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Abstract

On June 30, 2016, the Ontario Ministry of Education released The Kindergarten Program, a document which outlined the expectations to be taught and the pedagogical approaches to be used in all publicly funded Ontario kindergarten classrooms with a mandatory implementation date of September 2016. This document included a focus on self-regulation, since research has shown that self-regulation skills are essential for not only early learning but for social and emotional success throughout life. This Organization Improvement Plan (OIP) investigates several possible strategies for ensuring that all kindergarten teachers and Early Childhood Educators in School Board X can articulate what self-regulation is and why it is important, and that they can teach, document, assess and report on the self-regulation expectations. Strategies used in this OIP to develop and deepen educators’ understanding of self-regulation are underpinned by a constructivist orientation to learning (Butler & Schnellert, 2012) whereby learners actively construct knowledge and understanding, and build upon their prior knowledge, experience and beliefs. The change implementation plan in this OIP leverages existing structures in School Board X utilizing Cawsey, Deszca and Ingol’s Change Path Model (2016) as a guiding framework. The proposed solution explores how the educational leaders of the Curriculum Support Department can use a distributed leadership framework to create, support and sustain a Self-Regulation Leadership Team. Once implemented, this OIP is anticipated to effect positive change in kindergarten educators’ understanding of self-regulation and ensure that all learners reach their full potential.
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Executive Summary

This Organizational Improvement Plan is a theory and research-informed plan to improve one school board’s efforts to enact the self-regulation expectations in the Ontario Ministry of Education’s Kindergarten Program document (2016a). An inquiry into the organizational context examined how political, economic, social, human resource and culture factors contributed to the problem of practice. Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) Organizational Congruence Model was used as a framework for guiding this organizational analysis. The gap analysis included a PEST analysis of factors external to the organization which was augmented by reframing the Problem of Practice through Bolman and Deal’s (2013) structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames.

This Organization Improvement Plan is underpinned by a leadership framework of distributed leadership (Gronn, 2010; Harris, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001; Woods & Woods, 2013). A distributed perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals and can transcend formal leadership positions (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Strategies used in this OIP to develop and deepen educators’ understanding of self-regulation are underpinned by a constructivist orientation to learning (Butler & Schnellert, 2012; Merriam & Bierema, 2014) whereby learners actively construct knowledge and understanding, and build upon their prior knowledge, experience and beliefs.

Three solutions were considered for ensuring that kindergarten educators in School Board X can enact the ministry’s self-regulation expectations: the train-the-trainer model, school based professional learning communities, and the development of a Self-Regulation Leadership Team. A comparative analysis led to the selection of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team as the
preferred solution. The creation of a Self-Regulation Leadership Team aligns with the distributed leadership framework and builds on leadership practices already used by School Board X. It is an economical solution as it would only require the same amount of release time as the current FDK team and members could utilize existing professional learning resource materials available from the board, the ministry and the MEHRIT Centre.

The Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) method is proposed as a strategy for monitoring and evaluating the progress of this change initiative as it will allow the educational leaders to engage in ongoing evaluation throughout the Change Path Model, and adjust their implementation plan and timeline to more precisely meet the needs of kindergarten educators. A comprehensive communication plan, aligned with the stages of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) utilizes a range of online and face-to-face strategies to share the vision for change, build and maintain momentum, and ensure all stakeholders are informed throughout the change process.

Finally, this OIP explores possible next steps and future considerations through the lens of sustainability, depth and a shift in ownership of this change process. The creation of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will allow the educational leaders of the Curriculum Support Department and this author to develop a cadre of knowledgeable and confident educators who can support their colleagues and deepen and sustain the implementation of the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) for many years to come.
Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem

On June 30, 2016, the Ontario Ministry of Education released The Kindergarten Program, a document which describes the pedagogical approaches and lists the curriculum expectations to be taught in all publicly funded kindergarten classrooms in Ontario. The expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) are organized into four frames: (1) Belonging and Contributing, (2) Self-Regulation and Well-being, (3) Demonstrating Literacy and Mathematics Behaviours, and (4) Problem Solving and Innovating.

