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**ECPC Intensive TA Leadership Institute**

*Avon Old Farms Hotel | 279 Avon Mountain Rd, Avon, CT 06001*

*August 18-21, 2019*

*Evaluation Summary*

**The Event:**

 The ECPC Intensive TA Leadership Institute was a four-day event held at Avon Old Farms Hotel located at 279 Avon Mountain Rd, Avon, CT. Thirty-one (31) individuals attended the institute (Table 1). The event began on Sunday, August 18, with the introduction of state representatives, who presented on current personnel initiatives. During the following three days, participants were provided with an overview of the blueprints for a CSPD, the four implementation phases of CSPD activities, recruitment and retention strategies, and evaluation methodologies. Participants also engaged in workgroups with their state team and a technical assistant. Workgroup contents included personnel standards, pre-service programs, and action plans.

On the last day of the institute, participants continued to work with their state team to finalize their self-assessment, action plan, timelines, and deliverables. Lastly, participants completed an evaluation. The evaluation consisted of three sections: Meeting Objectives, The Facilitators(s), and Overall, which included questions on quality, relevance, and usefulness of the meeting. Response options were on a four-point scale and ranged from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Participants were also asked to respond to three open-ended questions. Twenty-six (26) participants responded to the survey, with a response rate of eighty-four percent (84%).

Table 1. *Particpants’ Roles (n=31)*

| **Roles**  | **N** |
| --- | --- |
| Part C | 4 |
| Part B (619) | 4 |
| EC Partner  | 3 |
| Family | 2 |
| IHE/ UCEDD | 4 |
| Leadership Coordination and sustainability | 3 |
| State personnel standards workgroup | 2 |
| Recruitment and retention workgroup | 2 |
| Pre-service workgroup | 3 |
| In-service workgroup | 1 |
| Evaluation workgroup | 2 |
| EC partner and In-service workgroup  | 1 |

Table 2. *Evaluation of Meeting Objectives (n=26)*

| **During the Meeting:** | **SD** | **D** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Current and emerging state issues in Part C and B/ 619 programs were described.  | -- | -- | 13 | 12 | 1 | 3.48 | 0.51 |
| The ECPC Implementation Model for State Early Childhood CSPD Development was described.  | -- | -- | 11 | 15 | -- | 3.58 | 0.50 |
| The six components of an EC CSPD were reviewed.  | -- | -- | 6 | 20 | -- | 3.77 | 0.43 |
| Division of Early Childhood recommended practices (RP).  | -- | -- | 14 | 10 | 2 | 3.42 | .050 |
| The ECPC/ECTA personnel framework was used to assess and plan objectives in each of the six components of an Integrated and Comprehensive System of Personnel Development in each state. | -- | -- | 5 | 21 | -- | 3.81 | 0.40 |
| Evidence-based practices in adult learning to strategic planning and workgroup management were applied.  | 1 | -- | 13 | 11 | 1 | 3.36 | 0.70 |
| Individual state planning time was used to outline EC state plans for each of the 6 CSPD components | -- | -- | 4 | 20 | 2 | 3.83 | 0.38 |
| All of the objectives of the institute were addressed. | -- | -- | 8 | 18 | -- | 3.69 | 0.47 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

Table 3. *Evaluation of Presenters (n =26)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Presenter(s):** | **SD** | **D** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| The facilitator(s) were well prepared and organized. | -- | -- | 10 | 16 | -- | 3.62 | 0.50 |
| The facilitator(s) were knowledgeable in the subject. | -- | -- | 5 | 21 | -- | 3.81 | 0.40 |
| Information was presented in a way I could easily understand | -- | -- | 11 | 15 | -- | 3.54 | 0.51 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

Table 4. *Evaluation of Overall Session (n =26)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Session:** | **SD** | **D** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| I gained knowledge as a result of this meeting. | -- | -- | 5 | 21 | -- | 3.81 | 0.40 |
| I am satisfied with the meeting. | -- | -- | 7 | 19 | -- | 3.73 | 0.45 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

Table 5. *Quality of the Meeting (n=26)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SD** | **D** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| The meeting presented information that reflected current research, best practice, and theory (e.g. scientific or evidence-based approaches, a solid conceptual framework, and other evidence of conceptual soundness). | -- | -- | 4 | 21 | 1 | 3.84 | 0.37 |
| The meeting communicated information clearly (as evidenced by being free of editorial errors, appropriately formatted, and well organized). | -- | -- | 10 | 15 | 1 | 3.60 | 0.50 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

Table 6. *Relevance of the Meeting (n=26)*

|  | **SD** | **D** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topics/sessions at the meeting addressed important problems or critical issues. | -- | -- | 9 | 17 | -- | 3.65 | 0.49 |
| Topics/sessions at the meeting matched problems or issues facing you and your stakeholders (e.g., information was pertinent to you and your stakeholders). | -- | -- | 11 | 15 | -- | 3.58 | 0.50 |
| Topics/sessions at the meeting were applicable to diverse populations of personnel serving infants, toddlers, preschoolers with disabilities. | -- | 1 | 9 | 16 | -- | 3.58 | 0.58 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

Table 7. *Usefulness of the Meeting (n=26)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SD** | **D** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| The meeting presented information in an easily understood way, with directions or guidance regarding how problems or issues could be addressed. | -- | -- | 13 | 13 | -- | 3.50 | 0.51 |
| Information/strategies presented at the meeting will likely be used or have been used. | -- | -- | 8 | 18 | -- | 3.69 | 0.47 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

