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Objectives

• Learn about Indiana’s QRIS evaluation

• Share findings of provider and coach longitudinal study

• Discuss what we are learning
### Overview of Indiana’s QRIS Evaluation

- **Phase I:** Validation and Implementation Study
- **Phase 2:** Provider Focus Groups
- **Phase 3:** Currently underway
  - Provider Outcome Study (focus today)
  - Child Outcome Study
  - Parent Awareness Survey
Indiana’s QRIS: Paths to QUALITY

- Health and Safety
- Learning Environments
- Planned Curriculum
- Learning Environments
- Health and Safety
- National Accreditation
- Health and Safety
Paths to QUALITY
Incentives

• **Level 1:**
  • One time non-cash award $50

• **Level 2 and Level 3:**
  • $1,000 non-cash award to centers and ministries
  • $300 non-cash award to homes

• **Level 4:**
  • $1,500 one time award to centers and ministries; $1,000 cash annual award for maintenance of Level 4
  • $300 one time and annual award for homes

• **Tiered reimbursement** based on PTQ level
Distribution of rated levels, licensed child care centers, 2010-2015

- Level 1: 2010 - 190, 2015 - 125
- Level 2: 2010 - 100, 2015 - 30
- Level 3: 2010 - 100, 2015 - 225
- Level 4: 2010 - 100, 2015 - 175
Provider Findings:

- Providers motivated to move up levels
  - 23% moved up at least one level after 6 months

- Level 2 providers were most likely to advance a level within 6 months (41%), followed by Level 1 providers (26%)
Phase 2: Provider Focus Groups

• **Goal:** gain up-to-date, in-depth perspectives on providers’ views and experiences in PTQ

• **Findings:** advancement requires a great deal of effort
  • Coaching is critical to advancement
  • Barriers: staff education level, staff training, coach continuity, time for documentation
Phase 3: Provider Outcome
Longitudinal Study (2 years)

• Is PTQ effective at providing T/TA to child care providers that helps them advance to higher quality levels?

• How is PTQ advantageous for providers?

• What are the best predictors of provider advancement in PTQ?
Phase 3 Longitudinal Provider Study Sample Description

• 5 provider interviews with 179 randomly selected providers rated at Levels 1, 2, 3 over a two year period

• 3 coach interviews with provider’s coach

• Interviews focus on plans to advance, provider-coach relationship, motivation to advance, types of assistance provided.
After 4 years of QRIS operation: Are providers advancing levels?

- Mid-way through the 2 year study--
  - Interest in advancement remained high (75% from Time 1 compared to 69% at Time 3)
  - 26% of providers advanced at least 1 level in one year
  - 11% decreased levels or dropped out of PTQ from Time 1 to Time 3
Why do providers want to advance?

- Parents are starting to look at PTQ levels and it is important to show parents I am providing quality care.
  - Home provider, Level 2

- Pride of knowing we are providing high quality care and having evidence to show parents.
  - Center director, Level 2

- The new dollar incentives for CCDF made all the difference.
  - Center director, Level 2
## Obstacles to Advancement

- **The largest obstacle is staffing - hiring new staff that have the education and training that is required of PTQ. Also, keeping current staff up to date with training hours.**
  - Center director, Level 2

- **We have long-standing staff so it can be difficult to motivate them to go to training or to get their CDA.**
  - Ministry director, Level 1
## Coach Perspectives on Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of advancement in next 6 months</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider engaged during coaching visits</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to advance</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=not at all; 2= somewhat; 3= likely/engaged/motivated; 4= very likely/engaged/motivated
Relationship Quality

How would you rate your relationship with your coach/provider?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very good; 5= Excellent
Coach Continuity

- Half of providers reported coach changes between Time 1 and Time 3
  - 51 providers had coach changes due to staff changes
    - Represents 18 coaches total
  - 22 “natural” coach changes; providers increased levels
  - 19 changes due to site closing, no longer on PTQ, or no coach assigned
Percentage of coaching strategies used with providers

- Consultation with director/owner: 94% (Time 1), 93% (Time 3)
- Observation: 83% (Time 1), 76% (Time 3)
- Prep for rating visit: 74% (Time 1), 63% (Time 3)
- Consultation with staff: 55% (Time 1), 59% (Time 3)
- Direct mentoring: 51% (Time 1), 46% (Time 3)
What are effective coaching strategies?

1=not effective; 2=somewhat; 3=effective; 4=very effective
Motivation to Change

Stage of Change Scale, Children’s Institute
## Potential Predictors of Provider Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child care providers:</th>
<th>Coach:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>Provider’s motivation to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to change</td>
<td>Quality of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of coach relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training hours within past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of coach changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Results: What predicts provider advancement?

- Provider’s motivation to change
- Provider relationship with their coach
- Training hours
- Coach reports of providers’ motivation to change and relationship with providers non-significant or marginally significant
- Provider’s education level did not predict advancement
What are we learning?

- Coaching is an important element to QRIS
- Coaching continuity is important to providers
- Staff education and training are significant challenges
- Should more of coaches’ attention be focused on working directly with teachers/caregivers?
- Future analyses will use improved data about amount and types of T/TA provided
Questions?

Purdue evaluation research briefs, technical reports, and measures manuals:

www.cfs.purdue.edu/cff/publications/publications.html
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