Research has shown that self-regulation, an integral part of the second frame, is the cornerstone of development, a central building block of early learning, and a strong predictor of later school achievement (Duncan, Schmitt, Burke & McClelland, 2018; Pascal, 2009a in The Kindergarten Program, 2016) but there is confusion over what self-regulation means (Burman, Green & Shanker, 2015). This Organization Improvement Plan (OIP) uses the definition from The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a): self-regulation is “the ability to manage your own energy states, emotions, behaviour and attention in ways that are socially acceptable” (p. 154). Since self-regulation is central to a child’s capacity to learn and provides the underpinnings for essential skills needed throughout life (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2007; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a; Shanker, 2016b), there is a need for an organization improvement plan to ensure kindergarten educators in School Board X understand and can teach, assess, evaluate and report on this important skill.

This Organization Improvement Plan investigates and offers possible strategies for ensuring that all kindergarten educators, teachers and Early Childhood Educators, in School Board X can articulate what self-regulation is and why it is important, and that they can teach,

**Organizational Context**

School Board X, anonymized for this OIP, is a school district in Ontario with over 50 elementary schools and over 15 secondary schools in both urban and rural areas. In its kindergarten programs, School Board X employs over 175 kindergarten teachers and more than 150 Early Childhood Educators (ECEs) for an enrolment of over 4500 kindergarten students. Curriculum Support Department staff in the district central office, including coaches and consultants, assist teachers and ECEs with curriculum implementation under the direction of the Superintendent for Curriculum Support and Professional Learning. Kindergarten educators receive targeted support from three Curriculum Support staff – the French Immersion/FSL Consultant, the Parenting and Family Literacy Centre (PFLC) manager, and the Early Years Lead Principal, who is a principal seconded from an elementary school to the Curriculum Support Department for a three-year term. The amount of support each educator receives varies widely depending on whether they participate in voluntary professional learning opportunities, whether they choose to engage with the instructional coaches, their school’s participation in board initiatives, and other factors.

The Education Act (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1990) sets out duties and responsibilities for school boards in Ontario including an obligation to implement the Ministry’s curriculum policies. The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) has a unique status. All other curriculum documents are considered policy documents and their implementation is mandatory under the Education Act. Kindergarten is an optional program in Ontario and school attendance for children is not mandatory until grade one; as a result, The
Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) is considered a program document not a policy document. However, The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) clearly states that all Kindergarten programs in publicly funded schools in Ontario “will be based on the expectations and the pedagogical approaches outlined in this document” (p.4).

Educators are responsible for teaching and documenting learning of all specific expectations for all students over the two-year kindergarten program but assess, evaluate and report on only the overall expectations. Many of the self-regulation expectations are also found in the other three frames; in the self-regulation and well-being frame, the examples illustrate what that skill would look like in a self-regulation and well-being context. Because an understanding of the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) is critical to understanding this OIP, they are presented in Table 1.1. Some examples have been edited for brevity.

Table 1.1

Overall and Specific Expectations – Self-Regulation and Well-being

As children progress through the kindergarten program, they:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Expectation 1</th>
<th>Communicate with others in a variety of ways, for a variety of purposes, and in a variety of forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 use and interpret gestures, tone of voice, and other non-verbal means to communicate and respond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 use language (verbal and non-verbal communication) to communicate their thinking, to reflect and to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 ask questions for a variety of purposes (e.g., for direction, to make meaning of a new situation) and in different contexts (during discussions and conversations; in learning areas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Expectation 2</td>
<td>Demonstrate independence, self-regulation, and a willingness to take responsibility in learning and other endeavours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Demonstrate self-reliance and a sense of responsibility (e.g., make choices and decisions on their own; take care of personal belongings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Demonstrate a willingness to try new experiences (e.g., try out activities in different learning areas) and adapt to new situations (e.g., having visitors in the classroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Demonstrate self-motivation, initiative, and confidence in their approach to learning by selecting and completing learning tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Demonstrate self-control (e.g., be aware of and label their own emotions; accept help to calm down; calm themselves down after being upset) and adapt behaviour to different contexts within the school environment (e.g., classroom, gym, library, playground)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Develop empathy for others, and acknowledge and respond to each other’s feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Expectation 3**
Identify and use social skills in play and other contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Act and talk with peers and adults by expressing and accepting positive messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to take turns during activity and discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Demonstrate an awareness of ways of making and keeping friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Expectation 4**
Demonstrate an ability to use problem-solving skills in a variety of contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Use a variety of strategies to solve problems, including problems arising in social situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Expectation 6**
Demonstrate an awareness of their own health and well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the effects of healthy, active living on the mind and body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Investigate the benefits of nutritious foods and explore ways of ensuring healthy eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Practise and discuss appropriate personal hygiene that promotes personal, family and community health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Discuss what action to take when they feel unsafe or uncomfortable, and when and how to seek assistance in unsafe situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Demonstrate in play what makes they happy and why</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Expectation 22**
Communicate their thoughts and feelings, and their theories and ideas, through various art forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>Communicate their ideas about something through music, drama, dance, and/or the visual arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizational Structure
Like all public school boards in Ontario, School Board X is governed by its publicly elected trustees. The trustees appoint a Director of Education who acts as the chief executive officer. In School Board X, the director oversees nine superintendents, each with specific responsibilities (Figure 1.1). The eight superintendents of education are former
Figure 1.1 Simplified Organizational Structure of School Board X
elementary or secondary principals; the superintendent of business is an accountant with no teaching qualifications. While Curriculum Support Department staff often work with school administrators as they support educators and students, staff do not report directly to the administrators and instead report to the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional Learning.

