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Executive Summary

The Early Childhood Director Leadership Institute (ECDLI) project began with the awarding of a Race-to-the-Top Early Learning Challenge grant to Child Care Resources Inc. (CCRI) in Charlotte, North Carolina to conduct a statewide professional development initiative for early childhood program administrators. A project coordinator was hired, a leadership faculty was convened, and curriculum was designed for three 3-day Leadership Institutes beginning in the first quarter of 2013. The leadership faculty met in March, April, May, and August of 2013 to develop the scope and sequence of the curriculum for the 3 Institutes.

Institute participants and coaches were identified and recruited during the second and third quarters of 2013 and the first Institute was held in the fourth quarter of 2013. The second Institute was held in the fall of 2014 and the final Institute took place in the summer of 2015. Comments from participants on all activities and presentations from all 3 Institutes were overwhelmingly positive. All project goals related to the Institutes were met or exceeded. In addition to delivery of the leadership curriculum, the Institutes provided for training on additional leadership topics including the Program Administration Scale (PAS), the theory and application of Small Tests of Change (SToC), and the process of creating a change framework for becoming a culturally competent leader at both the program and systems level. CCRI developed a detailed implementation plan which included specific goals for the Institutes. At least one evaluation team member was present for all leadership faculty meetings, coaches meetings, additional planning and development meetings, and all sessions and activities of each of the three Institutes. All phases of the project were managed and directed in a timely and exemplary fashion and were observed and verified by the evaluation team.

Each participating program director received individualized coaching and support from an early childhood expert. They also participated in coaching teams and received support from each other. The SToC training involved the application of the Plan-Do-Study-Act model (PDSA) on a problem area of each leader’s choice in their ECE centers. The PDSA model was identified as an approach to problem solving that could be applied widely and continuously to facilitate positive change. Sixty-three of the 76 leaders in Institute III completed all components of the SToC. Eighty-two percent selected problems that involved existing policies or procedures and 18% developed plans for new policies or procedures. By the completion of the final Institute, 87% of the directors were ready to implement the changes in their centers and 13% needed more data or further study of the problem before implementation.

The PAS was used to evaluate program quality and managerial and administrative effectiveness. Complete pre- and post-assessments on the PAS were collected from 66 of the participating programs. On average, the program completers successfully accomplished 77.16% of their program improvement goals. The median percent of goals completed was 81.50%. Many of the participants were able to complete 100% of their goals (30.3%) and 78.1% of them completed the majority of their goals. The PAS was the primary indicator of program improvement and nearly all programs demonstrated improvements. The difference between the average pre and post-test scores was statistically significant and the average gain score was 1.06 (standard deviation = .60, effect size = 1.35). Over 98% of the programs made gains in PAS scores and most of the participating programs ended with average PAS scores in the “Good” range.

Introduction

In 2011, states competed for Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grants designed to improve access to high-quality early learning and development programs for young children. Through the RTT-ELC program, states created proposals to compete for funds to improve early learning by coordinating existing services, evaluating and rating program quality and increasing access to high-quality programs. An emphasis was placed on serving children with high needs including those from low-income families, children with disabilities and English learners from birth to age five. The RTT-ELC effort has been jointly administered by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, working together to expand and improve services for these young children and to date over $1 billion in grants have been awarded. In the first year, 37 states submitted applications for RTT-ELC funds and nine states were awarded grants: California, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island and Washington. In 2012, five additional states were awarded grants: Colorado, Illinois, New Mexico, Oregon and Wisconsin.

In 2011, North Carolina was home to almost 375,000 children, birth to kindergarten entry age, from low-income families. The state requested and was awarded $69,991,121 over 4 years from RTT-ELC, leveraging $1,319,900 in other state funding sources to support the grant effort. The combined funds allowed North Carolina’s “NC Ready” reform agenda to build on and take advantage of its considerable early learning and development system’s strengths, while advancing carefully selected strategies to dramatically improve outcomes for children, especially those with high needs. The state reform agenda already in place at that time included four major areas of focus:

- Strengthen the State’s early childhood system and build its capacity to foster positive results for young children.
- Enhance access to and quality of programs to serve young children and their families.
- Strengthen the early childhood workforce to increase staff and system effectiveness and sustain change.
- Target high-intensity supports and community infrastructure-building efforts to turn around poor outcomes for young children in the highest need counties through the establishment of a Transformation Zone.

In its RTT-ELC grant proposal, the North Carolina governor’s office targeted the following seven Focused Investment Areas as drawn from their application: 1.) developing statewide learning standards, 2.) supporting effective uses of comprehensive assessment systems, 3.) improving the school readiness of children with high needs, 4.) engaging and supporting families, 5.) supporting early childhood educators in improving their knowledge, skills, and abilities, 6.) understanding the status of children’s learning and development at kindergarten entry, and 7.) building and enhancing an early learning data systems. Once the RTT-ELC funding was received, the state of North Carolina conducted several competitions through which they sought partners capable of helping them accomplish their goals in each of the seven focal areas. CCRI responded to a call for proposals in the area of supporting early childhood educators. In this strand of activity North Carolina was seeking to enhance their educator professional development system, collect data on the early childhood workforce, and examine the effectiveness of various strategies designed to improve the quality of and access to professional development. Multiple prior workforce studies have provided
the state with data on the education, compensation, demographics, workplace supports, professional development needs, and turnover of the early childhood workforce, and have been used to create strategies to promote system-wide improvements. Child Care Resources Inc. submitted a proposal to conduct a statewide professional development initiative for early childhood program administrators that fit naturally into this area of activity and their proposal was selected for funding.

**Rationale for the Project**

The lead administrator of a child care program is responsible for every aspect of its program operations and is often the gatekeeper to its quality. These leadership responsibilities are multifaceted, ranging from basic sanitation compliance to complex educational, fiscal, and legal issues. The lead administrator’s role requires significant skill in communication and decision-making, with an increasing focus on the performance of child care centers as business enterprises that require skilled resource management and leadership (Nupponen, 2006). Additionally, coaching and mentoring programs help promote desired changes by providing opportunities for administrators to focus on their leadership capabilities (Fleming & Love, 2003).

In research conducted across 560 centers in 25 states, researchers at the McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership (2010) found that the quality of instructional leadership practices and the learning environment for children were stronger when directors were well-educated and had access to leadership and business administration training along with peer support. Unfortunately, further research shows that many child care program administrators assume their positions without the necessary instructional, management, and leadership skills and experience to sustain high quality services and financially viable programs. In addition, opportunities for growth and professional development for these particular leaders in these areas have been scarce. Gaps in the knowledge of early childhood program leaders include knowledge and skills specific to financial management, planning, leadership development, personnel and human resources, and curricular planning and implementation (Boulton, 2008). There is a need for early child care administrators to have access to formal instructional opportunities that address the complex role of directors and their many areas of responsibility.

As a first round RTT-ELC grant winner, North Carolina was awarded approximately $70 million to improve their services and programs for young children. One of the mandates in the award was to enhance leadership development in the early childhood education field. $750,000 of the state’s $70 million award was designated to meet this specific need. Child Care Resources Inc., a private non-profit, 501c (3) child care resource and referral agency, was selected to fulfill this portion of the grant mandate.

**Child Care Resources Inc. (CCRI)**

CCRI was established in 1982 through a community planning process initiated and commissioned by the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners to improve and expand the county’s child care services. For more than thirty years, CCRI has successfully advanced the mission of partnering with families, communities, and early care and education and school-age child care professionals and programs to ensure that all children have access to high quality, affordable early learning and school-age opportunities and experiences. CCRI was Mecklenburg County’s first partnership to privatize government services and the first nationally-certified Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) agency. They are governed by a 21 member Board of Directors and presently administer close to $50 million of child care subsidy funds. The extensive work of CCRI is
largely credited for 87% of the children in their service area (a five county region in North Carolina) being enrolled in licensed child care settings with 4- and 5- star programs.

Beyond its local and regional footprint, CCRI has a long history of successful collaboration at the state level. In 2004, in collaboration and at the request of the NC Division of Child Development, they co-founded the North Carolina Child Care Resource and Referral Council and have served the state on this Council since its inception. In its role with the Council, CCRI ensures quality CCR&R service delivery statewide, provides competent statewide leadership for one of the Council’s special initiatives, Promoting Healthy Social Behaviors in Child Care Centers, and also houses the Council’s Consumer Education and Referral and Technical Assistance/Professional Development specialists. Given its strong partnerships with NCDCDEE and child-focused and child-serving organizations throughout the state, CCRI was well-positioned to develop and lead the effort to enhance leadership development even further throughout the state.

As evidenced by its status as the first CCR&R agency in North Carolina to become IACET-approved for the delivery of Continuing Education Unit (CEU) coursework, CCRI was already developing appropriate curriculum and designing the delivery of effective training to improve the leadership and program management skills of child care administrators in the region. In 2006, CCRI launched a project in Mecklenburg County known as the Directors Leadership Academy (DLA). The goals of this effort were to 1) strengthen child care administrators’ planning, and mentoring for the benefit of their programs; 2) promote and support their leadership roles within the field; and 3) nurture a cadre of lead teachers who would be prepared to succeed current leaders as opportunities arose.

The success of the Director’s Leadership Academy captured the attention of the local school system. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) is a large, urban district serving almost 150,000 students K-12. When the More at Four initiative was launched in North Carolina (now NC Pre-K), CMS called on CCRI for its expertise and proven capacity and contracted with CCRI to customize and implement their project.

**The Early Childhood Directors Leadership Institute**

The overarching goal of the ECDLI was to design and lead the implementation of a statewide leadership institute for 100 diverse early childhood directors from across the state of North Carolina. As part of the project, curriculum for CEU credits would be developed and piloted with a goal of making this curriculum available for delivery to others beyond the scope of the project in the future. The curriculum designed for this project would be delivered over the course of three 2 or 3-day Institutes, during which the 100 director participants would be convened. In addition to delivery of the curriculum, the Institutes would provide for training on other topics including the Program Administration Scale (PAS), the theory and application of Small Tests of Change (STC), and the process of creating a Change Framework for becoming a culturally competent leader at both the program and systems level.

CCRI developed a detailed implementation plan to insure that the overall goals of the project would be accomplished. This plan included the following 13 specific goals for the 2013 project year:

1) Hire the Project Coordinator  
2) Recruit a geographically diverse pool of 100 eligible Directors  
3) Select a diverse pool of 100 Directors to participate in the ECDLI  
4) Convene the Leadership Faculty  
5) Develop curricula
As of December 2013, CCRI exceeded the target performance outcomes for five of these goals (2, 7, 8, 9, and 13). The performance outcomes were met for four of these goals (1, 3, 4, and 6). For three of these goals, all involving ongoing activities that will extend across project years, the performance outcomes were partially met as expected (5, 10, and 11). For the remaining goal (12), the activities were postponed until the 2014 project year.

To address goal 1, a job description with required qualifications was developed and Lisa Shporer was hired as the coordinator of the ECDLI project on January 2, 2013. Lisa holds a Bachelor’s of Science in Early Childhood Education as well as an MBA degree. She has experience in early childhood educational administration, served as Executive Director of a children’s museum, and has ten years of business and management leadership experience. She was also the project manager of CCRI’s Directors Leadership Academy.

To address goals 2 and 3, recruiting and selecting 100 early childhood directors from throughout North Carolina to apply and be accepted to participate in the Early Childhood Directors Leadership Institute, the project coordinator took steps to recruit a cadre of ethnically, culturally, and racially diverse directors from urban and rural regions across the state. North Carolina is divided into 100 counties and child care programs are rated using a 5 star rating scale with 5 being of highest quality. Only directors from 3- 4- or 5 star programs were invited to apply. The project coordinator took the number of 3 – 5 star programs available per county and selected participants based on a matching percentage. For example, in Alamance County, there were only 56 programs with 3 – 5 star ratings while in Mecklenburg County there were 228 at that time. Consequently, a higher percentage of applicants were admitted from larger counties.

Participants also needed to meet additional requirements. They must have been administrators in the early childhood field for at least 3 years and have supervised at least 4 other workers to apply. Additional information on the applications included education level, number of children served in the facility, star ratings, and number of children with subsidies their program served. The directors also needed to have internet access and to supply references. Writing samples were taken from all applicants including a self-reflection on their comfort level in dealing with change. Efforts were made to recruit participants from a diverse setting physically as well as geographically, from large programs and small programs, from urban, suburban and rural. No home centers were recruited to participate. Participants had to be willing to commit to all three of the multi-day Institutes over the 2-year time duration of the project. If too many applicants were accepted from the same county, a lottery system was used to select participants. In total, 172 directors applied for the ECDLI and 109 were selected taking into account normal attrition rates in the field, thereby exceeding the performance outcomes. These directors represented a geographically diverse cross section of the state as they worked in 49 of North Carolina’s 100 counties.

