
4. Community Outreach	In the past, activities included resident participation on committees, as well as in mentoring and advising other neighbourhood groups, writing joint funding proposals, making presentations to various organizations, and doing press interviews. Currently, community outreach is the responsibility of the community staff person whose role is to increase community outreach, providing information, door knocking, accompanying to programs, presentations and displays. Parents key to outreach success.
5. Safety Committee	Community safety issues addressed. Activities included advocating for a traffic light or a crosswalk, building relationships with police and housing managers, reducing drug "hot spots" in neighbourhood
6. Fundraising	Teens hold a number of events to raise funds for a trip each year.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

GUELPH (continued)	
7. Christmas Party	A holiday party is offered.
8. Community Leadership	Provides support and mentoring to neighbourhood leaders, with hands-on leadership activities. Also provides information, advice, and guidance on neighbourhood and personal issues.
9. Awareness of Prevention of	Women in Crisis facilitated a weekly group for women who have experienced violence in their lives. They also support women in need of their services. The children's programs also promote non-violence through problem-solving and leadership development activities
10. Volunteer Recognition	Volunteers are recognized regularly throughout the year. Better Beginnings does this by thanking them at special events, planning an organizational thank-you during volunteer week, and providing meals for meetings that are held during the dinner hour.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

WALPOLE ISLAND	
<i>Child-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Family Resource Playgroup/Drop-In Centre	Offered a playgroup with structured activities for parents/children, a clothing exchange, the weighing and measuring of babies, support for breast feeding, and a chance for parents, children, and staff to socialize and build networks. The program ran four times per week. Parents with children 0-4 and grandparents were the typical participants.
2. Native Language in Play Groups	This program taught Ojibway words. Sing songs and storytelling were also used. It was offered twice a week for 15 minutes during playgroup/circle time. The typical participants were parents and preschool children.
3. Home Visiting	Well-trained family support workers (2 staff focused mainly on home visits and 2 staff focused on running the playgroup) visited families with preschool children in their homes to provide them with support and resources. The goal of the program was to ensure that every newborn was healthy and well-developed. The program ran 4 days per week or when requested. Typical participants were families with children 0-4 and expectant mothers.
4. Blanket Program	This program was similar to the Playgroup program. Children were brought to different parks where they enjoyed various outdoor activities. Lunches and snacks were provided. It operated during July and August. Typically, participants were parents and children 0-4.
5. “You Make the Difference” Parenting Program	A community-based program for parents and preschoolers that helps children to communicate. It provided information to parents and teachers and supported all participants. Typically, participants were families of children 0-4. This program was composed of 10 sessions with a 2-hour session occurring once a week. A set of sessions was offered in the spring and fall.
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Cultural Enrichment Programming	Encompassed a variety of activities: community enrichment sessions, native learning circles, native craft teachings, relearning culture, healing issues, and women’s time out (the latter program ended due to lack of appropriate resources). Since a regular schedule for programming had yet to be established, meetings were held on a quarterly basis. Typically, participants were community members.
2. Boozhoo Nijjii Newsletter	A monthly publication that provided information on events/activities at the project. It contained parenting information and Native language contents. This newsletter was mailed to parents of children aged 0-4.
3. Nobody’s Perfect	Two staff members provided one-on-one instructions on parenting skills during home or office visit. Two 6-week sessions were offered annually in a group setting or on a one-on-one basis if requested. Participants were typically parents with children 0-4 and expectant mothers.
4. Walpole Island Volunteer Elf Association	Responsible for planning the annual Santa Claus Parade. Currently, 15 members who are mainly community volunteers are involved in the project.
5. Bkejwanong Early Years Advisory Team	Mainly a group of service providers in the community who responded to the Early Year’s Study. They wanted to take the study recommendations and apply it to programming offered in Walpole Island.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

WALPOLE ISLAND (continued)

6. Native language Advisory Group	Established by the Community Development Officer to advise and meet the needs of the community using different methods of native Ojibway language instruction for preservation. Not currently a Better Beginnings group, but Community Development Officer is an active member of the Native Language Advisory Group.
7. Special Needs Action Partners (SNAP)	Group of mainly service providers (there are a few community representatives) who are working towards the coordination of service delivery strategies to meet the needs of individuals in the community who have special needs.
8. Native Language Programs	Originally called Native Language Classes, this program gave the community an opportunity to learn more about their culture by offering lessons on oral and written Ojibway, songs and games. Refreshments were provided at the end of each lesson. Classes ran 2-4 hours per week. Currently, it is in a new form. A Native Language Coordinator was hired by the community to coordinate Native Language programs.
9. Fundraising	Various fundraising activities
10. Good Food Box	Originally called Monthly Food Box, there were one or two draws for money. The family draw was \$60 and the seniors draw was \$40. Families entered a ballot every month while seniors' names remained in the box until they were selected. Draws took place in the middle of the month to assist people until they received their pay cheques. Now offered in a new form. There is no longer a draw for the food box. The program, now called the Good Food Box, and is offered by the Child and Youth Services Unit of Social Services.
11. Monthly Information Sessions	Originally called Monthly Community Potluck, a potluck dinner for the community was held once a month. Although initially successful, this program was ended due to dwindling participation, the busy time at which the potluck took place, and the fact that staff were doing most of the work and food preparation required to deliver the program. Currently, Monthly Information Sessions are offered by the Central Intake Unit.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

REGENT PARK	
<i>Child-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Perinatal Group	An informal discussion group for pregnant women and their partners, coaches, or friends that meet bi-weekly for 1 and a half hours. The topics for each meeting are decided upon by those attending the group. The Community Visiting Team Leader, a public health nurse, and a prenatal nurse co-facilitated the group.
2. Play and Learn Toy Lending and Resource Centre	Operates only on a limited basis.
3. School Readiness Program	Focused on preparing pre-school children for school.
4. Toronto Speech and Language Support Program	A Speech and Language therapist available on-site two days per week and has provided some training to the family visitors.
5. Early Years 2 (external funding)	A relatively new and still developing program was Early Years 2 (for children aged 0 to 6), which has been added to the Better Beginnings programming as a result of external funding that was secured by the Regent park site to address the service gaps for complex, high-needs families. This was money available only to community health centres, for children aged 0 to 6. The funding has allowed the project to hire a social worker and have the services of a consulting psychologist. They are also in the process of hiring a half-time nurse practitioner.
6. Incredible Years Parenting Program (IYPP)	Run in partnership with the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH). According to the CAMH website, IYPP “promotes positive behaviours in children, provides an understanding of child behaviour, reduces stress and improves parent-child relationships.” Consists of 12 weekly sessions and is run out of a local elementary school.
7. Dinosaur Social Skills Program for Children (DSSP)	Run in partnership with the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH). DSSP “promotes children's problem-solving skills, self-esteem, frustration management and social skills.” The program was in response to some concerns identified by staff, community members, and teachers about the high incidence of child behaviour programs in young children. Consists of 18 weekly sessions and is run out of a local elementary school.
<i>Family-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Family Visiting	Family Visitors make one-to-one visits with expectant parents and families with children from 0-4 years old. Also, provided child development and prenatal information, support, advocacy, referrals, crisis intervention, family planning information, information on local services, etc. Frequency of visits decreased as the age of the children increases. Families are sometimes brought together for group visits.
2. Family Drop-In	An unstructured environment in which families can drop-in. Parents discussed issues of interest with childcare staff and children can play with the toys. A child development activity, snack, and meal time were part of every session. Special events and activities were held throughout the year. Offered then terminated in the middle years, but was recently re-instated to encourage more informal drop-in.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

REGENT PARK (continued)	
3. Family Resource Centre	Offered numerous resource materials that parents can lend free of charge. Two main activities at this centre were the lending resource library and the clothing and baby equipment exchange. The Play and Learn Toy Lending and Resource Centre only operated on a very minimal basis. However, recently, there was some discussion about expanding this program once again.
4. Parent and Child Mother Goose Program	Group experience for parents and young children. Parents learn through rhymes, songs and stories how to develop bonds, and have fun interactions with their child. The program is run by two facilitators. Each session ends with a story told to the parents, primarily folk tales. Program runs for 10 weeks and is one hour in length.
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Young Men's Community Drop-In	Initially a drop-in for young men. Then became a drop-in for the entire community that operated two nights per week. A meal or barbecue was prepared by the young men for each session. This program initially ran year long, but was then reduced to operating only in the summer due to high participation. Currently the program has evolved into weekly basketball groups with young men and police, and doing systemic advocacy.
2. Pick Your Own Farm Trips	Trips to Pick Your Own Farm periodically offered.
3. Parent Groups	Various groups for parents are offered based upon need and interest.
4. Anti-Racism Training	Provided the community with tools to deal effectively with racism on various ecological levels. The training model used was such that participants were able to educate others in the community on how to work against racism. The program consisted of 10 six-hour workshops spread over a 10-month period. Status unknown.
5. Kindergarten Registration Package	Parents were encouraged to bring their children to kindergarten registration day at each local school. Children were given a bag with school supplies. Parents were then invited back to school Parenting Centres to have some refreshments and chat. Status unknown.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