**Vision, Mission, Purpose, Values and Goals**

The actions of all staff are guided by School Board X’s vision, mission and purpose statements as well as by their values. These have been paraphrased to ensure anonymity of School Board X.

**Vision Statement:** Building tomorrow – every learner, every day

**Mission Statement:** Quality education – confident learners, involved communities, ethical stewardship

**Purpose:** In the curriculum support department of School Board X, our purpose is to inspire, guide and support educators and administrators by providing professional learning opportunities, support and resources.

**Values:** The focus of School Board X’s Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well-being (BIPSA) is engaging and empowering all staff, students, families and the community so that all children can achieve their full potential (Author, 2016). This reflects our value of collaboration - people working together, sharing knowledge, skills, experience and resources to achieve a common goal. The Curriculum Support Department purpose reflects our value of professionalism - engaging in ongoing learning and reflection so that our practice is based on current research and understanding about how students and adults learn.

**Goals:** The learning foci of the 2016-17 BIPSA, determined by the director and superintendents, are Math JK – 12, primary reading, creative and critical thinking, resiliency, and
closing the achievement gap for students in risk. In the elementary panel, specific targets for increased EQAO standardized test scores have been established for primary reading, primary and junior math, primary and junior writing. There is no specific health and well-being goal or resiliency goal but there is a belief statement on the BIPS that if students are supported by opportunities for physical activity, sound nutrition and mental wellness then students will be optimally prepared to engage in learning. The ability to self-regulate aligns with this goal of mental wellness. A growing body of research identifies the ability to self-regulate as key to children’s long-term physical, behavioural and educational well-being (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Florez, 2011; Shanker, 2013).

The focus of School Board X’s BIPS is on engaging and empowering students, staff, families and communities so that every learner can reach their full potential. School Board X values professionalism as evidenced by an emphasis on educators as reflective practitioners and inclusivity is valued by ensuring all learners and their families feel welcome, safe, respected and valued in our schools. A formal hierarchy, common to neoliberal contexts (Ryan, 2012), exists in School Board X and one’s position on the hierarchy impacts what leadership one may or may not be able to demonstrate. For example, a consultant cannot send out a system memo directly to principals, instead they must go through a hierarchy of approval processes. The consultant drafts the system memo, and once it is approved, the memo is formally sent from the superintendent to administrators; administrators then forward the memo to educators. Educators are to contact their administrator if they have any questions and the administrator contacts the consultant. The purpose of this protocol is to prevent administrators from being overwhelmed with emails from central office staff and to prevent consultants from being overwhelmed by emails from individual teachers and ECEs. In my own experience as a consultant for eleven years, educators
often phoned or emailed me directly with their questions regarding policies, programs and resources.

**Leadership approaches and practices** Within the board’s formal structure, leadership is taken up in different ways. An emerging leadership approach involves the flattening of the traditional hierarchy. Professional learning models such as collaborative inquiry (Donohoo, 2013) and Lab Class (Cranston, 2016; 2019) allow consultants to engage with colleagues as co-learners rather than being ‘the sage on the stage.’ This approach allows educators to take up leadership in a safe and supportive environment and direct the content and the goals of their own professional learning. For example, during a Lab Class project with several teachers, the two Curriculum Support Department staff brought in professional literature on the topic the teachers had selected as an area of focus based on their observations of their students. Each teacher decided which articles they wanted to read, what big ideas from the literature were relevant to their inquiry question, and what next steps they wanted to take for subsequent learning.