To address goal 4, Lisa Shporer convened a leadership advisory group of university faculty and other highly qualified professionals to guide the development and writing of content that would be included in the curriculum of the Institute. The following individuals serve on this
faculty: Dr. Richard Lambert (UNC-Charlotte); Dr. Stephen Hancock (UNC-Charlotte); Dr. Rebecca Shore (UNC-Charlotte); Dr. Karen Geiger (Queens University); Dr. Renee Sanders (Johnson C. Smith University); Tammy Hamilton (JCSU); Jennifer Johnson (NCDCDEE); and Janet Singerman (CCRI). The leadership faculty met in March, April, May, and August of 2013 to develop the scope and sequence of the Institute curriculum. The leadership faculty represented a cross section of stakeholders and included among others a NCDCDEE appointee, a NCCCR&R Council representative, and university faculty with expertise in leadership, cultural competency, early childhood programming and evaluation. Members met both in-person at CCRI headquarters in Charlotte, North Carolina, and through call-in to participate in the development of the curriculum. Therefore this performance outcome was met.

Table 1.
Demographic Characteristics of ECDLI Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center STAR Rating</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Number of Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Number of Children Served Birth - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>5,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Shporer and the leadership faculty began developing the curricula for the ECDLI, they incorporated effective practices for leadership development focusing on the following criteria and guiding principles.

The ECDLI would:

- Be based on participants’ perceived needs;
- Be problem-centered and site specific;
- Focus on the administrator as leader/change agent;
- Meet the needs of the working professional;
- Promote the professional advancement of the participant;
- Promote active learning and instructional leadership;
- Promote collegiality and networking; and
- Include ongoing technical assistance.

At this time, all goals are expected to be met by project end.

Concomitant to the meetings of the leadership faculty, and to address goal 6, ten coaches were recruited and hired across the state to support the 100 Institute participants throughout the duration of the project. The coaches were experts in early child care leadership rooted in practice across diverse geographic regions of North Carolina. Their role would be to work with ECDLI participants in the application of knowledge gained through the Institute including goal-setting, self-
reflections, action plans, and all aspects of the curriculum including phases of the PAS and the Small Test of Change process. Applicants for the coaching position were recruited through multiple measures, primarily through electronic messages to experts in the field. Highly qualified coaches were sought statewide. Candidates had to have experience working with young children in North Carolina. Ten successful coaches were selected among 58 applicants to support the 100 participants of ECDLI. Once hired, the coaches were matched to areas of greatest need and geographic location was an additional consideration. A map of territories was created by the project coordinator and one coach was assigned to 10 Institute participants creating ten teams for the duration of the project. The coaches were trained to visit participants face-to-face in their work settings as well as communicate via phone and through electronic communication. Goal 13 was exceeded as these coaches began the process of meeting with and supporting the Directors. Every participating Director received at least 5 hours of contact and many received significantly more.

The individuals participating in ECDLI were connected using manaba, an on-line community software tool. At the start of Institute I, 94% of the participants were connected through manaba and used it on a weekly basis. Manaba enables:

- Leadership faculty to share information and comments on the curriculum development,
- The project coordinator to connect to the entire cohort, individual team members, coaches, and the leadership faculty,
- Coaches to connect with their team members and other coaches, and
- Participants to connect with their teams and share resources, identify topics of common interest, post resources, and provide information and feedback to address challenges.

To address, Goal 10, conducting pre-assessments for all participating programs and their directors, the project coordinator was trained as a PAS evaluator and began the process of visiting each program. During 2013, 12 pre-assessments were completed. This process continued and the remaining pre-assessments were completed in early 2014. Therefore this performance goal was met. Similarly, the process of developing individual action plans, goal 11, was partially met at Institute I. The process of development was started and 12 action plans were developed based on the data collected during the completed pre-assessments. Goal 12, the Small Steps of Change process was postponed until all pre-assessments and action plans were completed and this goal was completed by the final Institute.

Institute I - October 28-30, 2013

Goal 7 involved conducting a two day Institute for the Directors. This goal was exceeded given that a three day institute was held. Goals 8 and 9 involved attendance at and satisfaction with the Institutes. This section of the report provides a detailed account of what took place at the first Institute, the engagement and attendance of the participants, and their level of satisfaction with the event. The first Institute took place at the Embassy Suites Hotel in Winston Salem, North Carolina. Between acceptance to the program and the opening activities of Institute I on October 28th, 8 of the 109 participants were not able to attend the Institute and 1 had to depart after the first day so a total of 100 early childhood leaders attended and completed the first Institute. Learner outcomes were developed and made available to all participants and detailed instructions for all involved were delivered. Resources were ordered and organized and coaches arrived early to participate in a pre-meeting with the program coordinator prior to the opening session. Evaluation personnel from the Center for Educational Management and Evaluation (CEME) were present at all planning meetings and attended all 3 days of Institute I.
Day 1: Coaches Meeting – 1:00 – 3:30 pm

Prior to the opening session of Institute I, Lisa Shporer conducted a meeting with all ten coaches and personnel from the CEME in a conference room at the Embassy Suites. Coaches were instructed in protocol for working with the 100 participants and in accountability measures. They were instructed to record both the questions they were asking the participants and the questions the participants were asking them, as well as rating the level of engagement of each participant. This would be captured qualitatively through minutes of meetings as well as quantitatively through recording of number and duration of meetings through manaba. Research on measurement properties and evaluation of management climate was shared with the group (Lambert 2002) in addition to other performance information and the evaluation of teachers. Coaches were advised that early childhood administrators have been shown to rate the performance of their teachers higher than their own.

At 6:00 pm on October 28th, 2013, Janet Singerman, President of Child Care Resources Inc. took the podium of the Grand Pavilion Ballroom and welcomed the participants, coaches, and support personnel to the opening of the Early Childhood Directors Leadership Institute. She delivered brief, motivational remarks utilizing inspirational quotes from leaders woven between important information regarding leadership in early childhood. Janet Singerman’s remarks were followed by a welcome from Lucy Roberts, the Executive Director of the North Carolina Early Childhood Advisory Council.

At 7:25 p.m., Dr. David Rendall, author of The Four Factors of Effective Leadership delivered the opening keynote address of the Institute. His informative (and humorous) talk summarized research and writing of outstanding scholars on leadership in addition to highlighting the essentials for moving forward in leadership. He provided a framework for assessing the participants’ current competence and guiding their improvement in four specific areas of leadership: Influence, integrity, inspiration, and continuous improvement. Dr. Rendall concluded his remarks at 8:55. Lisa Shporer finished with brief “housekeeping” remarks and the opening session ended at 9:00 p.m.

Day 2: October 29, 2013

All participants reconvened in the Grand Pavilion Ballroom for the opening session of Day 2. Jennifer Johnson, Section Chief for Education and Quality for the North Carolina Division of Child Development and Early Education delivered a welcome to the group. Following the opening welcome, Dr. Stephen Hancock, Associate Professor of Multicultural Education from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte presented Parts I and II of the opening Institute Module. This Module, developed by the program coordinator and leadership faculty, was titled Introduction to Early Childhood Leadership and Management. It included topics:

- Developing as a visionary, culturally competent leader;
- Grounding leadership in values and ethics;
- Understanding the process of change; and
- Using evidence-based practice and program assessment;

Dr. Hancock engaged participants in an opening large group discussion answering the question, “Why do we do what we do?” He then facilitated learning about visionary and culturally competent leadership, grounding leadership in values and ethics, and understanding the process of change. He also discussed the role of assessment strategies for program improvement and addressed differences between leadership and management. Many opportunities for self-reflection were
incorporated throughout the Module and numerous opportunities for journal writing were included. Questions posed to participants included, “What do you believe about what you do?” “How are education, security, and judgment reflected in the world around us?” “How does your own perspective on culture affect your definition of leadership?” “When considering your personal stereotypes and biases, do you focus on people that are alike or different from you?” “How does the management of life stresses and challenges affect our world view?” “How does it affect our world view of the families of the children we serve?” Participants addressed each of these questions in their journals and further explored their own values, beliefs and ethics through various activities and small and large group discussions. The group moved to the neighboring ballroom to participate in the Privilege Walk, an activity to further emphasize the wide variety of backgrounds of early childhood leaders and the impact that this variety can have on vision and approach to their work. This portion of the Module was broken into two parts by a buffet lunch in an adjoining room to minimize lost instructional time (11:30 – 12:15) and was completed at 1:45 p.m.

At 1:45 p.m., Tomoka Higuchi McElwain, Vice President of ASAHI Net, Incorporated, gave the participants an orientation to the on-line community software that would be used throughout the duration of the project. During a brief (5 - 10 minute) technical problem with the hotel technology, participants were asked to write down on a piece of paper their “hopes and dreams” for the Institute. By the time participants’ thoughts were written and collected, the technical glitch was solved and this orientation was completed.

Participants then transitioned through a 30 minute break. Participants reconvened in small pre-established teams to meet their coaches and other geographic work group members. These informal meetings took place throughout the hotel and generally ran for two hours from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. One CEME evaluator walked through the hotel and identified all ten groups engaged in discussions getting to know one another, sharing the role of the coach, and plotting the course for the next two years of work together. Following these meetings, participants had a break before dinner and team-building activities conducted by Michael Raines and associates from the YMCA Camp Hanes. Activities included a variety of physical activities designed to further develop team building and incorporate movement for the participants. Activities were designed to be enjoyable and based on observations of participants engaged in them, met that objective. It was noteworthy that participants all appeared to be actively engaged. This event concluded at 10:00 p.m.

Day 3: October 30, 2013

At 8:00 a.m., Dr. Jill Bella, Director of Quality Support from McCormick Center for Early childhood Leadership and co-author of A Great Place to Work and Zoom began her presentation introducing the Program Administration Scale (PAS). Dr. Bella pointed out that the ECE program director is the gatekeeper to quality for their services and she shared strategies to support efforts to achieve program excellence through the PAS. This instrument provides a framework for measuring and benchmarking quality improvements in ECE programs and will be used as an evaluation tool for the project.

Dr. Bella opened with an activity called “Just Like Me” in which she asked participants to stand up if her questions applied to them. The responses were telling in further showing the overall profile of the participants. The first question was, “How many of you got up early and exercised this morning prior to attending this session?” Only 2 people among all of the participants, coaches, and support personnel stood up. When asked how many had hired a new teacher in the last 6 months, almost half of the participants in the room stood up, supporting research showing high turnover rates for early childhood educators. When asked how many participants had worked in early childhood for 1 – 5 years, only 2 people stood up. 6 – 10 years brought about a dozen more, 11-15
saw about a dozen more, but the approximately a quarter of the participants stood for the
experience range of 16 – 20 years. Another dozen stood for 20 – 25, another dozen for 26-30, and
four participants have worked in early childhood for 31-35 years. These folks received an
enthusiastic round of applause.

Dr. Bella then lead the group through a series of interactive activities targeting problems in
their work, big problems and small problems, and lead them to a discussion on formal assessment.
She helped show that formal assessment gives feedback to help pinpoint their challenges, strengths,
and areas to further explore. She discussed the formal gathering of data through surveys, rating
scales, child assessments, teacher evaluations, and documentation of behaviors. The presentation
was particularly well-organized and participants appeared fully engaged. The group evaluated 11
other agencies and instruments and found some widely used tools such as the ECERS and the Early
Childhood Work Environment Survey, but concluded that there were no tools widely available for
evaluation of leadership and management practices. This absence of a tool lead to the development
of the Program Administration Scale or PAS. She concluded by pointing out that classroom quality
cannot be maintained without systems and policies in place at the organizational level.

At 4:15 p.m. in the afternoon, Lisa Shporer delivered closing remarks to an enthusiastic
showing of applause by the participants. The engagement and stamina of the participants after
Institute I was noteworthy. Overall, the first Institute provided a very content rich, three day
experience for the directors. They were heavily engaged throughout all of the activities and each
session contained a variety of stimulating and interactive activities.

Evaluation of Institute I

“My Greatest Hope”

While the writing prompt activity in the Grand Pavilion Ballroom in the morning session on
October 29th was not a pre-planned activity for evaluating the results of the opening Institute, it
does serve as an important source for what participants expressed as a need and provides evidence
for the motivation for their carving out the time from their busy jobs to participate in the project.
99 responses to the prompt “My greatest hope for this Institute is…” were collected from
participants. These responses were coded into themes. The most prevalent response, 65 participants
hoped to improve their leadership skills in some way. Some of these respondents elaborated on
specifically which leadership skills they hoped to improve; Staff Relations – 7, Communication – 5,
Assertiveness – 4, Avoid Burnout/Inspiration for Me – 4, Get Resources -2, Delegate – 2, and
Technology – 2, while most just hoped to improve their leadership abilities. Examples of responses
included the following showing themes:

Improve Leadership Skills - “My greatest hope is to improve my leadership skills, to motivate me as
a leader at my child care center, and to gain knowledge on how to develop as an effective leader.”

