Overview of the Early Years Engage Evaluation

Van Vilaysinh
Three Phases of Early Years Engage

Presented at May 31, 2018 ELCC Forum

**Phase 1 (2017): Implementing EYE**
- Assess
- Children and Families
- Quality of Life
- Plan
- Do

**Phase 2 (2018): Evaluation**
- Ask about service provider and CMSM experiences in implementing EYE
- Determine mandate and scope of Early Years Engage
- Clarify roles and expectations of service provider and CMSM
- What does the 2017 data tell us?
- What should we focus on next?

**Phase 3 (2019): Measurement Framework**

*Aligning with the Province:*
- Define program and system level quality
- Determine metrics to assess and monitor quality improvements at the program and system level
- What difference does Early Years Engage make in improving program and system level quality?
It all began with some not so simple questions...

**Purpose and Changes**
"Why did EYE start?"
"What's changing?"
"What's the timeline?"

**Engagement and Communication**
"Who has been or is involved with EYE and how?"
"What feedback has been gathered? How will it be used?"

**What Next**
"How will data be used to inform future direction?"
"What will success look like?"

**Alignments**
"How does EYE align with the Province's directives?; with College of ECE's? With delivery of the PRC?"

**Accountability and funding**
"What is the Region's role in quality?"
"What happens when programs don't show improvements?"
Then, to choose an approach that would facilitate an adaptive process to answer these questions and inform the future direction of EYE.

Our program just started, we have no idea where to go or how to evaluate.

We'll start by predetermined the program's outcomes using very little evidence then over the years we'll judge you according to that.
Developmental Evaluation 101
The seed is planted…

June 28, 2018

• Meeting with PRC (Goranka and Maria) & CHS
  – shared their work plan
  – progress of Ideas Connect, completion of annotated bibliography of quality in the ELCC sector
  – suggested a "Visioning Day"

• Opportunity to leverage students to complete literature review and municipal scan
Summary of literature review

• There is compelling research linking quality Early Learning and Child Care (ELCC) with positive outcomes of children

• There is no single definition of quality ELCC
  – Our Vision, 8 Elements, Ideas Connect, HDLH?

• Quality is not a static issue

• Provincial acknowledgement without clear direction

• Community needs, resources and challenges are unique and ever evolving
### Summary of municipal scan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- All municipalities have a quality initiative
- Approaches are different
- General principles that define quality
- No consistent agreed upon definition
- Concerned with how quality is monitored and measured
- Models/frameworks used to measure or monitor quality varies
- There are roles dedicated to quality initiatives
- Types of roles, capacity and level of funding and resources
- Accountability role is with CMSM
- Supporting quality improvement role varied (e.g., CMSM, community, PRC)
- Service provider expectation of ongoing professional learning and quality improvement
- How service providers are expected and supported to do this varies
- Role of PRC in other municipalities (funding, partnership with CMSM)
QI Team

11 2017/18

59 2017/18
17 so far 2018/19

FEEDBACK since 2015
7 ELCC Forums
20+ discussions

Municipal scan

Literature Review

ONLINE SURVEY
Key Insights

1. Engaging with community partners
2. The Early Years Engage process
3. Supportive role vs accountability role
4. Defining and measuring quality
5. Professional learning

What we heard

Recommended next steps in draft. Some already in progress.
Community partners have been engaged, but feel their feedback has not been meaningfully implemented, and/or communicated back.

"[There is a] need to share the summary of the feedback and the concerns that were heard as part of the Forum Feedback and other consultations".

-ELCC forum

What is meaningful should be based on purpose, situation, and audience.
2. The EYE process

There is value in implementing a continuous quality improvement process.

"We have found the Early Years Engage to be very beneficial to us in reflecting on our program, our engagement and environments." – Online survey
2. The EYE process

The process is confusing and needs to be clearer and simpler.
There is redundancy in the EYE process.

Felt as though they were already doing the goals and now they are writing them down.
-1:1 interview

Re: The Annual Planning Template
Concentrating on too many goals at one time. It's affecting quality. You lose the quality.
-1:1 interview
2. The EYE process

The EYE site visits is not fully inclusive of educators working in ratio. There are challenges for them to participate in all the steps of the Assess, Plan, Do, Review cycle.

Supervisors have more access to this type of information, not direct service staff. "It doesn’t trickle down."
-1:1 interview

"I don’t know if all of our staff really understand what Early Years Engage is."
-1:1 interview

Changes to continually improve the EYE process. Will hear more from Debbie.
3. Supportive vs Accountability roles

- QI team currently has dual role in quality (supportive and accountability)
- The supportive approach of Early Years Engage feels inauthentic because it includes a mandatory compliance component.

More clarity on the purpose is needed. E.g., How does it impact funding? See the Region as "getting into the weeds"

-ELCC forum
The Professional Resource Centre (Pedagogical Consultant) has a supportive role to improving quality; however, it is not distinguished from the Region’s role.