On May 31, 2016, the Ontario Ministry of Education released Policy/Program Memorandum (PPM) 159 on Collaborative Professionalism. The intent of this memo aligns with the collaborative inquiry approach our board is using in much of our professional learning. It speaks of “a vision for collaborative professionalism that involves sharing ideas to achieve a common vision of learning, development and success to improve student achievement and well-being of both students and staff” (p.1). A collaborative environment takes time and effort to develop, and is built on a foundation of trusting relationships with teachers and administrators (Datnow, 2001; Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2009; Stoll, 2009; Whitworth & Chiu, 2015).

As a collaborative environment develops, leaders need to consider collaboration beyond the school and into the community. For this OIP, additional support could be sought from the
MEHRIT Centre which conducts a variety of online and in-person training sessions on self-regulation and produces many free resources about self-regulation for educators, parents and others. After retiring as the Kindergarten to Grade 3 Consultant from School Board X, I now work part-time as a Self-Regulation Facilitator for the MEHRIT Centre. In this new role, I can continue to assist the Curriculum Support Department staff with the enactment of the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a).

**Leadership Position Statement**

This problem of practice and my own leadership philosophy aligns with a liberal ideological perspective on both student learning and leadership. A student receiving a Liberal education is expected to develop core values such as social responsibility, critical thinking, and critical self-reflection (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013; Dearborn, 2013; Raven, 2005). The development of self-regulation skills by educators and students aligns with the liberal vision of holistic learning. Indeed, Freedman (2001) argues that in today’s hyperkinetic media-saturated society, the reflective nature of a liberal education is more imperative than ever before. Self-regulation is an important skill for adults and children for coping with the stressors in modern society (Duncan et al., 2018; Shanker, 2016).

A distributed perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals and can transcend formal leadership positions (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Leadership is stretched over the work of multiple leaders. A distributed leadership model utilizing a collaborative team of interested teachers, ECEs, administrators, trustees and others can be used to support educators in enacting the self-regulation expectations of the ministry document. Formal leaders, specifically the Curriculum Support Department staff responsible for kindergarten programs and a facilitator from the
MEHRIT Centre, (this author), will support those informal leaders and ‘infuse capacity building into all levels and the work of the system (Fullan & Quinn, 2016).

It is important to note that a distributed leadership does not necessarily mean that there is democratic leadership. Gronn (2010) cautions readers that “extended participation provides no guarantee of control, and if collective control is one’s measure of democracy then widening the net of engaged colleagues need not make a fundamental difference to the leadership dynamic…while it may facilitate voice, distributed leadership does not necessarily guarantee a veto – perhaps the closest organisational provision for collective control” (p.420-421). And even when leadership is distributed, it co-exists with the continuing leadership of individuals such as principals, superintendents and ministry officials. While leadership may be distributed, power is not. Fitzgerald and Hunter (2008, p. 334) argue that distributed leadership may simply be a way to encourage educators to take on more work and more responsibility without any increase in salary or time allotment, and that teacher-leaders should be activists and policy-makers, not policy-takers. These perspectives on distributed leadership are important to consider for this OIP as those engaging in leading capacity-building around self-regulation for the system will not have the power to determine policy; that has already been established by the ministry. When identifying possible change agents, this OIP will consider how to ensure that this work is meaningful and purposeful for those leading the change.

My educational beliefs focus on the importance of knowing what we do and why we do it, and are summarized in the following two statements:

**Educational leaders need to reflect on their practice, and they need to be able to articulate what they do and why they do it.** John Dewey believed that teachers must have a passion for lifelong learning and share their knowledge of teaching with colleagues. "No one can be really
successful in performing the duties and meeting these demands [of teaching] who does not retain [her] intellectual curiosity intact throughout [her] entire career…..To the ‘natural born’ teacher learning is incomplete unless it is shared” (Dewey, APT, 2010, p. 34-35). Staff in the Curriculum Support Department discourage educators from using one-size-fits-all prepackaged programs and instead ask them to use their professional judgment based on their knowledge of the curriculum and of their students. We support educators not only in implementing ministry teaching expectations and pedagogy but in understanding why this is the most developmentally appropriate learning for our youngest learners. As educational leaders, we need to apply a critical lens to each solution offered rather than employ a quick-fix program because it is from the latest management guru.

