Defining and Measuring Early Care and Education Program Leadership
October 12-13, 2017

Disclaimer. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

MEETING OVERVIEW

On October 12-13, 2017, the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE) in the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) of the US Department of Health and Human Services convened a meeting, ***Defining and Measuring Early Care and Education Program Leadership,*** in Washington, D.C. This meeting brought together experts from various sectors (academia, research firms, government, and technical assistance) to discuss the role of leadership and organizational functioning in supporting quality early care and education (ECE) services. We sought to advance the state of research on ECE leadership by building a dialogue with the K-12 education field and learning from K-12 research in this area. The experts presented their work, which prompted discussion that raised a range of important questions, such as:

- What are the key components of effective leadership in ECE settings?
- What factors, processes, or characteristics predict effective leadership in ECE?
- How does leadership relate to desired short- and long-term outcomes for ECE programs and the populations they serve?
- What do we know about how to improve leadership effectiveness?
- What lessons can be drawn from research in the K-12 education field to inform these questions?
- How can we advance research and improve measurement of leadership in ECE research?

This document includes a brief overview of the key ideas that emerged during the one-and-one-half day discussion, followed by the attendee list, the agenda, and detailed meeting notes.

Defining ECE Leadership

- Individual leaders and leadership activities in ECE are not linked to one specific job title.
- The leadership activities in ECE are often not centralized within one building or one umbrella organization.
- There is a tension between applying definitions and operationally defining them, without reducing leadership to “a pile of binders.”
- What are the features, qualities, and constructs that make up high quality leadership in ECE?
- What are the best ways to categorize and define the many facets of leadership?
    - Pedagogical versus administrative/organizational
    - Process versus structural
    - Adaptive versus technical
    - An individual versus organizational structures

    - Behavior versus practices
    - Management versus leadership
- How diffuse is leadership in ECE?
    - Who is the team of people making key decisions and how much does that vary from one program to another within and between settings?
    - Is there too much distribution of leadership in ECE to get an accurate assessment of leadership by focusing on one individual?
    - How much distributive leadership is there in ECE?
      Can we accurately assess ECE leadership by focusing on individual leaders (e.g., Program Directors)?
    - Does diffuse leadership lead to greater stability (and other positive outcomes) within an organization over time compared to singular leadership?
    - What outcomes are impacted when quality varies among diffuse leaders?
- How do intention (leader report of goals, etc.) and action/implementation (teacher report of experiences under leadership) differ?
    - Does one link with outcomes more strongly than the other?
    - Does measuring aspects of both lead to the greatest associations with outcomes?
- What combination of leadership features, characteristics, and processes are needed in ECE to produce desired outcomes?

Contexts around ECE Leadership

- When examining ECE leadership, context is important because different leadership skills may be more or less effective, valued, or needed depending on factors, such as:
    - QRIS involvement, where emphasis is on classroom quality and directors meeting a standard
    - Resources and funding
    - Size of the organization (capacity)
    - Community needs
    - The motivations and goals of ECE leaders and staff:
        - Children's development and school readiness
        - Providing high quality learning environments
        - Business and profit
        - Having fun with kids
        - Providing a child care service

Outcomes of ECE Leadership

- The expected outcomes of ECE leadership have not been clearly defined. Therefore, many questions were posed by the group:
    - What are the proximal and distal outcomes impacted by leadership?
        - What is the length of time needed for a new leader or new initiatives to begin impacting proximal and distal outcomes?

    - What are the mediators connecting leadership constructs and outcomes?
    - Do these elements vary by ECE setting?
        - Head Start
        - CCDF
        - Partnerships
        - Family-based child care

Measuring ECE Leadership

- An overarching goal for the ECE field may be to ultimately align leadership standards, measurement, training, hiring practices and job descriptions, and job evaluations.
- The group agreed there is need for additional measurement work that is specific to ECE.
- What are the most important aspects of leadership to measure?
- Can we have common measures to use across settings?
- Who are the most reliable and valid respondents by construct and which constructs need to be observed? Which constructs are best reported by individuals in leadership roles? By staff? By parents?
- Should we measure aspects of the individual or aspects of the organization?
- What can we adapt or create measures from defined constructs and existing standards in the K-12 setting?
    - Collaborative
    - Vision/goals
        - Aligning budget and activities with goals
        - Communicating goals
        - Gaining buy-in for goals
    - Managing up
    - Working with board members and other governing bodies
    - Working with data
    - Balancing external accountability with internal continuous quality improvement
    - Collaboration with community and other community organizations
    - Balancing various motivations (profit, service, child development)
    - Professionally developing teachers
    - Promoting equity and cultural responsiveness
    - Curriculum and assessment
- Gaps in existing measurement were identified during the discussion:
    - The extent to which leadership is distributed
    - How leadership is distributed
    - Ability of leaders to align resources with vision
    - Ability of leaders to manage up
    - How and if leaders adapt to program and community needs
    - Inspiring others

MEETING PRESENTERS

Maia Connors
Ounce of Prevention Fund

Teresa Derrick-Mills
Urban Institute

Stacy Ehrlich
University of Chicago Consortium on School Research

Becki Herman
RAND Corporation

David Jones
Office of Head Start
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Gretchen Kirby
Mathematica Policy Research

Kelly Maxwell
Child Trends

Teri Talan
McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership
National Louis University

Kathryn Tout
Child Trends

Jacquelyn (Jackie) Wilson
Delaware Academy for School Leadership,
University of Delaware

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Jacqueline Davis
National Center on Program Management and Fiscal Operations

Anne Douglass
Institute for Early Education Leadership and Innovation
University of Massachusetts Boston

Janet Weiss
University of Michigan

John Williams
National Center on Program Management and Fiscal Operations

Federal Staff

Alysia Blandon
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Sarah Blankenship
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Amanda Bryans
Office of Head Start
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Kimberly Burgess
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Erin Cannon
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Tracy Carter Clopet
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Wendy DeCourcey
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Caroline Ebanks
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education

Christine Fortunato
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Laura Hoard
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Lindsey Hutchinson
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning & Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Amy Madigan
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Sarah Merrill
Office of Head Start
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Mary Mueggenborg
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Nina Philipsen Hetzner
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Colleen Rathgeb
Office of Head Start
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Katina Stapleton
Institute of Education Sciences
U.S. Department of Education

Mary Bruce Webb
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, October 12, 2017	
8:30-9:00 AM	**Arrival & Registration**
9:00-9:45 AM	**Introductions, Welcome, & Overview**
9:45-11:30 AM	**Early Care & Education Frameworks & Empirical Evidence about Leaders & Program Functioning** **Purpose:** This session will set the stage with information about how the field of early care and education (ECE) conceptualizes leadership and program functioning. We will explore current theories and frameworks and discuss how leadership and program functioning have been defined and hypothesized to relate to the quality of services and child/family outcomes. We will also discuss how the frameworks were developed, how they are supported by research, and how they have used to guide and deploy technical assistance (TA) for Head Start and child care programs. **Remarks:** David Jones, Office of Early Childhood Development, ACF Teresa Derrick-Mills, Urban Institute Kathryn Tout, Child Trends Maia Connors, Ounce of Prevention
11:30 AM- 12:30 PM	**Lunch (one your own)**
12:30-1:30 PM	**Discussion & Questions** **Topics:** What have we learned from providing TA to ECE programs around program leadership and functioning? What have we learned from research? Which aspects of program leadership/functioning are most important, how are they connected, and how do they work to improve program quality and/or child outcomes? Where are our knowledge gaps?

Thursday, October 12, 2017 (continued)	
1:30-3:00 PM	**Frameworks, Empirical Evidence, & Practical Lessons from K-12 Settings** **Purpose:** Presenters will discuss practical and empirical work about the role of program leadership and functioning in supporting quality and student achievement in K-12 education. We will examine K-12 research on the associations between leadership quality and student and teacher outcomes and how information from K-12 may be adapted for both practical and empirical use in ECE contexts. **Remarks:** Rebecca Herman, RAND Jacquelyn Wilson, University of Delaware
3:00-3:15 PM	**Break**
3:15-4:15 PM	**Discussion & Questions** **Topics:** What have we learned from working in and studying K-12 settings? What can be applied to ECE? What are key K-12 leadership constructs and how do they align with constructs in ECE? What are the important associated outcomes to examine?
4:15-4:30 PM	**Summary & Next Steps**

Friday, October 13, 2017	
8:30-9:00 AM	**Arrival & Registration**
9:00-9:15 AM	**Welcome Back & Recap**
9:15-10:45 AM	**Measuring Early Care & Education Program Leadership** **Purpose:** Presenters will discuss existing and emerging tools to measure ECE leadership and other constructs at the program level. Tools will be discussed in the context of their purpose, potential uses (e.g., research, monitoring, and/or TA), and how well they tap key constructs of interest. **Remarks:** Kelly Maxwell, Child Trends Teri Talan, McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership Gretchen Kirby, Mathematica Policy Research Stacy Ehrlich, University of Chicago
10:45-11:00 AM	**Break**
11:00 AM- 12:00 PM	**Discussion & Questions** **Topics:** Which key constructs can be measured with existing tools? Where are the gaps? What measures have been and can be adapted from K-12 education? Which measures are most appropriate for use in surveys and/or evaluation studies? Which measures might be useful for TA purposes? Which measures might be useful for monitoring and/or performance measurement?
12:00-12:30 PM	**Summary & Closing Remarks**

MEETING NOTES

Welcome

Nina Philipsen Hetzner welcomed the group. Introductions were made and Nina set the stage for the day's discussion.

The purpose of this meeting was to create a dialog around building a framework for early care and education (ECE) leadership, by outlining key constructs of leadership and defining and hypothesizing links that may impact outcomes for children and families in child care and Head Start programs.

Session #1: Early Care & Education Frameworks & Empirical Evidence about Leaders & Program Functioning

This session set the stage with information about how the field of early care and education (ECE) conceptualizes leadership and program functioning. The group explored current theories and frameworks, discussed how leadership and program functioning were defined, and hypothesized how they relate to quality of services and child/family outcomes. The session also included a discussion of how the frameworks were developed, how they are supported by research, and how they have been used to guide and deploy technical assistance (TA) for Head Start and child care programs.

