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Intervention

Early language skills are a crucial building block for children’s development. Children naturally develop language skills at different rates but some children fall behind at an early age. Depending on the measures used, 7 to 15 per cent of preschool children are defined as experiencing language difficulties and 14 to 18 per cent do not reach the expected level in the Communication, Language and Literacy domain of the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Profile (Law et al, 2017). Children from socially disadvantaged backgrounds are, on average, much more likely to experience delays and difficulties.

The importance of language skills is reflected in the EYFS. In response to a recent review of Reception year which recommended greater focus on oral language and vocabulary development¹, reforms to the Early Learning Goals are underway.

A key determinant of language development is the amount and quality of language to which a young child is exposed. Given that over 95 per cent of 3-4-year olds participate in formal early education², early years practitioners play an important role. Although the majority (88 per cent) of EY settings are assessed by Ofsted as being good or outstanding³, the early years workforce is comprised predominantly of Level 3 qualified staff (below degree level)⁴ and recent research points to a downward trend in qualifications⁵. It is likely, therefore, that the workforce would benefit from CPD targeted at language.

Learning, Language and Loving It™ - The Hanen Program® for Early Childhood Educators (Hanen LLLI) is a training program for early years (EY) practitioners to promote social, language and literacy learning in EY settings. It is a CPD programme designed to provide early years (EY) staff with practical strategies to enhance children’s communication and language skills through specialised ways of interacting and communicating with children during normal daily routines.

Hanen LLLI is not widely used in the UK, with a handful of Hanen training programs having been run in the past two years, focusing mainly on a shortened version on Hanen LLLI, called Teacher Talk.

Slightly different versions of Hanen LLLI exist for different age groups. A standard programme is tailored to meet the needs of the participants by selecting from a choice of demo, practise activities and videos the most relevant for the age of children the participants work with. The programme being delivered in Warrington is the Later Language Learner version of the LLLI programme. This is a version that is available for all programme leaders to choose to use dependent on the language levels of the children that attendees support. Essentially the different versions of the programme have a stronger focus on the strategies appropriate to the children’s language level.

Hanen is in the process of reviewing the content of all the LLLI programmes, to add in up-to-date research, particularly with regards to literacy, vocabulary, English as an Additional Language and self-regulation. Revised programmes will then be shared with current licensee via the Hanen website.

The programme leads in Warrington tasked with delivering this version of Hanen LLLI have been given advance sight of some of the revisions, especially for Session 5 (on vocab) and session 6 (on book reading), so that the programme is the same for the pilot as the trial. This version of Hanen LLLI is being delivered to Reception teachers of school-based nurseries in the North-West of England.

⁵ https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/early-years-workforce_analysis/
The evaluation of this pilot was set up with a view to progressing to a full trial in 2019/20, depending on the pilot results.

The intervention’s simplified logic model is illustrated in figure 1. A full logic model is included in the appendix.

**Fig. 1 Hanen LLLI Simplified Logic Model**
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**Intervention delivery**

Hanen LLLI was developed by The Hanen Centre⁶, based in Canada. In this evaluation the intervention will be coordinated and delivered by Communicate SLT CIC, a speech and language therapy organisation based in the North West of England. Communicate SLT are Hanen-certified trainers for some of the Hanen programs but are otherwise not affiliated in any way with The Hanen Centre.

**Mode of delivery**

The Hanen LLLI programme includes eight training sessions and six individual feedback sessions, which focus on guided reflection, the implementation of bespoke techniques, such as ‘Observe, Wait, Listen (OWL)’, and Program Leaders providing feedback on videotaped interactions between EY practitioners and children.

The training and feedback sessions are delivered by qualified and Hanen-certified speech and language therapists (SLTs). These SLTs, known as Program Leaders, are fully qualified and accredited by Hanen to deliver LLLI. Two separate groups of EY practitioners will be trained; each group will be led by one of two program leaders recruited by Communicate SLT. The video feedback sessions will take place in the nurseries of participating practitioners. Practitioners will also take part in two further recorded interactions with children – once at the beginning of the programme and once
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⁶ The Hanen Centre’s mission is to enable parents and professionals to transform their daily interactions with young children to build the best possible lifelong social, language and literacy skills.
at the end – to establish a baseline level for the use of the intervention and for their own reflection subsequent to the intervention.