**Educational leaders must engage and empower staff, students, parents and the community and support all participants so that they may reach their full potential.** It is my belief that we must educate the whole child so that they reach their full potential and become caring, compassionate, critical thinkers who are responsible, contributing members of society. Fullan (2001) refers to this as the moral purpose of education, making a difference in the lives of people and in society. Ayers (in Griffiths & Portelli, 2015) states the purpose of education is “to achieve the fullest development of each – given the tremendous range of ability and the delicious stew of backgrounds and points-of-origin – as the necessary condition for the full development of the entire community, and conversely, to realize the fullest development of all as essential for the full development of each” (p. 3). As educational leaders, we need to ensure we don’t get so focused on improving academic scores that we lose sight of the bigger picture. Leadership is not a craft or science, but a moral endeavour (Heck & Hallinger, 2005). In the past, our board improvement plan set goals for achievement based on EQAO scores (i.e., 80% of grade six
students will achieve level three or four on EQAO math) but now BIPSA goals include well-being in addition to academics, and encompass students, staff, families and community partners.

My values, beliefs and leadership philosophy align with the dominant values and beliefs of our board but are not always a fit with the neoliberal provincial context and its emphasis on standardized testing. Like Ryan (2012), I believe that “neoliberal practices in education exclude already marginalized students and their parents” (p.3) by focusing on standardized testing results and accountability measures which restrict the activities of professional educators. Darling-Hammond (2010) states that standardized tests have not improved schools or created opportunities for students and in fact, the questions on the test are often from a middle-class, Eurocentric perspective. Students from inner-city, high poverty, and diverse populations are penalized for being unable to answer questions or write passages about situations that they do not understand. This neoliberal emphasis on standardized testing and standardized curriculum does not fit with my own liberal beliefs about the purpose of education.

Our board exists within the neoliberal context of Ontario education, where both provincially and locally there is a continued emphasis on EQAO standardized testing results, particularly on scores in elementary mathematics. All stakeholders in School Board X are working to improve the math scores of our students and the math teaching skills of our educators while continuing to advocate for a more comprehensive view of the social and moral purpose of education that incorporates the whole child, their family and the community.

**Leadership Problem of Practice**

Will Rogers reportedly said, “You can’t teach what you don’t know any more than you can come back from where you ain’t been” (Darling-Hammond, 1990, p. 345). All Ontario
kindergarten educators are required to teach, document, assess and report on self-regulation, yet the educational leaders of School Board X do not seem to have a clear picture of educators’ current understanding of self-regulation. How can educators teach what they don’t know? This OIP aims to address the problem that many kindergarten educators in School Board X are struggling to enact the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). Since self-regulation is central to a child’s capacity to learn and provides the underpinnings for essential skills needed throughout life (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a, p.7) there is a need for an organization improvement plan to determine how educational leaders can ensure educators understand and can teach, assess, evaluate and report on students’ self-regulation skills.

The successful implementation of this OIP will result in students and staff developing their self-regulation and self-awareness skills. Educators will be able to reframe their own behaviour and that of students as stress behaviour or misbehaviour. In cases of stress behaviour, they will follow the steps of self-regulation to recognize and reduce stressors, as well as reflect and restore themselves to a state where they are calm, alert and ready to learn/teach. As educators develop their own self-regulation skills and note the impact self-regulation has on them, they develop a deeper understanding of why self-regulation is important, not only for their students but for the adults in the school as well (Hurley, 2018). Strengthening skills such as coping with stress and self-regulation for educators in kindergarten and child care settings can reduce mental health vulnerability for children and for educators (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2013). A school district where students and educators are developing and deepening their understanding of self-regulation and their own ability to use self-regulation
aligns with the view of Liberal education that values the education of the whole person so that they are a self-aware, critical thinker (AACU, 2013; Raven, 2003).

Framing the Problem of Practice

The release of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) and Growing Success, The Kindergarten Addendum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b) occurred at the end of the final school year of the five year roll out of Full Day Kindergarten in the province of Ontario. This timing created an opportunity to reflect on our district’s implementation of The Full-Day Early-Learning Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a), to look towards a new vision for kindergarten programs based on the most recent ministry documents, and to consider the factors that impact the enactment of these documents.

Historical Overview

**Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) Roll out and Implementation:** As the Teacher-Consultant for Kindergarten to Grade 3 it was my responsibility to roll out FDK programs from September 2010 to June 2015 based on the FDELK document (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a). Self-regulation was only one component of a complex picture of our evolving kindergarten programs. Kindergarten teachers were learning to co-teach with ECEs, moving from theme-based to inquiry-based programs, learning about pedagogical documentation, and adapting from half-day or alternate day schedules to full day, every day kindergarten.