Remarks:

David Jones, Office of Early Childhood Development, ACF
Teresa Derrick-Mills, Urban Institute
Kathryn Tout, Child Trends
Maia Connors, Ounce of Prevention

Summary:

David Jones began by presenting the essential components of the Head Start Management System Wheel. It is a core resource used by the National Center for Program Management and Fiscal Operations, the Regional TTA network, and Head Start grantees to drive service delivery. The goal was to align the Wheel with the Head Start Program Performance Standards.

David Jones emphasized that leadership is key; everything starts with leadership. The wheel places emphasis on aligning management and organizational strategic initiatives and is used as an organizational tool to pave the way to solid service delivery. Leadership is not only the "director;" middle managers also play key roles, especially in multisite programs. A governing body, tribal council, policy council, and program leadership are all considered to be part of management of Head Start programs. The Management Wheel allows for flexibility—allowing grantees to tailor services to meet their unique needs. It also helps grantees see the interconnectedness and think about management systems and key functions for effective oversight, resulting in quality child and family outcomes.

David Jones discussed the components of the Management Wheel:

- Program planning addresses the efficient and effectiveness of services delivery to meet needs of children and families. Areas of consideration include talking to everyone in the program who can give insight, including families, and how the data-informed decision-making and coordinated approaches are used to drive service delivery.
- Ongoing monitoring evaluates progress toward goals and ensures adherence with program requirements. The annual self-assessment looks to see if program staff are properly engaged and thinking strategically to manage programs with a business mindset. Topics include effective communication with internal and external stakeholders, supporting staff, and how to prevent working in silos with a fully integrated approach. Middle managers and service area managers play key roles in identifying ways to strengthen continuous quality improvement and target unmet programmatic goals. UCLA offers a 2-week leadership development initiative for new Head Start Directors.
- Human Resources ensure all staff receives training, orientation and professional development to support them in their jobs. Policies and procedures are the foundation and is a shared responsibility. Leaders must be trained and have an understanding of record keeping and reporting to inform decision making and help maintain institutional knowledge. Leaders analyze data to understand overall program operations.
- The annual update and annual community needs self-assessment are linked, but separate, annual activities to identify community standards and to answer the question, "How did we do with the goals we set?" Review of the community needs assessment is supported by solid data to ensure the neediest families are being served.

During the group discussion following David Jones's presentation, John Williams stated the Office of Head Start and National Center were rethinking the management system approach and revised the 2016 standards. The tone supports exploration through guiding questions to inspire grantees to identify what works for their community. It is designed to be a functional tool for grantees and allows flexibility to explore ideas of leadership and innovation, cultivate culture, and identify new solutions. Amy Madigan said the goal of the system is to make sure high quality services are consistently offered.

Teri Talan pointed out that leadership is on the outside and management on the inside. She asked if participants had given any thought to why. Jackie Wilson stated the Head Start governance structure is not just the board; it also includes the policy council. Governance is an integral part of the success of Head Start. Leadership and governance is thought about in the confines of structure while management is thought about in terms of overseeing program operations. UCLA scaffolds leadership with decision - making—it is evolving and strategic.

Next, Teresa Derrick-Mills presented information from two completed studies: The 2012 OPRE-funded Head Start Leadership and Excellence Data Systems (LEADS) study and the Head Start School Readiness Study. In LEADS, the research team created a framework for identifying the components to continuous quality improvement (CQI). A literature review scan of 100 sources across disciplines—public management, education, healthcare management, and organizational learning was conducted. The

advisory panel paired down the list and 50 sources were examined for frameworks that facilitated or impeded leadership. In the second phase, eight Head Start programs that were high data users were visited to talk about what they saw as facilitators and barriers. Teachers, governing body members, and parents were interviewed.

The Head Start School Readiness Goals study looked at how Head Start programs handle goal setting, use data, and participate in continuous feedback loops. A framework was not created; instead, data were used to examine if a framework could be applied. Seventy three grantees were surveyed, followed by visits to 11 high-use sites where various staff were interviewed about how they used data for CQI purposes.

The interdisciplinary literature review showed eight elements were important; however, none was more important than the other. Leadership is the foundation that holds everything. Literature focused on the peer-to peer-model and noted that only one champion is needed. The four foundational principles of a leader are: 1) being a role model; 2) embracing data; 3) data-informed decision making; and 4) leading by example. The staff reported leaders were implementing the principles.

Teresa Derrick-Mills explained that when leaders implement distributive leadership they lead by example and spread leadership functions to others. That way, no one person has to have all the desired leadership qualities and others feel like they are involved in a part of the process. Teachers reported they knew how to use data, and 59% of education coordinators reported they were involved in data use. Leaders expect others to appreciate and use data as part of their work. The hope is they bring ideas grounded in data to show where they came from and continue to think about how to improve the organization.

When external literature about governing bodies was reviewed, the researchers did not find information about the policy council because it does not exist in other areas. It is important to get the Board involved with data so they understand it, value it, and want to see it. In the hospital-based literature, boards indicated what data they needed to see. In the Head Start literature, data usage by Boards was mixed. Head Start staff reported that they used and shared data with the Board, which was also reported by board members. However, the Board did not see their role in using data.

The focus needs to be on ways leaders can support infusing data-driven decision making in the organization. Leaders have to prioritize time to discuss data and let people see data being used. Using data for CQI takes time; you have to figure out how to work with the data.

Data are important to individualizing instruction. Teachers have a responsibility to complete assessments and use that data to individualize instruction. Allocating time for staff is one of the biggest challenges. Teachers have to collect data, enter it into the computer and then reflect on the data. How do we help them learn from the data? This is ineffective; the goal is for the site leader to figure out scheduling so teachers have time. Some sites have been successful in identifying time. Some sites only have half day class on Fridays and teachers are able to use the afternoon as planning time and to use data. Some teachers are doing it at nights and on weekends on their own time. Leaders have to figure out how to make it work.

There must be a time for programs to discuss data and understand what the data say. Programs may struggle with how to have conversations. Programs must create a safe space for discussion without blaming or punishment. Figuring out when to have these discussions is also a challenge. Some programs use staff meetings by incorporating data analysis as part of the meeting agenda. Should there be special data meetings? Higher functioning organizations use data to create multiple CQI loops across silos. Everyone brings something to table.

Technology is a big part of collecting and using data. Technology systems could help but it is happening in piece meal; bringing everything together is a challenge. Resources must be allocated for technology and choosing the right system for the organizational needs is important—some track child progress while others manage Human Resources or attendance. It is important to recognize all staff may not be computer savvy and comfortable with the system, which means staff must be trained to use it. Investing in technology is a challenge. There is not a perfect solution. Programs use work-arounds, which are inefficient. Some programs have created positions—such as a data manager or data coordinator. They grappled with training staff and the analytic capacity of staff. The question was "Do you need data experts or program staff?" Programs started off with data experts, but now only have program staff. There appeared to be a gap in staff capacity in both collecting the data and what to do with it. Sometimes program people were trained in data. Professional Development for the staff should come from developers of systems.

During the discussion following Teresa Derrick-Mills' presentation, Wendy DeCourcey asked if the sites in the two studies looked at resource level. Did they have non-federal funds to support? Answer provided was no.

Amanda Bryans stated size matters. Very large grantees have more resources because of the economy of scale. Leadership is more distant from operations. In the studies, this was not examined; however, they tried to get a range of programs, including ranges in size.

John Williams stated we may need training for board members. Health care board members are thought to be "higher powered," which is part of the reason they could set the tone. Head Start is challenged because boards are diverse on purpose. Programs are obligated to share information; boards have fiduciary responsibility. The question lies in how to make data accessible and for boards to understand that it is their responsibility to use data. Boards may think they are there to present perspective rather than focus on data. More successful organizations have figured out how to present data to the board.

Jackie Wilson said in her experience as a hospital board member, the hospital director sought a diverse group to serve the community. The Hospital Chief saw different skill levels and educated the board on data. This is a perfect example of the job of a leader.

The third presenter, Kathryn Tout, presented from a broader ECE child care perspective. Evaluating leadership in ECE has only recently been implemented. Leadership has not been the focus of preparation programs. Leadership has focused on supporting and improving classroom quality. Now there is a limited focus on leadership constructs. Other complimentary constructs: work environment,

administrative practices, compensation, and benefits. We must think about what we can learn from other fields.

Leadership practices are not receiving enough attention. There is emerging research, but the systems focus is on aspects of classroom quality versus leadership practice—Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) came out of this focus. QRIS takes the pulse on where we are in the ECE system (child care and Pre-K). QRIS has fewer constructs than Head Start program standards. In QRIS, a number of states have state specific credentials for directors that help programs reach a higher level.

What are the other constructs in the field? There are many resources to help us define and measure the most important pieces. The 2010 QRIS study was a compendium of 26 QRIS systems where administration and management were components, but leadership was not included. All systems tended to include education, training qualifications, common indicators of business practices, record keeping, and staff evaluation. These are all on the surface level. Only one state included the Program Administration Scale (PAS) using self-assessment and developing a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP).

In 2016, many more states had QRIS—41. There were major changes. All have program management, leadership and administration included. Half include CQI and 10 include PAS or Business Administration Scale (BAS) in their ratings. Others use those components in their technical assistance (TA). Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) focuses on Environment Rating Scales, CLASS™, and classroom quality.

Several questions were posed about organization capacity. What is leadership? What is organization capacity? What is the role of organizational capacity in quality improvement? The point was made that we need more research to understand how relationships are working. Leadership academies recognize leaders while teacher communities of practice and Directors Circles promote peer learning and extend TA. Most efforts focus on teacher quality and/or classroom quality issues. When directors are involved, the focus is on how to meet the QRIS standards. Is this the right focus for leadership—preparing for the QRIS assessment? A question to consider is how directors and other staff can be engaged with a combined focus. We need a model of leadership that is more inclusive and looks across levels incorporating different constructs. Anne Douglas' book on relational leadership asks how to construct a leadership ecosystem.