**What did you *like* most about the meeting?**

* Dedicated teamwork time with ECPC staff facilitators and notetakers- this helped teams focus on work and not have to focus on notes, etc.
* Opportunity to learn, connect. Mary Beth's support on upcoming grant RFP helpful in extending our work.
* Direct application of issues transferred into draft work plan lots of team time for conversation and planning. Support from faculty and recorder at the team meeting. Presentation and topics. Team time for teamwork.
* The opportunity to work on goals, objectives, and activities for the workgroups.
* Opportunity to collaborate and coordinate in the development of the CSPD.
* Set up: Presentation and then team time to apply it.
* The opportunity to work together as a state team with excellent facilitators to provide information and keep us on track. Flexibility.
* ECPC allowing the teams to bring representatives from the workgroup, Each representative was valuable to the work we did over the past 2, 1/2 days. If we did not have these individuals, the work would be difficult to complete.
* Work time for each state group.
* The format was constructive.
* The time to be with my team and the TA was pushing us to put it in writing and have timelines.
* Everything. The camaraderie of participants.
* Good info important work.
* The opportunity to hear specific information related to completing the action plans was helpful. The allotted time to work within our group.
* I enjoyed the state time because it was uninterrupted work time!
* The work time with my state.
* Workgroup sessions!
* State time we hardly ever get to all sit down together.
* The ability to network with other states and gain knowledge of other experiences. Also, the ability to share resources.
* State team time
* Group time. Learning about standards.
* The pace of the days- they were full in terms of content but did not feel rushed or exploitative.
* I enjoyed the time spent with our TA in our state work time.
* The whole experience was a great learning opportunity to me personally.
* Adult learning. Briefs.
* The support to take action and make goals/ work happen during our time together. We couldn't have done all this without these few days and the ECPC team. The energy of the team and collaboration with the other states was awesome! Especially as someone new to all of this.

**How could the overall event be *improved*?**

* Links to slides right away to take notes electronically for those who benefit from taking notes linked to content specifically shared- some great info was shared I would easily apply to daily work.
* More opportunity to work as just a team! Connect with our states on best practices.
* Deb and David- Would have preferred a more interactive session with David, more concrete examples.
* Add information on effective strategies to facilitate meetings group around tough barriers More state-specific data. National data is great but ir would have been more relevant and impactful if it was paired with state-specific data for states present at this meeting. Even if the info is "no data" or “no good data” that's helpful to compare to other states.
* Having a projector for us to view work product notes being developed would be more helpful.
* Have a projector to project on the screen o have a visual. Zoom so other members of the team can participate in state team time.
* State sessions on time.
* Projectors so that our note talker/ recorder could project the teamwork during state team time.
* Shorted by 1/2 day. Either skip Sunday night, so it's 2.5 days or ends on Tuesday and make Sunday night more productive.
* Have a state that is doing a CSPD will present- how has this helped them and what does it look like on the other side?
* More state-to-state interaction. While we reported out to one another, I would have liked to have worked within a group of multiple state participants. I am not sure what that would look like or even if it is feasible.
* More interaction activities, opportunities to work with other states. Less sit and get 1 hour is too long for adults to sit. Please practice what you teach.
* Providing more examples of materials that can be used to collect data or measure outcomes for action plans.
* Nothing.
* PPT up before the sessions start.
* Maybe have shorter intro sessions and provide more time with workgroups.
* Online presentation was hard to stay engages with.
* Evaluation
* Hawaii
* None at this time.
* Not sure, but I will think about this.

**What is the *most important* *thing* you will take away from the meeting?**

* Next steps in our action plan and clear means to take them forward and complete tasks by timelines.
* Steps to move towards in our state work.
* So important to have the right people at the table! Work so complex, but exciting to be a part of the conversation. Need to convene work group quality to help engage them.
* Next steps to keep this work moving.
* Action plans.
* I have a much clearer vision of the groups' role and my function as part of this group. I am a relatively new member of the team and feel a part of the group now.
* Representation from different states is key.
* Strategic plan.
* Action plans. Please have a p[rojector for each breakout room so we can work together instead of on chart papers.
* Action plans!!
* The access that we have to resources (TA, grants, etc.).
* Plans for moving forward.
* Defined timelines and expectations to work when I return home.
* Our action plan that now has items and a timeline that is doable.
* More solidified objectives and activities to begin work once back in home state.
* Next steps for our team.
* More plan.
* Collaborative practices.
* A better understanding of the ECPC logic model.
* Action planning document alignment,
* The importance of getting everyone in our state to collaborate and pout out the word on the importance of more funding for ECE.
* Adult learning. Briefs on content delivery. Assessing realistic ability to be in intensive team is strong and working.
* The work we have accomplished including immediate next steaps to keep us going.

**Additional Comments:**

* As additional states are getting set up as teams, I would encourage teams to gather input from an interdisciplinary community. Even if focus needs to be on standards for EC teachers at all levels the interdisciplinary team, particularly IHE faculty training those of PD specific to other disciplines, need to be informed at a minimum.
* Thank you! I can see a lot of planning! Hard work went into this.
* I know you are not working environment, but it was pretty cold in the room! And the food was delish.
* Thank you for everything!
* Thank you!
* Thank you.
* Please clearly spell out acronyms. Provide a shared understanding incorporate more adult learning techniques — more activities, movement, smart group work.
* Thanks for a great institute!
* Thanks!
* Thank you to everyone who worked so hard to make it so easy to engage to be successful.
* Thank you so much. I always learn so much and feel productive when we get together.
* Thank you!