**Program Staffing:** When the planning for the roll-out of FDK begin in 2009, the Curriculum Support Department staffing was limited to my role alone. Later, more staff were added to create the Kindergarten Team: two program staff with kindergarten experience – the PFLC manager in September 2013 and Teacher Consultant for French in September 2015, and a
ministry-funded Early Years Lead administrator in September 2014. However, the PFLC manager accepted a ministry position in November 2015 and was replaced by a teacher with no kindergarten experience, and when I retired in June 2016 my position was not filled. Currently the responsibility for kindergarten is shared by three program staff – the Teacher Consultant for French, the PFLC manager and the Early Years Lead administrator- only one of whom has kindergarten teaching experience. Shared responsibilities have both promise and pitfalls to consider. As it is difficult for the new team to meet regularly, there have been difficulties in creating common understandings and common messages. An addition consequence is that educators and administrators are uncertain who to contact when questions arise.

**Distribution of Resources:** Many resources for kindergarten educators have been purchased or developed by the program department and then shipped directly to schools or distributed at workshops. Once the resources arrive in the schools, they become the responsibility of the school staff. When teachers move into kindergarten assignments, they often report that they cannot locate previously distributed resources. As a result, teachers do not have access to the full range of supports that should be available to them in their new kindergarten assignment. The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) curriculum expectations and pedagogy are very different from Ministry curriculum for grades one to eight, so it is important that teachers receive access to resources in a timely manner.

The Ministry of Education has released a wide range of print and online resources to support kindergarten educators. In the past, these documents were shared electronically on School Board X’s First Class email in a conference for Kindergarten and Primary teachers that was open to all board staff. Educators shared resources, questions, ideas and suggestions in this conference and it became a vibrant online community. In September 2013, the board moved to
Outlook email and the online conferences were replaced by ‘pages’ on the board intranet. These were very unpopular so the board added Yammer, an online site separate from the Outlook email. Yammer was replaced in September 2016 with Edsby. These frequent changes have made it challenging to electronically inform educators about board and ministry self-regulation resources.

**Four Frames Analysis** Bolman and Deal’s (2013) four frames – political, structural, human resources, and cultural/symbolic - provide a lens to examine this problem of practice and to consider possible factors which may foster, impair or facilitate change.

**Political:** Winton and Pollock (2013) define politics as the way we try to create the type of school we want, the choices and conflicts about how to distribute resources, and the processes used to determine that distribution. Political factors can impede change around teachers’ understanding of self-regulation. During the roll-out of FDK, the Curriculum Support Department had a generous budget from the ministry for resources and professional learning. Since then, limited funds have been provided to boards from the ministry to support the implementation of the new kindergarten documents. Currently, the board’s senior administration team has a focus on mathematics learning and instruction with a multi-year math task force (Author, 2016b) and a newly created position of Teacher Consultant for Mathematics K-12 in the Curriculum Support Department. There will be few, if any, resources expected for professional learning about self-regulation given current political realities.

The ministry’s 2016 release of both The Kindergarten Program and Growing Success, The Kindergarten Addendum was a major political factor creating a need for change in our school board. Usually when the ministry of education releases a new curriculum document teachers have one year of ‘invitational implementation’ with mandatory implementation the
following year. The Kindergarten Program document was released late on June 30th, 2016 with mandatory implementation beginning September 2016. Growing Success, The Kindergarten Addendum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b) provides Kindergarten Communication of Learning (KCOL) templates which all Ontario Kindergarten teachers was released in May 2016 with mandatory implementation beginning in January 2017.

Prior to January 2017 each board in Ontario developed its own kindergarten reporting documents and timelines. School Board X’s report template, created by a committee of kindergarten educators, had boxes for anecdotal comments in all six strands and was distributed to parents at the end of term two and three. Kindergarten students also received an anecdotal progress report focusing on Personal-Social expectations and adjustment to school at the end of term one. The KCOL template provides four equal-sized reporting boxes for teacher comments on student learning in each of the four frames: Belonging and Contributing; Self-Regulation and Well-being; Demonstrating Literacy and Numeracy Behaviours; and Problem Solving and Innovating. ECEs are required to teach, document and assess the expectations and shares their observations with the teacher. The teacher is responsible for evaluation and for completing the report card comments and signing the report card.