There are challenges in measuring leadership and management in the QRIS context. We need to determine which are instrumental in the context of leadership skills. Because these qualities are not role specific, we have to look at how to capture them, decide if they are pieces of leadership or outcomes of leadership, and determine how they are related. In addition, think about the level of analysis—at the individual or program level. We must think about components in a granular way. Questions we need to answer include: what new research do we need, is there a systematic approach, and how do we think about balance with limited resources and do it all.

During the discussion following Kathryn Tout's presentation, Amanda Bryans stated leadership is complex and we must be mindful that we don't want to reduce leadership to folders or binders on a table. We should think about leadership in terms of inspiring, creating, critiquing, digesting, and reflecting. She stated we need a vocabulary and everyone struggles with leadership. Kathryn stated

there is no leadership pathway or professional development when someone is promoted because they were a good teacher. Amanda added that the leadership academy at UCLA for Head Start model came out of needs in the nursing field. That model was then tweaked for Head Start, as a pathway for leadership. Teri Talan said we should keep on the back burner the work going on with Power to the Profession. She asked how critical are those pieces and how can this work inform the interactive process of enhancing early education professional development and leaders.

Jacquelyn Wilson stated succession planning is used to build organizational capacity. Kim Burgess asked how long leaders typically stay with organizations. She said it is an interesting question that she will research.

As the last presenter for this session, Maia Connors presented on the influence of State and system level policies on ECE leadership. What we know is that high-quality ECE supports learning and development. Effective methods support quality. Some methods can decrease access by closing programs. How we can support bottom up innovation and improvement? We know best practices to improve quality—structure, resources, and time. However, it does not provide infrastructure for processes. Policies support directors, leaders, and teachers towards quality improvement and this is supported by empirical evidence in K-12 education and the nursing field.

Most policies focus on the process components (e.g., CLASS™). They have helped make progress in the field but are not getting us where we want to go. Improvement is hard; it is easy to forget that classroom quality is an outcome from teacher's learning. Intervention strategies are professional development intensive. Some effective interventions focus on teacher preparation, training, TA, and coaching. They are effective models but resource intensive. Taking these interventions to scale leader by leader can't be the only strategy because they are not sustainable. It is part of the solution to the problem—but only half the picture. We have to think about professional environments for teachers with structural elements including resources, time, and space.

Professional culture of collaboration (i.e., warm supporting, trusting relationships) is the norm and expectation of programs. CQI is thinking about practices and testing out ideas. Everyone is working to get better through improved practice that is policy. There is some evidence that structural quality plays a supportive role. Teachers are people most directly responsible for classroom quality. The program leader is directly responsible for program quality—the question lies in how to allocate resources, create policies and set up programs. It could be in single program, across a network, or at the grantee level.

Discussion & Questions Following the Early Care & Education Frameworks & Empirical Evidence about Leaders & Program Functioning Session

Tension lies between pedagogic leadership and structural or organizational leadership. Teri Talan does not like labels because they are too binary. It is not either/or because they are integrated. Organization or administrative leadership and pedagogy leadership are different skills but they overlap and are interdependent. They don't need more silos; rather, they need to understand how to connect. If the

goal is to have teachers involved in exploring data, someone has to create a safe environment through organizational structures.

Jackie Wilson said the leader in the school or center is the person with vision to make decisions so that structural pieces operate and work. A question lies in how to distribute leadership to grow teachers to help do that work. She said she is a proponent of distributing leadership to build leaders and capacity.

Jacqueline Davis pointed out leaders learn as they are developing programs but the premise is so much larger. They need a big picture perspective and at the end of the day their skills are at a higher level of thinking. It's not separate; ECE leadership must think broadly.

Nina Philipsen Hetzner asked if there are separate things that we could define and measure or are they so connected that you can't tease them out.

Jackie Wilson asked what the priorities are based on data. Is the emphasis on priorities, or superintendent focused? There are things some people are better at than others; some lack skills and those are professional growth experiences.

Leadership skills are continuous and apply across the continuum. Jacqueline operated as a coach for DC Public Schools (DCPS) preschool programs. The goal was to work with school leaders who didn't have ECE backgrounds. The leaders would go into Pre-K classrooms and not understand how to adapt the space to make it developmentally appropriate. Basic ECE knowledge is important, but if they have leadership skills they are able to support teachers to transform classrooms into ECE environments.

Stacy Ehrlich stated ECE struggles more than K-12 with having leaders who are structural leaders. It is a shift in language and we have to make sure we support leaders to be structural leaders. We are starting to emphasize something that was overlooked. We want to improve experiences for children. The people in charge, the decision makers, understand pedagogy and process leadership. Maia Connors said leaders have knowledge, skills, and vision but are not able to put it into practice because of structural requirements. Jackie said leaders have different skill sets when they are promoted from a teaching position to being the assistant director. How do we hold people accountable?

Janet Weiss pointed out that we have not defined leadership. There are lots of ways to think about what we admire in successful leaders. In the research on leadership, the business literature focuses on behavior. It does not necessarily talk about successful organizations, but practices of individuals who may be occupying varied roles. It is behaviors that people engage in and which promote high-quality leadership practice. People can engage in these behaviors and not succeed because of obstacles. Some obstacles could potentially be the leaders fault; others are bigger and no one in that role would be able to overcome them. We should focus on leadership behavior and think of contextual factors that employ leaders to be successful or suppress emergence of leadership. We should get away from the tendency to think about the "great man theory"—that some people are so awesome that they can do anything.

Jackie Wilson said there is a set of standards for school leaders in K-12; the research is clear. These are things effective leaders do. You can teach people how to lead—for example, teaching them about good communication skills and better ways to grow teaching staff. It is important to have great preparation and high quality professional development. Becki Herman said there are qualities that enable leaders to succeed. Context matters if leaders are going to shine.

Teresa Derrick-Mills pointed out that we must think about motivation of the people in these positions. Not every program is opened with the aspiration of operating the highest quality program. Some people become the leader after being a teacher, some are owner-leaders, and some open businesses because they want to help kids and serve a community need. Some are in it as a business where the goal is to ensure kids are safe but are not interested in helping kids reach their highest potential. Kelly Maxwell commented that it is an interesting discussion because K-12 principals would not say that is the difference in the two audiences. Becki Herman followed up that principals used to be managers but are now more of an instructional leader. The model has been in transition.

Teri Talan mentioned site-based leaders and suggested we should think about how much of what we are talking about is at the site-based level. Colleen Rathgeb said they made that mistake in Head Start, not thinking about site based leaders so she agrees that it is important. Teri followed up that there is no description for a site based director and no clear idea of the qualifications. It is important for us to understand that role of policy. Colleen asked if we would want to put in regulations. Amanda Bryans commented on the variety of sizes of programs. Some sites have one classroom and the teacher is filling the director role as well, while some sites might have a center director functioning like a principal and an education coordinator. It is an organic nature and emphasis on meeting individual needs.

Kelly Maxwell said centers' assumptions are things we could test. She said it seems like we are saying to look at leaders as individuals. We could look at the site and individual level. She asked if there is a range of skills and behaviors we should expect someone to have. Are there skills we think are foundational and everyone needs or a good leader would need a mixture of at least 3 or 4 – or some threshold? She said we can't look at leaders without looking at organizations. All things have to be taken into consideration in the organization when designing research questions.

Nina Philipsen Hetzner mentioned the Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) and asked how we will know who the right person is to ask questions. Is it at the director and grantee site level? It really needs to be someone who will know the answers. We want to avoid asking the same questions to multiple people—we want to ask the most appropriate person and that needs to be thought-out ahead of time. We want to aggregate data rather than see if it matches. Colleen stated we must be careful to not say that there is one right model.

Teri Talan said there is a difference between leader's behaviors and leadership. Leadership is a framework. There are behaviors all organizations need but they do not have to all be in one person. One person is not likely to hold all the competencies. Jackie said if it is one person it is not sustainable. If someone leaves the program the program's leadership is gone. A leader's job is to grow those they work with—to distribute leadership in the agency to build leadership capacity. David Jones asked why it can't

be both. Amanda said it is about growing capacity and preventing a bottle neck—getting results because people with the best information are participating. She said she likes making the distinction between leader and leadership.

Becki Herman said there is a process and structure that allows you to work as a team. Someone has to look across activities and bring it together. Janet mentioned leadership scheme. Leadership is what we do and is not hierarchical. Many people have leadership contributions to make—people see need and will step up.

Jacqueline asked what are the characteristics or things that help the "main leadership role" person see what it takes. What does that look like? That's part of what this conversation looks like.

Nina Philipsen Hetzner said it's the capacity or ability to create culture in an organization so people are empowered to play leadership roles, embrace responsibilities, share a collaborative philosophy to leadership, and see behavior and dispositions. Stacy Ehrlich commented that it is behaviors and experiences and asked if there are things we can identify and support before they are in the leader role.

Jackie added that lots of people know instruction, know how to work with teachers, and perceive the mission as the vision, meaning they are not sure where to go. She said she sees this as the missing piece with leaders. Leaders with the most success get results because they know where it is they want to go and can communicate that clearly to others. Resources follow the vision. Leaders have to look at the data and have a vision for using the data.

David Jones said there is a skill set in the job. Different skills are needed and you have to know how to leverage and utilize boards and other leaders. If you do not have skills, surround yourself with people that do. Everyone does not have to be visionaries. Amanda pointed out quiet and effective leaders learn from communication and build vision.

John asked what the role of the environment is to shape a leader. Janet said it is a two-way street—leaders have to interpret data and allow staff as much room as possible to make contributions.

Wendy DeCourcey asked how we prep someone to be a director. We can't put all of these things in the job description. Jackie stated standards should drive recruitment and hiring. Why would you hire someone that will not meet standards? You should never expect someone to meet all of the standards but a preponderance, and then from there we grow the others.

Stacy Ehrlich asked to qualify "having vision." It depends on the type of vision. How do different schools improve attendance? There are major differences in how leaders think about it—improvement versus compliance. What is the "vision" of the leader—is it to check box, is it to motivate children to come to school? How do we get to motivation? Becki Herman wanted to know how to get the entire school on board with a leader's vision. Stacy said it is a lot easier to remove barriers—to which Becki said it is the ability to go outside regulations. Janet asked if it was to teach versus adapt. To teach would be to check

the boxes whereas to adapt is to determine changes that need to happen to meet the demands coming at us. Teri Talan said it needs to be both.

