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This Morning’s Presentation:

- Integration: What it is and Why do it.
- The TFD Model and Aims
- Research Approach & Tools
- Findings
- Conclusions/Learning
What is & Why do Integration?

Conceptual Integration

- There is some way to go before practitioners and stakeholders develop a clear understanding of integrated services. The evidence suggests that the current guidance and terminology associated with integrated service provision need greater clarity (Report on UK service integration from Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 2009).

- Need for clarity applies to integrated service demonstration projects like TFD, and to implementing integrated service policy at scale.

- Ideas, Tools and Evidence can help.
What it’s Not: Service fragmentation

What is integration? Types and levels

- Neighborhood service types
  - Hubs and centres
  - Networks
  - Service navigation and referrals

- More than the neighborhood service level
  - Local and regional organizations
  - Government ministries and systems
What is it? Degree/progress

Why integrate separate early childhood services?

- Continuity in children’s lives & support for families
- Efficiency
- Improved programming
- Covering service gaps
- Equity and outreach
- Ambitious aims (school readiness, prevention, etc.) with “big indicators”, need ambitious approaches, not isolated efforts that don’t reach critical mass
- A platform to support Early Human Development (McCain & Mustard, 1999)
Why integrate? Research....

- The evidence base is limited

- UK Sure Start- from networks to centres
- US CCDP- service navigation
- Ontario’s BBBF- community networks
- Child and Family centres/hubs- Chicago Parenting Centres and TFD/BS in Peel


The TFD model, aims, and partners

“The first duty of every society is to care for its youngest members...”
### TFD1 Core Model

- Integrated core:
  
  `{kindergarten, child care & family support}`
  
  + other services

- Integrated on dimensions of
  
  • early learning environment,
  
  • staff team,
  
  • governance,
  
  • seamless access &
  
  • parent participation

- Neighbourhood schools as hub

- Different starting points – opportunities, partners & communities

---

### TFD Aims from the Partners: ACF, City of Toronto, & TDSB

- To transform public policies on early childhood programs

- By developing & researching a universal early learning & care program for every child that:
  
  • Supports the healthy development of children, *and at the same time*
  
  • Supports parents in their parenting role
  
  • Supports parents to work or study
Research Approach & Tools

TFD Research Questions

- **Can it work**- Integration of existing, separate services?
- **What are the processes** in implementing & sustaining the program?
  - How does implementation work across sites?
  - What are the barriers & facilitators?
  - What processes link to program success?
- **What are the outcomes** of the program?
Research design & evaluation methods

- Design research approach
- Mixed-methods & multiple measures
- 5 Case studies at site level
- Implementation Process over time
- Community control site comparisons for children and parents
- Dose-response analysis for children

Conceptual Approach

Develop a Theory of Change about the processes by which the new approach will have its effects and then measure processes as well as outcomes.

Program > Processes > Outcomes
<     <

Design research: feed findings back to the project for continuous improvement
## TFD Tools & other measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>CHILD OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of Change (IoC)</td>
<td>Early Dev Instrument (EDI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake &amp; Tracking (I &amp; T)</td>
<td>Child readiness rating by Kg Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Envir Rating Scale (ECERS-R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Obs Framework (COF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Obs Framework (POF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Parent Daily Hassles (EC-PDH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus stakeholder surveys, focus groups, interviews, document analysis, field notes

## TFD Illustrative Findings

- Professional staff teams
  - Integration and quality
- Parents & family
  - Outreach & involvement
- Children
  - Outcomes in Kindergarten
TFD Theory of Change: “Process” Pathways

TFD Model

- Staff teamwork: eye on results
- Parents: parenting & participation

Children’s development

TFD staff team “process”

TFD Implementation

- Top down support and pressure
- Bottom up buy-in
- Time to meet
- Building respect
- Joint professional development
- Leadership at all levels
- Technical supports & research

Staff teamwork and focus on results-integration, quality & outcomes
Staff team, integration & quality

- What is the early years team?
  - ECE, ECA, K Teacher, Site Coordinator (EC supervisor), Principal, Partner Agency Manager, Parenting and Family Literacy worker
  - Also site management team: includes EY staff team + partner agencies & parents

- Research Tools provided feedback on integration (IoC) and quality (ECERS-R) to help Team improve both

ECERS-R Quality Dimensions

- Space and Furnishings
- Personal Care
- Language Reasoning
- Activities
- Interaction
- Program Structure
- Parents and Staff
TFD Indicators of Change (IoC)

- A self/assisted assessment tool for reviewing and benchmarking progress towards integration

- Degree/Progress rated on a continuum from co-existence> coordination> collaboration> integration