Improve Staff Relations – “My greatest hope is to improve staff relationships and commitment to
growing the future of our children. Planting seeds.” “My greatest hope is to improve staff relations.”

Communication – “My greatest hope from this Institute is to improve my ability to communicate
with my staff in their ‘language’.” “My greatest hope for the Institute is to improve the
communication between everyone.”
An additional theme emerged with 42 of the respondents specifically stating that they hoped to inspire and/or motivate others both at the local, state, and for a small few, at the national level. While it is likely that some coaches’ responses were in this mix, it is still significant that almost half of the participants were seeking ways to help others besides themselves by attending the Institute. Examples of these responses include:

“My greatest hope is to improve my own leadership skills and help others discover ‘the greatness’ in themselves.

“My greatest hope is to inspire my employees.”

“My greatest hope from this Institute is to improve public policy regarding ECE in North Carolina.”

Evaluation forms were developed by the program coordinator in collaboration with the Leadership Faculty in the planning months prior to the opening Institute. These forms were administered and collected at the conclusion of the Institute. Respondents were asked to indicate from a scale of Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor, how useful the information was for them and to rate the presenter’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions. Participants were also invited to write out how they would use the information from each particular session. Table 2 provides an overview of the survey responses.

**Session I – The Four Factors of Effective Leadership by Dr. David Rendall**

Regarding Dr. David Rendall’s presentation of *The Four Factors of Effective Leadership*, 89% of respondents rated the session as Excellent and 11% found it Good. No respondents responded with Fair or Poor. Also, 91% found Dr. Rendall’s delivery and ability to answer questions Excellent and 9% found it Good. Again, no respondents rated the session Fair or Poor.

A total of 96 participants provided written comments regarding how they would use the information shared. The responses were coded and seven themes within the responses were established. The largest category of qualitative responses indicated the participants (35) would use the information from the session for self-evaluation and improvement. Example responses for using the information included “fine tune my leadership skills and become more aware of the impact of my interactions and changes on leadership,” and “the change starts with me.” Another 28 respondents wrote that the session would improve their leadership skills. “I will use the information to improve my professional and volunteer leadership skills.” “Begin with ‘why’, not ‘what’.” Eleven participants from this 28 specifically mentioned the 4 leadership factors shared by Rendall on their form. “I will implement the 4 factors of Effective leadership and I will start with myself.” “Implement the 4 factors to help me become a better leader.” “Can’t wait to read the book.” Thirteen respondents claimed that they would share the information with their staff and/or children and/or parents and 4 of these believed that the information would help with their staff relations.

One claimed that they would take the information to a “staff meeting to inform the staff what I learned.” Another wrote, “I will be doing a mini workshop for my Assistant Directors on being an effective leader.” Eight respondents reported that they would use the information to inspire others and 7 claimed that it inspired them. “I will use this information in my current role to inspire my colleagues and the directors I am coaching.” Twenty-one commented (unsolicited by the form) that this opening session was “fun” and “a great way to start the Institute!” “Especially good for evening presentation since humor kept it interesting and engaging even when tired.” “Adding humor helped get the information across.” “He was funny.” “Great speaker and wonderful start to
this event.” Finally, 7 specifically wrote that they planned to buy his book and three claimed that they intended to conduct a book study with their staff on *The Four Factors of Effective Leadership.* “Will use this book for book club for my Team.” “Book study with my teachers/staff.” “Can’t wait to read the book.”

**Session II – Early Childhood Leadership and Management by Dr. Stephen Hancock**

Regarding Dr. Stephen Hancock’s presentation on Early Childhood Leadership and Management, 86% found the usefulness of the information to be Excellent and 13% rated it Good with one participant responding that it was Fair. On the second question regarding delivery, 85% rated the session Excellent and 15% responded Good with no Fair or Poor ratings.

A total of 100 participants provided written comments regarding how they would use the information presented by Dr. Hancock. Six themes were established from these responses. The most prevalent use of knowledge by participants was that they would share the information with staff (34 respondents). Another 22 wrote that they would “start by asking ‘why’” they do what they do, a focal point of Dr. Hancock’s message. Seventeen claimed that the session encouraged them to practice self-reflection. “I will use some of the techniques to evaluate myself, as well as my program. Loved the presentations. Great presenter.” Another 15 wrote that it would help them to implement change. “POWERFUL and CHALLENGING presentation. I really enjoyed it. Definitely will change how I pursue change and lead my organization. Truly beneficial.” One respondent said they would use the information “to make a change in my program to become better. I really enjoyed the interaction and the information that was delivered to us.” Six responded more generally that they would be able to improve their leadership skills with the information they learned. In this particular session, 14 respondents wrote (unsolicited) that there was so much information shared that they felt somewhat rushed and needed more time to process and engage with the quantity of information delivered. One wrote that the information would “help me organize changes and plan staff experiences, hone my leadership skills. Began and ended very well…Needed more time for group processing and discussion. Privilege walk was insightful.”

**Session III – Team Building by Michael Raines & YMCA Staff**

Participants were asked to rate the Team Building activity that followed dinner on Tuesday evening presented by Michael Raines and his team from the YMCA. 72% of respondents rated the event as Excellent, 23% as Good, and 3% as Fair. No participants found the event to be Poor, even with the possible influence of an abbreviated night’s sleep due to the fire drill followed by a long day of workshops. 74% rated the delivery of the session as Excellent, 25% Good, and 1 respondent found it Poor.

Eighty-four participants provided written comments regarding the session. Three themes emerged. Forty-five respondents claimed that the session would help them to build stronger teams at their work places. “Great team building ideas for staff. How to build up staff morale.” “Great team building activities to do in my program. Super fun and I don’t usually enjoy those types of events. Our team certainly bonded during this activity.” Another 37 indicated that they would share the activities with their staff, and 28 others wrote (unsolicited) that this session was a lot of fun. “Bring back team building activities to do with staff. Michael was energetic and kept us all on our toes. Even though it was after dinner, he motivated all of us to get up and participate.”
Session IV – Leading the Way to Quality: The Director’s Role – Dr. Jill Bella

Both the morning and afternoon work sessions were devoted to understanding the Program Administration Scale. Ninety-two participants (87%) rated the usefulness of the information presented as Excellent and 14 respondents (13%) rated the session as Good. No participants rated the session either Fair or Poor. Ninety participants (86%) rated Dr. Bella’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions as Excellent and 10% rated this category as Good. Four respondents rated this session as Fair and no participants rated it as Poor.

Qualitative comments were written on evaluation forms by 89 participants. The vast majority of participants (67) reported that they intend to use the PAS at their work sites. “This information will be used to assess my program and start working on things that need improvement.” Another 15 wrote positive remarks about the information but didn’t not state specifically if they intended to use the information. For example, one wrote, “Really helped having the PAS explained.” Another 4 responded that they would use the information to be a better leader but did not specifically state they were implementing the instrument. Only 4 out of 89 stated that there was too much information included in the session.

Overall Satisfaction

At the conclusion of the first Institute, participants were asked a series of questions regarding their overall satisfaction on a number of different facets (See Table 2). Seventy-three percent found the location Excellent, 25% Good, and 2% Fair. Eighty percent found their hotel rooms Excellent, 15% Good, 4% Fair and 1 found it Poor. Eighty-one percent found the meals and snacks Excellent, 14% Good, and 5% Fair. Ninety-three percent found the books and resources provided at the Institute Excellent and 7% Good. Eighty-two percent found the networking opportunities Excellent, 13% Good, 4% Fair, and one respondent rated networking opportunities Poor.

Participants were asked to choose a “best part of the Institute.” One hundred and six participants responded; clearly coaches commented on this portion of the evaluation as well. Thirty-five respondents indicated they liked “everything” about the Institute, primarily the information shared and the keynote presenters. A few chose favorites; 11 liked Dr. Hancock’s presentation best, 6 selected Dr. Rendall. A dozen participants thought that the PAS training by Dr. Bella was top. However, 50 respondents claimed that the networking opportunities were the most valuable part of the Institute. “Networking with other directors, forming new friendships, learning new ideas. I really enjoyed the institute & I’m excited for all the changes I’m gonna make in my center!

Lisa Shporer gave participants the opportunity to submit input regarding dates for the second Institute scheduled for summer, 2014, and will investigate best times for scheduling Institute II. The second Institute is planned to take place at the same site, the Embassy Suites hotel in Winston-Salem. An interview with Shporer revealed extensive consideration and investigation before selecting the site for the Institutes. She visited many sites before deciding on Embassy Suites. In the Grand Pavilion Ballroom, one wall has floor to ceiling windows that open to an enclosed nature area of trees and other greenery. During presentations, participants had their backs to this nature scene, however, during breaks, the view out the windows created a calming, open effect.
Table 2
Overview of Satisfaction Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Randall</td>
<td>Information was useful</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery, Answers to questions</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hancock</td>
<td>Information was useful</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery, Answers to questions</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Raines</td>
<td>Information was useful</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery, Answers to questions</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Bellis</td>
<td>Information was useful</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery, Answers to questions</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Satisfaction | ECDLI Institute overall | 75.8% | 24.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Location            | 72.6% | 25.5% | 1.9%  | 0.0% |
| Hotel room          | 80.0% | 15.2% | 3.8%  | 1.0% |
| Meals, snacks       | 81.0% | 14.3% | 4.8%  | 0.0% |
| Books, resources    | 93.3% | 6.7%  | 0.0%  | 0.0% |
| Networking          | 81.6% | 14.3% | 3.1%  | 1.0% |

Summary Evaluation of Project Activities to Date

The Early Childhood Director Leadership Institute project began with the awarding of the grant to CCRI, Inc. and the hiring of the project coordinator who began work January 2, 2013. All activities were successfully carried out on schedule throughout the project according to the established project timeline. The leadership faculty was convened and the curriculum design began in the first quarter of 2013. Participants and coaches were identified and recruited during the second and third quarters of 2013 and the first Institute was held in the fourth quarter of 2013. At least one evaluation team member was present for all leadership faculty meetings and additional planning and development meetings. At least one evaluation team member attended all activities included in the preconference with coaches and the three days of the opening Institute itself. It was verified that all phases of the project were managed and directed in a timely and exemplary fashion. Comments from participants on all activities and presenters within the first 3-day Institute were overwhelmingly positive.

Presently, participants are receiving pre-certified PAS assessments. Twelve were conducted in the closing months of 2013 and program action plan goals were set. Coaches have begun quarterly meetings as a group, and are logging at least 5 hours per month of contact time (more than
15 minutes each) with each team member. Types of coach contact include communication over manaba, book studies, and topic discussions. Sixteen learning communities have formed within the group, which include interest topics such as strategic planning, family engagement strategies, and fiscal matters. By the end of 2013, 94% of the directors were actively using manaba. All of the community learning groups and the contact hours, including types of contact by coaches is tracked by the project coordinator at the end of each month and data is already being collected.

Summary of Institute I - October 28-30, 2013

The first Institute took place at the Embassy Suites Hotel in Winston Salem, North Carolina. Evaluation personnel from the Center for Educational Management and Evaluation (CEME) were present at all planning meetings and attended all three days of Institute I. At least one evaluation team member was present for all leadership faculty meetings and additional planning and development meetings prior to the first Institute and at least one evaluation team member attended all activities included in the preconference with coaches and the three days of the opening Institute itself. It was verified that all phases of the project were managed and directed in a timely and exemplary fashion. Comments from participants on all activities and presenters within the first, three-day Institute were overwhelmingly positive.

Between Institute I and Institute II, participants received pre-certified PAS assessments. Twelve were conducted in the closing months of 2013. Coaches held quarterly meetings as a group, and logged at least 5 hours per month of contact time (more than 15 minutes each) with each team member. Types of coach contact included communication over manaba, book studies, and topic discussions. Sixteen learning communities formed within the group which included interest topics such as strategic planning, family engagement strategies, and fiscal matters. At the time of Institute II, roughly 94% of the directors had used manaba. All of the community learning groups and the contact hours, including types of contact by coaches, was tracked by the project coordinator at the end of each month and data has been collected.


Institute II was held at the Greensboro Marriott Downtown in Greensboro, North Carolina. A coach’s meeting preceded the opening luncheon work session.