**Structural:** The structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) guides us in examining the organizational architecture of the school board. In our board, support for educators in enacting the ministry’s Kindergarten documents is the responsibility of the Early Years Lead Administrator and the Teacher Consultant for French, while Growing Success is the responsibility of the Consultant for Assessment, Evaluation and Reporting, both working under the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional Learning. Self-regulation is also addressed by the psychologists and speech-language pathologists working under the
Superintendent for Special Education Programs as part of a social-emotional literacy project. As a result, there is not one specific person or department in our board developing a clear vision for self-regulation education. The division of professional learning initiatives between the two departments stems from cultural as well as structural factors. Each department has its own priorities, philosophies, and budget, however joint efforts are funded primarily by the Curriculum Support Department. Curriculum Support Department staff is focusing their professional learning sessions and resources on the Shanker Self-Reg® approach, while the Special Education Department staff is piloting The Zones of Regulation® program in several schools (Kuypers & Winner, 2011). While Zones of Regulation® is also focused on helping young children develop self-regulation skills, there are fundamental differences between their program and the Shanker Self-Reg® approach (see Appendix A for a detailed comparison). The Shanker Self-Reg® approach is the foundation of the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). This OIP must consider how to engage stakeholders in both the Curriculum Support and Special Education departments to build cohesiveness and capacity for each department and for the system.

Adults are motivated to learn when organizational structures allow them to work together and learn from one another on a continuous basis (Datnow, 2001; Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2009; Lam, 2005; Riveros, A., Newton, P, & Burgess, D., 2012). Structure at the school level may impair change since many of our kindergarten educators work in isolation from their grade one to eight colleagues. Some administrators structure school Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings by division so kindergarten teachers only meet with other kindergarten teachers. ECEs do not attend PLC meetings due to supply coverage and contract issues so they are unable to participate in the learning and discussions that occur during these
meetings. In some of our smaller schools this can result in kindergarten PLCs of only two teachers, or the kindergarten teachers may attend the primary teachers’ PLC. Primary teachers are teaching different expectations from different documents than the kindergarten teachers, and they do not have self-regulation expectations to teach, so the topics discussed at the primary PLCs may not be as relevant for kindergarten teachers. When considering possible solutions this OIP must look beyond PLCs to ensure we are meeting the needs of ECEs as well as teachers.

**Human resources:** The human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) focuses on people in the organization – what is their motivation and is there a fit between the needs of the people and the needs of the organization? A human resources/political element that may foster change for teachers while impeding change for ECEs and administrators in our board’s context is the role of the unions and the impact of differing collective agreements for teachers and ECEs. Teachers in School Board X are represented by ETFO (Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario) and ECEs are represented by OSSTF (Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation). ETFO provides excellent professional learning resources and hosts conferences for kindergarten educators during the school year and the summer. Costs for the conferences are covered by ETFO and applicants are chosen at random to attend. Since the ECEs are OSSTF members, they cannot attend any of the provincial ETFO learning events. Teachers and ECEs are expected to work together, co-planning and co-teaching the kindergarten program. Both teachers and ECEs are responsible for documenting and assessing self-regulation, yet ECEs do not have planning time as part of their collective agreement so planning with teachers must be done before or after school. And while ECEs document and assess student learning, only teachers are responsible for the creation of comments for the Kindergarten Communication of Learning documents which are sent home to parents three times per year.
All Educational Support Staff (ESSs), including ECEs, fall under the supervision of the Superintendent for Special Education, while professional learning for teachers falls under the supervision of the Superintendent for Curriculum Support and Professional Learning. On Professional Development days teachers attend meetings lead by the school administrator or by Curriculum Support Department staff while ESS attend different meetings lead by special education staff held at off-site locations. As a result, teachers and ECEs sometimes attend different professional learning events conducted by different departments and may hear differing messages.

