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The Environment Rating Scales Family
Three Basic Needs of Children

• **Protection** of their health and safety

• Chances to **build relationships** with other children and the adults who care for them

• Appropriate **learning opportunities**
Two Ways of Measuring Quality

• **Structural indicators of quality**
  • These are inputs that help provide quality in the classroom when the inputs are of sufficient amounts and quality.
  • In early childhood, these inputs are commonly regulated by states to provide a basic level of support for quality, most often done though the state licensing process reinforced by QRIS requirements. These are inputs that help provide quality in the classroom when the inputs are of sufficient amounts and quality.

• **Process quality assessment**
  • The daily practice in operation of early childhood programs covering various levels of quality – what is happening in early childhood classrooms that are designed to enable and support the development of children.
Process Quality Assessment

Examples:

- **Interactions among people (staff-child, child-child) throughout the day**
- **Availability and use of materials and equipment**
- **Schedule of the day and use of time**
- **Availability and use of space**
- **Activities that enable children to develop physically, socially, emotionally, and cognitively and that develop learning practices.**
- **Protection of children from disease and harm**
ITERS-3

Rethinking the Infant/toddler Environment Rating Scale
Key Differences between ITERS-R and ITERS-3

• Scores based on observation of ongoing classroom activity (3 hour time sample)

• No teacher interview -- only a few questions prior to the observation

• Eliminates Parents and Staff subscale to allow more time to focus on actual classroom practice

• Change in upper end of age range covered
Age range change—For use in programs for children birth to 36 months
Key Differences (cont.)

• More emphasis on interactions and the teacher’s role

Decreased emphasis on counting materials, more on how materials are used to encourage learning

Increased emphasis on engaging language and literacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE AND FURNISHINGS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indoor space</td>
<td>15. Fine motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Furnishings for care, play and learning</td>
<td>16. Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Room arrangement</td>
<td>17. Music and movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Dramatic play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL CARE ROUTINES</td>
<td>20. Nature/science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diapering/toileting</td>
<td>22. Appropriate use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Health practices</td>
<td>23. Promoting acceptance of diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE AND BOOKS</td>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Encouraging vocabulary development</td>
<td>26. Supervision of play and learning (non-gross motor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Responding to children’s communication</td>
<td>27. Peer interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encouraging children to communicate</td>
<td>28. Staff-child interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff use of books with children</td>
<td>29. Providing physical warmth/touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Schedule and transitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Free play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Group play activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITERS-3:
INITIAL VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY
Background:
Preliminary work on ITERS-R

• Collected 1976 ITERS-R assessments conducted as part of State Quality Rating and Improvement Systems.
• From 3 states - Georgia, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania.
• Analyzed data to examine difficulty indices for each indicator.
• Looked at item, subscale and total scores.
• Allowed us to focus very specifically on scaling issues with the ITERS in the revision process.

• Special thanks to all of the authors of the ITERS-3 as well as Dari Jigjidsuren who helped with the statistical analyses and Gayane Baziyants who coordinated the data collection.

• Particular thanks also go to personnel in the 3 states for allowing to use de-identified data from their states for this purpose.
ITERS-3 Field Test

- Predictive and Concurrent Validity of the ITERS-R and ECERS-3 are established.
- The ITERS-3 maintains the basic properties of these two scales.
- Thus the ITERS-3 field test focused primarily on the degree to which this new version maintains the ability to be used reliably under normal data collection protocols.
- Small pilot trials using a draft revision were conducted in late spring - early summer 2016.
- A larger field test was conducted after adjustments were made based on the pilot work.
- Further study will be needed to confirm the predictive and concurrent validity of the final version of the ITERS-3.
Study Design

• A group of 9 observers from the three states were trained to reliability by the authors and key ERSI personnel, including direct observation in early childhood classrooms of varying degrees of estimated quality.

• Observers had to meet the criterion of a mean item reliability of 85% within one point across the full 33 items of the scale.

• Additional observers were trained by these trained observers, when back in their home states.

• All of the observers had previously been trained to reliability on the ITERS-R and were seasoned observers.

• Personnel from the three states participated fully in the study, providing personnel for training and data collection, obtaining a diverse sample of classrooms for assessment, and generally providing us with advice. However, we conducted the data analysis and interpretation and take full responsibility for any errors.
Study Design, cont.