Day 1: August 4, 2014

9:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. – Coaches Meeting

As with Institute I, prior to the opening session of Institute II, Lisa Shporer conducted a meeting with nine of the ten coaches in the Cape Fear room of the hotel. One coach was not in attendance for this meeting due to a medical complication. Lisa provided a Coach Meeting Agenda (appendix) and thanked the group for their work. She delivered an inspirational opening message for about 5 minutes summarizing the work of the coaches since the last Institute and pointing out specific tasks they had accomplished in the interim. Coaches had visited directors, organized study groups, developed and held book study groups, and communicated with them on manaba to name a few accomplishments. Lisa also shared some inspirational comments from participants on the work so far. Following this opening, Lisa led the group through an overview of the agenda for the Institute and through the materials for the upcoming three days of work. This included the overall schedule, several less formal activities such as the planned Yarn ball activity to understand
components and connectivity of systems, Zumba class for team building, and the locations and activities for the Team Times. She then reviewed the roles of the coaches for the breakout sessions and encouraged them to use this face-to-face Institute to rededicate themselves to these protocol requirements. A lively discussion ensued around issues concerning the engagement of a few of their participants. A couple had a participant that had not been active on manaba yet. Other coaches shared ideas that had been successful for them and shared materials and handouts for participants that they felt they were still working to more fully engage. Lisa encouraged them all to consider this a new opportunity to explore, reflect, and renew.

11:15 a.m. – Hotel Check In

12:15 p.m. – Opening Luncheon Work Session – Coaches & Participants

Jennifer Johnson, Education & Quality Section Chief of the North Carolina Division of Child Development & Early Education welcomed the full group to the Institute. Afterward, ECDLI Program Coordinator, Lisa Shporer, welcomed them and thanked them for their work since the last Institute. 98 people were in attendance.

Session I: 1:15 p.m. – The Work of Leaders, Dr. Karen Geiger

Karen Geiger, President of Karen Geiger & Associates, Incorporated, was the speaker for the opening session of Institute II. She shared research findings on leadership, including the concepts that executives learn by doing, learn from other people (through conversation) and learn from their mistakes. She pointed out that the last way they usually learn is through training, however, she recommended that they should all “suspend beliefs” before they opened their DiSC Profile of Leaders results.

For this opening session, the participants had been strategically placed at tables in groups of ten based on their responses to the DiSC leadership instrument. Each participant had filled in the DiSC instrument since the last Institute and their personal results had been compiled and were in their registration materials. Once at their designated tables, they each opened their results and studied them. This activity of viewing and discussing results with their tables took approximately 25 minutes. Participants were at first slow to engage, however, Lisa brought the microphone around the room and eventually increasing numbers of participants shared their thoughts concerning their results and the DiSC instrument in general. Dr. Geiger then pointed out similarities between the Myers-Briggs and the DiSC and all viewed a video on the work of leaders which discussed vision, alignment, and execution of leadership activities. The video also shared what leaders do; craft visions, build alignment, and champion executions of efforts.

Following a five minute break, Dr. Geiger led the group through an investigation of personal mission statements and helped guide them in steps toward the creation of a vision. She had analyzed the group responses on their DiSC beforehand and had selected examples from each table to expand on the vision concept and further explain the DiSC instrument and how leadership behaviors play out. She showed how one participant scored high on one end of a particular DISC continuum and another scored high on the other end. She had participants read their results and the group analyzed how these different leadership approaches may play out in their centers. Dr. Geiger did an excellent job of personalizing this workshop by having studied their individual DiSC results prior to the Institute and this brought about high engagement in the analysis portion of the workshop. Dr. Geiger used early childhood center examples throughout discussions. “How do I
know if a center is aligned? When anybody in it can do a tour because all know the vision.” This opening session on the work of leaders lasted until 4:00 p.m.

The resulting evaluation responses from the participants were all positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work of Leaders</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Geiger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Karen’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Characteristic Comments:**

“I will use this information to examine my practice bearing in mind my leadership style and how it impacts others.”

“Really liked the DiSC profile—will share with my staff so they better understand my leadership style. I wish we did the model of listening to both sides of the characteristics into execution but we ran out of time.”

“I will use the information to improve my leadership style by being more encouraging and offering more praise but it also gave me insight of recognizing staff’s profile.”

4:00 p.m. – Break & Team Meetings

Each coach then led their team members to the respective predetermined breakout locations for open discussions. As CEME evaluators walked through the hotel and monitored these breakout group meetings it was determined that all groups were engaged in dialog about multiple topics related to the Institute.

5:30 p.m. – Reception

Lisa Shporer had arranged a reception in a large suite, Room 319 in the hotel and when CEME evaluators arrived all seats were taken and participants were engaged in loud and lively dialogue with one another throughout the rooms of the suite. The top recommendation from participants from Institute I was to have more time to network with other participants. The activity at this reception showed appreciation for the time to talk with one another before the structured evening activities ensued.

6:30 p.m. – Dinner & Networking

Participants were placed in their teams at tables for dinner. Lisa made a variety of announcements, reminded the directors to use manaba, pointed out how they had been supporting
one another (largely through this platform), and explained the activities for the remainder of the evening. After dinner, the directors walked out of the dining area and into the ballroom lobby and escorted the participants into two very long lines of chairs facing each other to participate in an activity named Speed Networking similar to speed dating. Each participant was given a card with prompts on it which included information to share during the Speed Networking session. They could share their names, program locations, business cards (participants had been encouraged to bring these to the Institute and to dinner that night). They then each had to answer the question “What is one of your best leadership moments?” and “What is your favorite PAS resource?” Each participant had to deliver this information in the span of a 2 minute time period. Each round totaled four minutes (Lisa served as timekeeper), at which point one side got up and moved down a chair. This highly enjoyable activity created a noise level that made it difficult to hear beyond the person across from each participant, indicating the directors were greatly engaged and enjoying this activity. At the close of this activity, Lisa asked the directors to share out any unusually inspirational leadership stories. One example shared was of a 78 year old who works with toddlers who had gotten an AA degree and completed their GED while working for this leader. This caused an impromptu round of applause from the group. While this Speed Networking activity was not formally evaluated as the other work sessions were, it was clear that all participants were greatly enjoying engaging with their fellow directors and hearing of the successes and challenges of their peers.

8:15 p.m. – Zumba Exercise Class

The final activity of the first evening of Institute II was a Zumba class, conducted by a Zumba teacher from a local Greensboro YMCA. This session was not formally evaluated, although one CEME evaluator participated in the class. The activity generated much positive dialog and provided additional opportunities for the directors to get to know each other and interact in a more casual relaxing informal setting.

Day 2: August 5, 2014

Session II: 8:00 a.m. – Introduction to Early Childhood Leadership and Management, Lisa Shporer

After a breakfast buffet from 7 – 8 a.m., Lisa Shporer delivered a curriculum module on leadership and management in early childhood leadership. She reminded the directors that they would receive .5 CEU for the module. She opened the session with some focus questions aimed at redefining leadership and with a video of Drew Dudley on *Ted Talks*. Dudley spoke of “Lollipop Moments” and perceptions of leadership. The group shared lollipop moments of their own and presented one to Lisa for her outstanding work organizing the Institute and her prompting the leaders to be readers through use of the resources provided through the Institute.

The session spelled out learning goals, focused on “gaining knowledge on public education and awareness of local, state, and federal levels of influence. The participants were to respond to questions, reflected on them, and write in their journals about them. Then table members discussed their questions and placed them on chart-size post-it paper to post throughout the ballroom. The questions asked how the directors had grown in their leadership positions and what they had learned since embarking on the Institute journey. Responses included examples such as “We’re more confident in ourselves,” “Change is good,” “It’s OK to delegate,” and “It’s OK to say no.” Another question involved addressing challenges they still faced. Responses included examples such as
“Wearing too many hats,” “Money,” “Quality of staff,” and “Neglecting our own mental and physical health.”

Lisa then shared research on professional development for educators, particularly addressing the relationship between increasing education, including completing higher degrees. Research showed that two of the strongest correlations for increased quality of staff were 1) teacher salaries, and 2) more highly educated staff. Lisa shared a wide variety of statistics from the North Carolina Working Conditions Study produced by Child Care Services Association and provided participants with the study. She encouraged directors to use this data for grant writing and community education efforts. This led to a discussion of how to increase the professionalization of the early childhood field, a topic that would be expanded on in sessions later in the day.

Lisa shared several resources and forms, many from the CCRI website, to guide efforts to encourage staff professional growth. She also gave guiding questions to begin the conversations with staff members; “Do you have an Infant/toddler Certificate?” “Where are you going in this career and what do you need to get there?” She then shared an employee engagement video which addressed the difference between the verbs “involve” (doing to) and “engage” (doing with) approaches for leaders.

The discussion moved on to increasing community support and participation and what kinds of questions to ask on parent surveys. Directors shared successful efforts they had made to include their stakeholders. They also shared concepts addressed and examples of data collected through surveys, such as communication, quality of care, trust in relationships, safety, curriculum, resources they found from the programs, etc. This concluded with a Blueprint for Action resource written by Paula Jorde-Bloom and provided to each participant. The group filled out a program self-assessment checklist created by NAEYC which emphasized knowing their parents and knowing their communities. It was stressed that connection points can be organized around fun or around learning. All were encouraged to document their ideas on manaba so that all could share in successful strategies. Participant reviews of Lisa’s session were very positive as shown by a 100% of respondents showing a “good” or “excellent” response on the usefulness of the information and a 98% “good” or “excellent” response to rating Lisa’s delivery of the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction to Early Childhood Leadership and Management</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Shporer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Lisa’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Characteristic Comments:**

“ME-Be the agent of change.”
“Information was very insightful and reflective. Very appropriate for home and work. Helps looking at all staff and leadership styles. Understanding how the team can improve using strengths of the team.”
“Great resources to use with my program. I plan to use the professional development plans.”

Session III: Lifting Voices Training for Early Childhood Leaders, Michele Rivest

To conclude this morning module, Michele Rivest, president of Michele Rivest Consulting, Incorporated, shared information on the Lifting Voices Training Series. She shared much information on public policy, how the government works, and how directors can help drive advocacy efforts to be more effective through community communication. She shared outlets for unexpected yet helpful voices in a community such as a sheriff talking with other sheriffs, pastor speaking with other pastors, etc. She also shared information on the First 2000 Days organization, website, and data, hammering home the great need for higher quality early childhood education and how lack of this important service leads to problems for all of us later on: “75% of Americans ages seventeen to twenty-four cannot pass the armed forces exam.” She shared a video on the Heckman Equation and the website associated with this concept. She concluded her remarks by recommending that when someone asks them what they do for a living, they would be accurate in replying that we “protect our national security” rather than “I work at a day care.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems and Systems Thinking</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michele Rivest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Michele’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Characteristic Comments:

“By creating a list of who are my unexpected voices within my parents and see how they can help me.”
“To gain more knowledge re: How I can be involved with law, congress, senate, etc., i.e., public policy.”
“Concrete mission and goals. DRIVE, STEER, the organization.”

11:30 a.m. – Lunch
A buffet lunch was served for the director participants while coaches had lunch in a breakout room with author, Stacie Goffin who would be conducting an afternoon session and evening session with the larger group. Dr. Goffin, author of Ready or Not: Leadership Choices in Early Care and Education and a new book, Early Childhood Education for a New Era: Leading for
our Profession fielded questions from the coaches. She also asked for ideas on how to make early child care education a true profession.

Session IV: 12:15 p.m. – Community Engagement, Tracy Zimmerman

Tracy Zimmerman, Director of Communications for the North Carolina Early Childhood Foundation, and Lisa Finaldi, a Community Engagement Leader also for the North Carolina Early Childhood Foundation conducted a 90 minute session on ways to better and more effectively engage the communities of the directors. Using the model First 2000 days as an example of how to utilize messaging to programs stakeholders. They expanded the conversation beyond just their own centers and encouraged the directors to look at their statewide community. This session was another stepping stone leading up to Dr. Goffin’s charge of redefining the early childhood education professional altogether. Ratings and comments on this session were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Engagement</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Zimmerman and Lisa Finaldi</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Tracy and Lisa’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Characteristic Comments:
“Remind others of the important job that I do. I am building leaders for tomorrow.”
“I will utilize key messengers/unexpected voices to assist in promoting early care.”
“Educate my team better use their site videos etc. so every staff team member realizes EXACTLY how CRITICAL & VITAL this PROFESSION is.”

Session V: 1:45 p.m. – Ready or Not: Leadership Choices in Early Care and Education

Dr. Stacie Goffin, President of Goffin Strategy Group, LLC, opened her session by asking all of the participants to “stretch their minds” and address a major problem she has noted with the early childhood education profession; that is, it cannot be fully defined as a profession in her view yet. She asked the group how we could make it more professional. She stated that the ECE profession was not “organized” such as in “organized medicine”. She believes that there has been “exponential growth in programs” and plenty of public recognition of the importance of the early years, but that we were not yet a true profession. She facilitated discussion on the criteria for a field becoming a full profession. The dialog was complex and abstract and some participants were not as fully engaged as during most other activities as evidenced in survey responses.
Keynote Address: Ready or Not: Leadership Choices in Early Care and Education
Stacie Goffin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How useful was the information presented?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate Stacie’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How will you use this information?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Characteristic Comments:

“Stepping outside of the box to improve the profession.”
“Use in staff meetings. Professional conversation. Thought provoking conversation.”
“This is such a new concept so I’m not sure how to use this information.”