KINGSTON	
<i>Child-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Parent Relief	Short-term parent relief five half-days per week in three separate sites in the community. Limit of five children at one time when parent is off premises.
2. Childcare	Better Beginnings provides high quality child care on and off-site for different groups and committee meetings. Training, supervision and support are a strong focus, in order to maintain quality and childcare providers are paid for planning time as well.
3. School Readiness Program	Provided through funding from Early Years 2. The program works with children and parents to work toward a successful start in school. The program works with children and their parents the year before the children begin Kindergarten. It is offered one morning per week. “Bridge to School” is a school readiness parent group also offered one evening per week.
4. Parent and Baby Get-Together	For pregnant women, new mothers, their partners, and their babies (up to 1 year). Parent to parent support, informal education, role modeling, contact with staff. Filled the gap for pregnant women between the early and late prenatal classes and for those that did not want to take prenatal classes or have a parent visitor. Co-facilitated by a health educator, community programs worker, and parent visitor
5. Child Care	Provided high quality childcare on- and off-site for different groups and committee meetings. Childcare providers were casual staff, paid hourly. Childcare workers were community residents
6. You Make The Difference	Created through money received from the Challenge Fund.
7. Encouraging Parents	Created through money received from the Challenge Fund.
8. School Readiness Program	The School Readiness Program, which is aimed at preschoolers to try to improve the skills that they will need in their first year of school, began as a result of Early Years funding.
<i>Family-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Parent Visitor	Parents visited other parents in the community, in their homes. Home visits from prenatal stage up to age 4. Parent visitors provided support and information to families with children in the age range. Four full-time parent visitors work a 35 hour work week. Four part time visitors work 17.5 hours per week
2. Play Groups	For parents and children to come together, with the goal of parents being able to fulfill their own individual needs (e.g., socialize with other parents, time to play with preschooler). Well-stocked toy shelf, comfortable sitting space for the parents, activities were planned for a wide variety of ages, and nutritious snacks and beverages were provided fore parents and children. Playgroups were run out of three different locations, two times per week.
3. Infant Group	For pregnant women, new mothers, their partners, and new babies up to one year of age. Provides parent-to-parent support, informal education, role modeling, and there is contact with a nurse.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

KINGSTON (continued)	
4. Toddler Group	Drop in for parents and children from crawling age to age two. A group was developed for children who had graduated from the Infant group; once children start to crawl and pull themselves up to tables, they are encouraged to join the Toddler Group. Once the children reach 2 years of age, they can join the playgroups. Schedule of activities is planned, based upon input from the participants (e.g., crafts, guest speakers, planned discussion). Facilitated by two Family and Community Support Workers.
5. Parent Support Group	A weekly support group for parents run by parents. Activities include guest speakers, parenting discussions, crafts, and cooking.
6. Baby's Coming	Series of up to 9 sessions of information sharing of preparing for labor, birth and life with new baby. The emphasis was on coping techniques for postpartum, budgeting, changing relationships. Hospital tours were included. Offered when needed and co-facilitated by health educator and parent visitor
7. Prenatal and Parent Drop-In	Externally funded through Early Years 1. For pregnant women, new mothers, their partners and new babies up to 18 months of age. Focus is on highest risk parents. Lunch is served.
8. You Make the Difference	Externally funded through Ontario Early Years Centre. An 8 week parent-child communication program. Parents learn and practice ways to connect and communicate with their child during everyday activities.
9. Right From the Start	Funded through fundraising activities. An 8 week program for parents with children 0 to 2 years old. Parents have the opportunity to develop their interaction skills with their infant/toddler, foster parent-infant attachment and meet other parents and caregivers.
10. Encouraging Parents	Funded through fundraising activities. A 10 week basic parent training series teaches parents to foster positive behaviours in their children and gives parents effective techniques to deal with common behaviour.
11. Healthy Relationships	Funded through Early Years Challenge Fund. Two concurrent groups offered for men and women to talk about relationships.
12. Kingscourt Playgroup	Funded through Ontario Early Years Challenge Fund. Run during the Healthy Relationships group times.
13. Special Delivery Club	Funded through the Community Health Centre. Prenatal classes for teens offered twice yearly.
14. RAPP	Funded by Kingston Literacy. Family literacy program.
15. Prenatal Nutrition Program	Funded through Early Years Challenge Fund. Food supplements and meals at programs.
16. Toy Library	Funded through Ontario Early Years Centre. Mobile library visits two playgroups.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

KINGSTON (continued)	
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Special Events	Over the years, a variety of different events have been offered including: community picnics, strawberry picking trip, apple picking trip, trip to zoo, and holiday celebrations (e.g., Halloween, Christmas). Trips and events were open to anyone living in the BBKC community; a nominal fee (\$1 to \$5 per family) was charged for trips. A roster of special events continues to occur throughout the year. The CD worker works with a team of 10 residents to plan and implement 10 community events annually.
2. Co-facilitator/volunteer training	BBKC applied for a 3-year Trillium grant to hire a Volunteer Coordinator and were successful; this position was filled in the summer of 2004. The Coordinator has been updating all families and becoming familiar with volunteer programs. The Coordinator worked with the CD coordinator and another staff person to offer an 8-week Volunteer Skills Development Training. The Coordinator is working with staff and volunteers to develop job descriptions for new volunteer positions in the organization.
3. Operation Warm Feet	Winter boot drive; the idea for the campaign originated from a community member who recognized that many children in the community were going without warm winter boots. The residents pulled together a group of people to help her, including the CD worker. A team of people advertised the program and set-up drop locations throughout the city. Over the past 5 years, the campaign has grown from 40 to over 200 pairs of boots distributed annually.
4. Splash Pad	BBKC is currently working on building a splash pad in North Kingston, in collaboration with Community Response to Neighbourhood Concerns. It is expected that the splash pad will be built in spring 2005.
5. Seasonal Referrals	BBKC and NKCHC take referrals for food hampers and toy drive.
6. Active Living Working Group	BBKC along with others in the community have conducted community consultation with seniors, City of Kingston staff, Boys and Girls Club, Kingston Housing staff, and community members, to submit two applications for funding. The first application is for a grant to develop a community sports and physical activity framework and action plan for North Kingston. The second application is to implement five projects to build the capacity of the community to deal with physical activity.
7. Social Issues Networking Group	BBKC working with others to focus efforts on encouraging utility/housing supports and developments (accessible resources, position support and advocacy) through funding at city and organizational level. Revitalizing efforts at provincial and federal levels to end the National Child Benefit Supplement Clawback. Working to develop better networking around problem solving issues or common concerns to community members.
8. Community Housing and Homelessness Advisory Committee	This committee was originally developed by the Social Planning Council and is now administered by the United Way. The purpose of the committee is to develop local guidelines and processes to consider and fund initiatives supporting local housing and shelter.
9. Kingston Health and Housing/Closing the Distance/Room of One's Own	These three groups have been working to develop strategies to work within the city's Kingston Affordable Housing Strategy to ensure housing and shelter and associated health care services for all.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

KINGSTON (continued)	
10. Kingston Entitlement Access Program (KEAP)	This is a City of Kingston program which is administered by the NKCHC. Families on Ontario Works or ODSP can contact the program to discuss their eligibility; if eligible, an appointment is set up so individuals can receive a portion of their National Child Benefit Supplement; KEAP staff help people with the process.
11. Share the Warmth	Share the Warmth is a registered, not-for-profit charity that purchases heat and energy on behalf of families, seniors, the terminally ill, and the disabled – people living at or below the poverty level. BBKC helps put people in touch with the charity.
12. Community Based Workers Network	This group was initiated to keep community workers abreast of each other’s work. It continues to be an opportunity to update each other on upcoming events, discuss issues, and coordinate their work better.
13. Transportation	BBKC and NKCHC hoping to work with city on getting a bus route for local community street (Elliot Avenue). The City of Kingston has completed their master transportation plan, which emphasizes alternative transportation, and it is hoped that this will help in the community’s efforts to have a bus route for this street.
14. Sidewalks	BBKC and the community lobbied for sidewalks on a local street (Elliot Avenue) and were successful in their efforts; sidewalks have now been installed on Elliot Avenue.
15. Kingston Head Lice Coalition	The coalition has produced an information brochure which is available to local schools and through various organizations.
16. Kingston Coalition for Dental Care	A coalition was formed consisting of community members, local agencies and a dental consultant, to see what could be done around the issue of access to dental care, regardless of age, circumstance or income. The coalition is planning a series of meetings to gain more support from agencies, community members and funders.
17. PRO Kinds	This city-run program provides children and youth with the opportunity to participate in recreational programs of their choice, regardless of income. Parents need to complete a simple application form which is available at NKCHC and BBKC.
18. Fun and Friendly Activities	Nineteen people in the community were provided with First Aid Training and the group is looking to offering this type of training again in the future.
19. Community Response to Neighbourhood Concerns (CRNC)	Residents and representatives from schools, police and local organizations meet each month to talk about, address, and resolve issues in the community.
20. Junior Community Response to Neighbourhood Concerns	A new initiative of CRNC which provides the opportunity for children and youth to improve the quality of life in their community.
21. Falls Prevention Coalition	The coalition has funding for the next two years to offer the Stay on Your Feet project, which will promote falls prevention among seniors
22. Occupational Disease Prevention Project	This is a health promotion injury and disease prevention project; they are currently focusing on occupationally induced asthma in small workplaces in north Kingston

