Online Appendix I

**Case Selection Summary by Contextual Variables15**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SouthwesternValley - R1 | NorthwesternValley - R2 | Rural EastShore - R3 | Small CentralCity - R4 | UrbanTidewater -R5 |
| PopulationDensity | Low | Mixed | Low | Mixed | High |
| Percent belowPoverty Line | Mixed | Mixed | High | Mixed | Mixed |
| Percent Black | Low | Low | High | Mixed | High |
| Number ofDyads inHead Start Region (# Dyads participating in study16) | 4(3 total:Dyads 1-3) | 7(7 total:Dyads 4- 10) | 2(2 total:Dyads11-12) | 3(2 total:Dyads 13 –14) | 5(2 total:Dyads 15 –16) |
| # HS enrollees | 300 | 253 | 236 | 452 | 1,414 |
| # VPIenrollees17 | 412 | 1,200 | 270 | 537 | 2,555 |

15 The rankings of low, high, or mixed were given based upon a comparison to the Commonwealth of Virginia’s overall average for the specific indicator. A ranking of “Mixed” indicates that some of the localities of interest within the region are over the state average and some are below.

16  The total dyads in the service area are all possible HS-VPI combinations in a region; whereas, the total number participating in the study represents those dyads where both the respective Head Start and VPI administrators participated in this study.

17  The number of VPI enrollees reflects only the LEAs that participated in this study.

Appendix II

Collaborative Activities Short Inventory

VPI School or Head Start Administrators

Please fill in the name of the Head Start/VPI(s) that you work with in the column.

Mark all of the activities that you engage in with Head Start or VPI. It is ok if you do not engage in ALL of the activities with each school/classroom. In other words, some classes/schools may be different than others in your area.

Also, I have left blanks at the bottom so that you can fill in other ways that you work together with Head Start/VPI that are not reflected in the rubric.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name |  |  |  |
| Signed MOU between VPI and Head Start? |  |  |  |
| Share information about preschool applicants, such as number of students and/or names? |  |  |  |
| Share information about professional development? |  |  |  |
| Create a joint preschool application? |  |  |  |
| Single Point of Entry? |  |  |  |
| Sit down and review applicants together to make placement decisions? |  |  |  |
| Head Start and VPI classrooms in same building? (but do not blend children in classroom) |  |  |  |
| Create joint professional development programs? |  |  |  |
| Blend classrooms? Both VPI funded and HS funded children in the same classroom. |  |  |  |
| Make teacher hiring decision together? |  |  |  |
| Other activities? |  |  |  |

Appendix III

Krippendorff’s Alpha Reliability

Interorganizational Activities

Three Coders, Author (A1), Coders 1 & 2 (C1 & C2)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Collaborative Activity | Krippendorff Alpha  | Explanation if below .80 |
| MOU | .781  | C2 included a dyad as having MOU even though MOU is for VPI and migrant Head Start program, not traditional Head Start. |
| Share applicant information | 1.0 |  |
| Share professional development information | .835 |  |
| Joint preschool application | .896  |  |
| Discuss applicants for program placement | .896  |  |
| Share building space for HS & VPI classrooms | .736 | C1 included a dyad that formerly shared building space, but no longer shares space; A1 included a dyad that houses a Head Start program on school property (where VPIs are located), but not located “in a building,” C1 & C2 did not. |
| Create joint professional development opportunities | .81 |  |
| Share hiring decisions | .775  | A1 included a dyad that the interviewee commented that the school principal has input on hiring decisions with Head Start, C1 & C2 did not. |
| Single Point of Entry | 1.0 |  |
| Blend HS & VPI programs | .898 |  |

Appendix IV

Interview Questions

These are examples of types of questions to be asked, but the questions may change given the information provided by the informant.

*For VPI or Head Start Program Directors/Administrators (School district, Community Action Agency, County, City, etc):*

1. What is your current job title?

2. Describe your current job duties and responsibilities.

3. How long have you worked in early childhood development and education?

4. How many VPI/Head Start classrooms are in your county? Where are they located? How many classrooms per location?

Do different VPI programs/classrooms have a different relationship with the Head Start program in your county (city)? If yes, how so?

5. What does collaboration mean to you? What about partnerships?

5.a. Has your program ever attempted any collaborative activity between Head Start and VPI? (Answer first) – Go to rubric.

6. Were you involved in the decision to pursue a collaborative activity or combine the programs? (If yes, continue to questions 8 – 9), If NO, Were you involved in the process to combine programs? If yes, continue to questions 8-9; If No to both, Go to Ques 7)

7. Can you tell me who was involved in the decision to combine? Can you tell me who helped to combine the programs? Do you think they might be willing to be interviewed?

8. How did collaboration or combining them come about? What did you do to help this to happen? Are there things you do today to support collaboration between the programs?

Who have you interacted with at Head Start (VPI)?

9. Can you outline the specific steps it took to blend these program dollars together, including things such as combining regulations, talking to state and federal-level program administrators, meetings, etc?

10. Do differences in program standards/regulation between Head Start and VPI affect collaboration for your programs?

11. In your relationship with Head Start (VPI), do you have clearly defined roles and responsibilities? If so, what is your role? What is the other program’s role? If so, how did these come to be defined?