2:45 p.m. – Break & Team Meetings

After an hour of Stacie Goffin presenting, the group broke out into their teams for a meeting. The coaches delivered a professional development on the Small Test of Change (STOC) or Plan-Do-Study-Act model. The STOC is a model to use for problem solving challenges. Each team discussed a specific challenge and went through the steps of STOC to gain experience in using the model. Then had the option of attending another networking reception. Afterward, the group returned to more from Dr. Goffin.

5:30 p.m. – Session VI & Dinner: Stretch Your Thinking!

Dr. Goffin opened this session by throwing out ideas to the audience for coming up with a name for the early childhood education field. After a few ideas were shared, she asked for criteria defining the ECE profession. This was followed by the question, “What commitment can you make and what steps can you take to make something happen?” She gave examples of what other states were doing to try and define the profession. In Texas, some groups organized around wine & cheese & book study groups, in Washington, participants organized around book study by chapters, some made efforts toward writing reviews of ECE books on Amazon.com. There are lots of things we can do, she suggested. She also reinforced the importance of connecting on manaba with ideas. In conclusion she reminded the group that communication matters, clarity of expectations matters, hiring and keeping good teachers matters, and support matters, especially to the children. Dr. Goffin’s two sessions did not receive as high reviews as the other components of the Institute. The topic was selected in order to give participants an opportunity to think beyond their programs to the field of ECE. There was much discussion and controversy over the difference between a “profession” and “professional”. The topic did stretch the thinking of the group. Additionally, each participant did receive a copy of Dr. Goffin’s latest book, Early Childhood Education for a New Era: Leading for our Profession.
Stretch Your Thinking!!!
Stacie Goffin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Stacie’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Characteristic Comments:

“Push for early education to be a profession. Staff must have education to work in the field.”
“To stretch my thinking re: my career and the future direction of the industry of early childhood and my own personal journey in the future.”
“Liked the consensus on profession. The beginning of understanding gaps in our profession.”

Day Three: August 6, 2014

7:00 a.m. – Breakfast Buffet & Hotel Check-Out

Session VII: 8:00 a.m. – Leadership and Management Strategies- Program Management Inventory (PMI), Dr. Richard Lambert & Dr. Rebecca Shore

Dr. Richard Lambert, professor, and Dr. Rebecca Shore, associate professor, both in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, conducted this session explaining the background and purpose of the Program Management Inventory, an instrument created by Dr. Lambert and validated by research since its publication in 2002.

While the DISC instrument discussed on the prior day of the Institute focused on “your view of you,” the PMI is a combination of you and your staff’s view of your leadership. All participants had taken the leader portion of the PMI instrument prior to beginning this second Institute session. Their staff will be taking the other portion of the instrument prior to the third Institute. The responses by the leaders and their respective staffs will be analyzed for the next Institute. After sharing the history of the development of the PMI instrument, Dr. Lambert and Dr. Shore presented each of the three components of the PMI one by one and followed each segment with applied leadership practices, rationale for the practices, and brain-based explanations for different approaches to the different components.

The PMI session received the highest ratings of Institute II and a follow-up session will be scheduled during Institute III to share results of the full PMI for each director.
Leadership and Management Strategies
Rich Lambert and Rebecca Shore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How useful was the information presented?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate Rich and Rebecca’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How will you use this information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Selected Characteristic Comments:

“AWESOME!!! I would like to have my staff take the multiple intelligences and the find your hemisphere preference.”
“I have been empowered to continue my education in early childhood leadership.”
“I will use it to be deliberate and intentional about my practice. I will also use it to try to understand my staff, families and children better.”

Session VIII: 12:00 p.m. – Small Test of Change, Lisa Shporer

Lisa Shporer reviewed the Small Test of Change which was taught at the team meetings on Tuesday afternoon. One team reported on the challenge of networking in the community and gave specific information using the Plan-Do-Study-Act model to develop a plan to meet this challenge.

This last session was wrapped up with closing remarks by Lisa and reminders to complete the Institute Evaluation Surveys before leaving. The surveys could also be completed online. Resources were distributed.

1:00 p.m. – Box Lunch To-Stay or To-Go.


The second Institute took place at the Greensboro Marriott Downtown in Greensboro, North Carolina. A coach’s meeting preceded the opening luncheon work session. Evaluation personnel from the Center for Educational Management and Evaluation (CEME) were present at all planning meetings and attended all three days of Institute II. At least one evaluation team member was present for all leadership faculty meetings and additional planning and development meetings prior to the first and second Institute and at least one evaluation team member attended all activities. It was verified that all phases of the project were managed and directed in a timely and exemplary fashion. Comments from participants on all activities and presenters for both three-day Institutes were overwhelmingly positive.

Between Institute II and Institute III, PAS post-assessments and program improvement goals were completed. The Program Management Inventory (PMI) was completed by participants’ staff members. The Small Test of Change (Plan-Do-Study-Act) model challenge was completed by all participants. Coaches again logged at least 5 hours per month of contact time with their team.
members. Types of coach contact included communication over manaba, resource sharing, team meetings, book studies, PAS improvement goal resources, and topic discussions. At the time of the final Institute, roughly 94% of the directors had used manaba at least once, however, approximately 76% had become regular users. All of the community learning groups and the contact hours, including types of contact by coaches, were tracked by the project coordinator at the end of each month and data was collected.

**Summary Evaluation of Institute II**

Overall ratings for the second ECDLI were similar to the ratings for the first Institute by participants, being regarded as highly successful. Comments from participants indicated they were appreciative for the increased opportunities to network with other directors and that they gained ideas and built new relationships through these opportunities. They also indicated they appreciated the opportunities to reflect on their leadership, an activity that is hard to make happen in the hustle and bustle of running their centers day to day. Overall, participants were pleased and indicated that they learned much and grew professionally in the second Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your overall satisfaction of the following:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Institute</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking-Monday Evening</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumba</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Meetings</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Books</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Opportunities</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information/ Comments:**

What was the best part of the Institute for you?

- “Networking and gaining lots of ideas from guest speakers and fellow leaders!”
- “Loved the reflection time and understanding of leadership skills and styles. The discussion of moving Early Learning to a profession.”
- “Relationship building of peers.”

Do you have any additional comments/suggestions you would like to share?

- “This is something that needs to continue for our field to grow in the direction that is best for children.”
- “I like the easier, yet still intense scheduled. I feel more energized by the early childhood field.”
- “The networking has been wonderful. The local team meetings between Institutes has been amazing. There is a need for some breaks during the day to tend to the phone calls and emails that came through. The temperature was VERY distracting. The food was wonderful. I would love a workshop on How-what specific activities we can do with our staff.”
Between Institute I and Institute II, participants received pre-certified PAS assessments. Twelve were conducted in the closing months of 2013. Coaches held quarterly meetings as a group, and logged at least 5 hours per month of contact time (more than 15 minutes each) with each team member. Types of coach contact included communication over manaba, book studies, and topic discussions. Sixteen learning communities have formed within the group which include interest topics such as strategic planning, family engagement strategies, and fiscal matters. At the time of Institute II, roughly 94% of the directors had used manaba. All of the community learning groups and the contact hours, including types of contact by coaches, was tracked by the project coordinator at the end of each month and data has been collected.

Institute III – April 27-29, 2015

Day 1: April 27, 2015

9:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. – Coaches Meeting

As with Institutes I and II, prior to the opening session of Institute III, Lisa Shporer conducted a meeting with the coaches in the Cape Fear room of the hotel to review the activities for the Institute. One coach had left the program for personal reasons prior to Institute III, so one coach combined the new team with her original coaching group. Lisa provided a Coach Meeting Agenda and thanked the group for their work. She delivered an inspirational opening message for about 5 minutes summarizing the work of the coaches since the last Institute and pointing out specific tasks they had accomplished in the interim. Coaches had visited directors, organized study groups, developed and held book study groups, and communicated with them on manaba to name a few accomplishments. Lisa also shared some inspirational comments from participants on the work. For the remainder of the meeting, Lisa led the coaches through an overview of the agenda for the Institute and through the materials for the upcoming three days of work. This included the overall schedule, including more planning time based on requests from participants, much of this with coaches. She then reviewed the roles of the coaches for the breakout sessions and encouraged them to use this final face-to-face Institute to ensure that all participants had completed all components of this final session (11 were noted to still have any unfinished activities). An overview of the group for the final Institute was reviewed. Of the participants who were not able to attend the final Institute, 3 had babies (within the last six weeks), 1 was found to have a brain tumor, and others had left the profession due to personal reasons. 76 participants completed all components of the Institutes and were in attendance at Institute III.

11:15 a.m. – Hotel Check In

12:15 p.m. – Opening Luncheon Work Session – Coaches & Participants

Jennifer Johnson, Education & Quality Section Chief of the North Carolina Division of Child Development & Early Education welcomed the full group to Institute III. 98 people were in attendance. She commended those who had continued to remain active and attend all 3 Institutes. Afterward, ECDLI Program Coordinator, Lisa Shporer, welcomed the group and thanked them for
their work since the last Institute. She reviewed logistics such as parking, internet access, and an overview of the Institute schedule. She reminded them that she has read every comment on manaba and uses feedback from them to inform the Institutes. She offered inspirational comments such as, “You are all amazing! Your playgrounds are amazing, your programs are amazing, and the way you deal with cell phones is amazing! The way you support each other is amazing.” She shared some of the successes with manaba. “When someone writes, ‘I need ….’ within 10 minutes you have 12 comments!” She reminded participants that this was the final Institute and encouraged them to “engage, reach out to someone you haven’t met yet or don’t know well,” and assured the group that this Institute would include both more time for diving deeper into our data collected (PAS, STOC) as well as time to interact and learn from each other.

Session I: 1:15 p.m. – *Switch! How to Change When Change is Hard*, Susan Heath Hays

Lisa introduced Susan Heath Hays, sister of the authors of the book *Switch*, the Heath brothers, and their #1 Switch trainer. Susan’s background has included over 20 years of experience working with children including foster care and adoption and with Head Start. She opened the session by asking the participants to think of a change they wanted to make either in their personal or professional life. She tied elements from the book depicting types of change and responses to change such as the “Rider,” the “Elephant,” and the “Path.” Riders often become bogged down in analysis paralysis regardless of how noble the change effort of the Elephant may be and there is a constant conflict between the Rider and the Elephant along the path. She pointed out that change is hard work and is exhausting and that laziness is often mistakenly defined when it is actually often shear exhaustion.

Susan led the group through skills noted in the book for working through change. Tactics such as directing the Rider (rather than giving more information to analyze), shaping the path (removing barriers), scripting critical moves (make instructions behavioral; “some is not a number, soon is not a time”), and clarifying the destination (setting specific goals). She emphasized that we need to focus on the bright spots or what works; that we should study them and clone them, rather than focusing on what is not working (as low sales for a sales rep). Bright spots are something we can learn from while other data may be TBU (true but useless). This session ended at 4:30 at which point participants went into coaching team meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Switch! How to Change When Change is Hard</strong></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Susan’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will you use this information?

- To help me move from one stage to the next level, to be more positive.
- Excellent motivated. Real world, real useful.
- To provide behavior change by looking for bright spots first.
- I am going to try some things in my private and professional life.
- Find the bright spot, evaluate the rider and the elephant within myself and the child care center.
- To better prepare, explain and equip my team to deal with change.
- Become a better problem solver.
- To take on opportunities in my center that need change and implement steps.
- I will use it to support my own thinking but I do plan to do a yearlong study and present to my staff.
- Apply it to my role @ ECE planning, growth-moving forward.
- Change has been a big thing this year. I really needed this training so I can go back and implement things I have learned.
- I will review the website & process and make an effort to plug into it.
- Changes to the field are looming. This will be useful.
- To better understand how people and the process of change can flow better.

Comments

“I will use this information during staff meeting to help staff.”
“I will read the book to understand the concepts and translate it to how I manage change in the center.”
“I enjoyed the videos that helped enhance the training they were memorable.”
“Very helpful.”
“Great presentation, love the involvement of everyone.”
“This was awesome, Susan kept my attention.”

4:30 p.m. – Break & Team Meetings

Each coach then led her team members to the respective predetermined breakout locations for open discussions. As CEME evaluators walked through the hotel and monitored these break-out group meetings, it was determined that all groups were engaged in dialog about multiple topics related to the Institute.

4:45 p.m. – 6:00 – Reception in Room 319

The top recommendation from participants from Institutes I & II was to have more time to network with other participants in the program. Lisa Shporer had arranged a reception in a large
suite, Room 319 in the hotel. The activity at this reception showed appreciation for the time to talk with one another before the structured evening activities ensued.