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

OTTAWA	
<i>Child-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Playgroup	Provides a morning playgroup four mornings per week that is designed to be child-focussed.
2. Play for Life	Gross motor activity provided for children and strategies and ideas provided to parents/caregivers to increase age appropriate physical activity for children 0 to 6 living in Better neighbourhoods. Sessions held during playgroup times, as well as in other community locations and during home visits.
3. You Can Make the Difference Workshops	A First Words Initiative. A nine-week parenting program (4 to 7 parents) that occurs once per year for parents of young children who have speech and language difficulties.
4. Books for Babes	Approximately 1400 books have been bought that cover 10 different languages. The program was designed to help improve pre-schoolers' expressive language. Two part-time staff were responsible for running this program.
<i>Family-focused Programs</i>	
1. Family Visiting	Program goals were to decrease social isolation, increase self-esteem, improve parenting skills, and strengthen parent-child relationships. Family visitors were residents who spoke a variety of languages (English, French, Somali, Arabic, and Italian); no formal post-secondary education was required for the position. Weekly visits to all pregnant women and women with children under the age of 5 in the Better Beginnings neighbourhood were provided. Visits lasted 1 to 2 hours. Family visitors provided information to residents, modeled good parenting skills, linked residents to various resources, and advocated on their behalf when necessary.
2. Community Nurse	The Community Nurse provides pre and post-natal support to mothers in the neighbourhood through two morning drop-in times, home visits, and phone contacts. The nurse is a trained and certified lactation consultant and provides breastfeeding support.
3. Baby Cupboard	Drop-in access once per month for diapers and baby food for families living in the community.
4. Pre/Post Natal Nutrition Supplements	Milk, eggs, and vitamin supplements provides as required to pregnant and breastfeeding women (up to 9 months of breastfeeding).
5. Infant Nutrition/Baby Food Making Workshops	Regularly scheduled five timers per year for families with infants and toddlers living in the community.
6. Parenting Workshop	With Early Years Centre, a 5 week parenting course is offered once per year for 10-15 participants. It is designed to promote positive parenting, optimal child development, and positive partnerships.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the YOUNGER CHILD SITES (Ages 0- 4) as of 2004

OTTAWA (continued)	
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Better Beginnings Community House	Situated in the heart of the Heatherington community. Houses the administrative offices, as well as a drop-in space, clothing bank, and a children's play room. A small area in the main living room now has some toys and a play area for small children.
2. Community Development	Program goals were to support residents; advocate on their behalf when necessary; bring the community together; neighbourhood development; as well as making service providers sensitive to neighbourhood issues. Community development was seen as an overall way of working and was the responsibility of all staff.
3. Community Celebrations	June celebration is a big community event organized by Better Beginnings with the help of many volunteers.
4. Clothing Bank/Exchange	Clothing donated to the bank, organized by committed volunteers, and available to community residents.
5. The Extras Neighbourhood Food Cupboard	Developed to help families make ends meet. Food was dropped off by the food bank, organized and then distributed by volunteers. Families were allowed to come once a month and receive enough food for three days. The program held an auction to raise money for the Food Cupboard and was successful in raising \$2,000.
6. Summer Park Program	Time limited opportunity for selected youth to maintain the park and take on a mentoring role with younger children. Three to five youth selected to participate. Resources through donations and Ottawa Community Housing
7. Bread Distribution	Regularly scheduled once per week, drop-in access for families living in the community. Weston Bakery donates and volunteers help organize.
8. Toy Distribution	Yearly collection and distribution of toys to families with children using the services of Better Beginnings.
9. Voices of Our Neighbourhood Newsletter	Developed and distributed twice per year to families living in the community.
10. Kids in the Hood	A weekly drop-in program for 10 to 14 year olds, co-facilitated by the Project Coordinator and an Ottawa-Carleton Police Services officer. The very small budget (\$500) is provided through the Trillium Foundation.
11. Community Connections Worker	A Better Beginnings staff person, provided 19 hours per week (paid by another organization) of assistance with settlement and integration issues for families in the Better Beginnings neighbourhood.
12. Coffee Time	Informal drop-in.
13. Theatre Group	No detailed information provided.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the OLDER CHILD SITES (Ages 4-8) as of 2004

CORNWALL	
<i>Child and Family- Focused Programs</i>	
1. Family Visits	Family workers maintained regular contact with interested families to offer support, information about child development, community services and resources. This program also ran seminars on various topics related to family development.
2. Family Visits for Parents with Children Going Into Kindergarten	Program included home visits and gifts for parents whose oldest child is about to start the Kindergarten program. The goal was to ensure that students integrate successfully into the school environment and to explain the community resources that are available to parents.
3. Holiday Activities	Offered interesting day trips and educational activities for children on civic holidays and professional development days (trips to zoo, museums, biodome, outdoor games, crafts, films, etc...).
4. Famille et École Travaillent Ensemble (FETE) Program	Provided a framework of positive, communicative, interactive experiences that contribute towards creating community links and contacts. The program targets 10 to 15 families that voluntarily get together for 8 weekly sessions.
5. Apprentissage Petite Enfance Canada (APEC) Workshops	A series of community workshops offered to parents with children aged 0 – 6, as well as individuals working with children of this age group. The workshops explored the role of parents in the everyday learning of children. In all, there are about 5 of these types of workshop opportunities for parents and children either offered on a regular basis or on an as needed basis.
6. Family Activity Centre	An incorporated agency that runs the family vacation camp.
7. Centre de Ressources familiales L'Estrie	External partner that is responsible for running programs first developed by Better Beginnings, such as the playground (summer camps), community toy library, and Saturday playtime.
<i>School- Based Programs</i>	
1. School Activities Program	The facilitators attempt to nurture the learning process, promote academic success, as well as influence their environment so as to respond to the individual and collective needs of the students.
2. The Breakfast Program	The purpose was to provide a healthy meal to start the day and offer a setting for social interaction.
3. Summer Tutoring Program	The purpose of the summer program was to review and consolidate academic learning from the previous school year and to provide a time for children to practice the French language during the summer months.
4. Homework Support	Currently being offered by the schools.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the OLDER CHILD SITES (Ages 4-8) as of 2004

CORNWALL (continued)

Community-Focused Programs

1. Montessori Program	Offered to Francophone children 18 months to 4 years of age. The program encouraged parental involvement in the delivery of the program.
2. “BÉBÉ FETE”	Offered to parents under the age of 21 and the grandparents of these families. This program was modeled after the FETE program.
3. National Children’s Day Activities	Consisted of the planning, organizing and coordinating of over 30 local activities in celebration of children. It involved over 100 partners, agencies, and schools.
4. Volunteer Recognition Night	A one-night event was organized by the project to honor Partir d’un bon pas and school volunteers during national volunteer recognition week.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the OLDER CHILD SITES (Ages 4-8) as of 2004

HIGHFIELD	
<i>Child and Family- Focused Programs</i>	
1. Family Resource Centre Drop-in	At the drop-in families can participate in activities (crafts, etc.), special events, and summer outings. The program is offered 4 mornings per week (2hr sessions). A nurse visits twice a month to talk about women and children’s health.
2. Toy Lending Library	Materials include over 500 toys, games, & puzzles. “Take a Book Program” has question sheets to get parents talking to kids about books. Also parenting resource books & activities to do with children. The library is open 4 days per week.
3. Play Groups	Activities are unstructured, with an emphasis on providing nurturing and educational environment where families can learn and interact together.
4. Preschool Computer Program	Operated during drop-in hours on a first come first served basis. Children each have five minutes on the computer.
5. Kindergarten Readiness	Replaced the preschool literacy program.
6. Parent Relief	Child care is offered 2 days per week (9 am - 11:30 am) for parents needing a break. Parents must book ahead because space is usually filled to capacity.
7. Parents’ Group	Parents met weekly to socialize, organize special events, do crafts, or have workshops (e.g., women’s issues, childhood illnesses, discipline, nutrition).
8. English Conversational Group	No information provided.
9. Parent Education Programs	No information provided.
10. Kindergarten Readiness Parent Support Group	Support Group for parents whose children are participating in the Kindergarten Readiness program.
<i>School- Based Programs</i>	
1. Health and Nutrition Program	The program holds nutrition assemblies, fairs, and other activities. There are workshops for parents, a Hot Lunch Program (\$.50/lunch), the provision of sandwiches for kids without lunches, fitness activities, Play Days, etc...
2. Educational Assistants, Parent Volunteers, and Academic/ Language Development	Four educational assistants spend time in Junior Kindergarten classes to increase kids’ exposure to English. In addition, activities included: adult support, Summer Enrichment programs, After-school Enrichment reading programs, Family Literacy Nights, as well as Made Dual Language tapes to be used by families.
3. Home Visiting	Currently, the home visiting program changed focus and moved into the School-Focused area of programming. It had previously been a part of the child-focused programming component.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the OLDER CHILD SITES (Ages 4-8) as of 2004

HIGHFIELD (continued)	
4. Incredible Years (part of the Kindergarten Readiness program)	Introduced in 2004 as part of the Kindergarten Readiness program, which has replaced The Lions Quest program. The Incredible Years is a social skills program for preschool children.
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Resident Participation and Leadership Program	Parents were informally encouraged to join project committees, get involved in planning community events, advocate for the community (e.g., lighting, bus shelters etc). Skill development and leadership building workshops were offered to parents. The Leadership Program was designed to train residents in community leadership and advocacy.
2. Welcome Baskets	Baskets contained information about Better Beginnings, other community services, as well as goodies. The baskets were given to new families through the schools in the area to welcome them and encourage involvement in the project and the community.
3. Before-and-After-School Program	Age-appropriate recreational activities and nutritional snacks provided for children at the primary school level.
4. March Break Programming	Fun and educational activities provided for children to prepare them for school.
5. Summer Programming	Fun and educational activities provided for children to prepare them for school.
6. Ethno-Cultural Programs & Activities	Included several different cultural events (e.g., Diwali, Holi, and Black History Month). Also, staff who had similar cultural backgrounds to residents were hired for this program.
7. Social and Recreational Programs	Included several different activities: Before and After School Programs, March Break Programs, fun activities, and ballet lessons for kids, aerobics, and bus trips for parents.
8. Family Movie Nights	Movie night held outdoors in the community. Very popular program.
9. Community Ethnic and Cultural Events	A jointly sponsored program. No further information provided.
10. English Conversation Circle	A jointly sponsored program. No further information provided.

