

**2015 CCPRC Annual Meeting  
Session Summary**

**1. Descriptive Information**

<p><b>Workshop B-1</b> (<i>Independence D &amp; E</i>)</p> <p><i>Implementing Systems Change in ECE Professional Development (PD) Systems: Developing Resources for the Coming Decade</i></p> <p><b>Description</b></p> <p>This workshop considered the supports needed to achieve movement toward a unified PD system that works across sectors, settings and auspice, as well as across the age span from birth to eight. Presenters shared new research and models for transforming ECE PD systems through coaching approaches at the individual, organizational, and state level. Group discussion aimed to identify new resources needed to support the implementation and transformation of ECE PD systems.</p>	<p><b>Facilitator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tamara Halle, Child Trends</li></ul> <p><b>Presenters</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Helen Raikes, University of Nebraska-Lincoln</li><li>• Anne Douglass, University of Massachusetts-Boston</li><li>• Sherry M. Cleary, New York Early Childhood Professional Development Institute</li></ul> <p><b>Scribe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amy Blasberg, Child Trends</li></ul>
---	--

**2. Documents in Session Folder**

The three PowerPoint presentations are saved on the flash drive distributed to participants. Additionally, a few handouts were distributed during the session by Sherry Cleary.

**3. Brief Summary of Presentations**

- **Summary of Presentation #1:** Coaching Capacity Building (Helen Raikes)

Nebraska has had tremendous growth in early childhood education; this is representative of the entire country. Schools in Nebraska are very competitive in vying for infant/toddler funding and a QRIS has been implemented. The increase in the provision of early care and education has led to an increased need for coaches and mentors. There are a wide variety of programs filling the need for coaches and mentors, but there is not an infrastructure for formal preparation of these professionals. Fueled by this lack of infrastructure, the University of Nebraska recently decided to modify their master's program by adding a 12-credit certification on coaching and mentoring. Coaches need generalized skills on topics such as providing feedback, guiding reflective practice, adult learning principles, and also specialized content knowledge in literacy, math, or science. The university is currently working on hiring an individual who will develop coursework to satisfy the 12-credit certificate in order to build capacity in this area. This process raises a question as to whether or not coaches should be required to be certified.

**Question:**

What is the difference between coaches, consultants, or mentors?

**Answer(s):**

Regardless of what you call it... it's basically all the same thing. Our team spent a lot of time discussing this, but we are not too worried about the nomenclature.

The core of this is about being relationship-based, so it doesn't really matter what they're called. Minnesota is looking at a credential that wouldn't require a certain education level given the commensurate pay rate.

One of the NAEYC glossaries defines these groups differently. But having credentials within each state is nervous-making because it invites a lot of variation across states.

New York has adopted the NAEYC framework. A mentor has a very personal, one-on-one commitment and may not include other agendas or other people. A consultant often comes in with his or her own agenda. A coach is very different because she or he is there to empower teachers to reach their own goals.

Technical assistant is another word to throw into the mix. It has elements of coach and mentor in it. The NAEYC terminology uses verbs rather than nouns. In Region 3, we are trying to come up with shared definitions.

- **Summary of Presentation #2:** Building Capacity for Organizational Improvement in Early Care and Education: The Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) Approach (Anne Douglass)

The purpose of this intervention was to support the adoption of trauma-informed care practices to promote better service delivery for children and families exposed to trauma and also to prevent trauma. The BSC is a structured, evidence-based quality improvement method for learning and implementing new practices. The goal is to close the gap between what we know and what we do and promote the sustainability of new practices. The learning collaborative process includes readiness work plus in-person learning sessions where teams from each organization come together. This approach represents a shift in professional development – it is not something that individuals do, but rather something that is done as a group, in the context of a preexisting system.

Three core components of the implementation framework were studied: (1) implementation teams, (2) data and feedback loops, and (3) implementation infrastructure. Each implementation team included administrators, teachers, parents, and mental health consultants. This group needed to step up and be empowered to drive change within their organization. The data and feedback loops involved using monthly metrics to reflect on what is changing, why, and what it might mean. The key challenge to overcome within the infrastructure piece was creating a space for adults to come together and meet on a regular basis. Anecdotes about the BSC model, participants' experiences, and documentation around using the "plan, do, study, and adjust" framework were shared along with lessons learned. These lessons include the need for an integrated and embedded professional development approach and the need to build organizational and systems infrastructure for improvement.

