“Readiness to Change” within Quality Improvement Initiatives
Overview of the Session

1. Introducing a definition of “readiness”

2. Three presentations on the measurement of individual, group, and organizational readiness within studies of quality improvement initiatives
   a. Meghan Broadstone
   b. Shannon Wanless
   c. Michelle Maier, Tamara Halle, Emily Moiduddin, & Sally Atkins-Burnett

3. Group discussion!
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Defining “Readiness”

“Readiness to change refers to the developmental process in which a person, organization, or system increases the capacity and willingness to engage in a particular activity.” (Peterson, 2013, p. 44)

- Individual Readiness
  
  (Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris, 2007)

- Workgroup Readiness
  
  (Rafferty, Jimmieson, & Armenakis, 2013)

- Organizational Readiness
  
  (Weiner, 2009)
Ready to Join? Why Child Care Providers Choose to Participate (or not) in Quality Improvement Initiatives

Meghan Broadstone, Ph.D.
Research Scientist
Education Development Center
Methods
Child Care Collaboration Study

GOAL: Measure child care providers’ engagement with QRIS and other state and federal initiatives

• Online survey completed by 283 center based and family child care providers

GOAL: In depth case studies to understand why providers do or do not engage

• Interviews with 15 center based and family child care providers
Findings

Individual “Readiness to Change”

• Four (overlapping) key issues
  – Hoops and Paperwork
  – Time
  – Geography
  – Education/Training

• Overarching Theme: Existing Capacity
Hoops and Paperwork

“When I first saw the materials, I didn’t consider it seriously. It looked like a lot of work. I just moved on because I have a million things going on.”

“Filled out the application. Jumped through the hoops. They were flexible enough. They were collaborative.”
“I am so busy. It’s 5:30 and I’m clocking out, these things (groups, trainings, collaboration) don’t come to mind.”

“I have to be flexible for the parents. I am working a 12-hour day. There’s no time for organizations and all that other stuff.”
Geography

“There are providers who [like me] live in the middle of nowhere. I could mentor somebody who is thinking of opening up. The process can be daunting.”

“In this neck of the woods, there’s not a lot of us. Very hard to network when you are so far away. I can’t commit to meetings. I won’t get home until 11pm.”
Education/Training Requirement

“[They] said you can’t do it if you don’t have a bachelor’s degree. I have 400 credits... been going to school to school since 1981. You are trying to tell me this? I refuse to.”

“No idea I would be a daycare owner. If you had told me that 10 years ago I would have laughed at you. I won’t be open forever."
Research Considerations

• Analysis of averages provides only part of the picture
• Exploration of outlier cases can reveal barriers to participation in the intervention
• In-depth case analysis that includes a mixed methods approach can shed light on sleeper findings
Policy Considerations

• Issues:
  – Focusing only on achieving results in a short amount of time can lead to “creaming from the top”
  – Improving quality of small, under-resourced, rural providers requires specific policy attention

• Recommendations:
  – Devoting resources and policy attention to preparing providers for participation is important, especially for those who are under resourced
  – Needs sensing that uses data regarding barriers to participation available across a range of projects can inform policy
The Role of Psychological Safety in Creating a Culture of Readiness

Shannon B. Wanless, Ph.D.
Ashley Shafer, M.S.
Cecily Davis, M.S.W.
University of Pittsburgh
Readiness to Implement

- Early childhood coaches estimate that 70% of preschool teachers are not ready to change their practice (Peterson, 2012).
- In business, a psychologically safe context has been shown to support readiness (Edmondson, 1999).
- Readiness may work in tandem with teacher well-being (stress, depression, emotion regulation; Taylor et al, 2016), and have implications for quality (Whitaker et al, 2015).

**FIGURE 24.1.** Conceptual model of the process of moving from building organizational readiness to shifting child outcomes.

Research Questions

• How do we define and assess readiness?
• How do readiness aspects vary across teachers and centers?
• How does readiness co-occur with psychological safety and other teacher well-being factors?
• How does readiness relate to quality?
Samples & Measures

*Pittsburgh Samples*

1. N=253 preschool teachers
   All women, 58% with B.S. or Grad degree
2. N=94 preschool teachers in RCT
   All women, 83% with B.S. or Grad degree

*Measures*

> **Readiness** (Wanless, 2014), 24 items, $\alpha=.91$
> **Quality** (Sample 1 = Star Rating)
> **Psychological Safety** (Edmondson, 1999), 7 items, $\alpha=.88$
> **Job Stress** (Lambert et al, 2001), 9 items, $\alpha=.82$
> **Depression** (CESD-R-10, Miller et al, 2008), 10 items, $\alpha=.74$
> **Emotion Regulation at Work** (Taylor et al, 2015), 9 items, $\alpha=.87$
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RISE</th>
<th>RISE Comm</th>
<th>RISE Schl</th>
<th>RISE Director</th>
<th>RISE Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>4.08 (.46)</td>
<td>3.99 (.55)</td>
<td>3.93 (.59)</td>
<td>3.93 (.86)</td>
<td>4.36 (.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.13 (.44)</td>
<td>3.94 (.58)</td>
<td>3.95 (.60)</td>
<td>4.07 (.69)</td>
<td>4.45 (.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Comm</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Schl</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Dir</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Alphas are shown above the diagonal, and correlations are shown below the diagonal. All correlations are significant at the .001 level (two-tailed) except where noted.