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the OLDER CHILD SITES (Ages 4-8) as of 2004

SUDBURY	
<i>Child and Family- Focused Programs</i>	
1. After School/ Holiday Programs	Daily program provides a safe place for 100 children to play after school and on school holidays. Snacks and special activities are offered. Children are encouraged to solve problems and conflicts fairly.
2. Summer Programs	Kids participate in activities similar to the After School programs, but with more emphasis on outdoor activities. In the summer of 2003, 4 programs were run, 4 days per week.
3. L'Arc En Ciel du Moulin a Fleur	A Francophone program that provided opportunities for parents with small children to meet and participate with a facilitator of the project in educational activities, discussions, and collective cooking. This program also tried to strengthen the ties between area schools and the project. Currently L'Arc En Ciel is a satellite Early Years program. The program now is offered for children aged 0 to 6, as per the Early Years mandate. The program was enhanced through money provided by Early Years – more equipment and toys were provided. As well, through additional support provided by Early Years, the program now runs for one more morning, and it continues through the summer.
4. Family Visiting Program	Provide support to families in a broad range of areas including parenting, communication, housing, and legal matters. The family visitor work in conjunction with certain agencies and social groups. Over the years the worker's role has changed somewhat and family visiting became less of a focus due to the termination of one other family visitor position.
5. Travelling Road Show	In the earlier years, a team of project staff worked with three public housing complexes on site and offered a variety of activities for parents and children one day per week. Parents and staff worked as a team; they developed new ideas for activities to do in the program; parents exchanged parenting problems and solutions and engaged children in appropriate play. Currently the program is still offered, but it is not as active as it was in the past. The Road Show no longer travels to three communities. Rather, it stays in one community and is offered 2 days per week, for 3 hours each day.
6. Christmas Baskets	Assistance was provided in the way of gifts and food at Christmas.
7. Babysitting and Transportation	The provision of child care and transportation to permit parents to participate in programs and committees.
8. Can Skate	Free skating every winter in partnership with the City. Skates were provided.
<i>School- Based Programs</i>	
1. Early Bird Breakfast and Play Program	Nutritious food is served (e.g., eggs, sausages, cereal, etc) and children participate in crafts and physical activities (e.g., basketball). Activities included art exhibits, holiday celebrations, active games, and group games. Program currently offered at 1 centre and 2 schools (because one school shut down).

Appendix E: Programs Offered at the OLDER CHILD SITES (Ages 4-8) as of 2004

SUDBURY (continued)	
2. Peaceful Schools Program	Aimed to create a peaceful environment for children and encouraged them to take part in a wide range of activities. In the middle years, a week-long anger management course was introduced, as was mediation and programs for individual children with anger problems. This program was open to children in Junior Kindergarten through grade 6 and called the “Peaceful Playgrounds Games Program.” Currently offered 1 day per week at 2 schools. Total of 10 hours per week.
<i>Community-Focused Programs</i>	
1. Community Kitchen Program	Parents at the above program planned a menu and cooked food while staff watched their children. The food was divided amongst participants and taken home. Each participant paid \$5. The Community Kitchen is still offered, but not to the extent it was during the middle years.
2. Environmental Group or Hands for Nature Program	Offered education and information to families about caring for the environment. A community garden was created, while establishing naturalized spaces around playgrounds and planting trees were activities being planned for the future. The project also started a movement to save a mountain from development. In the later years, this component changed and is now called “Hands for Nature.” It is funded through Trillium Foundation. The project participants have worked on a number of different environmental projects over the past 3 years. They also helped preserve a mountain as a green space.
3. Research Program	Provided community members and workers with the opportunity to work collectively and make decisions regarding research instruments developed by the Research Coordination Unit. Offered the community the possibility to develop local research projects and use the data stemming from its activities to initiate or coordinate other programs.
4. Pre-Teen After School Program	Offered activities suitable for this age group at two locations: St. Gabriel (French) and Cabot Park (English). This program was not directly funded by the project. In the later years, the program was offered through funding from Trillium Foundation and United Way. Two pre-teen after school programs were currently offered (one Anglophone, one Francophone), five days a week.

APPENDIX F

Junior Kindergarten Teacher Scales

Scales	Items
ABC Measure	<p>For each of the following skills and behaviours, choose the rating which indicates the child's level of development using the key provided:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Not yet apparent or becoming positive = 1 Beginning to develop or positive = 2 Developed or very positive = 3 Very well developed or extremely positive = 4 Extremely well developed = 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adjustment to school:</i> enjoys school, classroom activities and special events • <i>Attitude of self:</i> feels good about self, displays curiosity, confidence, enjoyment and beginnings of independence • <i>Relationship with adults:</i> beginning to relate in comfortable, helpful and respectful ways • <i>Relationship with children:</i> beginning to relate in comfortable, helpful and respectful ways • <i>Interests:</i> is interested in a variety of tasks, topics and activities • <i>Risk taking:</i> will try a variety of tasks, topics and activities • <i>Routines:</i> learns and copes with classroom organization and expectations • <i>Self-help:</i> attends to personal needs and comforts (e.g., takes off and puts on coat/sweater, uses washroom) • <i>Self-direction:</i> beginning to select activities independently • <i>Physical development (large muscle):</i> participates in indoor and outdoor gross motor activities and is developing a sense of co-ordination when climbing, riding, stepping, balancing, throwing, catching, rolling, etc. • <i>Physical development (small muscle):</i> participates in indoor fine motor activities and is developing a sense of dexterity while building, stringing, pouring, hammering, colouring, painting, drawing, cutting, finger playing, etc. • <i>Self-determination:</i> makes wants, needs and ways of being and doing known • <i>Collaboration:</i> developing the notion of sharing equipment, materials and people (e.g., toys are for the class, Mrs. Smith helps everyone) • <i>Attention (teacher-directed):</i> focuses and sustains interest for varying periods of time depending on the nature of the task • <i>Attention (self-directed):</i> focuses and sustains interest for varying periods of time depending on the nature of the task • <i>Language interests:</i> finds language-related activities engaging (e.g., storytelling, story reading, poetry, anecdotes, book sharing, book looking, environmental reading, music, drama) • <i>Communication:</i> uses language to express wants, needs, wishes, interests, experiences, knowledge, accomplishments, and social interactions

Scales	Items
<p>NLSCY Prosocial Scale</p>	<p>Following is a series of descriptions of behaviour often shown by kindergarten pupils. If the child shows the behaviour described by the statement frequently or to a great degree, choose “often or very true”. If the child shows behaviour described by the statement to a lesser degree or less often, choose “sometimes or somewhat true”. In as far as you are aware, the child does not show the behaviour, choose “never or not true”:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True</p> <p>C1 Tries to stop a quarrel or dispute between friends or brother(s) and/or sister(s). C5 Invites a shy child to join in a play group. C11 Tries to help a friend (or brother or sister) who is hurt. C17 Helps to pick up things that another child has dropped without being asked. C19 Takes the opportunity to praise the work of a less skillful child. C24 Shows sympathy for a child who has made a mistake. C26 Offers to help clean up a mess made by somebody else. C30 Offers to help a friend (or a brother or a sister) who is having difficulty. C35 Helps a friend (or a brother or a sister) who appears to be sick. C39 Comforts a child who is crying or who is upset.</p>
<p>NLSCY Emotional Disorder-Anxiety Scale</p>	<p>Following is a series of descriptions of behaviour often shown by kindergarten pupils. If the child shows the behaviour described by the statement frequently or to a great degree, choose “often or very true”. If the child shows behaviour described by the statement to a lesser degree or less often, choose “sometimes or somewhat true”. In as far as you are aware, the child does not show the behaviour, choose “never or not true”:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True</p> <p>C3 Seems to be unhappy, sad or depressed. C10 Is not as happy as other children. C16 Is usually fearful or anxious. C22 Is worried. C33 Cries a lot. C37 Appears miserable, unhappy, tearful or distressed. C45 Is nervous, high-strung, or tense. C48 Has trouble enjoying self.</p>
<p>NLSCY Physical Aggression Scale</p>	<p>Following is a series of descriptions of behaviour often shown by kindergarten pupils. If the child shows the behaviour described by the statement frequently or to a great degree, choose “often or very true”. If the child shows behaviour described by the statement to a lesser degree or less often, choose “sometimes or somewhat true”. In as far as you are aware, the child does not show the behaviour, choose “never or not true”:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True</p> <p>C4 Gets into many fights. C28 When another child accidentally hurts him/her (such as by bumping into him/her), assumes that the other child/youth meant to do it and then reacts with anger and fighting. C32 Physically attacks people. C34 Threatens people. C38 Is cruel, bullies or is mean to others. C46 Kicks, bites, hits other children.</p>

Scales	Items
<p>NLSCY Hyperactive/Inattention Scale</p>	<p>Following is a series of descriptions of behaviour often shown by kindergarten pupils. If the child shows the behaviour described by the statement frequently or to a great degree, choose “often or very true”. If the child shows behaviour described by the statement to a lesser degree or less often, choose “sometimes or somewhat true”. In as far as you are aware, the child does not show the behaviour, choose “never or not true”:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True</p> <p>C8 Is distractible, has trouble sticking to any activity. C15 Can’t concentrate, can’t pay attention for long. C21 Is impulsive, acts without thinking. C27 Has difficulty awaiting turn in games or groups. C31 Can’t sit still, is restless or hyperactive. C36 Cannot settle to anything for more than a few moments. C47 Is inattentive.</p>