The pilot evaluation aims to train two-thirds (minimum 50%) of the staff working with three to four-year-olds in each participating nursery school. These will predominantly be early years teachers and practitioners, newly-qualified teachers (NQTs) and teaching assistants (TAs), but may include other more senior staff. In order to be eligible to take part in the intervention, a school must be able and agree to release a minimum of 50% of its staff for the training and agree to take part in the evaluation activities.

The Hanen Centre have a licensee agreement in place with certified SLTs. The intervention activities are prescribed by The Hanen Centre and non-specified adaptations of the course and training materials and handouts are neither allowed nor encouraged. Minor accepted deviations are detailed in the course handbook for Program Leaders.

Program Leaders are expected to help facilitate the four broad aims of Hanen LLLI:

- **Education**: provide teachers with information on language, social and literacy development and on how best to promote these during everyday play activities, conversations and daily routines
- **Application**: provide teachers with opportunities to practice and apply strategies and approaches which promote children’s development, with feedback from the LLLI programme leader
- **Collaboration**: work together with teachers as they plan and implement individual programmes for children with specific needs
- **Peer support**: give teachers the opportunity to share ideas, issues, and concerns with their colleagues

Trainers are instructed to use the 4P teaching cycle while providing training:

1. **Prepare**: Give teachers a reason for learning by starting with asking them to think about what a particular topic means to them in order to tap into personal experience and interest.
2. **Present**: Present facts and information to deepen or expand knowledge in ways that are interesting, interactive, relevant and enjoyable
3. **Practice**: Create opportunities for learners to practice newly learned skills in a variety of hands-on ways with guidance and feedback
4. **Personalize**: Provide opportunities for teachers to apply and integrate information into their own situation and to generalise into a variety of situations.

**Duration and dosage of intervention**

The intervention will be delivered across 31 weeks, including orientation meetings to explain the intervention and evaluation, eight training sessions lasting 2.5 hours each, six individual feedback sessions and a pre-intervention video and a post-intervention video.

Dosage is typically conceptualised in terms of the amount of an intervention that has been implemented. For completeness, the dosage of the intervention to be delivered is as specified above. For exposure in this pilot, the dosage of the intervention to be received by EY practitioners must be no less than six of the eight training sessions and all EY practitioners must attend the first training session. For settings to be compliant they must release a minimum of 50% of their staff that work with 3-4 year olds for the training.
Study rationale and background

A recent review of language interventions recommended further research on the effectiveness of training early years practitioners to deliver programmes within EY settings\(^7\). The Learning Language and Loving It programme, developed by The Hanen Centre, was found to be particularly promising with high effect sizes (albeit based on low security of findings) for the impact of professional development on EY practitioners’ conversational responsivity and children’s linguistic productivity and complexity. The review found that the majority of language interventions focus on improving vocabulary whereas Hanen LLLI recognised the importance of conversation and oral narrative.

Hanen LLLI is based on linguistic responsiveness which is child-oriented, promotes extended interactions between children and EY practitioners and models complex use of language. It has been delivered in the UK, but, as yet, no trials of the intervention have taken place in the UK context. For this reason, it was decided to carry out a pilot of Hanen LLLI.

Research questions

The research questions the pilot aims to answer are as follows:

- **Evidence of promise**
  - In what ways, and to what extent, is programme participation perceived to affect staff practice?
  - Is there evidence of cascaded knowledge and skills?
  - Do providers perceive the programme to have impact on children’s language?
  - Are there any perceived unintended adverse effects?
  - Is there evidence to support the intervention logic model?
  - What do setting managers, practitioners and trainers perceive to be the optimal number/proportion of staff to be trained in order to balance benefits and challenges for children and the setting?

- **Feasibility**
  - Was the programme delivered as intended?
  - What were the facilitators/barriers to successful delivery of the programme?
  - What were the facilitators/barriers to engagement in the training and feedback sessions?
  - What was the level of attendance at training and feedback sessions (dosage)?
  - How did practitioners perceive the training and feedback sessions?
  - To what extent did practitioners feel able to apply the learning from training and feedback sessions?