**Session II: 6:00 p.m. – Dinner, Questions & Answers, & Networking**

Following dinner, the Education and Quality Section Chief of the North Carolina Division of Child Development and Early Education, Jennifer Johnson gave a presentation on the history of early childhood education in North Carolina. She pointed out changes that had taken place over two decades. Keeping with the day’s theme of change, she then informed the group of changes currently pending including quality standards and assessment and measurement in the field. She covered changes in laws including those involving custodial grandparents raising children, EEC’s being loaded into the workforce data base and resulting changes from these new procedures, and the new NCFAST and its implications. She fielded many questions from the floor from participants including license issues and the revocation of a license, background checks and their timeliness, and child abuse reporting. She clarified new policies regarding receiving credits for professional growth courses, college courses, and transcripts.

Following this enlightening Q & A session, participants took part in a networking activity called Networking Monday Night. Table topics had been placed on 8 tables in the ballroom as shown by signs placed on the tables. The topics were:

- Enrollment
- Faith-based
- Family Education
- Fundraising Ideas
- Healthy Eating & Living
- Marketing Ideas
- Staff Morale
- Stress Reduction

A coach was assigned to each table and participants were encouraged to select a topic they either have a challenge with or one where they have an idea to share with others, a bright spot that has worked for them regarding the topic. Instructions directed participants to begin by sharing their business cards (which all were advised to bring to the Institute prior to arrival), introduce themselves, and then begin sharing. Rounds were 25 minutes each and participants progressed through 2 rounds before adjourning for the evening at 9:00 p.m.

**Day 2: April 28, 2015**

7:00 a.m. Breakfast and Opening Remarks

Lisa greeted the group, complimented them for their dedication to their field and to these Institutes, and shared some summaries regarding the group. These early childhood leaders reach more than 8,000 children through the work in their centers and an even wider community through parents and families they serve. They listen, soothe, motivate, inspire, care, and share as they educate. This list was met with impromptu applause. Lisa then introduced Dr. Lucy Roberts, the Executive Director of the Early Childhood Advisory Council. Lucy built on Lisa’s introductory
comments by sharing that the participants had experienced a 28% increase in PAS scores since being involved in the Institutes. She reminded the group that the RTT - ELC grant was initially intended to build a more coherent structure of supports and improve quality for early childhood education through this leadership development component and all indicators suggest it has met all of its goals with great success.

**Session III: 8:15 a.m. Let’s SWITCH Some More…. Susan Heath Hays**

After breakfast, Susan Heath Hays continued her discussion of *Switch*, and participants dove more deeply into the leadership skills for change that are proposed within the book. She wove several brief videos depicting actual representations reinforcing the Switch strategies to implement change efforts more effectively. For example, one scenario depicted a goal of improved health and included suggestions for “scripting the critical moves.” Participants were advised to pick battles carefully and “get behavioral” with food rules such as not eating anything that comes in through a car window or not eating any cereal that turns the milk different colors. These real world applications of the Switch strategies were interspersed by table group discussions during which participants engaged with one another brainstorming applications of the new knowledge in their lives and/or their centers. Following each topic, table groups reported out. To encode these leadership skills even more deeply, participants engaged in an activity termed Tuesday Team Breakout Session which involved moving to another room. Participants were divided into 9 teams, each with a coach facilitator, and were instructed to use the Switch Framework to answer any three of 4 questions. The participants moved from table to table in 3 rounds based on the questions selected. Questions were:

- How can we improve family involvement?
- How can we manage the job requirements in a 45+ hour week?
- How can we improve personal and care reduce stress?
- How can we consistently implement policies for staff/families? (Cell phones, timeliness, etc.)

The Switch Framework used was structured as follows:

- **DIRECT THE RIDER**
  - Find the Bright Spots
  - Script the Critical Moves
  - Point to the Destination

- **MOTIVATE THE ELEPHANT**
  - Find the Feeling
  - Shrink the Change
  - Grow Your People

- **SHAPE THE PATH**
  - Tweak the Environment
  - Build Habits
  - Rally the Herd
Participants used this framework to address their selected program problems and garnered ideas for affecting change in their centers. They moved through 3 questions via 3 rounds of engagement with colleagues. Many best practices emerged through sharing table discussions. This second part of Susan’s Switch session was evaluated separately as seen by the responses below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Let’s <strong>SWITCH</strong> Some More…</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Heath Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Susan’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you use this information?

- When and where even I can use the different strategies.
- I will use this as an avenue to help me grow my teachers to be more effective.
- These activities and breakout sessions allowed us to understand the steps for change.
- I feel more confident and love how it focuses on the positive.
- The practice gave me a better understanding to utilize these tools.
- Loved the opportunity to practice the tools.
- To implement for centers changes and get staff buy in.
- I will use this information to support site administrators as I provide TA.
- Remembering I'm not alone and I have a great staff so use their talents more.

Comments:

“This is a concrete way to involve everyone in change, and to help find ways to move the center forward.”
“Learning to use SWITCH was very helpful, the practice solidified the process for me.”
“I believe this module is definitely an ongoing practice is a completely new way for me to resolve situations.”
“I enjoyed being able to use each of the ways in a small group.”
“I appreciate the practice.”
“The group were very reflective and provided ideas to share with each other.”
“Lively and interesting speaker, I really enjoyed listening and interacting with her.”
“Very helpful. A new way of making decision- Great!”
“The exercises really opened the process up to me and the team. We all want what was written down so many ideas from each phase of this process what a winner!”
Session IV: 12:30 p.m. – Small Test of Change, Lisa Shporer

Lisa began this session by showing participants the leadership books that they would be receiving at the close of this Institute. Titles included *Managing Legal Risks in Early Childhood Education*, *Toybox Leadership*, *The People Pill*, and *Leaders Eat Last*. She then launched into the session on the Small Test of Change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Name</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>colors identify stages</td>
<td>Define the challenge</td>
<td>How do we engage more with families?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Determine what/how to analyze and who will participate</td>
<td>At pick up and drop off ask families not to use their cell phones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Try out the plan</td>
<td>Parents more informed on child’s day and program events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Evaluate the data collected</td>
<td>By eliminating the use of cell phone during pick up and drop off, staff learned more about the families and families learned more about their child. Begin the cycle again where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lisa transitioned from the Small Test of Change to sharing the PAS cohort results. Participants learned that “it wasn’t about the scores, it was about the process.” Leaders learned where their gaps and where their struggles existed and were able to build from within. The cohort results identified the opportunities for improvements, and program strengths. There was improvement in all post-PAS assessments scores from between .08 and 2.13 points which on average is a 26% increase. Each of the PAS subscales and items was discussed and successes and opportunities shared:
- Personnel – Provided additional benefits such as YMCA memberships, give staff care discounts.
- Assessment – Increased in staff and family program assessment and establishing feedback loop.
- Fiscal Management – Developed budgets need to create strategic plans.

The results revealed outstanding community outreach and excellent technology use in particular. Participants shared some of the challenges known to most leaders in the room such as the difficulty getting staff, particularly educated staff. Participants shared that the work is long and hard. One noted, “helped me as an individual grow – a lot of the things I was supposed to be doing, I didn’t know to do. I was just ignorant because I didn’t have a background in ECE.” Another commented, “It gave validity to some of the things I had been bringing to my board. Once they knew it was in a national instrument, they were on it.” Overall, the group exceeded national averages on the instrument of 3.40 and grew from a pre-score of 4.09 to a post-score of 5.17, an indication of the growth of leadership skills and level of the professionals in the Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Happened? What’s Next?</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Shporer</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Lisa’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

“Implement and continue to use the PSA... A great tool.”
“I will use this to make sure I continue to stay on track and grow.”
“I will use the PAS to build the program from the inside out.”
“To work with my staff and myself to make improvements to grow.”
“I have used this tool and plan to continue to utilize it.”
“Love Data.”
“I will use Lisa’s words to inspire me to work harder in my program. Excellent job! Lisa’s gentle disposition put everyone at ease and made her delivery ever more meaningful!”
“I was interested in how I did with PAS and it was interesting to hear about others. Make more interactive.”
“Better habits in working with others.”
“The PAS information provided great insight on the Director's ability to accept change within the administrative environment. Great scores!!”
“Continue to improve my leadership skills.”
“This session helped the group to reflect on the pre & post assessments. The questions she posed helped them to reflect on the process.”
“Lisa is always a joy to hear speak. She has so much passion and drive that you can't help but get excited with her!”
“To check myself, stay organized and revisit areas.”

2:15 p.m. – Break/Team Time

Coaches met with their individual groups for a final discussion before dismissing to the reception and dinner.

4:45 p.m. – Reception

5:45 p.m. – Dinner & Activity

Following dinner, Janet Singerman, President of CCRI, Anna Carter, President of the Child Care Services Association, and Shelia Hoyle, Executive Director of the Southwestern Child Development Commission, engaged the participants in new thinking about ways to improve services through the possible sharing of talents, wisdom, etc. maximizing efficiencies and assimilating best practices. The presenters shared a product they have been developing named Early Childhood Shared Services. The aim is that through increasing leadership capacity, we may be able to improve child outcomes. The goal of the service is to build both pedagogical and business capacity.

Janet, Anna and Shelia shared the traditional notion of stand-alone centers and pointed out the difficulties of getting to economies of scale one by one. They contrasted this with access to a service that could provide everything an ECE Director may need found all on website. They shared the different parts of the website and discussed possible rollout rates with the participants. The product they unveiled has been rolled out in 22 states and North Carolina will be offering it soon as well. Participants shared feedback from presenters regarding their thoughts and ways to make it even more efficient for users.

Day 3, April 29, 2015

7:00 a.m. – Breakfast and Hotel Check-Out

Session V: 8:15 a.m. – Leadership and Management Strategies Results from the PMI, Dr. Rich Lambert & Dr. Rebecca Shore, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Rich and Rebecca welcomed the group to the last session of the last Institute and reminded them that this session involved digging deep into the data from their PMI results. Directors had completed a leader survey and between Institute II and Institute III, their employees were to have completed anonymous surveys regarding their leadership and management of the centers. Results had been tallied and separated by center and were returned to each leader for their investigation. The four categories of the PMI had been sorted and placed in separate envelops to better facilitate discussion.
At their tables, the participants were given an overview of one category at a time by Rich and Rebecca, then given 10 – 15 minutes to read the responses from their staff regarding that category, discuss whatever they wished to share with their tables, and then work together to create a “best practices” poster with their group to share out. The process was repeated with all 4 categories of the PMI: Communication; Policy Clarity, Hiring & Retention, and Support. Each table produced a “best practices” list based on their table discussions and shared that list with the group for each of the 4 categories. While 85% rated the material presented as Excellent and 91% reported the same regarding the presenters’ ability to share the information and answer questions, there were 3 center directors whose surveys were either not submitted or were not found by the evaluators to be analyzed. There were no negative evaluations reported regarding the PMI process or activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership and Management Strategies Results from the PMI</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich Lambert and Rebecca Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was the information presented?</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate Rich and Rebecca’s ability to deliver the information and answer questions?</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you use this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you use this information?

- As a tool to speak one on one with the teachers. I will make a spreadsheet with each category and have them place in their rooms and add to what we can do to make these areas successful.
- Awesome information!
- Clearly I need to go back and review some policies & benefits with my staff.
- Follow Top 4 leadership skills—PMI.
- Fun and engaging with complex info! Really enjoyed.
- Go back with a new mindset and set new goals.
- Going back to team meetings with data for planning new strategies with staff.
- I am going to change how I view policies.
- I love listening to these two.
- Mindfulness in how I interact with teachers.
- Talk with staff about areas scored low, and hear reasons given. Improve myself in areas.
- To better improve program.
- To continue to motivate me and grow my staff and business.
- Use data to maximize efficiencies.
• Use it in my PD. Look at my staff perceptions and where I need to concentrate clarification, work on better tools.
• Very useful feedback! I am grateful for their expertise!
• Use data to maximize efficiencies.
• Use the info to improve what I've, done and to look for "Bright Spot" in supporting my staff.
• To continually be mindful of our centers climate and what needs to be tweaked/amended to better serve our educators.
• This is a great information to share with my supervisors and board. It also offers insights and good material for discussion with staff.
• Will share and work on lower scores.
• Loved to see how my perceptions compare to my staff. Areas to Grow!

Comments:

“I will go back and begin to review my abilities as a leader and see where I can begin to improve.”
“I will use this information to engage my staff in discussions as to how to best improve their overall satisfaction.”
“I really enjoy the presentation from Rich and Rebecca they are so involve and upbeat during the last session.”
“I enjoy hearing them speak! So fun and interesting.”
“They are great presenters and the information was helpful.”
“Will use the information within my directors COP.”
“Saved the best for last! Very useful info-just what I needed! Thanks!”
“Interactive they are hilarious and make a good team of presenters.”
“This team is always energetic and informative.”