- For data collection, each observer was paired with a second trained observer.
- Observers collected data independently of one another in the same classroom at the same time.
- Data collection occurred during the prime time of the day, usually beginning at 8:00 or 9:00 AM.
- Data collection was for exactly 3 hours.
- If needed, a short extended time was allowed for examining the following, if not observed during the 3 hours:
  - Observing the gross motor area and equipment,
  - Observing diapering/toileting for sanitary practices,
  - Observing Meals/snacks for sanitary practices and nutritional adequacy, and
  - Classroom materials which could not be assessed earlier without disturbing the class.
- No assessment of child and teacher interactions, availability of materials, or learning activities could be assessed during this short extended time.
Study Sample

The full sample consisted of 53 classrooms.
Sites included: Georgia (15), Pennsylvania (16), Washington (18) and North Carolina (4).

Sites were diverse in terms of estimated quality with a goal of having 1/3 low quality, 1/3 medium quality and 1/3 high quality.

Estimates of quality were made by individual state personnel and included QRIS scores or other similar methods of quality assessment.

ITERS-3 scores from the field test indicated that the sample was somewhat skewed toward moderate to low quality settings, but state personnel felt these reasonably represented the distribution of quality in their states.
Results – Indicator Level Reliability

• Across the 33 items, there were 476 indicators in the scale.
• Indicators could be scored Yes, No or in some cases NA.
• Six of the items could be scored NA, in such cases all indicators were scored NA.
• Overall reliability was **86.9% exact agreement**.
• A few indicators scored below 75%. In such cases the indicators were modified to improve reliability or were dropped.
• Other indicators were dropped because of problems with scaling or redundancy.
Results - Item Reliability

• For the full 33 items, exact agreement was 60.6%.
• Agreement within one point was 86.1%.
• Mean weighted Cohen’s Kappa was .600.
• Kappas ranged from .376 for Room arrangement, to .753 for Staff use of books with children.
• Only Room arrangement has a kappa below .400.
• All items with kappas below .500 were edited to improve reliability.
## Results – Intraclass Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N paired</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 1: Space and Furnishings</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2: Personal Care Routines</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 3: Language/Books</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4: Activities</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 5: Interaction</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 6: Program Structure</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Subscales 1–6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale (based on Observation score)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Internal Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 1: Space and Furnishings</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2: Personal Care Routines</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 3: Language/Books</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4: Activities</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 5: Interaction</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 6: Program Structure</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Subscales 1–6</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale (Items 1-33)</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITERS-3 Field Test -- Summary

• Overall, the measures of reliability are certainly adequate to conduct quality assessments using the scale for research and evaluation.

• The findings are similar, and slightly better than for earlier versions of the ITERS.

• The results of the Field Test were used to make minor revisions prior to publication of the scale. These revisions should further improve the reliability statistics presented here.

• The rather minor modifications completed after the Field Test reduced the number of indicators to a total of 457 for the full scale.

• Further research will certainly be needed to verify the expected concurrent and predictive validity of the Scale.

• My conflict of interest.
A History Lesson...
Defining a new approach.

Age of QRIS  
STARS Inquiry  
Revisioning
Defining a new approach.
Transitioning to the ECERS-3:
What did we anticipate?

ECERS-3 introduced new expectations and overall scores may be lower.

The Keystone STARS system and our staff are ready to support programs with this transition.
LET'S TALK QUALITY!
Program Quality Assessment in PA.

It isn’t about “doing the ERS.” Really, it isn’t.
The ERS observation gathers information that helps teachers know what might be a priority in their quality improvement work. The ERS is NOT the quality improvement work. It’s a tool – not a rule!

What does the information collected during an ERS assessment tell us about the child’s experience in the classroom?

A STRENGTHS BASED APPROACH TO BEST PRACTICE USING THE ECERS, THIRD EDITION
Keystone STARS Program Performance Standards
May 2017
Getting to know the ITERS-3.
Fifteen ITERS-3 Field Study assessments were completed:

- Range of STAR 1 through STAR 4 programs;
- Included one high quality classroom that was not in the Keystone STARS program (Early Head Start), and
- Included one STAR 4 site that was also NAEYC accredited
Finding our keystone...
A transition for “us” too!