Appendix G
Early Development Instrument
(EDI) Scales

Scale	Items
<p>Physical Health and Well-Being</p>	<p>Since the start of school in the fall, how often has this child arrived: <i>Scale:</i> Never Rarely Sometimes Usually Always Don't Know</p> <p>A2 over-or underdressed for school-related activities A3 too tired/sick to do school work A4 late A5 hungry</p> <p>Would you say that this child: <i>Scale:</i> Yes No Don't Know</p> <p>A6 is independent in washroom habits most of the time A7 shows an established hand preference (right vs. left or vice versa) A8 is well coordinated (i.e., moves without running into or tripping over things)</p> <p>How would you rate this child's: <i>Scale:</i> Excellent Good Average Poor Very Poor Don't Know</p> <p>A9 proficiency at holding a pen, crayons, or a brush A10 ability to manipulate objects A11 ability to climb stairs A12 level of energy throughout the school day A13 overall physical development</p> <p>Would you say that this child: <i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C58 sucks a thumb most of the time</p>
<p>Social Competence</p>	<p>How would you rate this child's: <i>Scale:</i> Excellent Good Average Poor Very poor Don't Know</p> <p>C1 overall social/emotional development C2 ability to get along with peers</p> <p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the one that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child: <i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True</p>

Scale	Items
	<p style="text-align: center;">Don't Know</p> <p>C3 plays and works cooperatively with other children at the level appropriate for his/her age</p> <p>C4 is able to play with various children</p> <p>C5 follows rules and instructions</p> <p>C6 respects the property of others</p> <p>C7 demonstrates self-control</p> <p>C8 shows self-confidence</p> <p>C9 demonstrates respect for adults</p> <p>C10 demonstrates respect for other children</p> <p>C11 accepts responsibility for actions</p> <p>C12 listens attentively</p> <p>C13 follows directions</p> <p>C14 completes work on time</p> <p>C15 works independently</p> <p>C16 takes care of school materials</p> <p>C17 works neatly and carefully</p> <p>C18 is curious about the world</p> <p>C19 is eager to play with a new toy</p> <p>C20 is eager to play a new game</p> <p>C21 is eager to play with/read a new book</p> <p>C22 is able to solve day-to-day problems by him/herself</p> <p>C23 is able to follow one-step instructions</p> <p>C24 is able to follow class routines without reminders</p> <p>C25 is able to adjust to changes in routines</p> <p>C27 shows tolerance to someone who made a mistake (e.g., when a child gives a wrong answer to a question posed by the teacher)</p>
<p>Emotional Maturity</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the answer that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C28 will try to help someone who has been hurt</p> <p>C29 volunteers to help clear up a mess someone else has made</p> <p>C30 if there is a quarrel or dispute, will try to stop it</p> <p>C31 offers to help other children who have difficulty with a task</p> <p>C32 comforts a child who is crying or upset</p> <p>C33 spontaneously helps to pick up objects which another child has dropped (e.g., pencils, books)</p> <p>C34 will invite bystanders to join in a game</p> <p>C35 helps other children who are feeling sick</p> <p>C36 is upset when left by parent/guardian</p> <p>C37 gets into physical fights</p> <p>C38 bullies or is mean to others</p> <p>C39 kicks, bites, hits other children or adults</p> <p>C40 takes things that do not belong to him/her</p> <p>C41 laughs at other children's discomfort</p> <p>C42 can't sit still, is restless</p> <p>C43 is distractible, has trouble sticking to any activity</p> <p>C44 fidgets</p> <p>C45 is disobedient</p> <p>C46 has temper tantrums</p> <p>C47 is impulsive, acts without thinking</p>

Appendix G: Early Development Instrument (EDI) Scales

Scale	Items
	C48 has difficulty awaiting turn in games or groups C49 cannot settle to anything for more than a few moments C50 is inattentive C51 seems to be unhappy, sad or depressed C52 appears fearful or anxious C53 appears worried C54 cries a lot C55 is nervous, high-strung or tense C56 is incapable of making decisions C57 is excessively shy
Language and Cognitive Development	Would you say that this child: <i>Scale:</i> Yes No Don't Know B8 knows how to handle a book (e.g., turn a page) B9 is generally interested in books (pictures and print) B10 is interested in reading (inquisitive/curious about the meaning of printed material) B11 is able to identify some letters of the alphabet B12 is able to attach sounds to letters B13 is showing awareness of rhyming words B14 is able to participate in group reading activities B15 is able to read simple words B16 is able to read complex words B17 is able to read simple sentences B18 is experimenting with writing tools B19 is aware of writing directions in English (left to right, top to bottom) B20 is interested in writing voluntarily (and not only under the teacher's direction) B21 is able to write his/her own name in English B22 is able to write simple words B23 is able to write simple sentences B24 is able to remember things easily B25 is interested in mathematics B26 is interested in games involving numbers B27 is able to sort and classify objects by a common characteristic (e.g., shape, colour, size) B28 is able to use one-to-one correspondence B29 is able to count to 20 B30 is able to recognize numbers 1-10 B31 is able to say which number is bigger of the two B32 is able to recognize geometric shapes (e.g., triangle, circle, square) B33 understands simple time concepts (e.g., today, summer, bedtime)
Communication Skills and General Knowledge	How would you rate this child's: <i>Scale:</i> Excellent Good Average Poor Very poor Don't Know B1 ability to use language effectively in English B2 ability to listen in English B3 ability to tell a story B4 ability to take part in imaginative play B5 ability to communicate own needs in a way understandable to adults and peers B6 ability to understand on first try what is being said to him/her B7 ability to articulate clearly, without sound substitutions

Appendix G: Early Development Instrument (EDI) Scales

Scale	Items
	<p>B41 can communicate adequately in his/her first language (based on your observation or parent/guardian information)</p> <p>Would you say that this child: <i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C26 answers questions showing knowledge about the world (e.g., leaves fall in the autumn, apple is a fruit, dogs bark)</p>

Appendix H

Scales used to Compare

Junior and Senior Kindergarten Samples

NLSCY Scales	Items
<p>Prosocial Behaviour</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the answer that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C27 shows tolerance to someone who made a mistake (e.g., when a child gives a wrong answer to a question posed by the teacher)</p> <p>C28 will try to help someone who has been hurt</p> <p>C29 volunteers to help clear up a mess someone else has made</p> <p>C30 if there is a quarrel or dispute, will try to stop it</p> <p>C31 offers to help other children who have difficulty with a task</p> <p>C32 comforts a child who is crying or upset</p> <p>C33 spontaneously helps to pick up objects which another child has dropped (e.g., pencils, books)</p> <p>C34 will invite bystanders to join in a game</p> <p>C35 helps other children who are feeling sick</p>
<p>Hyperactivity-Inattention</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the answer that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C42 can't sit still, is restless</p> <p>C43 is distractible, has trouble sticking to any activity</p> <p>C47 is impulsive, acts without thinking</p> <p>C48 has difficulty awaiting turn in games or groups</p> <p>C49 cannot settle to anything for more than a few moments</p> <p>C50 is inattentive</p>
<p>Emotional-Anxiety Disorder</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the answer that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C51 seems to be unhappy, sad or depressed</p> <p>C52 appears fearful or anxious</p> <p>C53 appears worried</p> <p>C54 cries a lot</p> <p>C55 is nervous, high-strung or tense</p>
<p>Physical Aggression</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the answer that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C37 gets into physical fights</p> <p>C38 bullies or is mean to others</p> <p>C39 kicks, bites, hits other children or adults</p>

Appendix H: Scales Used to Compare Junior and Senior Kindergarten Samples

	Items
<p>ABC/Social Competence</p>	<p>How would you rate this child's: <i>Scale:</i> Excellent Good Average Poor Very Poor Don't Know</p> <p>C2 overall social/emotional development</p> <p>Below is a list of statements that describe some of the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, choose the answer that best describes this child now or within the past 6 months. Would you say that this child: <i>Scale:</i> Often or Very True Sometimes or Somewhat True Never or Not True Don't Know</p> <p>C3 plays and works cooperatively with other children at the level appropriate for his/her age</p> <p>C8 shows self-confidence</p> <p>C9 demonstrates respect for adults</p> <p>C15 works independently</p> <p>C24 is able to follow class routines without reminders</p> <p>C27 shows tolerance to someone who made a mistake (e.g., when a child gives a wrong answer to a question posed by the teacher)</p>

APPENDIX I

Comparisons of 1999 vs. 2003 Teacher Ratings in Younger Child Sites

Appendix I: Comparisons of 1999 vs. 2003 Teacher Ratings in Younger Child Sites

Scale	Kingston						Peterborough						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1999			2003			1999			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	2.80	3.11	127	2.31	2.99	88	2.72	3.01	311	2.26	2.84	303	0.19	0.847	
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	2.26	2.65	127	2.10	2.50	88	2.33	2.42	311	1.20	1.92	303	2.93	< .01	.45
Physical Aggression	1.71	2.96	126	1.57	2.74	88	1.48	2.40	311	1.08	2.02	302	0.92	0.356	
Prosocial	4.71	2.42	127	5.94	3.08	84	3.97	2.20	311	5.71	2.96	294	1.48	0.138	
Social Competence	6.60	2.30	127	7.32	2.48	88	6.02	2.07	311	7.76	2.33	303	3.16	< .01	.45

Scale	Ottawa						Peterborough						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1999			2003			1999			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	2.73	2.83	106	1.28	2.12	133	2.72	3.01	311	2.26	2.84	303	2.19	< .05	.32
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	1.18	1.46	106	0.65	1.35	133	2.33	2.42	311	1.20	1.92	303	1.89	0.10	
Physical Aggression	1.68	2.85	104	0.38	1.26	132	1.48	2.40	311	1.08	2.02	302	2.42	< .05 ¹	.36
Prosocial	2.88	2.10	105	5.78	3.09	87	3.97	2.20	311	5.71	2.96	294	2.59	< .01	.38
Social Competence	5.40	1.85	106	8.57	1.94	132	6.02	2.07	311	7.76	2.33	303	4.22	< .001	.58