Jackie suggested a network—Community of Practice (CoP), professional learning communities (PLC), or collegial time—might lead to more and better relationships with school systems. ECE should leverage the ability to work with K-12 partners. K-12 needs the child care partnership because they receive the children from child care. She said she never understood why superintendents would not engage more with the child care community. David Jones mentioned that in a New York Early Head Start, they had a director cluster that would get together for peer mentoring. They worked with an onsite child care at the school and the principal understood the premise, had buy-in and it operated smoothly. There was a change in leadership and the program ended. Jackie said that it is the importance of the systems approach—so it is not contingent with that one particular principal. Jacqueline said that the issue with PLCs is having time. They have to "steal" the time from somewhere to come together. Jackie stated that they can be creative—use online learning and virtual meetings to get rid of the excuse of lack of time.

Jacqueline mentioned research was done on characteristics of admired leaders. The characteristics were forward looking, honest, inspired, and competent.

Session 1 Summary

Nina Philipsen Hetzner provided the following summary. The main characteristics of leadership include: vision, goals, collaboration, the ability to align the budget to priorities, understand context, to manage-up, work with boards, understand how to establish data systems and interpret data, balance accountability with improvement, and motivate. All these characteristics do not have to be in one person. This needs to be thought of at the organization level. Training, standards, and measurement should ideally be aligned across characteristics.

Session #2 Frameworks, Empirical Evidence and Practical Lessons from K-12 Settings

Presenters discussed practical and empirical work on the role of program leadership and functioning in supporting quality and student achievement in K-12 education. They examined K-12 research on the associations between leadership quality and student and teacher outcomes and how information from K-12 could be adapted for both practical and empirical use in ECE contexts.

Remarks:
Rebecca (Becki) Herman, RAND
Jacquelyn (Jackie) Wilson, University of Delaware
Janet Weiss-moderator, University of Michigan

Becki Herman was the first presenter of the session. The K-12 context most recently has been thinking about if and how they impact child outcomes. It has been determined that school leaders have positive impacts; principals are second only to teachers in determining student achievement. No successful turnaround happens without strong leadership. Greater emphasis is placed on selecting and supporting school leaders and more funds are going into resources for leadership. Principal's impact is indirect—

such as improving hiring and teacher development and impacting of climate/culture at the staff and student level. Principals look at the paths between action and student outcomes. What is the best path? Principals have to take the pulse on student outcomes, understand where gaps are and tailor support. It takes time to affect climate, teacher and student outcomes; it can take years to make decisions. Sometimes principals move on without knowing the impact they had on student outcomes. The question that was posed is how to get better principals in place? The path to improvement is important. You have to recognize how to get support and resources and think about the whole path and context. All steps are evidence-based. There are more traditional roles and the new 21st century roles—turnaround leadership highlights skills and competency such as inspired leadership, school level factors leadership, and climate conditions. The key question is which pieces transition well into ECE setting? The ECE field has a greater focus on non-academic outcomes.

Traditional leadership looks at classroom level staff practices: measures attendance and behaviors, develops professional learning for staff, sets vision, direction, and goals; and fosters school wide engagement. In addition, managing the instructional program involves evaluating teachers and curriculum; managing school operations, budgets, and resources; and ensuring a safe environment.

Twenty-first century principals however, focus on: challenging the status quo; using data, theory and evidence; interacting with external stakeholders; advocating; adapting to school needs; identifying when to change leadership style to fit the needs; and inspiring staff. It is a disservice to leaders to put them in a box—adaptability is imperative to be successful.

There should be school level factors like shared leadership, shared culture and values. These allow leadership to improve school conditions that affect other elements of the school, like classrooms; motivation; belief in self and community; and teacher capacity skills, knowledge, and abilities. Teacher retention and turnover are key. It is important to understand how to retain effective teachers and turnover of ineffective teachers as well as understanding when you can improve ineffective teachers.

At the student level, understanding student attendance and behavior are important precursors of outcomes. Better conditions for teaching and learning yield fewer suspensions and positive school culture. Higher teacher retention and motivation, and the perception by teachers that they can have positive impact on classroom and culture correspond to achievement.

The research on connections is quantitative—only relationships are statistically significant. The field is not as strong as we would like; there are gaps in evidence. The larger picture is that not everyone who comes to leadership in ECE or K-12 has all skills and competencies that are needed. The question is how can we improve?

The study based on the Every Student Succeeds Act says there are six types of K-12 initiatives to improve leaderships. There are types of interventions that are more impactful. The leadership evaluation system was the most promising, while preservice and internships were less promising. There were negative findings for strategic staff management, such as replacing principals. There is no strong evidence that

principal turnover impacts child outcomes. It is difficult to give principals decision-making power that does not undercut district authority. How do they go around district requirements?

After the presentation, during the discussion, Colleen asked what we know about the impact of principals before turnover. Becki Herman said when a principal had impact on instruction, it could disappear if the next principal is incompetent. When a principal impacts climate, that progress will likely stay, or the school will lose teachers. The program will be more ready for the next leader to move the process forward. Principal selection process should be thoughtful. David Jones asked if retention or turnover is for the right reason, does that factor into what was looked at? The answer depends on whether they took a school perspective rather than a teacher perspective. Successful teacher retention is to have an effective teacher in every classroom which leads to better student outcomes—less so than members of a leadership team, it is harder to tease out those effects.

Measuring leadership is a challenge. You have to measure if they are able to translate, or mobilize to get through the steps of the process. We need to look at how leadership roles in K-12 and ECE are similar. Are they relevant and important to ECE? Are there certain outcomes that you would focus on more and paths to get to outcomes?

A question that was asked was “what do we mean by policy?” The answer was many things—standards, regulations, QRIS, and things that are required or encouraged by the governing agency or program. For example, Head Start performance standards are policies, but leader and teacher preparation programs are not policies.

Jackie Wilson gave the example of changing needs that drove policy. In Delaware, they pushed for policy around leader preparation. It forced higher education to revamp their programs to have them approved so students would get certificates. The change forced higher education to redesign their programs based on national standards.

Teri Talan stated there is a difference in the education expectations of leaders in child care programs versus teacher expectations. Only a handful of states require directors to have AA degrees. It begs for standards and policies if we value leadership.

Jackie Wilson asked how many states require early learning directors to have requirements. Kathryn Tout said that we have that data but it may not be what we want it to be. QRIS is different from licensing. Teri Talan said some states have no requirements other than to be 21 years old. The LEAD Early Childhood Clearinghouse is one place that someone could get data about leaders across programs. Statutory language was used across sectors to get information. The link is: www.leadclearinghouse.org.

Jackie Wilson mentioned pre-service education is what gets us prepared for this work. In ECE it is ongoing. She asked if there is any type of certification or policy that says these are the basic requirements for anyone working in the field, whether in homes and centers. Education level is one way to address the quality issue.

Jacqueline pointed out the business owner perspective. When she worked with family child care (FCC) providers, it was not easy for them to see themselves from the leadership perspective. She said the bottom line is, it can happen. We have to use strategies to get them to see from that perspective and it takes time. John added it is a business mindset for FCCs, and also important for FCCs to think about the neighborhood ecosystem. They are providing a service, so we must adjust the framework. They survive based on sustaining relationships with families and the community. If not, they will not be in business long.

Jackie Wilson began her presentation by emphasizing the importance of standards. The National Policy Board has had standards in place since 1996. It is a consortium of organizations engaged in schools with the mission to enhance leadership for the nation's schools and the perpetration of future school leaders. The standards are based on research and have gone through three revisions. Changes in standards have largely been influenced by the research of Joe Murphy, from Vanderbilt. Models of professional standards or leadership are applicable at the district level and at the teacher level. They looked at over 600 empirical studies in a variety of focus areas of what school leaders do. They received input from 1000 school leaders and teacher-leaders from Superintendents to parents. There were two rounds of public comments. They ended up with 10 standards tied to preparation programs. Jackie said they received over 1000 surveys and read every comment. Standards drive everything in states—preparation, professional development, and accountability measures. They looked at policy in all states and asked if the changes were going to disrupt policy that lives in statute, which could cause difficulty.

The big difference in the revision is a stronger emphasis on student learning so each child is well educated and prepared for 21st century. There is care and support for students —identifying how we are engaging families, making sure children get the supports they need, and looking at social-emotional learning. Principals spent the majority of their time on these tasks before focusing on academics. The 10 core principles create a much better balance. They don't work in isolation. The 10 core principles are: mission, vision and core values; ethics and professional norms; equity and cultural responsiveness; curriculum, instruction and assessment; community of care and support of students; professional capacity of school personnel (teachers and staff); meaningful engagement of families and community; operations and management; and continuous school improvement. Using the early learning lens, Jackie looked at Delaware Stars and compared to standards and have opportunities for growth.

There are not a lot of studies in school leadership because it is hard to measure. Studies would need to be longitudinal to gather the data we need, look at testing ideas in urban school districts, and look at the principal or school leader's pipeline. The development of standards is affirmation that these things matter. Teachers aspiring to move up and take a leadership role will need high quality training. We have to make sure the right people are in the program, all driven by the standards. We would have to work with school districts to get right people—look at who is hiring and placing people. To get greater outcomes, standards should drive job descriptions, how we train, hire, evaluate, and support leaders. Jackie Wilson stated she thinks preservice is important. HR can be a huge barrier to getting the right people and placing a good candidate at the right location. Performance evaluations should be professional growth experiences. The Wallace Foundation offers great resources for K-12.

During the discussion following Jackie Wilson's presentation, Caroline stated with an emphasis on preservice training, principals have very little experience in Pre-K or the type of trainings and support needed. Jackie replied principals are not specific to levels. A principal could move from high school to elementary or early learning center. What tends to happen is good leaders/principals depend on teachers understanding; they can't know everything. Amanda agreed and stated that with distributive leadership, when school turnover happens, great leaders don't have to know everything. They know about educating young children and let teachers do their job. They have standards and rely on early childhood committee to help with preservice and ongoing leadership efforts.