A new approach to:

Assessor training and support

Professional Development for Assessors and our STARS partners in addition to training and resources for programs

Delivering observation feedback
* Telling a Quality Improvement Story

Technical Assistance
* No fix-its
* Allow the program to own and drive the change
System Highlights

- Rating valid for 3 years
- Three star levels
- Tiered reimbursement (5%, 10%, 25%)
- Generous bonus packages at each star level
- Free training and technical assistance
- Two and three star programs eligible for QRi endorsement
ECERS-3 Implementation Timeline and the Lesson Learned from the Transition

- New Applications TA and Assessment with ECERS-3 automatic.
- Participating Prior to September 1st 2015 Choice of ECERS-R or ECERS-3 Assessment at time of program observation.
- December 31st 2015
- January 1st 2016

Any portfolio Submitted Assessed with the ECERS-3 regardless of when first began participating.
Total ECERS-R and ECERS-3 Classroom Average Scores

ECERS-R: 3.29
ECERS-3: 4.39
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>ECERS-R</th>
<th>ECERS-3</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Space/furnishings</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal Care Routines</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Language Reasoning (Language &amp; Literacy)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities (Learning Activities)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interaction</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Program Structure</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Total Obs Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E3 Scores Over Time

- 2015: N = 65, Average = 3.29
- 2016: N = 447, Average = 3.78
- 2017: N = 237, Average = 4.27
Participation in ITERS-3 Validation Field Test

Three Assessors trained to Gold Level Standards in NC by the authors

Fifteen ITERS-3 Field Study assessments were conducted by 4 Assessors:

• 12 programs ranging from 1 - 3 Stars
• 3 Participating programs, not yet rated
• 1 Early Head Start program

Average ITERS Comparison Scores for 12 Rated Programs:
- ITERS-R: 4.11
- ITERS-3: 3.36
ITERS-3 Adoption in Georgia

ITERS-3 Published June 2017

- Small Pilot to re-establish anchors
  August 2017

- Training/resource Development
- CCR&R and Providers
  Comparability Study

- Initial Portfolios = ITERS-3
  Summer 2018
  - Required renewal and requests for reassessment can select

2019
- All portfolios transitioned to I-3

ITERS-3-3 Published June 2017

ITERS-3 and Infant Subsidy Plus Classrooms Pilot
Impacts to ITERS-3 Adoption Timeline

Assessor and TA Needs

- Re-envision the Standards and the role of the Portfolio

Streamline Operational Processes

- CAPS 2020 Mandate

- Integration of OST in centers into QRIS

- Technology and Equipment Updates

- Roll-Out Communication Plan

- Training and Resources Development and Alignment

Create Improved Data Systems
A History Lesson...
Defining a new approach.

Age of QRIS

STARS Inquiry

Revisioning
Defining a new approach.
Transitioning to the ECERS-3: What did we anticipate?

ECERS-3 introduced new expectations and overall scores may be lower.

The Keystone STARS system and our staff are ready to support programs with this transition.
LET’S TALK QUALITY!

Program Quality Assessment in PA.

ECERS-3 Summary Report Companion

What Professional Development (PD) and resources are available to me?

- ECERS-3 Overview Webinar
  Announcement of this webinar is available on the ERS Page of the PA Keys website along with a Q&A session from summer 2011. This focuses on differences between ECERS-3 and ECERS-R, looks at several ECERS-3 teams, and reviews the start of Pennsylvania's work with the new tool.

- ECERS-3 Online Course
  This self-paced course provides an overview of ECERS-3 for five (5) PQAS hours. Log in to the Professional Development (PD) Registry to take this course.

- Notes for Clarification
  The authors of the ERS-3 have created Notes for Clarification released in August 2013. Check the ERS site at http://ers3.info for regular updates.

- ERS Page on the PA Keys Website
  Please visit this page for regular updates on ERS-3.

- Additional PD
  Any professional development that builds knowledge about developmentally appropriate practice is relevant. Look for PD events that touch on Literacy and Language development, Early Learning Framework, Mathematics (STEM), and Interactions.

- COMING SOON: ECERS-3 Face-to-Face Course
  Coming in 2018, an introducer, face-to-face course will be available.

It isn’t about “doing the ERS.” Really, it isn’t.

The ERS observation gathers information that helps teachers know what might be a priority in their quality improvement work. The ERS is NOT the quality improvement work. It’s a tool—not a rule!

• What does the information collected during an ERS assessment tell us about the child’s experience in the classroom?

A STRENGTHS BASED APPROACH TO BEST PRACTICE USING THE ECERS, THIRD EDITION
Keystone STARS Program Performance Standards
May 2017
Getting to know the ITERS-3.
Fifteen ITERS-3 Field Study assessments were completed:

• Range of STAR 1 through STAR 4 programs;
• Included one high quality classroom that was not in the Keystone STARS program (Early Head Start), and
• Included one STAR 4 site that was also NAEYC accredited
Finding our keystone...
A transition for “us” too!

A new approach to:

Assessor training and support

Professional Development for Assessors and our STARS partners in addition to training and resources for programs

Delivering observation feedback
  *Telling a Quality Improvement Story*

Technical Assistance
  *No fix-its*
  *Allow the program to own and drive the change*
Washington State

Asha Warsame
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