**Question:**

Where did the coaches come from? Part of me thinks it's a good thing they came from outside our field.

**Answer:**

We had people either from health sectors or child welfare agencies. These people had no idea that the different teachers didn't do the same routines. They were surprised by the lack of protocols. It took a long time for coaches to understand that there was very little usable technology in the centers.

**Question:**

Did the metrics that you used come from within the team or were they external?

**Answer:**

The metrics were developed by a group of outside experts – they created a framework and linked the metrics to this framework. They focused on metrics that the programs were likely to have collected. It turns out that people elected not to use the metrics they didn't like.

- **Summary of Presentation #3:** Implementing Systems Change in Early Care and Education (ECE) Professional Development: New York Works for Children (Sherry Cleary)

The organization started out by doing two key pieces of research: (1) a needs assessment and (2) a study about the workforce. Research is so much more powerful when people know the data, but then you make them pay attention to it. New York has three documents that comprise the early learning framework: (1) the pre-K foundation for the common core, (2) the core body of knowledge, and (3) the early learning guidelines. The workforce system is complex and has been refined multiple times (see chart in slideshow). Overarching topics include career pathways, career pathway supports, system development and accountability, professional preparation and development, program quality, and recruitment, retention, and compensation. The group has created separate competencies for coaches to create news career pathways. The coaches are being encouraged to use a tool to assess teachers and then use the *same* tool to map out goals for quality improvement. These programs are funded through both public and private dollars.

**Question:**

How do you pay for it [offering \$51,000 as the starting salary for teachers in community-based organizations]?

**Answer:**

We told the governor's office that if we want quality, we need to pay for it and they said, "okay."

**Question:**

Are the coaches employed by the state?

**Answer:**

They are employed by the state, city, QRIS, and licensing bureau. The Department of Health employs MSWs as well, but they are trained by CUNY.

#### 4. Brief Summary of Discussion

**Question:**

How do we do this with home-based providers?

**Answer:**

Sherry Cleary: In New York, our QRIS completely embraces regulated family child care. They are an integral part of our QRIS. Family child care providers will be involved in a training for a project starting in January.

Anne Douglass: The work in the BSC was only in center-based and school-based settings. Thinking about family child care networks, I'm not sure how the model would translate. I've been talking with Juliet Bromer about how systems within organizations apply or do not apply to family child care providers.

**Question:**

Shelly mentioned that higher education is static. What if it weren't static?

**Answer:**

Sherry Cleary: Every institution of higher education has a public service component, which needs to be stronger. If faculty got points for their public service, there might be a shift in behavior. We need to take responsibility for the community we are in. Where we place students for student teaching matters – there are endless opportunities. People are too often isolated in their own communities.

Anne Douglass: UMass Boston has a strong community engagement component. We need to stop talking about how difficult it is to work with higher education and start talking about who is doing it right.

**Question:**

I have so many things to say that I don't know where to start. I would like a venue for this conversation to continue. Higher education is just one piece of the puzzle that we need to solve.

**Answer:**

Tamara Halle: There is a session right after this focusing on infant/toddler core competencies and credentialing. There are also CCPRC working groups on both implementation and professional development and these groups will be collaborating in the coming year.

#### 5. Summary of Key Issues Raised (facilitators are encouraged to spend the last 3-5 minutes of workshops summarizing the key issues raised during the session; bullets below are prompts for capturing the kinds of issues we're looking for)

This workshop session used an implementation framework to examine building capacity in three different contexts: a university, a learning collaborative, and a state. The first presentation shed light on the process behind the decision to create a new certification program for coaches. The second presentation highlighted how ECE professional development could be embedded within a specific model of collaboration to address capacity-building of practitioners by using *plan, do, study, adjust* cycles to inform professional development. The third presentation focused on the strategies one state is using to build capacity within its PD system; by necessity, this involved a multi-pronged approach. This presenter stressed the importance of leveraging research to influence policy decisions. Although there was very limited time for discussion, the conversation will be continued through the CCPRC Implementation Working Group.