

**DRAFT 2015 CCPRC Annual Meeting
Session Template for Scribes**

File Naming Convention: B3 – Findings from Studies of Quality Improvement in QRIS 12.2.15

1. Descriptive Information

<p>Workshop B-3 (2:45-4:00)</p> <p><i>Findings from Studies of Quality Improvement in Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS)</i></p> <p>Description The “I” in QRIS has received little attention in recent years, as most evaluation efforts have focused on validation. Yet, technical assistance and initiatives to support QI efforts through QRIS represent a large proportion of the investment that States are making with their quality set-aside funds. The goal of this workshop is to hear findings from recent studies in Indiana and Pennsylvania and to learn about the characteristics of programs and the features of QI support that are linked to movement up the quality levels in a QRIS. A facilitated discussion will focus on the implications for research and practice.</p>	<p>Facilitator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Megan Campbell, OCC, ACF <p>Presenters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Ruprecht, Purdue University • Mallory Warner-Richter, Child Trends • Dale Epstein, Child Trends <p>Scribe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Bultinck, Child Trends
---	--

2. Documents in Session Folder (Please list any electronic documents or web links used during the session.)

- PowerPoint presentation (for each presenter)
- Blueprint: <http://www.childtrends.org/?publications=a-blueprint-for-early-care-and-education-quality-improvement-initiatives-final-report>

3. Brief Summary of Presentations

Summary of Presentation #1: Indiana Paths to Quality (QRIS) Evaluation by Karen Ruprecht

There are three phases of Indiana’s QRIS evaluation:

- Phase 1: Validation and Implementation Study
 - Findings showed providers are motivated to move up levels
 - 23% of providers moved up at least one level after 6 months
- Phase 2: Provider Focus Groups
 - Conducted focus groups to answer the question, “What will it take for providers to move up levels?”
 - The goal was to gain up-to-date, in depth perspectives on providers’ views and experiences in Paths To Quality (PTQ)
 - Findings: Coaching/mentoring is critical to advancement of providers in PTQ
 - Barriers to advancement included coaching continuity, education levels, trainings (availability, motivation), time (amount to advance levels)
- Phase 3: Provider Outcome Longitudinal Study (2 years)
 - To answer the questions, “Is PTQ effective at providing T/TA to child care providers? Is PTQ advantageous for providers? What are the best predictors of provider advancement?”
 - Provider interviews focused on plans of advancement, provider-coach relationships, and motivations to advance, and types of assistance provided to providers.
- After 4 years of the QRIS study:
 - Provider interest in advancement remained high
 - 26% of providers advanced after one year
 - 11% of providers decreased levels or dropped out from Time 1 to Time 3
- Why do providers want to advance?
 - Parents’ awareness of PTQ levels and quality has increased
 - The monetary incentives offered to programs
 - The pride of high quality care

- Obstacles
 - Staffing – hiring and training new staff
 - Difficulty in motivating long-standing staff to further their education, take additional trainings, etc.
- Relationship Quality
 - Dips from Time 1 to Time 3: reasons unknown at this time
- Coach Continuity
 - Half of providers reported coach changes between Time 1 to Time 3
 - Staff changes at organizations where coaches were hired from
 - “Natural” coach changes, i.e. providers changed levels; site closing ,or no longer participating in QRIS
- Predictors of Provider Advancement
 - Provider’s motivation to change , quality of relationship with coach, and training hours
 - Coach reports of providers’ predictors were non-significant
- Conclusions
 - Coaching is an important element in QRIS
 - Coaching continuity is important to providers
 - Staff education and training are significant challenges

Summary of Presentation #2: Evaluation of Success by 6 in Greater Philadelphia by Mallory Warner-Richter

- Keystone STARS -- Background Information
 - Block-style QRIS with 4 levels
 - Staff Qualification and PD, Learning Program, Partnerships with Family and Community, Leadership and Management
- Success By 6 in Greater Philadelphia
 - Quality improvement program designed to move centers from Star 2 to Star 3 in Keystone STARS
 - Improvement supports: ERS assessments, TA, program improvement funds, director leadership circles
 - Maintenance supports: quality awards, peer leadership circles, access to Institute for Family Professionals coursework
- SB6 Questions – Looking deeper at different aspects of quality improvement
 - How does SB6 align with effective practices in ECE QI?
 - Are SB6 activities delivered with fidelity and consistency??
 - What are the experiences of directors, teachers, and TA consultants?
 - What can we learn about the success rate?
 - How do programs differ who move-up in Stars?
- Methods
 - Synthesis of QI literature to inform questions about SB6 design
 - Multiple sources of data: 14 interviews, 18 observations, 260 surveys, 365 contact logs, census data on location of SB6 centers, admin data
 - Analysis of above sources to understand SB6 success rate
 - Current Participant Surveys: over a 50% response rate
 - Previous director survey: over a 50% response rate
 - TA surveys: 100% response rate
- Highlights
 - SB6 incorporates many blueprint practices
 - “Blueprint for Early Care and Education Quality Improvement Initiative” – (available on Child Trends’ website)
 - Helpful graphic depiction of efforts and activities, that helped provide direction and specific items for action
 - Foundational Elements
 - Implementation Efforts
 - QI Activities
 - Also provided basis for key questions in the design of the evaluation
 - Adaptation of Readiness Group in 2014: provided extra support to get programs ready to change
- SB6 TA Consultation