- **Readiness for trial**
  - What changes, if any, are needed to the intervention theory?
  - What changes, if any, are needed to the way nurseries/staff are recruited, and the delivery of training?
  - Are any refinements needed to the training, feedback sessions and/or supporting materials?
  - Is the intervention considered affordable by nurseries?
  - Can the training be delivered at scale? What level of adaptation/flexibility is acceptable to EY staff?
  - Have appropriate and acceptable primary outcome measures been identified by the evaluation team and Communicate SLT? Are the primary outcome measures used in the pilot suitable for an efficacy trial of Hanen LLLI?
  - Are the outcome measures suitable for testing on a large scale?
    - What are the practical implications of each of the two measures, in terms of costs, resourcing, equipment?

- How might nurseries (and families) be compensated for participating in child-level testing?
- Have suitable measures and approaches been identified for intermediate outcomes?
- What is the likely level of attrition? What strategies might help to minimise this?
Methods

Recruitment

Recruitment of nurseries will take place in October 2018 and will be carried out by Communicate SLT. They will aim to recruit 12 school-based nurseries from the Warrington area in the North West of England. The Warrington local authority was selected for the pilot as it is close to the Communicate SLT delivery team and an area with low levels of child speech and language development, as identified by the delivery team. They will use links with local authorities to recruit nurseries, as well as approaching schools directly. The eligibility criteria for nurseries are:

- The nursery has not received any Hanen training in the last two years
- At least 50% of practitioners must not have completed Hanen’s Teacher Talk
- None must have completed Hanen LLL
- The nursery must release a minimum of 50% of its staff for the training

Nurseries that have expressed their interest in taking part will sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which explains in detail what their participation in the pilot evaluation will involve. In signing the MoU, nurseries agree to taking part in the various components of the evaluation, if selected. Interested nurseries then attend an orientation meeting which outlines the requirements of the programme.

Once selected to take part, nurseries will then nominate between half and two thirds of their staff to take part in the intervention. Recruited nurseries will send an information letter to parents, informing them of the evaluation and that their child’s name, Unique Pupil Number (UPN) and date of birth will be shared with NatCen. Parents will have the right to object to their child’s details being shared with NatCen and used in the evaluation. Nurseries will transfer the data of all three and four year old children to NatCen, via our secure file transfer protocol (FTP) site.

Data collection

The pilot comprises two strands of work. Strand 1 fieldwork will take place between August 2018 and January 2019 (with analysis and reporting completed by February 2019) and Strand 2 fieldwork will take place between March 2019 and April 2019.

Strand 1

Strand 1 methods will inform the decision whether to proceed to trial and the impact evaluation design.

Intervention and logic model review: The pilot will include familiarisation with the intervention and supporting evidence, and a review and revision of the logic model established with Communicate SLT prior to the start of the pilot. This will inform the pilot methodology, trial design and choice of primary and secondary outcome measures. Activities will include:

- Desk based review of intervention materials, existing research evidence and appropriate outcome measures
- Set up meetings with Communicate SLT and EEF
- Logic model/Intervention Development and Evaluation Analysis (IDEA) workshop with Communicate SLT
  - This will be developed between the Communicate SLT delivery team and the evaluation team at NatCen in the summer prior to the intervention commencing.
- Telephone conversations with Hanen Centre staff in Canada
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8 To introduce early childhood educators to the Learning Language and Loving It™ approach, The Hanen Centre developed a flexible series of three 1-day trainings called Teacher Talk.
After discussion with the delivery team, it was decided to pilot two outcome measures – one as a primary outcome measure and the other as a secondary outcome measure – in order to capture an intermediate outcome at the child-level, an increase in vocabulary. The two outcome measures are:

- British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS3) – Primary outcome measure
- Renfrew Action Picture Test (RAPT) – Secondary outcome measure.

Observation of training sessions: Across the 24-week pilot delivery period, we will observe four training sessions. This will include the first and final training sessions, plus two more to sessions through the course, to be agreed upon with Communicate SLT. We will seek to include both training groups and thus observe both Program Leaders at least once. These observations will provide insights into feasibility and fidelity and stimulus material for investigation in interviews. Early evidence will be available by February 2019 and more detail by June 2019.