Many principals don't get it; if principals are not supportive of best practices or developmentally appropriate practices (DAP), it can be disruptive. We must build teacher leaders to push back. Some districts are moving Pre-K and K to a separate building and looking for that ECE principal.

Jackie Wilson said that when evaluating leaders, teacher-leaders should be a part of the evaluation process. This will empower teachers and build the next group of leaders. Jaqueline said in her work with DCPS-Pre-K, for their teacher evaluation they wanted to do a crosswalk with the curriculum to show impact and Pre-K influences as a component of the public school.

Ivelisse stated the core values and concepts relate to schools and ECE. She agrees that standards drive what happens. For a reality check, in ECE over 30% of directors do not have degree, certificate or credential. In research that asked what drives hiring [no reference given], job postings that included qualifications were examined in relation to which teachers were hired. Teachers hired were the least qualified because programs can't afford to hire qualified teachers. There is a disconnect with what we know at the preservice level. Teachers spend money for education and expect compensation. Jackie Wilson agreed; she said if they go to college they usually go to a public school to get more benefits. This is where policy comes into play; there should be a relationship or partnership between ECE and the school system. She gave an example of when the ECE community and public school had a better relationship—they saw themselves as partners because ECE is feeder for elementary schools. We should encourage them to not be afraid of partnerships. Amanda Bryans stated that the idea is that a child belongs to a community, and communities have resources. This should be the leadership disposition for school leaders and ECE leaders, recognizing they are both resources. Jackie stated it only takes one principal who believes in this philosophy. John Williams added that as we think about qualities of leaders, maybe equity at this point is guidepost for adaptability.

Discussion & Questions following the Frameworks, Empirical Evidence, & Practical Lessons from K-12 Settings Session

Teresa Derrick-Mills said when thinking about policy related to pre-& in-service, most states probably have in-service requirements for director training. She asked how to make it more meaningful for leadership. How can that be leveraged better?

Teri Talan stated the idea of counting hours of seat time is not the best way of working on professional development for leaders or teachers. In general, most states do not have specific requirements for

ongoing professional development for leadership. Head Start preservice is an interesting avenue to look at. She urged us to not shy away from preservice requirements. We didn't always have preservice requirements for teachers. How can we build in the same for leaders, in a graduated way and make ongoing professional development more strategic? There are no standards in what the core competencies are—state licensing bodies decide—they are generally voluntary systems. A handful of states dictate one course or training in Child Development/ ECE foundational knowledge. There is a lot of room to grow. We need to think about a goal plan and how to get there.

Maia Connors commented that even with preservice preparations, there is a question about how to transfer knowledge to practice. Illinois ran into how to get professional development credits for job-embedded work while working in your program. Teri Talan asked what would job embedded professional development look like for leaders. Jackie Wilson answered anytime a director or principal received coaching, or participated in collaborative learning. No longer is professional development a one shot deal. Professional learning is ongoing, rigorous, and reflective. These types of learning don't require lots of money. The question lies in how to define it in states. She agreed with Teri that we should not give up on this. We can impact state policy. The more noise there is about something, the more likely it is to get noticed by politicians.

Becki Herman said we have a glass half full. We have enough evidence but the type of evidence is weak. It is something to look into and suggest what the evidence would look like. She asked what type of questions we want to answer. There are different configurations of ECE programs. She suggested looking for research methodology to see how schools are configured and how many standards they have in place. Do we have methods to do causal claims? How do we do this at the ECE level? In 5-10 years we will have studies in place.

Teri Talan said QRIS is an amazing lever to accomplish policy to enhance leadership. The first generation of QRIS only looked at staff qualifications. In the next generation staff qualifications were pulled apart. It requires a change in terminology and an examination at a granular level. How do states build-in a director's credential? Are director credentials based on competencies? In Illinois, they embedded director credential in licensing, QRIS and state Pre-K requirements—across all three areas. Not all credentials the same; some are more robust but it is the first step, and a vehicle.

Teresa Derrick-Mills said phrasing the goal as competencies rather than credentials (i.e., education) may help. If people received their degrees a long time ago and have an early childhood degree it is probably elementary education not ECE. Barriers could be lack of director buy-in because if they have degrees they may not feel like they need the credential. Caroline Ebanks stated attitudes and beliefs are key. If there is a framework of expectations and what to assess, but directors do not change their thinking or have the right attitude, it will be a huge barrier. Stacy Ehrlich wonders how to measure those things. Implementation matters. We should be careful not to limit measurement from the leader perspective. It is important how others experience the leadership. Jackie Wilson said a 360-degree evaluation, where the leader, supervisor, and those they lead all participate, can focus on what leadership means and use

evaluation as a growth opportunity. Then they can provide high quality professional development if change of behavior is needed.

Stacy Ehrlich said The Ounce had a study focused on leadership and collaborative CQI. They saw change in child outcomes and want to scale-up the study. Someone asked if they looked at retention in the study and Stacy said there was turnover in the study.

Teri Talan said McCormick has done intensive leadership studies for 25 years. Research reports were created at the 10 & 20 year marks. There is an increase in the retention of leaders—people are staying in field. She said we need to do better job at looking at those impacts/outcomes; they are significant. Paula Jorde Blume has been collecting early childhood work surveys for about 30 years. Thousands have completed the surveys to look at organizational climate. Everybody in organization completes the survey. Data are collected on how the leader evaluates organizational climate as opposed to other staff. It is a rosier picture from the leader than staff, but it's consistent. The conclusion is that leaders have a bigger picture and feel more in control. There is a difference in perception of how leaders view organizational climate versus staff. The surveys are completed in Head Start and child care programs.

Becki Herman stated there are two ways you can measure leadership: a 360 evaluation and a climate survey. Evaluate the leadership team with a balance between alignment of the two [perceptions] to identify gaps. Jackie Wilson said if a new leader is brought in because a change is needed, there is a very different perception depending on which side you are on. Is it disrupting the status quo? Kelly Maxwell agrees with core leadership. Her question is how impactful can ECE be in relation to K-12, especially with ECE teachers having low education levels and low compensation. How can we measure leadership better? We need to think about measurement so we can identify the questions and make hypotheses.

Caroline Ebanks said a framework is a cohesive system. K-12 has a framework that we need to unpack by dimensions. ECE does not have a framework and we have to identify factors that are critical: size, bureaucracy, and age of kids. In ECE we have to think across settings—Head Start, Pre-K and child care. What is the starting/entry point? The framework has to map out the starting point, what measurement approaches should be used and lay out how the system would play out. Becki Herman said there is a complex set of options.

Caroline Ebanks asked which dimensions matter most for ECE settings. Stacy Ehrlich said we may not have the same measures and asked who the leader is. Gretchen Kirby commented that it is structure. Different bodies of literature can inform our work. There are many similarities—kinds of things organizations and leaders have in place to produce good outcomes (qualities of the leader, leadership structures, and shared vision that translates into climate). Measure the abilities of leaders, the process, and how people experience the leadership.

Teresa Derrick-Mills asked what the questions are. What is it that we expect to see? She wanted to go back to Kathryn Tout's comment about TA providers saying directors were barriers. She asked if the barrier is the director or are we not delivering needed TA. She clarified that it is not the only barrier and

that it was just an example. We have to parse it out and figure out how much of the problem is the director.

When you look at it from a systems perspective, if the director does not support the effort, how many resources do we invest without leadership buy-in? Jackie Wilson suggested conducting a readiness assessment to see if they are ready for the support. Who do we hold accountable? We can provide great professional learning experiences, using resources to support practice and if nothing changes, then need to address leadership. We have to look for the cause—maybe the leader/director doesn't know next steps or she/he may need coaching. She added that states are no longer funding one shot deals for professional development because they are looking for impact data.

Teri Talan asked for clarification on what it means to say the director does not buy-in. Kathryn Tout defined "not buying in" as when the director does not know what the interventions are and why they are important. Caroline Ebanks asked who manages the intervention and if the TA went only to the teachers. Someone must know about work going on in the program, therefore someone has buy in. If the teachers don't feel supported, what are the barriers to buy-in? Amy Madigan said there is a spectrum of buy-in and engagement. Kathryn said someone is supporting change. Part of the "breakthrough series collaborative" model is a change in teachers and those teachers spread to others in program who are not participating in the intervention.

Teri Talan asked if the director has the knowledge, skills, resources, and understanding of systems perspectives. That's critical to readiness. We have to assess leaders' understanding of organizations and how it all needs to work together. That is what readiness is because otherwise you are feeding fish rather than teaching leaders to fish. Calling it "not having buy-in" is too mushy. Kathryn Tout said as a leader you have to be able to choose what is right for your program. You have to say this is not for us—it's not the right time for our staff. Sarah Merrill said it takes leadership characteristics of trust and getting feedback from teachers.

Caroline Ebanks said we have to systematically look at what we mean by support. If you change the knowledge and attitudes of teachers but lack support and buy-in from leaders; what does that mean for the sustainability of the intervention? Stacy Ehrlich said it is because there is not a clear vision.

Amy Madigan asked what the challenges were to implementing quality improvement without leadership buy in. Are there models or frameworks that have buy-in that help to engage leadership at multiple levels? She asked if we know what leadership readiness looks like and what readiness questions and factors we need to think about. Maia Connors asked what should we do with the programs that aren't ready; what can we do to bump the floor up a bit? Becki Herman said it was top down models and Stacy Ehrlich asked if they work. The answer was in sprinkles, it is not consistent.

Janet Weiss said to follow the trail to leadership behavior and competencies through intermediate steps to outcomes. What can leaders do now, and how can the literature to apply to ECE settings? We have to take what we know at the classroom level and ask what we want center directors to do. We have to

ask what we can do to prepare leaders to help and see if there is another way to think through the problem.

Kelly Maxwell asked what supports bring change and what makes it harder. Gretchen Kirby said time. Some leaders give teachers time. Time is really stretched, and is key to support. When working with leaders and leadership teams, considerable effort was put into restructuring time so teachers could collaborate with each other. Teresa Derrick-Mills said new interventions are not being evaluated, which is a challenge. John Williams said a challenge could be the length of time a person is in the field, due to the learning curve. Leaders are trying to digest what is going on with other environmental factors—rules, standards, in addition to learning the new environment, and leading people. Agencies should explore how they can standardize operations, what is being measured, and what the leader is ultimately responsible for.