- 5/13 consultants reported following half of the guidance in the TA model
- They are positive about their relationships with centers, but only somewhat agree that time with centers is spent efficiently
- Director and Teacher Perceptions and Satisfaction
 - Directors were much more likely to agree with statements like “Working on goals with my SB6 TA is helpful in improving my center,” compared to teachers.
- Strategy for Understanding the SB6 Success Rate
 - Many center characteristics were used in the matching process to identify a comparison group for SB6 centers to account for factors besides SB6 that are associated with QI
 - Propensity score matching was conducted
- Outcomes
 - About half of the SB6 programs moved up from a Star 2 to Star 3
- Barriers
 - Educational qualifications
 - Staff turnover – (which can incorporate above, if a center loses a staff member with a higher educational level)
 - Data collection
- Summary and Recommendations
 - Enhanced supervision and mentoring for TA consultants
 - Learn about teachers’ needs and their roles in SB6
 - Environmental focus in SB6; possible benefits in incorporating a focus on interactions and intentional teaching
- Full report offered in the next month

4. Brief Summary of Discussion

Megan Campbell (discussant)

- With CCDBG, another push to increase quality in states’ QRIS, with a focus on components of a QRIS.
 - Where are providers improving? Participation rates: Where are states moving – hopeful next steps to gather the data
- Is there a focus on strengthening relationships?
 - -Indiana: Providers are not happy when there is a discontinuity with their coaches. In the past few months, the state has changed this to increase the potential to maintain the relationship. On another note, not all the relationships are healthy for teacher/directors and coach.
- Were there different focuses among coaches across states’ QRIS?
 - Indiana: The focus is on teacher/child interactions. Most of this focus is based on a “check-list”
 - Philadelphia: Coach towards a level 3 standards; harder for coaches to deal with the variety of programs they are working with, in terms of quality
- Are the “check-list” based questions “easy” things to change? More “quality” vs. “procedural” changes?
 - Indiana: There is an intrinsic motivation for this change to occur. Are the quality standards what they need to be to really impact children’s development? This is the bigger question that we are looking at.
 - Philadelphia: Health and safety aspects were often the focus in observations. It also depends on where each staff member is at on their check-list.
- Do coaches help with education aspects, finding trainings, classes, etc.?
 - Indiana: It was combined. They worked with the directors’ level versus the teacher level.
 - Philadelphia: Most coaching was provided with director as well
- How did providers use the incentives they receive?
 - Indiana: We are unsure on monetary incentives. Non-monetary were items such as catalogs for supplies/materials for the teachers/directors to order from

- Philadelphia: About 40% of what they were asking for was classroom materials. Another large portion was maintenance related (fixed sink, etc.). Small amount of incentives were spent on PD. Main focus was on environmental changes.
- Big picture questions: What are good solutions to incorporate more trainings and professional development?
 - Motivations: are there other pathways to increase credentials that do not require staff to attend school, asking what counts and what doesn't
 - Fear that if teachers receive higher credentials they will move on to a higher or another career/position.
 - How to count hours towards trainings vs education. Higher quality training offered
 - It can be a challenge to find the balance on including basic guidance (health and safety) vs. quality changes, and finding more innovative ways to incorporate this and move forward.
- Is there beginning to be attention to late-joiners to QRIS? Is this something you are seeing in more than one state?
 - Philadelphia: It is a rising concern. They are trying to identify who has not joined. They tend to have similar amount of years in the field, but lower credentials. There will need to be new ways created to engage them.
 - Indiana: Reimbursement may work – award certain grants if you are at certain levels.
- Can you speak more to motivation for centers to move up because of parent interest?
 - Indiana: Through surveys – parent awareness has significantly increased, i.e. knowing about their state's QRIS and willing to pay more for their child(ren) to attend at programs participating in a QRIS. It has become more intentional in states' QRIS as well, marketing to parents, and other intentional efforts to attract parents.
 - Philadelphia: Very few programs reported telling their families about SB6.

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)

- Coaching is an important element in QRIS
- Coaching continuity is important to providers
- Staff education and training are significant challenges to quality improvement
- Effective implementation of quality improvement requires monitoring and flexibility to adjust policies and procedures
- Management structures that include key partners are important for quality improvement initiatives
- Support for the workforce is a key challenge in these types of QI initiatives