Research with nurseries: We will select eight nurseries for in-depth case study investigation. The case study nurseries will be selected to achieve a range in size with at least one being a large nursery to pilot LLLI in the context of large numbers of staff and children. We will recruit four case study nurseries working with each of the two SLTs delivering the intervention in the pilot. Each case study nursery will be revisited during Strand 2, to provide longitudinal understanding of how the intervention is received and is perceived to shape professional practice over time. To maximise fieldwork efficiency and flexibility, the first phase of research with nurseries will be conducted via telephone interviews. The Strand 1 telephone interviews will include:

- Interview with a nursery manager to explore motivations, barriers and facilitators to engagement with early training, extent of cascading knowledge
- Interviews with the 1-2 trained practitioners to explore experiences of early training, perceived early impacts on practice, adequacy of support to date

Testing child outcome data collection procedures: We will test the data collection procedures for the two selected child outcome measures in the four non-case study nurseries. In two of the nurseries we will administer the British Picture Vocabulary Scale (BPVS) and in the other two we will administer both the BPVS and the Renfrew Action Picture Test (RAPT). This is to assess the acceptability and feasibility of trialling just the BPVS, and the BPVS and the RAPT together. We will request a list of all eligible children (i.e. all children aged 3 or 4) from each participating nursery and then test a random selection of 15 eligible children. We are randomly selecting 15 children for the assessment as this reflects the number of children required for a sufficiently powered trial. The assessments will be delivered by qualified SLTs. These will be freelance SLTs, subcontracted by NatCen for the purpose of carrying out the assessments. They were recruited locally through advertising on local SLT forums. The purpose of this testing exercise is to assess the feasibility and suitability of these data collection procedures for a trial of Hanen LLLI, and not to assess child outcomes. No assessment results will be taken away from the nursery or analysed for this pilot.

As well as testing the procedures, we will conduct face-to-face interviews with one or two members of staff in each nursery (including a senior manager) to gather feedback on the feasibility and acceptability and recommendations for improving the testing process (including communications and data collection procedures). We will gather evidence on:

- Acceptability – how acceptable is the measure for practitioners, parents and children (from the perspective of staff)? How might nurseries and/or families be incentivised to take part?
- Practical considerations – how many visits would it take to test all eligible children, or what level of attrition can we expect? How long does it take to deliver the test per child? What equipment is needed? What are the other cost implications? is the mechanism and staffing of test delivery suitable?

We will also conduct a debrief with the SLTs administering the assessments to get an idea of acceptability, feasibility and:

- Data management - how easy will it be to collect and collate data from tests (including transcription processes if relevant)?
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• Analysis – how clean is the data produced, how straightforward is the analysis process?

**Strand 2**

Strand 2 research activities will inform intervention refinement and implementation and process evaluation (IPE) design, and provide further intelligence for our impact evaluation design.

**Strand 2 research with nurseries:** The Strand 2 research will comprise a two-day site visit to each of the eight case study nurseries. This will entail:

- Interview with nursery manager to explore feasibility and affordability of the intervention, support requirements, evidence of cascading knowledge, and perceived impacts on staff and children.
- Observation of 1-2 video feedback sessions to provide insights into delivery and material to investigate in interviews.
- Interviews with 1-2 trained practitioners to assess perceived adequacy of support, changes in practice, perceived impacts for children and recommendations for intervention improvements.
- Cognitive testing of practitioner survey questions about changes in practice, use of strategies and confidence.

Interviews in this strand will also discuss strategies for minimising attrition in the trial, based on the chosen outcome measure. This will include probing nursery staff and managers on how to increase buy-in to the intervention and evaluation activities.

**Interviews with SLTs:** Strand 2 will also include interviews with the two SLTs delivering the intervention to early years staff. These interviews will provide evidence on the delivery of training and video feedback, and perceived impacts and recommendations for intervention improvements from the perspective of these expert trainers. The interviews will be conducted by telephone, or face-to-face as part of the Strand 2 site visits.

The table below illustrates which strands of the work feed into which research questions.