History of the PMI Instrument and Analysis

CEME developed The Program Management Inventory (PMI) (Lambert, Abbott-Shim, & Oxford-Wright, 1999; Lambert, 2002) using funding from the Head Start Bureau. The measure has been used to evaluate the management climate of early childhood programs across the country. This measure includes administrator and teacher versions. The measure provides information regarding staff perceptions of the success of the program administrators in the areas of Communication, Policy Clarity, Hiring and Retention, Support of teachers, and a total score for overall management climate and working conditions.

The PMI was used as a formative evaluation tool in this project. Each director and the teaching staff of each participating center were offered the opportunity to complete the measure through an online survey site. A total of 598 teachers and 79 directors responded. Individual reports were prepared for each center and were provided to the directors as feedback regarding the management climate and perceptions of their teachers. This information was used for goal planning
and as an additional source of feedback within the coaching process. In general, the teachers were positive about the climate in their centers. There was, however, substantial variability in the responses and the reports provided to each director indicated both areas of strength and areas for relative improvement. A five point Likert scale was used for each item. Each item is scaled such that 1 indicates the teachers strongly disagree with statements about successful administrative practices and 5 indicates the teachers strongly agree with the same statements. Each section of the PMI yields a total score on a scale of 1 – 5, which results from the average of the item responses. In the area of Communication, the teachers were generally positive. The average score was 4.23 (standard deviation = .64), indicating an average score in the “agree” range. The range of average scores was from 1 – 5. A similar pattern was found for the Policy Clarity (mean = 4.42, standard deviation = .54), Hiring and Retention (mean = 3.92, standard deviation = .81), Support (mean = 4.13, standard deviation = .71), and Management Climate (mean = 4.13, standard deviation = .71). For each of these scales the range of teacher total scores was 1 – 5, indicating variability across the teachers.

The Program Administration Scale (PAS) History & Results

The Program Administration Scale (PAS) (Talan & Jorde-Bloom, 2011) served as the primary quantitative outcome measure for this evaluation study. The PAS is an observational tool designed and validated to evaluate program quality and managerial and administrative effectiveness. The measure contains subscales that measure program quality across the following areas: human resource development, personnel cost and allocation, center operations, child assessment, fiscal management, program planning and evaluation, family partnerships, marketing and public relations, technology, and staff qualifications. These components of program quality are assessed by trained observers who visit the program, observe program operations, interview staff, and review artifacts and documents. The trained observers complete 25 rating scale items, each of which includes a 7 point scale ranging from Inadequate to Excellent. Each point on the rating scale includes specific observable anchor behaviors. This project included two trained observers who visited the programs at the beginning and end of the project to gather pre and post-test information. The item level ratings are summarized into a total scale that represents the average rating across the 25 items.

A total of 92 programs were evaluated at the beginning of the project. The average pre-test score was 4.07 (standard deviation = .94). The pre-test scores, as shown in Table 1, ranged from 2.16 to 6.83. The middle 50% of the scores ranged from 3.42 to 4.64 with a median of 3.92. The anchor point of 3 on the 7 point PAS scale represents “Minimal” and point 5 represents “Good”, so the average PAS pre-test score was between “Minimal” and “Good”. A total of 66 (71.7%) programs were evaluated at the end of the project. There were 26 program administrators who did not complete the project. Therefore it was useful to evaluate whether administrators who were functioning at a higher quality level at the beginning of the project were over-represented among those who completed the program. The average PAS pre-test score for the completers was 4.07 (standard deviation = .77) and the average pre-test score for the non-completers was 4.04 (standard deviation = 1.30). This difference was not statistically significant ($t_{90}=.112, p=.912$), offering evidence that there were no systematic differences between the completers and non-completers on the dimensions of quality measured by the PAS. The average post-test score was 5.13 (standard deviation = .71). The post-test scores ranged from 3.50 to 6.29. The middle 50% of the scores ranged from 4.72 to 5.63 with a median of 5.20. Therefore the average PAS post-test score was in the “Good” range on the PAS scale. The difference between the average pre and post-test scores was statistically significant ($t_{65} =14.38, p<.001$). The average gain score was 1.06 (standard deviation = .60). This difference, when
expressed as a standardized mean difference effect size using Hedges’ unbiased effect size metric, is 1.35 (95% confidence interval = 1.05 – 1.65). This difference, greater than a full standard deviation unit, would be considered large according conventional interpretations of effect sizes in educational research (Cohen, 1988). The gain scores ranged from -0.67 to 2.41. The middle 50% of the gain scores ranged from 0.65 to 1.56 with a median of 0.92. Only one program had a negative gain score indicating that 98.5% of the programs made gains in PAS scores from pre to post-test.

The coaches assisted each program administrator to set individualized program improvement goals based on the PAS pre-test scores, and then monitored the completion of the goals. On average, the program completers successfully accomplished 77.16% of their program improvement goals. The median percent of goals completed was 81.50%. Many of the participants were able to complete 100% of their goals (30.3%) and 78.1% of them completed the majority of their goals.

### Table 1
Pre and post PAS total scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Pre-tests</th>
<th>Non-Completers Pre-test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Completers Post-test</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Small Test of Change: Plan-Do-Study-Act Model – History and Results**

Quality improvement (QI) efforts are specifically designed processes aimed at improving the quality of products or services within a particular organization (Ogrinc 2008). Recently, such interventions as Total Quality Management, Continuous Quality Management, and Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles have seen increased and widespread use in a variety of organizations from manufacturing to the healthcare industry with notable success (Nicolay, et al 2012, Health Foundation 2011). In this research study, the Plan-Do-Study-Act model was implemented to improve aspects of early childhood education (ECE) systems in addition to providing ECE leaders with new skills for problem solving and professional growth. The model used is a 4-stage interactive problem-solving tool specifically aimed at improving a process in place at ECE centers or the carry out a perceived needed change in centers.

“Plan”

The first step toward implementation of PDSA is a phase that involved development of a Plan. Within the Plan stage are 3 subcomponents: Define; Assess; and Analyze. The ECE leaders were trained in these subcomponents. Before defining the process to be improved, the leaders were
instructed to assemble a team that had firsthand knowledge of the problem or situation selected for improvement. They were advised to carefully consider the strengths of each member of the planning team and directed to seek engaged, forward-thinking staff members or community stakeholders with as deep an understanding of the various parts of the problem as possible. Once these team members were identified and recruited, their roles and responsibilities were clarified and timelines and a meeting schedule were set.

The first subcomponent to the Plan stage involved defining what the leader and team wanted to accomplish as a written aim or objective. Three questions were suggested for the leaders to pose to their teams:

1. What are we trying to accomplish?
2. How will we know that a change is an improvement?
3. What change can we make that will result in improvement?

Team members brainstormed by asking questions such as, “What are we doing now?” “How do we do it?” “What are the steps involved?” “Who is involved?” “What do they do and is it done well?” “What could be done better?” Team Members were asked to gather as much detail as possible and to breakdown tasks into specific steps such as, “How long does the process currently take?” “List each step.” “Is there variation in the way the process is currently completed?”

Once a full task analysis was completed, the teams were asked to assess the problem using their written aims or objectives. They were then asked to write down their desired accomplishments and to use the data and additional information gathered to measure how their organization was meeting or not meeting those accomplishments. This then evolved into a written problem statement to clearly summarize the consensus on the problem. If teams identified more than one problem that needed addressing in their center, they were then asked to prioritize the problems and include a written justification of why they chose the particular problem on which they decided to work.

The third subcomponent involved analyzing causes of the problem. The team was asked to identify causes of the problem using tools such as control charts, work flow process maps, “fishbones,” or other graphic organizers. The analysis concluded with a summary of the cause analysis and description justifying the root causes of the problem. Questions posed may be, “Is this process efficient?” “What is the cost (time, money, or other resources)?” “Are we implementing the intended steps the correct way?” “Can this process be done another way?” Following this analysis, teams were asked to develop alternatives. They were directed to try to mitigate the root causes of the problem by completing the statement, “If we do ________, then __________ will happen.” They were asked to insert a few alternatives to consider. Finally, they were asked to develop an action plan, including the necessary staff, resources, timeline and risks that might be involved in implementation of the plan.

“Do”

Once the problem had been identified, defined, assessed, and analyzed, the leaders were ready to implement their action plan in their ECE centers. They were directed to collect data along the way to be used in the “Study” stage of the PDSA model. Leaders were encouraged to use a written checklist, flowchart, run chart or some other kind of written representation of the data collected and occurrences as they happened over time. They were also advised to document problems, unexpected effects, and general observations along the way.

“Study”
After the “Plan” had been implemented and data had been gathered during the “Do” stage, leaders and their teams gathered to “Study” their results. They were asked to determine answers to the following questions: “Did your plan result in an improvement?” “If so, by how much or little?” “Was the action worth the investment?” “Do you see any trends?” “Were there unintended side effects or ancillary benefits?”

“Act”

If the team determined that the implementation of the plan resulted in success, then the “Act” stage involved “standardizing” the improvement so that its use became regular at the center. Leaders were encouraged to celebrate improvements by communicating accomplishments to internal and external customers and to take steps to preserve their gains and sustain their accomplishments as best they could. After some time, they were to return to the Plan and re-examine the process to learn where it could be improved further. If the team determined that a different approach might be more successful, then returning to the Plan stage and developing a new and different Plan might result in success. The PDSA cycle is designed to be ongoing and it is hoped that this leadership skill would result in long-term improvements as PDSA cycles continued addressing problems in the ECE centers.

Analyses of the Plans

The ECE directors learned about the Small Test of Change project and were trained in the PDSA model in their profession development session during Institute II on August 5, 2014. They then went back to their sites to implement the model. Sixty-three of the 76 participating leaders (83%) completed and submitted their written data involved in the Small Test of Change activity which included the Plan-Do-Study-Act model and all data. Researchers received IRB approval to collect and analyze the data submitted. Each program director began by answering the questions, “What do we want to improve/change?” and “What are we trying to accomplish?” Of the 63 respondents, 52 leaders (82%) and their teams selected a problem that involved improving an existing process or procedure such as cell phone use, attendance, hand washing, and laundry. The other 11 came up with entirely new ideas on which to focus such as establishing a particular plan or policy (such as creating a Risk Management Plan) or establishing a substitute pool for centers to share in their regions.

More defined themes emerged through coding the responses to these questions. Twenty-two percent of directors worked on increased staff development (teacher learning to improve student learning). It is noteworthy that the highest interest item was focused on learning, suggesting that these directors maintained a focus on instructional leaders. Another 19% leaders chose communication with parents as their top problem. Sixteen percent of directors wanted to improve the motivation of their staff. Some viewed this as a personal leadership problem to be addressed while others focused on improving the climate and collegiality of their staff members. Eleven percent saw a need to increase student enrollment as their primary problem while another 10% saw a need to improve technology use in their centers. Eight percent focused on improving their playground equipment or outdoor areas and 6% sought to reconfigure staffing to be able to hire additional staff.

“Do”
Once plans were in place for problem-solving and data collection decision were made, the directors implemented their plans and recorded observations, special circumstances, and collected data. Data sources were coded and fell into 4 categories. The most prevalent category used by the directors (28%) was scripting or note-taking during meetings or activities. The second most prevalent category (27%) was the use of some kind of tally sheet, incident report, or sign-in sheet to collect data on their Small Test of Change effort. The next category used by 24% of the directors was some kind of survey, comment box, of results of an evaluation instrument. Eleven percent used personal interviews or discussions with stakeholders face-to-face. Six of the directors did not offer clear information on specifically how data was collected.

“Study”

When asked the question, “Did you get the results you expected?” 82% of directors responded “yes,” they did. Of the 18% who did not get the results they expected, the results were mixed. Some were positive outcomes, “I anticipated most of the (cell phone) use was personal but it was work related.” Some were negative, “The staff don’t seem to take serious their actions.” Others were simply, “need more time.”

When asked the question, “Are you ready to make the change?” 87% responded that they were ready. Six directors responded with “possibly,” indicating that they were waiting for some outside approval or results from a grant effort but most stated that they needed more time to further see actual results. Two directors said they were not ready to make the change, one indicating they needed more time and the second discovered that they did not have the authority to make the change they had planned.

Discussion

Perhaps the most interesting finding of the study was that while the largest percentage of respondents indicated they hoped to improve the learning environments in their centers, only one leader mentioned using the Teaching Strategies GOLD assessment, an instrument that has been available to early childhood educators in North Carolina since 2010. Research has demonstrated that Teaching Strategies GOLD® produces valid and reliable ratings of the developmental progress of children across the intended age range from birth through kindergarten (Lambert, Kim & Burts 2014), however only one of the 66 ECE directors mentioned this tool.

Additional Evaluative Information

Some additional survey questions were gathered at the conclusion at the end of the third and final ECDL Institute and are shared below. Coaches were evaluated as well as Team Meetings, Shared Services (Tuesday evening activity), Resources, and the Q & A session. Finally, participants were asked to respond to questions regarding their favorite parts of the final Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(41 responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was your experience with your coach? (Visits, emails, manaba, face to face

How would you rate your coach’s ability in engaging with you and providing coaching support?