Scale	Regent Park						Peterborough						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1999			2003			1999			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	3.06	2.78	81	1.57	2.01	169	2.72	3.01	311	2.26	2.84	303	2.09	< .05	.31
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	1.88	1.92	81	0.76	1.58	169	2.33	2.42	311	1.20	1.92	303	0.07	0.941	
Physical Aggression	1.05	2.01	81	0.79	1.65	169	1.48	2.40	311	1.08	2.02	302	0.66	0.512	
Prosocial	3.47	2.40	81	5.58	2.86	144	3.97	2.20	311	5.71	2.96	294	0.64	0.523	
Social Competence	5.39	2.02	80	7.77	2.19	168	6.02	2.07	311	7.76	2.33	303	1.64	< .10 ²	

Scale	Walpole Island						Peterborough						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1999			2003			1999			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	4.06	2.44	63	2.06	3.12	34	2.72	3.01	311	2.26	2.84	303	2.53	< .05	.55
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	2.25	2.66	63	1.09	2.21	34	2.33	2.42	311	1.20	1.92	303	0.08	0.933	
Physical Aggression	1.27	2.05	63	1.81	3.21	34	1.48	2.40	311	1.08	2.02	302	1.87	< .10 ³	.41
Prosocial	4.67	1.95	63	8.59	2.29	33	3.97	2.20	311	5.71	2.96	294	3.75	< .001	.77
Social Competence	7.20	1.97	63	8.48	2.29	33	6.02	2.07	311	7.76	2.33	303	1.64	0.348	

Appendix I: Comparisons of 1999 vs. 2003 Teacher Ratings in Younger Child Sites

Scale	4 Better Beginnings Project Sites Combined						Peterborough						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1999			2003			1999			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	3.04	2.89	377	1.67	2.40	424	2.72	3.01	311	2.26	2.84	303	2.85	< .01	.29
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	1.87	2.26	377	1.03	1.88	424	2.33	2.42	311	1.20	1.92	303	1.28	0.200	
Physical Aggression	1.48	2.61	374	0.91	2.04	423	1.48	2.40	311	1.08	2.02	302	0.49	0.626	
Prosocial	3.92	2.39	376	6.00	3.04	348	3.97	2.20	311	5.71	2.96	294	0.92	0.358	
Social Competence	6.11	2.19	376	7.98	2.23	421	6.02	2.07	311	7.76	2.33	303	0.37	0.712	

^a Test of differences in means between project sites and comparison sites over time.

¹ p<.01 significance with the randomization test.

² p>.10 significance with the randomization test.

³ p<.05 significance with the randomization test.

APPENDIX J

Comparison of 2003 SK Teacher Ratings in Younger Child Sites

Appendix J: Comparison of 2003 SK Teacher Ratings in Younger Child Sites

EDI Scale	Guelph			Comparison Sites			ANOVA		Effect Size
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t-test	p	
Physical Health and Well-Being	8.12	1.63	30	8.47	1.25	356	1.57	0.119	
Social Competence	7.43	2.78	30	8.04	2.11	356	1.70	0.089	
Emotional Maturity	7.01	2.77	30	7.82	1.75	356	2.64	< .01	.48
Language and Cognitive Development	8.44	2.11	30	8.02	2.24	356	0.97	0.330	
Communication Skills & General Knowledge	7.60	2.00	30	7.34	2.06	356	0.62	0.538	
EDI Scale	Kingston			Comparison Sites			ANOVA		Effect Size
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t-test	p	
Physical Health and Well-Being	8.42	1.31	79	8.47	1.25	356	0.36	0.716	
Social Competence	7.70	2.02	79	8.04	2.11	356	1.44	0.151	
Emotional Maturity	7.42	2.01	79	7.82	1.75	356	2.01	< .05	.24
Language and Cognitive Development	7.93	2.04	78	8.02	2.24	356	0.42	0.672	
Communication Skills & General Knowledge	7.50	1.94	77	7.34	2.06	356	0.56	0.578	
EDI Scale	Ottawa			Comparison Sites			ANOVA		Effect Size
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t-test	p	
Physical Health and Well-Being	8.93	1.00	117	8.47	1.25	356	3.68	< .001	.39
Social Competence	8.60	1.73	116	8.04	2.11	356	2.56	< .05	.27
Emotional Maturity	8.43	1.38	102	7.82	1.75	356	3.17	< .01	.34
Language and Cognitive Development	8.05	1.81	116	8.02	2.24	356	0.11	0.909	
Communication Skills & General Knowledge	7.84	1.94	117	7.34	2.06	356	2.39	< .05	.25
EDI Scale	Regent Park			Comparison Sites			ANOVA		Effect Size
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t-test	p	
Physical Health and Well-Being	8.40	1.00	155	8.47	1.25	356	0.59	0.553	
Social Competence	8.13	1.92	155	8.04	2.11	356	0.39	0.699	
Emotional Maturity	8.16	1.45	155	7.82	1.75	356	2.00	< .05	.19
Language and Cognitive Development	8.70	1.64	155	8.02	2.24	356	3.43	< .001	.33
Communication Skills & General Knowledge	7.22	1.82	155	7.34	2.06	356	0.67	0.503	
EDI Scale	Walpole Island			Comparison Sites			ANOVA		Effect Size
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t-test	p	
Physical Health and Well-Being	9.01	1.18	34	8.47	1.25	356	2.54	< .05	.45
Social Competence	8.65	1.85	33	8.04	2.11	356	1.62	0.105	
Emotional Maturity	8.53	2.17	33	7.82	1.75	356	2.22	< .05	.39
Language and Cognitive Development	8.25	2.42	34	8.02	2.24	356	0.63	0.527	
Communication Skills & General Knowledge	9.09	1.80	34	7.34	2.06	356	4.99	< .001	.87

Appendix J: Comparison of 2003 SK Teacher Ratings in Younger Child Sites

EDI Scale	5 Better Beginnings Project Sites Combined			Comparison Sites			ANOVA		Effect Size
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	t-test	p	
Physical Health and Well-Being	8.58	1.17	415	8.47	1.25	356	1.32	0.186	
Social Competence	8.17	1.99	413	8.04	2.11	356	0.78	0.437	
Emotional Maturity	8.03	1.80	399	7.82	1.75	356	1.51	1.131	
Language and Cognitive Development	8.32	1.89	413	8.02	2.24	356	1.93	< 0.05 ¹	
Communication Skills & General Knowledge	7.63	1.95	413	7.34	2.06	356	1.94	0.052	

¹ Significance of the randomization tests was $p < .10$.

APPENDIX K

Percentage of Children Who Attended JK With SK EDI Domain Scores in the Lowest 10th Percentile by Site: The Chi Square Tests of Independence

Appendix K: Lowest 10th percentile SK EDI Scores

EDI Domains	Guelph		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p*
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n		
General Knowledge & Communication	16.7	30	20.5	356	0.253	n.s.
Emotional Maturity	26.7	30	17.4	356	1.595	n.s.
Language & Cognition	13.3	30	14.9	356	0.053	n.s.
Physical Health & Well Being	36.7	30	20.8	356	4.063	n.s.
Social Competence	26.7	30	16.6	356	1.965	n.s.

EDI Domains	Kingston		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p*
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n		
General Knowledge & Communication	14.3	77	20.5	356	1.566	n.s.
Emotional Maturity	26.6	79	17.4	356	3.518	n.s.
Language & Cognition	19.2	78	14.9	356	0.913	n.s.
Physical Health & Well Being	27.8	79	20.8	356	1.875	n.s.
Social Competence	25.3	79	16.6	356	3.325	n.s.

EDI Domains	Ottawa		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p*
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n		
General Knowledge & Communication	12.0*	117	20.5	356	4.278	<.05
Emotional Maturity	6.9**	102	17.4	356	6.900	<.01
Language & Cognition	12.9	116	14.9	356	0.272	n.s.
Physical Health & Well Being	9.4**	117	20.8	356	7.743	<.01
Social Competence	11.2	116	16.6	356	1.949	n.s.

EDI Domains	Regent Park		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p*
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n		
General Knowledge & Communication	12.2*	156	20.5	356	5.101	<.05
Emotional Maturity	9.0*	156	17.4	356	6.115	<.05
Language & Cognition	5.1**	156	14.9	356	9.844	<.01
Physical Health & Well Being	16.7	156	20.8	356	1.171	n.s.
Social Competence	8.3*	156	16.6	356	6.094	<.05

Appendix K: Lowest 10th percentile SK EDI Scores

EDI Domains	Walpole		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p*
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n		
General Knowledge & Communication	2.9**	34	20.5	356	6.228	<.01
Emotional Maturity	12.1	33	17.4	356	0.601	n.s.
Language & Cognition	14.7	34	14.9	356	0.001	n.s.
Physical Health & Well Being	5.9*	34	20.8	356	4.394	<.05
Social Competence	9.1	33	16.6	356	1.262	n.s.

EDI Domains	Better Beginnings Project Sites Combined		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p*
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile	n		
General Knowledge & Communication	12.1**	414	20.5	356	10.13	<.01
Emotional Maturity	13.5	400	17.4	356	2.223	n.s.
Language & Cognition	11.4	414	14.9	356	2.117	n.s.
Physical Health & Well Being	17.3	416	20.8	356	1.514	n.s.
Social Competence	13.8	414	16.6	356	1.177	n.s.