- **RISE:** RISK, Impact, Education, and Service
- **RISE Comm:** RISK, Impact, Education, and Service Community
- **RISE Schl:** RISK, Impact, Education, and Service School
- **RISE Dir:** RISK, Impact, Education, and Service Director

**Correlation Coefficients:**

- **Alpha:** .90 (SD), .91
- **RISE:** .70***, .76***
- **RISE Comm:** .59***, .61***
- **RISE Schl:** .69***, .78***
- **RISE Dir:** .37***, .58***

---
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Results

• How do readiness aspects vary across teachers and centers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SDs across Schools</th>
<th>Ranges across Schools</th>
<th>ICCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>3.28 – 5.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.56 - 4.96</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Comm</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.00 – 5.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.62 - 5.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Schl</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2.88 – 5.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.13 - 5.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Dir</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.13 – 5.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.13 - 5.00</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Tch</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.13 – 5.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.00 - 5.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results

#### How does readiness co-occur with psychological safety and other teacher well-being factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psy Safety</th>
<th>Dep</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>EReg</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISE</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Comm</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Sch</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Dir</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE Tchr</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy Safety</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Education, Years Experience, and Years at this Center are not significantly related to Readiness.

Regression of Well-being on Readiness (N=94):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress at Work</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Regulation</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .50$
Discussion

• We define readiness as multilevel and propose that “it takes a village” to support sustained, meaningful change in practice.

• Readiness varies across centers, with director aspects of readiness varying the most, and teacher readiness being an overall strength.

• Teacher factors and center climate factors relate to readiness, with psychological safety showing the strongest associations.

• RISE scores are not related to quality ratings in this sample, and investigations into implementation are underway.
Who’s Ready?
And How Do We Know?
Measuring Readiness in 4 OPRE-funded Quality Improvement Initiatives
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Variations in Implementation of Quality Interventions (VIQI) Project

Michelle F. Maier
MDRC
VIQI Project Description

• 3-group randomized experimental design examining causal effect of different dimensions of quality on child outcomes

• Understand variation in impacts and implementation of quality enhancement efforts across ECE settings, initial levels of quality and readiness

• Measuring readiness
  – Describe center and individual readiness
  – Examine whether the effectiveness of ECE interventions varies based on the readiness or capacity level of a program
## Readiness Measures in VIQI Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center/ Organizational Readiness</td>
<td>• Assessment of a Preschool's Readiness for Change (Wanless, 2014)</td>
<td>• Teacher, Administrator surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stage of Change Scale for Early Education and Care 2.0 (SOC; Children’s Institute, Inc., 2009)</td>
<td>• Administrator survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Center capacity, sufficiency of resources</td>
<td>• Teacher, Administrator surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sources of funding</td>
<td>• Administrator survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional support opportunities</td>
<td>• Teacher, Administrator surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational climate</td>
<td>• Teacher, Administrator surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(National Center for Education Statistics 2011-2012; Chicago Consortium for School Research Teacher Survey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Readiness</td>
<td>• Stage of Change Scale for Early Education and Care 2.0 (SOC; Children’s Institute, Inc., 2009)</td>
<td>• Coach Log, Administrator survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, 1997)</td>
<td>• Teacher, Administrator surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-efficacy</td>
<td>• Teacher survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beliefs about early care and education; teaching priorities</td>
<td>• Teacher, Administrator, Coach surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Culture of Continuous Learning Project:
A Breakthrough Series Collaborative for Improving Child Care and Head Start Quality
Tamara Halle, Child Trends
Overview of the CCL Project

Assess the feasibility of implementing a CQI model – a Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) – to support social and emotional learning (SEL) in Head Start and child care settings

- Implement a BSC in 4 Head Start and 4 child care settings in Boston, MA
- Conduct a Feasibility Study
- Design an evaluation plan to examine the effectiveness of a BSC in supporting and sustaining teacher practices, an organizational culture of quality improvement, and children’s development

Measuring readiness:

- Selection into a BSC is, in part, dependent on organizational readiness for a center-wide approach to quality improvement
- Individual readiness on the part of teachers and directors contributes to the success of a BSC within a particular Head Start or child care setting
Readiness Measures in the CCL Project

Organizational Readiness
- Site Selection Questionnaire
- Early Childhood Work Environment Survey (Bloom, 2015)
- Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey (Bloom, 2010)
- Psychological Safety Survey (Edmondson, 1999)
- Interview with Directors (e.g., motivation for participation, center capacity, etc.)
- Discussions with Implementation Team and Faculty (e.g., perceived readiness of teams for a BSC)

Individual Readiness
- Experiences with and Attitudes about Professional Development
- Beliefs about Social and Emotional Learning (adapted from Brackett et al., 2012)
- Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (adapted from Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001 and VandeWiele, 2001)
- Director Efficacy Scale (excerpted from the Director’s Role Perception Survey, Bloom, 2017)
- Maslach Burnout Inventory – Emotional Exhaustion Subscale (Maslach, 1997)
- Perceived Problems Questionnaire: Preschool Teacher Problems Checklist; SEL items only (n=10)
The Study of Coaching Practices in Early Care and Education Settings (SCOPE)

Emily Moiduddin
Mathematica Policy Research
About the Study of Coaching Practices in Early Care and Education Settings (SCOPE): Research Questions and Strategies

• What features are hypothesized to be core to the practice of coaching in order to impact teachers’/providers’ knowledge and practice?
  – Strategy: literature synthesis and conceptual model development

• How do prevalence, implementation, combining, and tailoring of core features vary across early care and education classrooms?
  – Strategy: web surveys of center directors (60), coaches (90), teachers (120), and family child care providers (40) in late 2018

• How do programs select features, and what program or systems-level contextual factors (for example, infrastructure, resources, organizational climate) drive implementation?
  – Strategy: case studies with in-depth interviews and observations of coach-teacher/family child care provider interactions in 2019
Measuring Readiness in SCOPE

• Coach and center director surveys
  – Individual
    • Potential barriers to coaching such as teacher/provider resistance or discomfort, communication problems, teacher/provider emotional needs (items adapted from prior studies of coaching)
  – Organizational
    • Potential barriers to coaching such as lack of space or time for coaching (items adapted from prior studies of coaching)

• Teacher/family child care provider survey
  – Individual
    • Self-efficacy (items adapted from ECLS-K:2011 Spring Classroom Teacher Questionnaire)
    • Psychological Safety (adapted subscale of Psychological Distress Measure, Edmondson 1999)
    • Perceptions of coach and relationship (items adapted from prior studies of coaching)
  – Organizational
    • Climate (Early Childhood Work Environment Survey - Short Version, Jorde Bloom 2016)

• Case study interviews provide opportunity to explore readiness construct
We Grow Together: Q-CCIIT Professional Development System
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Sally Atkins-Burnett
Measuring potential barriers and facilitators
Measuring potential barriers and facilitators

- Beliefs about infant-toddler development and caregiving – Baby FACES survey, KIDI (MacPhee 2002)
- Beliefs about professional development – Baby FACES survey, Teacher Attitudes about Professional Development (Torff et al. 2005)
- Sense of self-efficacy – Teacher Opinion Survey (Geller & Lynch, 1999)
Discussion

For individuals:
What dispositions/attitudes do we hypothesize are most related to being “ready” to change? How do we effectively measure a change in a provider’s dispositions and attitudes?

For groups and organizations:
Does readiness to change look different in different types of ECE settings (e.g., Head Start, pre-K, child care centers, home-based care) or with different types of ECE staff (e.g., infant/toddler teachers, preschool teachers, lead vs. assistant teachers)?

What is the role of QI personnel (e.g., coaches) in working with multiple individuals to achieve organizational change? Are there any good measures of group readiness that exist (e.g., readiness of a collaborative or readiness of a PLC), or is this best captured descriptively?
Discussion

For systems: From a state, district, or program level, what additional evidence about readiness to change do we need to guide QI initiatives? What aspects of readiness at a systems-level do we hypothesize may be most relevant?
Discussion

1. Are there data sets available for secondary analysis to examine associations between provider, programs/organizations, and/or system characteristics and readiness for change at each of these three levels? Do we have any data sources that allow analyses of readiness to change across levels?

2. What research is out there on the “match” between “readiness” of the QI personnel/organization to deliver the support that an individual/organization needs, based on their level of readiness?

3. How are characteristics of individuals as well as of professional learning communities (PLCs) related to the construct of “readiness to change?”

4. How can we engage underrepresented populations in the design of measures of readiness to change?
Thank you!

SLIDES ARE AVAILABLE ON THE CCEEPRC WEBSITE
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