Comment on your experience with your coach
Do you have any comments on your experience with your coach?

“I will re-evaluate my leadership style.”
“Knowledgeable and helpful.”
“I was disappointed that my coach moved, although she tried with phone contact.”
“Coach was great! Even after relocating she continued to call and email regularly.”
“Very thankful for her.”
“Coach was excellent. Very knowledgeable.”
“Coach had the expertise, skill and knowledge to really elevate us as a group.”
“Coach was very supportive and is a great leader of our team, encouraging everyone in our group.”
“Coach was great, very helpful and informative, knowledgeable and eager to help.”
“Coach has been very resourceful, supportive, and friendly. I think that we will continue our mentorship. At least I will continue to call her for help and advice.”
“I don't feel like she took the time to get to know me.”
“Very supportive on so many different levels. I am truly grateful for the professional relationship.”
“Although the coach was our leader she allowed us to take the reins and lead.”
“Coach gives it her all & all.”
“Coach is awesome! She always pushing us to strive to be better and I/We can be.”
“My coach is an excellent coach—always ready to listen, always ready to lend a hand. I learned a lot from her.”
“Coach was great. She was always available to me and willing to help in any way.”
“Coach was superb. She was always emailing and calling. Willing to change her schedule to come and help us. GREAT LEADER!”
“Coach is very organized and continues to be an invaluable resource to us.”
“Coach did a wonderful job of leading our group.”
“No visits, changed coaches, a little disconnect.”
“Coach was an awesome resource and we hated to leave her.”
“Meeting my new coach at this last institute was excellent.”
“My coach was too busy to be a coach and shared too much personal information with the group. The new coach seemed good and well connected with her group.”
“Unfortunately the coaching wasn't aligned with my expectation.”
“Coaches were wonderful. Appreciate their time and effort.”
“I really enjoyed my coach. There were times where we all could have used a little more guidance. Overall the coach was fabulous! She found ways to inform-support us.”
“The coaches seemed as if there was not a lot of clear direction on what to do, making it up as they went.”
“Excited about continuous contact and support.”
“Helpful with ideas to up my scores.”
“I would like to continue to keep in touch with her.”
“My coach was consistent with following through and providing technical assistance.”
“Great getting to know her and if I needed her I know she would be there.”
“She is a role model of a professional business person. Encouraging, honest, enthusiastic, willing to help and guide- This is the project coordinator.”
“Coach tried very hard to engage our team. It was a great experience. I just had a lot going on and wasn’t always available for phone class or online team meetings.”
“I would like to continue to keep in touch with her.”
“My coach was a great coach supported us throughout the entire process.”
“My coach was consistent with following through and providing technical assistance.”
“Coach was great at keeping us engaged.”
“I love worked with my coach, my involvement with Smart Start, she is always available for any assistance needed.”
“Coach helped to keep me on track with phone calls and emails. She supported me when I was having trouble with one of my goals.”
“Our coach was so nice and kind to all of us. She seemed to genuinely care about our team. She maybe was a little preoccupied to do this 100%.”
“Coach was always there when we needed anything & kept us encouraged!”
“Coach is an awesome coach and I am going to miss her guidance.”
“She kept in contact and returned emails quickly, and made sure we all connected. Loved our team meetings & feel connected to directors in my area & feel like connections will continue.”
“She was very helpful and eager to push us and help us throughout the institute.”
“Very supportive, very positive-kept us on track & positive- We already have an awesome group. We have already set a date to get together in August.”
“Our team is really excited about knowing and working with one another. It’s one of the great outcomes of this training.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your overall satisfaction of the following:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Institute</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q &amp; A with Jennifer Johnson- Monday Evening</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Meetings</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Services- Tuesday Evening</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Books</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Opportunities</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information/ Comments:
What was the best part of the Institute for you? See below.
What was the best part of the Institute for you?
“Networking and knowledge learned about myself and how to lead better.”
“The information and the excellence of develop.”
“Switch.”
“Being with other directors. Listening and learning from them.”
“The teams meetings and SWITCH.”
“Networking and shared resources.”
“Networking with peers and creating a supportive community.”
“All of it was outstanding. I enjoyed being able to network and meet new people. I enjoyed all of the information and being able to implement.”
“This was excellent! The leadership books, coach, and PAS”
“Getting to meet and make new connections with other professionals in the ECE field.”
“The speakers and interaction activities.”
“Being able to make improvements on my leadership abilities.”
“The bond and networking with our teams. Resource materials effective materials. PDSA's etc. to help us become more effective directors. (Everything)”
“After coming together for the third time I have become comfortable and able to better network. I loved the support that was provided by the staff, Lisa and the coaches.”
“Returning to see everyone and planned events.”
“I had a few favorite parts: DISC, PMI, both helped with my leadership.”
“The best part was meeting other directors and experts, and learning that we shared similar challenges; also celebrating successes.”
“The team meetings, SWITCH presentation and application of SWITCH ideas.”
“Reconnecting with these incredible people.”
“Meeting many new friends and colleagues who have provided me a wealth of resources.”
“I've gained another family. How to be a better director.”
“The exchange of information and opportunity to rich resources.”
“The best part was networking and realizing the struggles are across the board.”
“PMI Info.”

“Sharing, hearing we are not alone.”

“The best part was the team meetings and interactions I learned.”

“Small groups with our coach.”

“Learning more about child's brain development.”

“Manaba not shared resources/ would subscribe to resource for job applicants.”

“Being the first to hear about shared services. This will help me promote and explain to directors.”

“Every part of the institute is always good. My time with my team was very enriching. I really got a chance to see how they have grown and trust each other.”

“Networking, The Switch, PMI, team time.”

“My Team (5) was amazing!”

“Sharing strategies, meeting my team”

“The breakout sessions were very helpful for planning goals.”

“The networking, hearing from other directors and varying leadership topics.”

“Honestly just being part- having the access to the wealth of knowledge, resource materials, and a great group of directors.”

“Meeting other quality directors.”

“Reflection process, PMI and learning PAS”

“To know I'm not the only one with challenges. The institute gave me insight on how to be a better leader and to face the challenges.”

“Time away from center.”

“Bright spots.”

“The entire institute was awesome.”

“Guest speakers, take-home resources, and quality collaboration.”

“The best part was meeting other directors and experts, and learning that we shared similar challenges; also celebrating successes.”

“Networking with peers and creating a supportive community.”

“Improvement in my program with the information I applied. I was pleased to know a lot of
what I was doing was on target!”

“Resources, new knowledge, connections, relationships, feeling appreciated and encouraged in my role in EC- Proud.”

“The exchange of information and opportunity to rich resources.”

“The connections, friendships, and resources.”

“The entire event and all the new tools and the accommodations were impeccable!”

“PAS, PMI, The teams, inspirational leadership info.”

Do you have any additional comments/suggestions you wish to share?

“Please continue to give this opportunity to other directors.”

“Thanks to everyone who made it possible.”

“I hope there can be more professional development/leadership conferences for early educators. I am yearning for a pathway for this field to become more professionalized and sustainable financially.”

“Thank you for allowing me to be part of this group.”

“I'm looking for resource education, i.e. subsidy, abuse and neglect, special needs, finding qualified teachers.”

“Loved it! Want to know what's next.”

“Continue to use manaba maybe charging an annual fee. It provides great information.”

“I did not care at all for the shared services presentation. I felt like I was watching an infomercial or a super long sales pitch.”

“A reunion?? LOL”

“Could we have an all-day director's event a couple times a year? Loved our team meetings and feel connected to directors in my area and feel like those connections will continue.”

“I appreciate the opportunity to attend the institute and network with like-minded peers. Resource books are great, but audio would be helpful. *We would all appreciate a "clearing house" of qualified ECE applicant/teachers. That is a service my school would pay for compared to ECE shared resources. Finding quality teachers is a struggle.”

“I think we need to turn ECDLI into a strong PLC (Professional Learning Community) for NC. We must figure out how to keep this going beyond the grant process. I want to continue even though funding is going away-PLC!”

“I wish there was funding to continue this process for us while being able to add new participants. Growing and supporting ECE leaders.”
“Project Coordinator did a great job and made this an awesome experience. Great learning experience that has helped me grow personally and professionally.”

“Would be nice if there could be a part 2 (2nd Institute)”

“Continue and create a community.”

“Project Coordinator is absolutely the best person, event planned, and mentor. Thanks to this great lady for making each of us feel like a million dollars, and like we were her only favorites (LOL) she is the GREATEST!”

“I just wanted the project coordinator to know you are a great supporter. You have supported me since I first started at CNI and I want you to know that I appreciate you. Thanks again.”

“Resource for teacher applicants.”

“Yes; this was a fantastic experience! I wish we repeated a similar experience periodically- even if it is once every two years!”

“Hotel very accommodating, they went above and beyond at the front desk.”

“Felt that the Tuesday evening session was not appropriate for this setting. Should have been an elective break out session. Not appreciated.”

“Q & A not her fault just a frustrating topic. Would like social time over Wi-Fi since I could never actually get on line.”

“Awesome Institute... Lots of information. (Useful)”

“Would love to have a resource in my area that would be a cleaning house of qualified applicants for open positions. I may have from subs-licensed teachers.”

“I'm so appreciative to have been a part of this wonderful event. Hats off to Project Coordinator, coaches, guest speakers and so on!!”

“Please add pictures beside the director's name in the directory. Audio books/Cd's or DVDs that would be used for training would be helpful.”

“It was the right amount of time for listening, participating and networking.”

“I think we need to turn ECDLI into a strong PLACE for NC. We must figure out how to keep this going beyond the grant process.”

“Thank you for your heart for our industry.”

“Love the last 20 months. This experience was great.”

“An alumni page for us to keep in contact was suggested by one of my team members and I think it is an awesome idea.”
Final Summary Evaluation of ECDLI Project Activities

The Early Childhood Director Leadership Institute project began with the awarding of the grant to CCRI, Inc. and the hiring of the project coordinator who began work January 2, 2013. All activities were successfully carried out on schedule throughout the project according to the established project timeline. The leadership faculty was convened and the curriculum design began in the first quarter of 2013. Participants and coaches were identified and recruited during the second and third quarters of 2013 and the first Institute was held in the fourth quarter of 2013. The second Institute was held in the fall of 2014 and the third and final Institute was held in the summer of 2015. At least one evaluation team member was present for all leadership faculty meetings, coaches meetings, additional planning and development meetings, and all sessions and activities of each of the three Institutes. It was verified that all phases of the project were managed and directed in a timely and exemplary fashion. Comments from participants on all activities and presentations from all 3 Institutes were overwhelmingly positive. Goals for the project were met or exceeded, except for goal 5, for which 87% of participants demonstrated positive change based on the small test of change rather than 90%. Also, the final number of Institute III participants was 76 due to attrition over the course of the 3 year project duration.
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## Appendix A

### Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Outcomes</th>
<th>Type of Objective</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Project Coordinator Hired (4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2012)</td>
<td>Observational Data</td>
<td>Hiring Letter</td>
<td>Outcome Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Leadership Faculty Convened (4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2012)</td>
<td>Observational Data</td>
<td>Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Outcome Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Institute participants will have a positive reaction to each of the Institute sessions (2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2013, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2014 &amp; 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2015 outcome)</td>
<td>Survey responses</td>
<td>Satisfaction Surveys distributed following each Institute session</td>
<td>At least 80% of participants reported being satisfied or very satisfied with each Institute session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Institute participants will have a positive reaction to the overall Institute (all three Institutes – 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2015)</td>
<td>Survey responses</td>
<td>Overall satisfaction survey administered at the end of the project</td>
<td>At least 90% of participants reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Institute participants will have implemented positive changes and improvements in their programs by the completion of the Institute (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2014, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2015)</td>
<td>Rubric-based scoring of the Small Tests of Change (STC) worksheets and artifacts</td>
<td>Small Tests of Change worksheets</td>
<td>The goal of 90% of Institute participants demonstrating positive changes in their programs, based on the STC was not met. However, 87% of the participants in Institute III demonstrated positive changes in their programs, based on this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Institute participants will report positive experience with coaching supports (face-to-face, phone, and email) (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2014, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quarter 2015)</td>
<td>Survey responses</td>
<td>Coaching Feedback Form</td>
<td>At least 90% of Institute participants reported satisfaction with support received from coaches through face-to-face meetings, phone conversations, and email communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute participants will have implemented positive changes and improvements in their programs by the completion of the Institute (2015)</td>
<td>Observational data</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Institute participants will have implemented positive changes and improvements in their programs by the completion of the Institute (2015)</td>
<td>Survey responses</td>
<td>Program Management Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Institute participants will implement positive changes and improvements in their programs by the completion of the Institute (2015)</td>
<td>Survey responses</td>
<td>Classroom Appraisal of Resources and Demands (CARD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>