**Research questions by pilot domain and research strand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot domain</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Strand</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of promise</td>
<td>In what ways, and to what extent, is programme participation perceived to affect staff practice?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there evidence of cascaded knowledge and skills?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do providers perceive the programme to have impact on children’s language?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any perceived unintended adverse effects?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there evidence to support the intervention logic model?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do setting managers, practitioners and trainers perceive to be the optimal number/proportion of staff to be trained in order to balance benefits and challenges for children and the setting?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Was the programme delivered as intended?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the facilitators/barriers to successful delivery of the programme?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the facilitators/barriers to engagement in the training and feedback sessions?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the level of attendance at training and feedback sessions?</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did practitioners perceive the training and feedback sessions?</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did practitioners feel able to apply the learning from training and feedback sessions?</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes, if any, are needed to the intervention theory?</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes, if any, are needed to the way nurseries/staff are recruited, and the delivery of training?</td>
<td>Observation of feedback sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any refinements needed to the training, feedback sessions and/or supporting materials?</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the intervention considered affordable by nurseries?</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the training be delivered at scale? What level of adaptation/flexibility is acceptable?</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have appropriate and acceptable primary outcome measures been identified?</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 testing feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviews with senior managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the outcome measures suitable for testing on a large scale?</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 testing feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviews with senior managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the practical implications of using such measures, in terms of costs, resourcing, equipment?</td>
<td>16-24 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 testing feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviews with senior managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How might nurseries (and families) be compensated for participating in child-level testing?</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have suitable measures and approaches been identified for intermediate outcomes?</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the likely level of attrition? What strategies might help to minimise this?</td>
<td>32-48 interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with SLTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data analysis**

Assessment data from the BPVS and RAPT will not be analysed, nor will it be made available to the evaluation team, as it is just the process of administering the tests that is being piloted. The test data will be destroyed once scored by the SLT administering the assessment.

All qualitative interview data will be digitally recorded with permission from participants and transcribed by a professional external transcription agency. Framework in NVivo will be used to manage the data and carry out within and cross-setting analysis. Using the themes covered in interview topic guides and incorporating new emerging themes a matrix will be set out in which each row represents an individual and each column a theme and any related sub-themes. Transcript data is thematically summarised and illustrative verbatim quotes added to the matrix. These summaries and quotes are linked to verbatim transcript data for cross-referencing, quality assurance checks, and transparency. Once all transcripts have been coded, analysis is carried out by theme and individual responses. Coded data can be collated by case study units if needed. Framework maintains individual narratives and allows for thematic comparison and identification of areas of convergence and
dissonance adding richness to the analysis. Triangulation of all data and thematic synthesis by the main pilot domains will provide a comprehensive assessment of evidence of promise, feasibility and readiness for trial.

Ethics and registration
NatCen has a robust ethics governance procedure. Research projects are scrutinised by the NatCen Research Ethics Committee (REC). The committee consists primarily of senior NatCen staff. If necessary, external research experts or professional experts (‘lay people’) may also be invited to review individual studies. Depending on the nature of the research and the perceived level of risk, projects undergo either an expedited review (scrutiny by the REC Chair) or a full review by the sitting REC.

The REC procedure is designed to provide ethical advice and guidance, and to ensure that all research undertaken by NatCen is ethically sound and meets the ethical standards of government and other funders. The process provides reassurance to potential research participants and, where relevant, to gatekeepers through whom they are approached. The REC has completed a full review of this pilot study and approved the study design.

Data protection
Like with all NatCen projects that involve the collection, storage or processing of personal data, this project will have its own data security plan. The plan will detail all data security procedures to be applied, including names of those who have access rights to respondent confidential data, details of third parties (e.g. transcribers) involved in the project and specific requirements for data destruction. The plan will be updated throughout the project via regular monitoring and internal audits. In the unlikely event of a breach to data security procedures, this will be immediately raised as an Information Security incident. Incidents will be automatically flagged and reviewed immediately by Lydia Marshall and other senior staff in the organisation to agree corrective actions. This will include amendments to the data security plan where required to minimise risk of reoccurrence.

NatCen would be the data controller and the data processor. The lawful basis for processing data is ‘legitimate interest’. We will issue a privacy notice\(^\text{10}\) to all concerned parties and publish it on the study’s webpage\(^\text{11}\) also. All data will be deleted six months after the end of the project.

Personnel
**Delivery team at Communicate SLT:**

Caroline Coyne – (Executive Director), Project Lead and Hanen Certified SLT – oversees the recruitment and contracts for the delivery team and the overall operational plan
Joanne Burr - (Executive Director), Quality and Requirements analyst and Hanen Certified SLT – oversees contracts, budgets and quality control
Sea Mooi Austin, (Office Manager) Admin and Systems support.
Rhian Owen – Member of the delivery team, a Specialist Speech and Language Therapist and certified to Provide Learning Language and Loving It™ — The Hanen Program® for Early Childhood Educators/Teachers
Maddy Murdoch – Member of the delivery team, a Specialist Speech and Language Therapist and certified to Provide Learning Language and Loving It™ — The Hanen Program® for Early Childhood Educators/Teachers

\(^{10}\)http://natcen.ac.uk/taking-part/studies-in-field/evaluation-of-hanen-learning-language-and-loving-it-pilot/privacy-notice/

\(^{11}\)http://natcen.ac.uk/taking-part/studies-in-field/evaluation-of-hanen-learning-language-and-loving-it-pilot/
Janice Greenberg, Director of Early Childhood Education Services, The Hanen Centre. External advisor.