Fisher's Exact Test (2 sided)
n.s. = not significant

APPENDIX L

Percentage of SK Students with One or More EDI Domains Scores In the Lowest 10th Percentile for Children

Appendix L: Percentage of SK Students with One or More Low EDI Domain Scores

Site	Better Beginnings Project Sites		Comparison Sites		Chi-sq. (d.f.=1)	p value
	% in lowest 10 th Percentile in One or More EDI Domains	n	% in lowest 10 th Percentile in One or More EDI Domains	n		
Guelph	53.3	30	37.9	356	2.760	n.s.
Kingston	46.8	79	37.9	356	2.149	n.s.
Ottawa	26.5*	117	37.9	356	5.047	<.05
Regent Park	29.5	156	37.9	356	3.376	n.s.
Walpole Island	26.5	34	37.9	356	1.747	n.s.
All Better Beginnings Sites	33.4	416	37.9	356	1.703	n.s.

*=p<.05 using Fisher's Exact Test (2 sided)

APPENDIX M
Grade 3 Teacher Measures

Scale	Items
<p>Hyperactivity-Inattention (NLSCY)</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements about the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, please choose the answer that best describes this student <u>now or within the last six months</u>:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never or Not True Sometimes or Somewhat True Often or Very True</p> <p>D2 Cannot sit still or is restless. D9 Is easily distracted, has trouble sticking to any activity. D15 Cannot concentrate, cannot pay attention for long. D18 Is impulsive, acts without thinking. D22 Has difficulty waiting for his/her turn in games or groups. D38 Is inattentive. D39 Cannot settle on anything for more than a few moments.</p>
<p>Emotional-Anxiety (NLSCY)</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements about the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, please choose the answer that best describes this student <u>now or within the last six months</u>:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never or Not True Sometimes or Somewhat True Often or Very True</p> <p>D6 Seems to be unhappy or sad. D11 Is not as happy as other children. D16 Is too fearful or nervous. D21 Is worried. D28 Cries a lot. D33 Appears miserable, unhappy, tearful or distressed. D36 Is nervous, high-strung or tense. D40 Has trouble enjoying himself/herself.</p>
<p>Physical Aggression (NLSCY)</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements about the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, please choose the answer that best describes this student <u>now or within the last six months</u>:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never or Not True Sometimes or Somewhat True Often or Very True</p> <p>D7 Gets into many fights. D23 When someone accidentally hurts him/her, he/she reacts with anger and fighting. D26 Physically attacks people. D31 Threatens people. D34 Bullies or is mean to others. D37 Kicks or hits other children.</p>
<p>Indirect Aggression (NLSCY)</p>	<p>Below is a list of statements about the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, please choose the answer that best describes this student <u>now or within the last six months</u>:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never or Not True Sometimes or Somewhat True Often or Very True</p> <p>D10 When mad at someone, tries to get others to dislike that person. D17 When mad at someone, becomes friends with another as revenge. D25 When mad at someone, says bad things behind the other's back. D35 When mad at someone, says to others: let's not be with him/her. D42 When mad at someone, tells that person's secrets to a third person.</p>

Scale	Items
Delinquency (NLSCY)	<p>Below is a list of statements about the feelings and behaviours of children. For each statement, please choose the answer that best describes this student <u>now or within the last six months</u>:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never or Not True Sometimes or Somewhat True Often or Very True</p> <p>D5 Steals. D12 Destroys things belonging to others. D29 Vandalizes.</p>
Conflict Management	<p>Next are descriptions about this student's behaviour. Decide how often this student does the behaviour. Please do not skip any items. In some cases you may not have observed the student perform a particular behaviour. Make an estimate of the degree to which you think the student would probably perform that behaviour:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never Sometimes Very Often</p> <p>C1 Controls temper in conflict situations with peers. C9 Controls temper in conflict situations with adults. C10 Receives criticism well. C15 Accepts peers' ideas for group activities. C19 Responds appropriately when pushed or hit by other children. C23 Gets along with people who are different.</p>
Cooperation	<p>Next are descriptions about this student's behaviour. Decide how often this student does the behaviour. Please do not skip any items. In some cases you may not have observed the student perform a particular behaviour. Make an estimate of the degree to which you think the student would probably perform that behaviour:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never Sometimes Very Often</p> <p>C6 Uses free time in an acceptable way. C7 Finishes class assignments within time limits. C12 Uses time appropriately while waiting for help. C13 Produces correct school work. C16 Follows your directions. C17 Puts work materials or school property away. C20 Ignores peers distractions when doing class work. C21 Keeps desk clean and neat without being reminded. C22 Easily makes transition from one classroom activity to another.</p>
Assertiveness	<p>Next are descriptions about this student's behaviour. Decide how often this student does the behaviour. Please do not skip any items. In some cases you may not have observed the student perform a particular behaviour. Make an estimate of the degree to which you think the student would probably perform that behaviour:</p> <p><i>Scale:</i> Never Sometimes Very Often</p> <p>C2 Introduces himself or herself to new people without being told. C3 Appropriately questions rules that may be unfair. C4 Says nice things about himself or herself when appropriate. C5 Invites others to join in activities. C8 Makes friends easily. C11 Initiates conversations with peers. C14 Appropriately tells you when he or she thinks you have treated him or her unfairly. C18 Joins ongoing activity or group without being told to do so.</p>

APPENDIX N

Comparisons of 1998 vs. 2003 Grade 3 Teacher Ratings in Older Child Sites

Appendix N: Comparisons of 1998 vs. 2003 Grade 3 Teacher Ratings in Older Child Sites

Scale	Cornwall						Ottawa-Vanier						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1998			2003			1998			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	2.68	3.50	53	2.22	2.91	99	4.16	3.91	258	5.17	4.43	252	2.24	< .05	.42
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	1.66	2.41	53	1.54	2.51	99	3.15	3.91	257	3.73	3.88	250	1.13	0.261	
Physical Aggression	1.42	2.68	53	0.75	1.57	99	2.32	3.44	257	2.59	3.56	251	1.85	0.064	
Indirect Aggression	2.25	3.01	53	1.33	2.35	99	2.18	2.99	256	2.69	3.21	252	2.39	< .05	.46
Delinquency	0.28	1.03	53	0.07	0.36	99	0.24	0.79	258	0.37	0.96	251	2.07	< .05	.37
Conflict Management	9.96	2.35	53	10.16	2.21	99	9.14	3.15	258	8.03	3.51	252	2.48	< .05	.46
Cooperation	14.44	3.56	53	13.90	3.63	98	12.58	4.63	254	10.99	4.90	251	1.39	0.164	
Assertiveness	11.89	2.87	53	9.88	3.95	99	10.27	4.16	258	8.88	3.40	251	0.81	0.419	
Received Special Education	25.5%	---	51	8.1%	---	99	18.3%	---	235	22.4%	---	255	9.21 ^b	< .01	
Grade Repetition	5.8%	---	52	6.1%	---	98	12.1%	---	231	14.2%	---	253	0.47 ^b	0.788	

Scale	Sudbury						Ottawa-Vanier						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1998			2003			1998			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	4.74	4.25	112	4.63	3.86	84	4.16	3.91	258	5.17	4.43	252	1.62	0.105 ¹	.27
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	3.75	3.80	112	3.74	3.12	84	3.15	3.91	257	3.73	3.88	250	0.93	0.351	
Physical Aggression	2.71	3.34	112	2.40	2.79	84	2.32	3.44	257	2.59	3.56	251	0.98	0.328	
Indirect Aggression	2.21	2.62	108	2.21	2.77	84	2.18	2.99	256	2.69	3.21	252	1.07	0.286	
Delinquency	0.56	1.23	112	0.35	0.81	84	0.24	0.79	258	0.37	0.96	251	2.21	< .05	.35
Conflict Management	8.04	3.01	111	8.48	2.90	84	9.14	3.15	258	8.03	3.51	252	2.95	< .01	.49
Cooperation	11.68	4.64	110	11.32	4.39	84	12.58	4.63	254	10.99	4.90	251	1.57	0.117	
Assertiveness	8.95	3.54	111	8.76	3.67	83	10.27	4.16	258	8.88	3.40	251	1.87	0.061	
Received Special Education	32.4%	---	108	20.0%	---	85	18.3%	---	235	22.4%	---	255	5.00 ^b	< .05	
Grade Repetition	14.9%	---	114	17.1%	---	82	12.1%	---	231	14.2%	---	253	1.47 ^b	0.92	

Appendix N: Comparisons of 1998 vs. 2003 Grade 3 Teacher Ratings in Older Child Sites

Scale	Highfield						Etobicoke						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1998			2003			1998			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	3.06	4.10	110	3.34	4.13	125	4.29	4.28	238	4.12	4.35	276	0.41	0.680	
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	2.31	3.16	110	2.26	3.71	127	2.81	3.38	237	2.57	3.21	277	0.33	0.743	
Physical Aggression	2.08	3.40	110	1.75	2.72	126	1.86	2.84	236	1.95	2.85	274	1.13	0.261	
Indirect Aggression	2.23	2.90	109	1.63	2.82	126	2.02	2.64	236	1.45	2.34	252	0.03	0.980	
Delinquency	0.43	1.04	110	0.30	0.88	127	0.51	1.10	238	0.44	0.97	276	0.46	0.641	
Conflict Management	8.97	3.30	110	9.32	2.52	127	8.62	2.74	238	8.48	3.04	279	1.27	0.202	
Cooperation	12.62	4.83	109	11.70	5.44	126	11.90	5.02	237	10.92	5.01	274	0.29	0.765	
Assertiveness	9.34	3.04	110	9.06	3.48	127	9.31	3.43	236	9.09	3.58	275	0.06	0.954	
Received Special Education	16.2%	---	105	7.8%	---	128	16.2%	---	228	15.6%	---	282	2.60 ^b	0.107	
Grade Repetition	4.7%	---	106	2.4%	---	127	5.1%	---	237	3.6%	---	278	1.95 ^b	0.744	