Becki Herman said some of the work in evaluating principal candidates could happen during preservice. The university and partner district could co-develop the definition and context to identify good leaders and how to evaluate leaders. Everyone is on the same page and reaches agreement on what it means and trains and evaluates on it. The conversation is fundamental.

Jackie Wilson mentioned teacher turnover. Turnover is not good; relationships with teachers make families feel safe. High turnover is also terrible for teacher-child relationships. What can the director do to reduce teacher turnover? Salaries, benefits, and resources vary across sites. Why people choose to stay or leave is not based on money. People stay in positions because of leadership and the support opportunities —coaching, mentoring, feedback and leadership. Centers need to look at what leadership opportunities they offer if they don't have lots of money.

Janet Weiss asked how Head Start directors are hired. John Williams replied that every agency has its own approach, from a single purpose to the state level. He said the beauty is it allows programs to determine their own policies and procedures. Teri Talan asked if that was the program director or center director. There are no qualifications for center director. Janet said if we want to see change in leadership, having basic information about who is doing the hiring and the selection criteria is important.

Closing Thoughts and Summary for Day 1

We are still in the position of identifying the starting place and figuring out a place to gain guidance to tweak the framework, questions, and processes. It sounds like standards are a pretty good place to start. Validating standards presented by Jackie Wilson had a lot of the same buzz words as Head Start Standards and Regulations. We also heard about the structure of programs.

Taking the standards we have is a place to start. We are in a different place than K-12 with what is realistic—where our leaders are and how to fully implement standards. In thinking about measurement, we are starting at a different place. We have to measure at the lower end of the bar. If measurement is in place, we could try to predict what is happening in classrooms.

In thinking about leader competencies and leadership readiness, it is an important construct and a tiered approach to leadership. The lowest functioning programs are those with the highest needs. We have to identify how to build a tiered approach starting at bottom, to avoid spending money on interventions that will not hold because of lack of leadership-related stability and buy-in.

Research was presented on having one leader and not a variety of leaders. Because of our field, we have to think about using a variety of leaders and take into account how deficiencies of one person can be compensated by others.

The Culture of Continuous Learning (CCL) project idea for OPRE is in the early development stage. There is a lot of potential in thinking about organization and people at varied levels, building buy-in and sustainability from this kind of intervention.

Friday, October 13, 2017

Nina Philipsen Hetzner welcomed the group. Several people had ideas to share that they thought about overnight.

- Teresa Derrick-Mills asked to clarify what it means when a director lets TA providers in the program but the intervention doesn't stick. The goal is for the intervention to be institutionalized so that when the TA is over, practice changes. Caroline Ebanks said it is interventions with no uptake. It is different than TA for QRIS; it is more about helping programs get aligned in the state.
- Caroline said there are two types of quality improvement plans. How do leaders support the maintenance or sustainability of the quality initiative? What is their role? Teresa Derrick-Mills said there might be some differences when thinking about interventions. We must remember context.
- Jacqueline Davis said she found a set of competencies that Head Start used to use. There are skills and competencies for directors, managers, and supervisors. She also found competencies from the office of program and management divided into six categories. Both competency sets are really well defined. This information could be helpful in how to frame research projects.

Session #3: Measuring Early Care & Education Program Leadership

Presenters discussed existing and emerging tools to measure ECE leadership and other constructs at the program level. Tools were discussed in the context of their purpose, potential uses (e.g., research, monitoring, and/or TA), and how well they tap key constructs of interest.

Remarks:

Kelly Maxwell, Child Trends
Teri Talan, McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership
Gretchen Kirby, Mathematica Policy Research
Stacy Ehrlich, University of Chicago
Nina Philipsen Hetzner served as moderator.

Kelly Maxwell started the first presentation by giving an overview of measurement. A small group of experts was convened to discuss what we know about quality measures—classroom and program level measures. They also talked about measuring readiness. Currently there are four program leader measures: early childhood quality improvement pathway system, EC WORK environment survey, PAS, and SEQUEL.

The Head Start Management Wheel and Professional Standards for educational leaders show they are comparable measures. Some constructs were discussed yesterday; other constructs are measured in classroom quality. There is overlap for all of these. In terms of readiness measures, research teams talked about considering some examples including safety, shared vision, and communication, professional development, learning communities and collegiality. Record keeping and reporting, communication and self-assessment, transportation, ethics, equity and responsiveness, and community

of care are missing. What has been discussed, but not currently measured, includes distributed leadership, alignment of resources to vision, measuring up, inspiring others, governance/advisory board.

Governance, distributed leadership, and alignment are covered in PAS. John Williams shared that Head Start is collaborative in these regards. Jacqueline Davis asked if shared and collaborative are the same.

Most classroom-based measures use observation. Program leadership and capacity require gathering information at the site level via director interview and survey. Information is used in a variety of ways such as QRIS, research, TA to guide individual program planning. SEQUEL can be at the state level. Measures were not developed and marketed for single purpose. We are measuring over 20 constructs—policies, practices, prescriptions, organization capacity, measuring aspects of leader, climate, and organization capacity. The current measures mix them all up. We should focus on leadership not individual leaders.

Kelly Maxwell posed some questions to the group: What aspects do we need to measure? Do we measure the leader or leadership, the site or the program? What are the key constructs we want to measure and what is the best way to get that measure? We have to think through the hypothesis. What do we need to consider across settings? Most of the questions are intended for center-based programs, so how does leadership look different for family child cares (FCC)?

Gretchen Kirby stated sometimes education qualifications are used as a proxy measure. They assume a BA in ECE means certain things; however, it may not map back to what is covered. It is better to use competencies rather than a degree or credential.

Teri Talan presented next. The McCormick Center has been analyzing information for 35 years. Teri said that there is a site that contains this data with state by state profiles and an executive summary. We should be looking at the leadership framework for early childhood programs rather than individual leaders. What are the domains for early childhood leadership? What are their relationships to each other? What are the things programs should be accountable for rather than leader level?

PAS came out of a funded project to create a research protocol to look at the pre/post quality for initiatives in Illinois. It was published to be the voice of valid and reliable tools and was first published in 2004 and the second edition in 2011. Nothing dealing with program capacity or leadership was found in the literature review. The change theory focused only on early childhood leadership. The program administration is seen as the driver of quality improvement and processes in the center. The center is the unit of analysis and can be in school systems, community-based organizations and Head Start programs, making it an all-inclusive measure.

PAS measures practices. There is a difference between behavior and practice. Program administration, inclusive of director, principal, and site manager have a direct impact on climate, teacher practices, and family engagement. They have indirect impacts on children's development and learning. In PAS, leadership and management are not seen as two separate areas but rather intertwined. Leadership is broader with abstract functions, and management is the more specific, concrete functions of planning supervision.

The goal is to have effective systems to support consistent services to children and families. This requires system thinking in the program. None are pulled out with title but you have to dig deep at the indicator level. Embedded within routines of CQI, at the indicator level, are organizational conditions to allow distributed leadership to flourish, and provide organizational supports for professional growth of all staff. It considers all staff in an organization at the site level, which is different than some tools mentioned.

The psychometric characteristics differentiate between low and high quality. We don't know what is important unless we measure it and what is measured will be what is changed/improved. We need a reliable tool to establish the hypothesis—leadership really does matter in quality ECE programs. If you look at early research, program levels were not considered because of a lack of tool. We need to get out of the catch-22 and let practice tell us what we need to research and develop. Psychometric characteristics are important for good interrater reliability—using large projects and training people to be consistent in using the tool. The subscales match Kelly Maxwell's presentation—10 subscales with two to four items. There is a total of 25 items with 81 indicator strands. Each strand is a rubric of quality to be measured and was created to be useful to directors. The tool is rated at the individual indicator strand. There are multiple purposes for this tool design—self-assessment, coaching and TA, and research. The guiding questions allow providers to do self-assessment. With clear communication and rigorous reliability and validity, it can be included in research.

Systems and systems-thinking is a critical component of organizational strength and effectiveness. It measures if there is thinking and building capacity, rather than being a monitoring tool. If practices are embedded, there are systems in place making it more likely for high quality programming to be sustainable. The language is very precise. Systems thinking is the intersection of people, structure, and process. If they can't tell you, then they don't have a system.

The tool checks if there is a system in place that is consistently implemented. The PAS score is an average of all items scored. It is a global measurement that looks at a variety of items. Data collection is primarily interview with some observation and document verification. Staff qualifications are completed through worksheets and documentation verification. It happens onsite to allow the assessor to ask questions, finalize, and score. The interview is conducted, documentation is presented, and items are rated. A tour is guided by the administrator. Documentation can be overwhelming when programs are not prepared. There is a struggle with how to inform programs about the documentation- it is one thing to ask about documentation, it is another hurdle to have programs identify *where it is*.

Research shows a strong correlation with PAS and ERS when the whole PAS tool is used. When the entire tool is not utilized, you don't get the same results. Sometimes the tool may be too cumbersome and programs are not interested in collecting all the data.

PAS was created to show growth over time. It can be used for self-improvement, formal CQI, high stakes research and evaluation, and public awareness of ECE program leadership. It provides a shared vocabulary and insight into why it matters. It is being used in a variety of ways across the county; some states use the PAS in their QRIS. Eight have it embedded in the state standards as a reliable and valid

tool, nine additional states use it for program improvement and three states use it to measure competencies for their administrative credential. QRIS is high stakes and needs accountability, so information needs to be clearly articulated about reliability. Level of reliability depends on how it is being used. If we don't measure it, it will not be improved.

Following Teri Talan's presentation, Ivelisse Martinez-Beck asked who responds in the interview and wanted to know if you get different results based on who responds. Teri replied that it was designed to interview one person—the person who has ultimate responsibility for the program. Using the concept of distributed leadership that one person should be able to speak to what is happening at the program, even the pieces for which they are not directly responsible. If leadership is shared across the program, they would talk with the site-level administrator. That person should be able to speak to pieces they are not responsible for.