12. Do you rely on a manager for coordination of your relationship with Head Start (VPI)? Who is most likely to initiate a meeting or phone call?

13. Do you and Head Start (VPI) have the same goals? If yes/no, can you discuss some of the similarities (differences)? If yes, how were these goals established? If yes, do you revisit these?

14. Do you participate in group brainstorming sessions with Head Start (VPI)? If yes, what about?

15. Do you consider Head Start (VPI) to be a serious partner? Explain.

16. What are some formal aspects of your relationship with Head Start (VPI)? (agreements, MOUs, other contracts). What are some informal aspects of your relationship with Head Start (VPI)? (phone calls, conversations at other meetings/professional meetings, etc.)

17. Do you think that by working with Head Start (VPI) you achieve goals better? Explain.

18. Do you think that Head Start (VPI) appreciates what your program brings to your relationship?

19. Do you trust your Head Start (VPI) counterpart? Explain. If yes, how do you think trust was established? Can you give an example? If no, do you think that the lack of trust hinders your relationship?

20. Is your program committed to continuing with a collaborative relationship? Do you think Head Start (VPI) is also committed? If yes, how do you think this commitment developed?

21. By collaborating with Head Start (VPI) do you feel that it affects your program goals? If yes, how? If no, why not? How do you balance your program goals with collaborative goals?

22. What are the advantages to collaboration or blending the programs?

23. What are the challenges to collaboration or blending the programs?

24. Any disadvantages you see in attempting to blending or combine?

25 . If you attempted collaboration in the past, but it doesn’t continue today, do you have ideas about why collaboration didn’t continue?

Appendix V

**Collaboration Process Dimensions and Collaborative Activities: QCA Condition Thresholds**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition orOutcome | Indicators | Decision Logic | IndicatorAttributes | QCA Condition Threshold |
| Governance | 1. Take Serious as Partners? | If yes to all 4, Governance = Strong | 1 |
|  | 2. Brainstorm Together? | If yes to 3, Governance = Medium-Strong | 1 |
|  | 3. Formal Aspects? | If yes to 2, Governance = Medium-Weak | 0 |
|  | 4. Informal Aspects? | If yes to 1 or less, Governance = Weak | 0 |
|  |
| Administration | 1. Have clearly defined rolesand responsibilities? | If yes to all 3, Administration = Strong | 1 |
|  | 2. Have clearcoordination/coordinator of efforts? | If yes to 2, Administration = Medium-Strong | 1 |
|  | 3. Agree on goals? | If yes to 1, Administration = Medium-Weak | 0 |
|  |  | If yes to 0, Administration = Weak | 0 |
|  |
| Norms | 1. Trust your HS or VPIcounterpart? | Deep relationship connectedness Strongand yes to 1 & 2, Norms = | 1 |
|  | 2. Are you committed/or ispartner committed to collaboration? | Deep relationship connectedness Medium-Strongand yes to 1 OR 2, Norms = | 1 |
|  | 3. Relationship connectedness | Weak relationship connectedness Medium-Weakand yes to 1 OR 2, Norms = | 0 |
|  |  | Weak relationship connectedness Weakand yes to 0, Norms= | 0 |
|  |
| Mutuality | 1. Achieve goals better by working together? | If yes to 2, Mutuality = Strong | 1 |
|  | 2. Other program appreciates what your program brings tocollaboration? | If yes to 1, Mutuality = Medium | 0 |

**Collaboration Process Dimensions and Collaborative Activities: QCA Condition Thresholds**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition orOutcome | Indicators | Decision Logic | IndicatorAttributes | QCA Condition Threshold |
|  |  | If yes to 0, Mutuality = Weak | 0 |
|  |
| Autonomy | 1. Challenging to balance both organizational and collaborativegoals? Tension between goals? | Steal Kids Issue and yes to 0, Autonomy = | Strong | 1 |
|  | 2. Does working together affectyour program’s goals? | Steal Kids Issue and yes to 1 OR2, Autonomy = | Medium-Strong | 1 |
|  | 3. Discussion of “steal kids”issue. | Steal Kids Issue OR yes to 1and/or 2, Autonomy = | Medium-Weak | 0 |
|  |  | No Steal Kids Issue and no to 1and yes to 2, Autonomy = | Weak | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-Org.Activities |  | Collaboration Or Coordination = Strong Inter-Org.Activity | 1 |
|  |  | Cooperation Or No Relationship= Not strong  Inter-Org.Activity | 0 |

**APPENDIX VI**

**TRUTH TABLES FOR QCA ANALYSIS**

Strong Collaborative Activity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| sgov | sadmin | sauto | snorm | smutual | number | consistency |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Not Strong Collaborative Activity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| sgov | sadmin | sauto | snorm | smutual | number | consistency |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Collaboration Degree of Collaborative Activity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| sgov | sadmin | sauto | snorm | smutual | number | consistency |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | .60 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | .50 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Coordination II Degree of Collaborative Activity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| sgov | sadmin | sauto | snorm | smutual | number | consistency |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | .50 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | .40 |