Ideally: would like to see that the region provide funding and other resources while the PRC operate the workshops -1:1 interview

Region can do more to strengthen partnership and make it more apparent to the local early learning community. -1:1 interview

Consider making changes to these roles to best support quality improvement while also being accountable.
4. Defining and Measuring Quality

• Focus of the work in Phase 3 – to define and develop a measurement framework for quality.
• Need to consider the system, program, and individual impacts
• Measurements also need to consider database systems and data collection methods
5. Professional learning

• There are barriers to accessing the Early Childhood Education Professional Resource Centre. E.g., cost of membership, parking, location, hours

• The Early Childhood Education Professional Resource Centre doesn't fully meet the needs of the community. E.g., professional learning for supervisors in the area of coaching and mentoring staff is needed.

The PRC provides us an invaluable path to professional development. But do not use often due to accessibility – e.g., location, cost and time

1:1 interview
5. Professional learning

The partnership between Children's Services and the Professional Resource Centre is “invisible”.

“I don’t really understand that relationship very well. I don’t know if they fund the PRC. I am assuming they do.”
-1:1 interview
Next steps

1. Engage meaningfully with community partners
2. Improve the Early Years Engage process
3. Define and clarify supportive role vs accountability role
4. Define and measure quality
5. Improve professional learning
And things started to grow…

What we did:

1. Presentations and discussions of our current work as it relates to quality in the ELCC sector – historical context, current context
2. Reflections and empathy mapping
3. Designing and visioning a partnership model to best serve our community partners
Group A

• *Share data/info re: CPL needs to use for future planning
• *Make permanent the Pedagogical leader position
• Gather data/use data about community needs
• Work jointly with the community feedback
• Share/promote each other’s work
• One communication source
• Joint public communication about quality
• One communication source (website)
• Promote/direct folks to each other’s programs/services
• Develop a mission & Vision for the PRC
• Meet again
• Schedule regular meeting times
• Develop a framework for collaboration
• Meet regularly with core group and communicate to others
• Consistent messaging about quality and quality initiatives
• Develop shared goals about quality and early learning
• Short and long term goals
• Provide free membership to PRC through Regional funding
• Strengthen value of PRC to community
• Focus on making PRC processes more efficient

Group B

• * December 1st Symposium
• *Have Quality at Waterloo Region “move in” with PRC
• *Analyze data that is not already analysed
• Ideas Connect ends – sustainability
• 2 quality discussions need to come together now – define current roles etc.
• Create a common/shared understanding of quality approach between PRC/Ideas Connect/ROW
• 2019 extend budget for Pedagogist (assume ROW funding)
• Barb and Kim will research CMSM role requirements
• Look at current roles of PRC/ROW CHS and think about who should do what
• Look at the items from previous exercise – go from there
• Develop some short term goals
• Share vision – greater communication
• Timing is everything
• Strategic committee forms – meets regularly, creates goals
• Continue the conversation, identify the opportunities
• Establish communication adv.
• Strategic plan
• Communicate a clear yet collaborative plan
• Concept development
THE INNOVATION CURVE

Where does our Vision fit?

CREATE NEW
Relationships

ENGAGE ADJACENT
Stakeholders

SERVE EXISTING
Community Partners

CORE
Optimizing existing partnership model for existing partners

USE EXISTING
Partnership model

ADD INCREMENTAL
CHANGE
to partnership model

TRANSFORMATIONAL
Developing new partnership model, requiring new relationships that currently don't exist

ADJACENT
Expanding from existing activity into "new to the organization" activity

Change communication

Change processes

Change structure/resources

DEVELOP NEW
partnership model
PRC – ROW Partnership on Quality

Barb & Goranka
EYE Evaluation Key Insights related to ROW- PRC Partnership

- Invisible partnership
- Unclear how roles of PRC and ROW are the same/different
- Tension between the supportive approach and mandatory compliance of Early Years Engage
- The accessibility of PRC is challenging
- Professional development for supervisors is needed
- PRC and ROW work in silos and the needs of the community are not being met
What's the solution?

• We are re-defining the partnership between ROW and the PRC to support the local Early Years and Child Care services and service providers in their journey "to meet a high standard of quality and safety".
What problems will it solve?

1. We will be more responsive to community needs
2. More people will seek support and use the resources
3. We will be more efficient in our use of limited resources
What problems will it solve?

4. It will be easier for people to network, access supports and resources
5. Our roles and responsibilities will be clarified
6. Our services will be more integrated
7. We will continue to build and maintain our relationship
Why will the ECE community care?
1. Sense belonging and well-being
2. Facilitate continuous professional learning
3. Successes and improvements in quality
4. Skill development
5. Decrease workload, stress, and burnout
6. Increase community awareness
7. Professionalization of the ELCC sector
How will we get there?
Thank you