If a program has less than four classrooms or 20 FT children, the program administrator does not need to be onsite. This changed in the revision because they took into consideration the fact that Head Start programs may not have an administrator onsite for small programs, but also felt strongly that any site with four or more classrooms needed an administrator onsite. The interview is done with the administrator who comes to the program. In looking at PAS, the minimum level of quality is roughly aligned with licensing standards. At the 5 level—the good level—PAS is aligned with Head Start Standards and NAEYC, and at the 7 level—it is intended to align with state funded Pre-K programs. Lessons learned for the next edition is to organize it along leadership domains and leadership essentials, allowing for different people to measure leadership practices in different places.

Site-level versus program-level evaluation can pose an issue. There was a study with Chicago Head Start programs to conduct PAS in every program and ECERS-R in every classroom. PAS was completed in every Head Start program to look at the relationship between the qualifications of the site-level administrator and the overall program environment. Maia Connors asked if they were in schools and it was clarified that there was a smattering in school-based programs.

To prompt discussion following the presentation, Janet Weiss asked who pays for the administration of PAS. Teri Talan said it depends on the use. For the most part, state agencies are funding its use. With QRIS, assessment is paid for by whoever funds the QRIS such as the Department of Human Services; Department of Education pays for it in Maryland, and Smart Start and the North Carolina Leadership Academy are other funding sources.

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck asked how it looks different in child care and Pre-K. The majority of child care in the country is quite small, below the 60 children threshold. How do you decide who is the appropriate person? Teri Talan explained that by definition in the scale it is the person primarily responsible for development and implementation of the program. Being a small program is not negative. In large programs, the person identified at the higher levels—the Grantee level in Head Start, is expected to know what is happening at that site and be able to answer questions.

Gretchen Kirby presentation, "Assessing the Implementation and Cost of High Quality Early Care and Education (ECE ICHQ)" was next. It was launched in 2014 with support from OPRE, to assess and

measure implementation and the cost of high-quality child care birth to age five. The set-up, approach and conceptualization are complete. They are still developing measures. It uses slightly different language but similar constructs. With investment in quality improvement initiatives at the federal and state levels, we are lacking how best to target resources at the center level.

The project measures what a center does to support quality. The focus is to look for implementation and cost measures to explain the variation in how resources are used to provide quality care for ECE. Ultimately, the hope is the tool can be used by practitioners and researchers. It looks at how these features are designed and what practices and tools are used. It also looks at the implementation system—are systems embedded and what are the qualities or structures? They are looking at implementation science to use a broader lens to identify factors common among programs that achieve outcomes.

Implementation measures and cost measures are tested together to help the field decipher what it takes to move to high quality and good outcomes for children. They are looking at activities, capacities, and money to achieve high quality in a center. The same information is looked at across all programs, no matter the size. The study will look to see if quality is affected by organization capacity, resources, and characteristics of the center, as well as community context. Information will be gathered during the interview with the site administrator, center director, or curriculum specialist. The information does not come from one person.

Last fall, 15 centers were looked at. Two rounds of data were collected. It captured what we might expect to see of what is and is not in place covering the range of implementation activities. Phase 2 is more structured; it launched last week and they are planning to wrap-up data collection in February with a report out next fall. They are in the process of thinking through hundreds of items to come up with a coding structure and analysis plan to develop a scoring structure.

A survey type instrument is used to get qualitative data. Initially the survey was distributed onsite but now it is web based. Cost information was collected in Excel; sites may or may not be able to do this on their own. The data collector used it with the site. One or more people can complete the information; it could be key administrators, the person who oversees the education program, and teaching staff.

How centers direct their time and money shows the program's priorities. We can also identify constraints and see how allocations change based on choices or constraints. The goal is to measure variation in organizational capacity. They looked at the literature and eight frameworks to identify organizational capacity needed to successfully implement a given program that moves quality from "should be" to action. They were interested in how to embed process and structure. Factors that support implementation account for the creation of quality. They looked at openness to change, work climate, supports and infrastructures as well as leadership's ability to provide guidance, adapt and solve problems. How do they align practice to implementation? They measure intentionality, consistency, and the prevalence of activities and stages of implementation in the center.

Data are collected via interview around 6 functions. All information is provided by the center and they are relying on them to share the process. The center director and education manager usually answer

the questions and very little prep is needed. They are moving toward a survey instrument with closed ended responses to code as go along. Leadership is not being measured directly, however it is reflected in various indicators. In order to capture leadership, quality of leaders, or environment we would need to triangulate data. They are looking at intentionality in decision-making, and if the leader disappeared tomorrow, how much would remain and carry through in the organization?

Workforce development functions to intentionally set priorities for training. Professional development questions include how the center determines training priorities, what they are and who helps determine them, and what documentation is tracked and maintained. In addition, they are interested in what supports are offered for training, such as when and how trainings are offered—in-house or does the staff have to find them on their own, are they offered on professional development days, are all teaching staff allowed to attend, and how coverage for teachers is arranged. Other areas include planning, goal setting and assessment, the communication process between leadership and teachers, problem solving, center climate, turnover and teacher commitment to center.

During the discussion, Teri Talan asked if the cost is determined by key function and if they know what the costs are while collecting data through budgets and finances. The answer was yes. So much of the costs are labor costs. It is very hard—sometimes the data are not there and some centers do not have the capacity to provide the information. Assessors have to get information through the back door. They have to figure out what the ideal cost measure is and hope they can get there with most centers.

Maia Connors asked if they are just getting a number or levels. The answer is they are getting a number of what it costs, so context matters. If infants and toddlers are served, you have to tweak the cost per child care hour to standardize. The sample includes a range of quality and proxy of using QRIS level and a mix of funding sources—high subsidy and a mix of private and public. Amanda Bryans noted that infant and toddler care is expensive. The center where her child went struggled to break even when the state offered free Pre-K. They had to recruit families because the true cost of infant and toddler care, if preschoolers are not served, is complicated. Head Start programs have a lot of cost categories. The non-federal share that programs have to account for may come into play with regards to wrap around services and whole services such as child and family support.

Stacy Ehrlich was the final presenter in the session and opened with a discussion about schools in Chicago in the late 80's. People wanted to know which schools functioned better than others and the ultimate outcomes for similar students and locations. Literature was pulled together—at the time—to create a framework, the 5 Essentials of Early Education (5 Essentials). They were looking at what conditions in schools contributed to certain outcomes over time. Ultimately what happens in classrooms influenced what happens outside classrooms/school. They determined that effective instructional leadership is the driver. Principals must be intentional and strategic in working with others— teachers, families—on a shared vision and focused on how to support student learning. In schools with distributed leadership, teachers are willing to work together and are open to work toward their own improvement because they feel a joint responsibility to support everyone. Principals may not think about making schools feel like open, welcome space for families and communities. They need to have safe and nurturing environments for students, families, and teachers while providing ambitious instruction.

Surveys were developed to measure constructs by measuring people's perception and experiences in the K-12 setting. The goal was to develop professional development experiences and help support programs to use data. Administrators, teachers and students (ages 6-12) were surveyed every year. Schools that were strong in three of five constructs were ten times more likely to show outcomes over the years.

They are adapting it for use in ECE settings. The literature is there to support the premise that all are critical in ECE settings as well. A scan was conducted on what reliable and valid measures are out there for ECE. What is not there is measuring constructs that support instructional practices. In the K-12 version, the teacher and student are surveyed. In the teacher survey, it was adapted for ECE by removing questions, tweaking language for relevancy and appropriateness, and creating new questions. Because they can't survey students, a family version is being created in English and Spanish.

They looked at center-based ECE settings in Chicago, including in schools and Head Start, to measure program climate. The sample was limited to programs with at least 3 preschool-age classrooms in a confined location. There would be at least six teachers responding to the survey to help protect the anonymity of the teachers. The leader was defined at the site level; they were not measuring a person but rather the general condition of the leader or leadership team created within the organization. The thought is that over time, they may be able to measure at the multisite level.

Rasch analysis was used to create the measure score to get at one construct of program coherence and teacher influence. They were looking to gauge how much teachers feel a part of decision making processes and instructional leadership. For example, has leadership communicated vision and does everyone feel connected and gauge how many feel that we are all in it together. Also, they looked to see if teachers view it as a safe space. A concurrent validity study is looking at whether a range of survey scores provide stronger outcomes and if it is related at the site level to CLASS™ scores and student attendance. The study was conducted in 81 sites, 41 school-based and 40 Head Start sites and community-based organizations. There were boots on the ground for parent surveys with tablets and paper versions. Qualitative data will be released soon. The validation study has supplemental measures that schools may be interested in seeing and learning. Too much information makes it hard to work on practice. It is psychometrically sound with high reliabilities. The report lays out all measures tested and the reliabilities; all were above 7 and looked to see if it captured variations across sites. They are conducting an exploratory factor analysis while trying to keep a level of consistency between ECE and K-12 versions using a continuum to show a range of beliefs and identify relatedness at the site level. Handouts with definitions and measures were created (attached).

They are looking to see if leadership and collaboration of the teacher is related to things going on in the classroom such as teacher-child interactions. Also, characteristics of the population that sites are servicing and attendance.

Measurement challenges about ambitious instruction involve questions like is there a relationship to CLASS™, is it fair to ask families to complete surveys, if math, English, and social-emotional development can be assessed, or should it be observation? Are there constructs at the organization level that may

influence the level of rigor? They are also looking to see if it can be measured in a culturally sensitive manner. Caroline Ebanks asked what the culture test is. The answer is that it is inclusive of everyone no matter what background, race, or language. Caroline asked if it was limited to parents. One to two items are included in the teacher survey, but they could think more about that. The struggles in the survey are many—people know there is a right answer, so that may skew answers.

After the presentation, Caroline Ebanks asked if that impacted learning and suggested reframing the question to ask what or how the teacher feels. Teresa Derrick-Mills suggested asking teachers how well the school leadership handles cultural sensitivity and how they experience cultural sensitivity. It is much easier if you ask about their perceptions. The answer was that they are not sure they currently get it that well.