Evaluation team at NatCen:
Lydia Marshall (Research Director) – Project Lead
Daniel Phillips (Research Director) – Impact Analyst
Sandy Chidley (Senior Researcher) – Day-to-day Project Manager
Phoebe Averill (Researcher) – Day-to-day project support
Molly Mayer (Researcher) – Day-to-day project support
Helen Burridge (Researcher) – Day-to-day project support

Risks

As part of our project management system we will develop and maintain a risk register, which will help us to anticipate and communicate risks in a timely way and to set out mitigation strategies. The main risks to this project are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood / Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation/Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries or practitioners reluctant to sign up to the pilot.</td>
<td>Likelihood: Low Impact: Medium</td>
<td>We will work closely with the developers to ensure that recruitment materials are attractive while providing full details about the requirements of the pilot evaluation. At the set-up meeting, we will discuss contingency plans in case recruitment is slow, including a phased approach to delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of success in gaining access to practitioners.</td>
<td>Likelihood: Low Impact: High</td>
<td>We will identify a key contact in each nursery (e.g. the nursery manager) to support the research and facilitate access to staff. We will work in close collaboration with the intervention developers and seek their support if we struggle to engage nursery staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries drop out of the pilot.</td>
<td>Likelihood: Low Impact: Low</td>
<td>This is a formative study mainly using qualitative methods. The research has been designed to minimise the burden on providers whilst ensuring depth of data. We will give providers advance notice of all research activities and arrange interviews and visits to suit their availability. We will work closely with the developers to address any concerns about research burden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s parents or nurseries oppose testing of children.</td>
<td>Likelihood: Medium Impact: Low for pilot, high for later efficacy trial</td>
<td>The pilot will assess test and promote acceptability by engaging with parents and providers early and emphasising the importance of testing in MOUs. We will also explore the value of offering incentives for completed tests and providing multiple opportunities for test completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Staff responsible/leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – November 2018</td>
<td>Nursery recruitment</td>
<td>Communicate SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>Parental information leaflet distributed</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>Start of intervention delivery</td>
<td>Communicate SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018 to April 2019</td>
<td>Training observations (Strand 1 and 2)</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018 to January 2019</td>
<td>Strand 1 research with nurseries</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November – December 2018</td>
<td>Testing pupil outcome measures</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018 – January 2019</td>
<td>Analysis – Strand 1</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – February 2019</td>
<td>Draft report – Strand 1</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – April 2019</td>
<td>Strand 2 research with nurseries (site visits)</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March – April 2019</td>
<td>Interviews with SLTs</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>End of intervention delivery</td>
<td>Communicate SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – June 2019</td>
<td>Analysis (Strand 2)</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Draft report (Strand 2)</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>NatCen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding**

- Materials: Leaders Guide, posters, participant guide, handouts, worksheets, presentation slides and videos, recruitment materials, website

- Personnel: 4 x licensed LIU programme leaders, Coordinator, CIC

- Recruitment: Selection of settings, teams and setting managers

- Pre-video and workshop assignment

- Video feedback session and feedback forms

- Post-video

- Programme leaders support

- Informal recording of learning

- 26 x 5 hr group workshops

- Access to resources

- 12 settings and 26 practitioners have participated in LIU and received certification

- 12 setting leads have updated orientation (or received information)

- Staff have videos for future use in staff reflection

- Children interact with trained practitioners

### SHORT-TERM

- Immediate/throughout programme

### MEDIUM-TERM

- Change in perception, attitude, values, belief regarding child-centred approach

- Improved communication

- Increased interaction

- Improved understanding

### LONG-TERM

- Within academic year/one year later

- Practitioners become advocates

- Practitioners engage with LIU alumni

- Local authority and settings support and promote LIU

- Improved social skills

- Improved behaviour and relationships

- Improved language, comprehension and writing

- Improved school readiness

- Practice in community

- Better mental health

**UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES for children and practitioners**