Scale	3 Better Beginnings Project Sites Combined						2 Comparison Sites Combined						ANOVA ^a		Effect Size
	1998			2003			1998			2003			t-test	p	
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Hyperactivity-Inattention	3.67	4.14	275	3.33	3.81	308	4.22	4.09	496	4.62	4.42	528	2.05	< .05	.21
Emotional-Anxiety Disorder	2.77	3.41	275	2.43	3.31	310	2.99	3.66	494	3.12	3.59	527	1.36	0.175	
Physical Aggression	2.21	3.27	275	1.61	2.51	309	2.10	3.17	493	2.25	3.23	525	2.63	< .01 ¹	.26
Indirect Aggression	2.23	2.80	270	1.69	2.68	309	2.10	2.83	492	2.07	2.87	504	1.58	0.115	
Delinquency	0.45	1.12	275	0.24	0.74	310	0.37	0.96	496	0.41	0.96	527	2.63	< .01	.25
Conflict Management	8.79	3.09	275	9.36	2.61	310	8.89	2.97	496	8.27	3.28	531	4.06	< .001	.41
Cooperation	12.60	4.62	273	12.30	4.76	308	12.25	4.83	491	10.96	4.95	525	2.21	< .05	.23
Assertiveness	9.68	3.39	275	9.24	3.70	309	9.81	3.85	494	8.99	3.49	526	1.06	0.290	
Received Special Education	24.6%	---	264	11.2%	---	312	17.3%	---	463	18.8%	---	537	14.27 ^b	< .001	
Grade Repetition	9.2%	---	272	7.5%	---	307	8.5%	---	468	8.7%	---	531	0.60 ^b	0.963	

^a Test of differences in means between project sites and comparison sites over time.

^b For the two binary variables (received special education and grade repetition), hierarchical log linear analysis was used and the test statistic reported is the likelihood ratio chi square.

¹ p<.05 is the significance level based on randomization test.

APPENDIX O

Better Beginnings, Better Futures Younger Child Sites

Elementary Schools Principals October Report: Children Receiving Special Education Services

Appendix O: Younger Child Sites – Elementary Schools Principals October Report

Site	Year	Total # of Students	Total # of Students Receiving Special Education Services	% of Students Receiving Special Education Services
Kingston	1992	1635	93	5.69
Kingston	1993	1586	133	8.39
Kingston	1994	1597	117	7.33
Kingston	1995	1557	110	7.06
Kingston	1996	1499	137	9.14
Kingston	1997	1485	119	8.01
Kingston	1998	1461	103	7.05
Kingston	1999	1449	152	10.49
Kingston	2000	1423	156	10.96
Kingston	2001	1340	166	12.39
Regent Park	1992	2101	294	13.99
Regent Park	1993	2041	233	11.42
Regent Park	1994	1986	194	9.77
Regent Park	1995	2130	228	10.70
Regent Park	1996	2096	199	9.49
Regent Park	1997	2242	220	9.81
Regent Park	1998	2340	281	12.01
Regent Park	1999	2461	368	14.95
Regent Park	2000	2512	260	10.35
Regent Park	2001	2499	152	6.08
Southeast Ottawa	1992	1366	85	6.22
Southeast Ottawa	1993	1384	91	6.58
Southeast Ottawa	1994	1384	86	6.21
Southeast Ottawa	1995	1409	86	6.10
Southeast Ottawa	1996	1469	93	6.33
Southeast Ottawa	1997	1465	93	6.35
Southeast Ottawa	1998	1454	113	7.77
Southeast Ottawa	1999	1407	92	6.54
Southeast Ottawa	2000	1448	136	9.39
Southeast Ottawa	2001	1480	134	9.05
Guelph	1992	1708	132	7.73
Guelph	1993	1693	135	7.97
Guelph	1994	1634	110	6.73
Guelph	1995	1712	108	6.31
Guelph	1996	1739	131	7.53
Guelph	1997	1870	131	7.01
Guelph	1998	1939	135	6.96
Guelph	1999	1769	108	6.11
Guelph	2000	1805	115	6.37
Guelph	2001	1746	106	6.07

Site	Year	Total # of Students	Total # of Students Receiving Special Education Services	% of Students Receiving Special Education Services
Comparison Sites Combined	1992	6546	603	9.21
Comparison Sites Combined	1993	6540	637	9.74
Comparison Sites Combined	1994	6121	650	10.62
Comparison Sites Combined	1995	6075	664	10.93
Comparison Sites Combined	1996	6009	711	11.83
Comparison Sites Combined	1997	5953	680	11.42
Comparison Sites Combined	1998	5806	729	12.56
Comparison Sites Combined	1999	5722	729	12.74
Comparison Sites Combined	2000	5474	658	12.02
Comparison Sites Combined	2001	5284	566	10.71

Results of Logistic Regression

Independent Variables: Year (continuous)
 Demo (1=project site, 0=comparison site)
 Demoyear (interaction of Year and Demo)

Dependent Variable: 0=children not receiving special education services
 1=children receiving special education services

Guelph (n=17,615) vs Comparison Sites (n=59,530)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	.029	.005	40.11	1	.000
Demo	-.284	.060	22.50	1	.000
Demoyear	-.055	.011	23.41	1	.000
Constant	-2.20	.024	8250.81	1	.000

Kingston (n=15,032) vs Comparison Sites (n=59,530)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	.029	.005	40.11	1	.000
Demo	-.490	.062	61.98	1	.000
Demoyear	.042	.011	14.22	1	.000
Constant	-2.20	.024	8250.81	1	.000

Ottawa (n=14,266) vs Comparison Sites (n=59,530)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	.029	.005	40.11	1	.000
Demo	-.60	.069	75.06	1	.000
Demoyear	.020	.012	2.61	1	.106
Constant	-2.20	.024	8250.81	1	.000

Regent Park (n=22,408) vs Comparison Sites (n=59,530)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	.029	.005	40.11	1	.000
Demo	.241	.047	26.64	1	.000
Demoyear	-0.60	.009	47.31	1	.000
Constant	-2.20	.024	8250.81	1	.000

APPENDIX P

Better Beginnings, Better Futures Older Child Sites

Elementary Schools Principals October Report: Children Receiving Special Education Services

Appendix P: Older Child Sites – Elementary Schools Principals October Report

Site	Year	Total # of students	Total # of Students Receiving Special Education Services	% of Students Receiving Special Education Services
Cornwall	1992	1261	184	14.6
Cornwall	1993	1334	167	12.5
Cornwall	1994	1416	148	10.5
Cornwall	1995	1376	128	9.3
Cornwall	1996	1259	76	6.0
Cornwall	1997	1248	87	7.0
Cornwall	1998	1277	89	7.0
Cornwall	1999	1198	74	6.2
Cornwall	2000	1137	50	4.4
Cornwall	2001	1122	43	3.8
Sudbury	1992	1434	114	7.9
Sudbury	1993	1418	115	8.1
Sudbury	1994	1391	139	10.0
Sudbury	1995	1367	173	12.7
Sudbury	1996	1321	139	10.5
Sudbury	1997	1276	106	8.3
Sudbury	1998	1189	102	8.6
Sudbury	1999	1013	88	8.7
Sudbury	2000	1103	87	7.9
Sudbury	2001	1114	103	9.2
Highfield	1992	615	31	5.0
Highfield	1993	687	35	5.1
Highfield	1994	768	32	4.2
Highfield	1995	881	34	3.9
Highfield	1996	852	24	2.8
Highfield	1997	929	33	3.6
Highfield	1998	1010	39	3.9
Highfield	1999	836	37	4.4
Highfield	2000	878	23	2.6
Highfield	2001	930	15	1.6
Etobicoke Comp.	1992	1528	124	8.1
Etobicoke Comp.	1993	1595	136	8.5
Etobicoke Comp.	1994	1868	156	8.4
Etobicoke Comp.	1995	1851	171	9.2
Etobicoke Comp.	1996	1864	178	9.5
Etobicoke Comp.	1997	1977	203	10.3
Etobicoke Comp.	1998	2051	136	6.6
Etobicoke Comp.	1999	1789	140	7.8
Etobicoke Comp.	2000	1798	147	8.2
Etobicoke Comp.	2001	1850	154	8.3

Site	Year	Total # of students	Total # of Students Receiving Special Education Services	% of Students Receiving Special Education Services
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1992	3278	302	9.2
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1993	3272	441	13.5
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1994	3203	343	10.7
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1995	3101	366	11.8
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1996	3010	339	11.3
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1997	2966	373	12.6
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1998	2960	355	12.0
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	1999	3215	342	10.6
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	2000	3174	527	16.6
Ottawa-Vanier Comp	2001	3109	430	13.8

Results of Logistic Regression

Independent Variables: Year (continuous)
 Demo (1=project site, 0=comparison site)
 Demoyear (interaction of Year and Demo)

Dependent Variable: 0=children not receiving special education services
 1=children receiving special education services

Cornwall (n=12,628) vs Ottawa-Vanier (n=31,288)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	.037	.006	37.832	1	.000
Demo	.322	.062	27.14	1	.000
Demoyear	-.189	.014	194.40	1	.000
Constant	-2.141	.033	4236.95	1	.000

Sudbury (n=12,626) vs Ottawa-Vanier (n=31,288)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	.037	.006	37.832	1	.000
Demo	-.12	.064	3.569	1	.059
Demoyear	-.042	.012	11.841	1	.001
Constant	-2.141	.033	4236.95	1	.000

Highfield (n=8,386) vs Etobicoke (n=18,171)

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	significance
Year	-.009	.010	.970	1	.325
Demo	-.583	.116	25.423	1	.000
Demoyear	-.042	.022	3.706	1	.054
Constant	-2.33	.051	2100.80	1	.000