Becki Herman asked about the source of the items for ambitious instruction and the response was that they were created by the team based on the previous version. Other questions included: are items validated separately and if it was correlated with CLASS™; are there items about domains; and how they align with philosophy of the program. She thought some of the negativity may have stemmed from not being aligned with program reflection in the framework. It was asked who was conducting CLASS™ scoring and Gretchen Kirby said it comes from the school district and city and that all programs are externally evaluated and have classroom level data.

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck asked if the teachers responding to the survey were the same teachers who were assessed. The answer was they were done in the same year but the surveys are anonymous.

It is seen as a useful tool to broaden the definition of quality and create feedback for programs for self-reflection. The 5 Essentials in K-12 are part of the accountability system in Chicago and maybe at the state level. It was stated that she (Stacy Ehrlich) does not think it should be part of accountability systems yet. It was pushed out without people understanding it, with little buy-in, and as a tool to guide improvement. Once it is put in an accountability measure by the state it negates [its utility as a tool for feedback and self-reflection].

In the future, they are going to expand outside of Chicago. They will be working with one district outside of Chicago and looking at how to report scores in meaningful ways so they can use them.

Discussion & Questions for the Measuring Early Care & Education Program Leadership Session

The goal is to connect how we think about the constructs to frame research questions and hypotheses. Kelly Maxwell said yesterday's conversation was helpful. Christine said a lot of measures are site-specific and there are other models like the new hub model that we are getting to know about and understand how it works in different ECE settings and how to translate that.

Becki Herman said we need to answer the leadership versus leader question. Today's conversation shows the importance of leaders bringing together the vision. In K-12, leaders have impact, but now little is known about the leadership team.

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck understands the leadership roles in ECE as being distributed and not having one individual leader. Becki Herman asked about two people-a visionary leader and managerial person. When there is a broader leadership team you still have to coordinate to bring them together. She is less sure of the connectedness when two people divide out management and instructional duties. Kelly Maxwell said that is the research question: how important is the director versus a director and an education coordinator together supporting leadership functions? Becki Herman said the survey assumes there is one leader. If you have two leaders, she wondered if they should talk to both and look at the intersection. Teri Talan said there are layers. More people impact the services and we need to consider including them in the survey as well.

Nina Philipsen Hetzner wondered if we could get that with the 5 Essentials structure as a way to ask a few more questions for those sitting in a hub or collaborative partnership model. Stacy Ehrlich said it could be the Principal and instructional leader from the central office.

Amanda Bryans said when she was a director, the organization had leadership team—education director, center managers, and used the distributed leadership approach where the center had oversight of teacher time, attendance and accountability. The education manager worked together to provide feedback on performance evaluations and observations. Teachers benefited from that support and it is hard to replicate.

Maia Connors is wondering if the 5 Essentials measure teacher perceptions and if that is an outcome. Teri Talan said the question yesterday was, what is the outcome? Gretchen Kirby asked if they were jumping to classroom quality and Stacy Ehrlich said that it is how Becki Herman laid out school climate.

Teri Talan said they looked at that in a study and work in NC and there is very strong correlation in programs with high scores on 10 dimensions. She feels that is the first outcome. She said she is still hung up with measuring organization climate and wonders if that can be determined only though leadership. She would hypothesize no, but thinks that is something that should be looked at. The result is a positive culture for teachers and families.

Kelly Maxwell said she is struck by the leader versus leadership question, but is thinking about leadership in the shared sense. In K-12, it is the leader. Constructs are important. All things are important and one person can't do them all. Amanda Bryans said it is hard, but we should figure it out. K-12 is hierarchical. If there is a healthy leadership team, they would be able to self-correct if there is a bad leader. Maia Connors asked if there is a great functional leader who is removed and staff is put in a terrible situation, then what happens? Amanda said if leadership is bad you can ruin a high functioning [center or progam?] and it is hard to overcome. If the center director is bad, what happens?

Janet Weiss said to be clear, we should separate behavior of the leader from organizational practices. Leader behavior is looked at by itself. Leadership has to be embedded to be powerful. A leader's behavior, routines, and practices are how the leader works to help the organization succeed. That distinction will be helpful. It is seen empirically with leader turnover.

Stacy Ehrlich said they have seen programs be resilient when administration changes. Becki Herman said it is complex to measure because you see impacts of a leader a year later and question who to attribute it to. Janet said leader behavior is almost never measured by asking leaders directly. People are not good reporters of their own behavior and success. A 360 degree evaluation seems to provide best practice.

Teri Talan asked if there a difference between behavior at personal level or center level. Jacqueline Davis said personal self-assessment tests ask the same question in a variety of ways as a way of getting information with variables that help at getting at the conversation about how long leader was in that role.

Leaders are synonymous with change and thinking of change. They know answers may be skewed. They are looking at how to make sure they get a variety of populations and get the results they are looking for. It is important to have a clear definition of roles.

Becki Herman asked how to measure these things. Most validated tools require documentation of what is said. It is harder at the individual level than the institutional, but it is not impossible. At the K-12 level, they use the 360 degree evaluation to include self-report and report those working with and for the leader. Self-report can be unreliable in both directions. Really good turnaround leaders may be harder on themselves, while others are not as hard on themselves. Self-report is not effective without triangulation. If evaluating a leader, then you have to give them enough time to establish relationships rather than teaching to change. Jacqueline Davis said if you are giving it to teams targeting the leader, they are going to know the questions. Becki said you have to write good questions; some questions have obvious right answers. Teresa Derrick-Mills said it may become something to add to FACES. Everything we talked about triangulates and is labor intensive.

Nina Philipsen Hetzner said the research questions need to be answered first. One person or many leaders may be connected to what is typically happening, with FACES linked to more opposite outcomes. She said they could start to explore in FACES and answer the director impact/turnover question. If the director changes from worse to better, what is the result? Does a positive system in place influence the director or vice versa?

Maia Connors asked where the line is between leader behavior and structures of organizational practice. It really is different constructs. Nina Philipsen Hetzner asked about the leader's intentions versus actions.

Caroline Ebanks asked about the purpose of measurement. Is it in the context of performance improvement, TA, or monitoring? 360 evaluations work well for program improvement but not for accountability. It is not a question of who to measure or access. One must instead measure the person responsible for practices/processes and outcomes for children and families. The question lies in who is going to be accessed—one person or three people; assessment protocol says it could be either one or three. This is what it means to have knowledge of the organization—to have in mind the setting and context. It is important to remember it is one point in time. Five to ten years from now we will have a core set of questions to ask.

Stacy Ehrlich said it depends on the ultimate goal—child and family outcomes. In K-12, the leader is the furthest away but they have a better understanding of the flow from leadership to child outcomes. We need to understand that path better and ultimately understand the leader. Are you missing a piece of the puzzle?

Christine suggested doing research to find items that work across all organizations including homes. ACF is interested in all settings. The question is where to start and decide how many models to look at because it will vary by setting and then get more specific information. Maia Connors said we know variations of leadership structure and getting very good descriptive language about structure.

Amanda Bryans said it is a proximal measure. We are getting more focused and getting closer to how well programs are learning from data collected. Questions posed include: is the leader using the data and understanding the effects, digesting and improving; is the program using data to get better and [to get] children engaged in curiosity and creativity; and how are leaders creating environments to do that?

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck asked how that is envisioned. Amanda Bryans said she is an organic person— she thinks a person who has vision learns to help others and has some idea of the process. Ivelisse said the first step is identifying who the person responsible to provide vision is, and is s/he the person who responded. Amanda said it is usually the director but could be a person on the advisory council.

Teresa Derrick-Mills led a study where they asked for an organizational chart. They wanted to get a shared understanding of the meaning rather than to start with the person with vision. They traced it back by starting with the end and followed it backwards to who is really guiding the process. It is network analysis. Stacy Ehrlich said you need to ask the right questions.

Teri Talan said preliminary data from the most recent FACES reported on the amount of time program directors spent on tasks. The majority of time is spent on compliance management. She is thinking about a leader who does not do compliance management and how to figure out who is providing vision. Role authority may take away from that report. Amanda Bryans said you need leadership to drive innovation. The new Head Start performance standards shifts away from compliance, which should be management.

Teri Talan pointed out that the issue is what happens when good leaders leave and how long can they sustain quality. She said Head Start quality lasts longer than child care because the standards are not there in child care. Amanda Bryans said it lasts longer in programs with stronger licensing regulations. Gretchen Kirby said we should not disregard centers.

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck said the survey [National Survey of Early Care and Education] asks who is the most knowledgeable about the program, to determine who should answer the questions. Gretchen Kirby said the staffing structure is the first component. She said to get systematic across organizations on how they describe roles and map to use their language back to them. Using their titles will take a lot of time to frame with 99 different titles.

Kelly Maxwell said she is now thinking backwards. We make a point of the role licensing places in supporting leaders and reflecting on how many constructs we have. Kathryn Tout said it comes out independently reliable in surveys and QRIS.

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck said research recognizes constructs but for each 20 item survey, if you can't use a few items, the psychometrics are gone. Becki Herman said constructs map together to sort and prioritize for actionable tasks. Kathryn Tout said it is challenging to get time to participate and have capacity to complete information. In the Cost of Care project, they were working with FCC providers who have never had a budget. The purpose is to help put one together. They see it as that is what you get as part of the process and this is how they can help.

Nina Philipsen Hetzner said it takes planning if you want alignment with standards and practices. Caroline Ebanks said recruit and incentivize programs to get invested, and asked what could be promised upfront. Gretchen said put together preliminary profiles to give information back. She also said there is a difference between implementation and costs. Cost-measures are clear; getting data are harder.

Janet Weiss said in private sector people are desperate for leadership assistance. Even experienced leaders have a lot to learn. It is something to give back to people to allow them to be more effective. PAS is already doing that to reflect on their own leadership. Any tool that can serve that role can add value.

Becki Herman said given the range, bounding the population you are looking at could help to group data and they need help to define those categories. Tiny categories may not be relevant. Leadership matters when the goal is to be better than certification requirements.

Closing

Nina Philipsen Hetzner closed the meeting with thanks to all the participants and speakers. The meeting ended at 12:30pm.