- Integration assessed along dimensions of
  - Program: Early learning and care environment
  - Staff team
  - Governance
  - Seamless access
  - Parent and community engagement

---

Toronto First Duty IoC at the Bruce Site: 2001, 2003 & 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Change Summary</th>
<th>Early Learning Environment</th>
<th>Early Childhood Staff Team</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Seamless Access</th>
<th>Parent Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFD - BWELC</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration - Level 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration - Level 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration - Level 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination - Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-existence - Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Time 3 - June 2005
- Time 2 - June 2003
- Time 1 - Starting Phase 2001

1. Curriculum Framework
2. Pedagogical Approach
3. Daily Schedule & Routines
4. Use of Space
5. Children’s Development & Progress
6. Program Quality
7. Program Planning & Implementation
8. Behavior
9. Policies & Procedures
10. Staff Development
11. Decision-making
12. Allocation of Financial Resources
13. Service Planning & Monitoring
14. Program Policies
15. Human Resources
16. Capacity
17. Child Care Provision
18. Child Care Affordability
19. Schedules, Enrollment & Attendance
20. Responsiveness to Community & TFD
21. Parent Input
22. Parent Participation in Programs
23. Planning Capacity
24. Relationships With Families
Bruce site case study continued past the initial demonstration phase of TFD.

Quality scores mirror integration level at each time point with dips in 2006.
TFD family/parent “process”

TFD Implementation
- Outreach efforts
- Menu of service choice
- Quality child care
- Parenting programs
- Reduction in family hassles
- Service as social support

Participation, parenting & parent-service connections strengthened

I&T: Prior Service Gaps for ELL Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs/Services Used for the Family Prior to Contact with TFD</th>
<th>English as a First Language vs. English as an Additional Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as a First Language</td>
<td>English as an Additional Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Nurse*</td>
<td>12% 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Groups*</td>
<td>21% 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation*</td>
<td>35% 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Centre*</td>
<td>23% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Resources/Drop In</td>
<td>23% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Programs*</td>
<td>33% 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* p < .05, significant difference by chi² test)
Uptake on both sides of the track: I & T data & mapping

From enrolment to “dose”: TFD I&T data on participation

- Demographic factors were unrelated to enrolment and hours logged in TFD programs, with one exception:
- Children whose mothers had lower education levels logged more hours in TFD services in four out of five sites

Sejal Patel’s PhD thesis
TFD Impact on Parent Involvement

TFD parents more likely (than parents in comparison sites with one school-based preschool program or no preschool programs):

- To Feel responsible to talk to their child’s teacher
- To Feel successful in helping their child learn

Patel & Corter, 2012

Parental Communication Role: Site Integration X Immigrant Status
TFD “Process” Pathways

TFD Model

- Staff teamwork: eye on results
- Parents: parenting & participation

Children’s development

What about the children?

- Outcomes for children are important but their experiences along the way count as well. Data included interviews with children as well as EDI teacher ratings.

- Hearing from children
  - Interviews
  - Focus groups
  - Drawings

- Early Development Instrument (EDI) teacher ratings
Early Development Instrument (EDI)

- Community-level measure of children’s “readiness” in 5 developmental areas (teacher rating scale at end of kindergarten)
  - Physical health and well-being
  - Emotional maturity
  - Social competence
  - Language and cognitive development
  - Communication and general knowledge

Dose-response: I&T participation hours in TFD services affect EDI

At the individual level, increased hours of uptake or ‘dose’ of TFD was a significant predictor of three domains on the EDI

- Physical health and well-being
- Language and cognitive development
- Communication and general knowledge

Sejal Patel’s PhD thesis
Conclusions

Learning: TFD Research Findings

- Integrating existing services is challenging but possible in a community-school-hub model
- Integrated service can deliver quality programs
- An integrated service platform pulls in underserved
- Integrated service can support parents & parenting
- Integrated services can support child development
- Partnered research & strategic Knowledge Mobilization can change policy
More Learning

- Integration isn’t a steady state achieved by introducing a model or program; it’s a work in progress
- System alignment at higher levels of government is needed to sustain community level improvements
- Tools that measure and that organize understanding & action are important for improving practice and policy
- Knowledge building is important within sites and staff teams, community organizations and governments. The Academy can work effectively in partnership with each of these levels

Going beyond the data

- Policy needs continuous improvement, as well as evidence based starting points
- Research: Integrating existing data on children’s development, service sectors & context is crucial for improving policy
- Knowledge Mobilization for parent, community and public understanding, not just for policy makers
- Integration should include services for learning, social functioning & health
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