**Cultural/Symbolic:** Lastly, the cultural/symbolic frame focuses on how we make meaning of the world including our work context, and how leaders can shape culture through story, ritual, symbols and ceremony. In Weick’s model (2009 in Riveros, et. al., 2012), “an individualistic analysis of human action – the focuses on individual performances and intrinsic psychological states – would be pointless.” In his model, people are seen as essentially attached to their environments through action and practices and people understand the world as they actively engage in practices to transform it. In other words, “understanding is a social practice and not the intrinsic cognitive processes of cognitively isolated individuals. A situated account of actors in schools provides a different and richer way to analyze the processes of knowledge production and its relationship with professional practices” (p. 210). We must ensure that we are not, as Bolman and Deal (2013) said, focusing too much on the actors and too little on the stage on which they play their parts. It is not enough to examine the perceptions of individual teachers or students, this OIP must consider that the problem of practice may differ from school to school, and from classroom to classroom.
Communication about self-regulation from the ministry has been comprehensive but has not always reached its intended audience. Resources intended to support FDK are located on different websites and print copies of documents are no longer sent directly to educators and administrators. In addition to being comprehensive, communication needs to emphasize the positive outcomes and explain exactly how focusing on self-regulation will impact student learning (Weller, 1998). Weller suggests that to further reduce change anxiety, we need to create a culture where participants have a voice in planning, designing and implementing the change so that they have a vested interest in its success. Similarly, Cawsey et al. (2016) advise that change agents “actively engage people in meaningful discussions early in the change process” (p.255). Employees can identify possible problems, their engagement can allow concerns to be addressed, and engaged employees are more likely to have positive attitudes towards the change. Educators in our board are frequently invited to participate in change initiatives such as core resource selection, resource development and various steering committees. This culture of participation can be leveraged to foster and facilitate organizational change in the Organization Improvement Plan.

**Internal data** The superintendent and staff in the Curriculum Support Department take pride in the range of professional learning opportunities and supports they provide, creating multiple entry points to serve the varied needs and learning styles of educators, administrators and trustees in School Board X. Feedback forms distributed at workshops as well as online surveys are used to gauge educator interest in various topics related to The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016) including inquiry learning, pedagogical documentation and self-regulation. Feedback forms and surveys both indicated a strong interest in learning more about self-regulation. Over 70 educators, several administrators and three trustees attended a
three-part book talk on self-regulation hosted by staff from the Curriculum Support Department and the Special Education Department in the spring of 2013, and another 70 attended when it was offered again in the fall. Average attendance at kindergarten after-school workshops is about 15 – 20 educators; over 30 participants is considered very strong attendance. This overwhelming response for an after-school professional learning session focused on self-regulation seems to support the interest this topic expressed in feedback forms and surveys. Work-to-rule action from May – December 2015 prevented Curriculum Department and Special Education Department staff from offering further sessions, and prevented teachers from attending after school professional learning events. The decrease in ministry funding has also impacted the range of professional learning opportunities made available to educators.

**External data** Researchers at the Self-Regulation Institute (Hopkins, 2016) have identified five common misconceptions held by educators and parents about concept of self-regulation:

- Self-regulation is the same as social emotional learning (SEL)
- Having good self-regulation means not misbehaving, showing accountability, having good self-control
- Only students have problems with self-regulation
- Working on self-regulation means reporting on student work habits, independence, organization and problem-solving
- There is very little that schools can do for students who struggle with self-regulation if their problems stem from difficulties in the early years or their day-to-day home life.

The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) notes that there are many misconceptions about self-regulation including “that children are able to self-regulate when they enter kindergarten, that children are self-regulating when they are sitting still with
their legs crossed, that when children look away an adult needs to remind them to keep focused, that self-regulation is the same as compliance and that the role of the educator is to manage children’s behaviour” (p.57). It is likely that the educators in School Board X have many of the same misconceptions since self-regulation has not been a primary area of focus for professional learning during the FDK roll-out.

Author’s perspective There is substantial evidence that children’s early experiences have implications for lifelong physical and mental health and well-being (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2007; Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, 2013; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2017; The Kindergarten Program, 2016a). Chronic stress in early childhood is associated with persistent effects on the nervous system and the hormone systems that can damage the developing brain and lead to lasting problems in learning and behaviour (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2007). Self-regulation helps a child effectively deal with stressors and recover so that they are calm and ready to learn. There is much that kindergarten educators can do to support children’s development of self-regulation including reducing stressors in the classroom, being attuned to children’s responses to stressors, teaching strategies to recognize and modulate emotions, and recognizing and supporting students’ efforts to self-regulate (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014). Educational leaders in School Board X need to ensure that kindergarten educators understand and teach self-regulation so our youngest learners reach their full potential.

Guiding Questions Emerging from Problem of Practice

The problem is that many kindergarten educators in our board lack the understanding of self-regulation needed to fulfill ministry policy requirements. Some guiding questions for this problem of practice are:
• What past and current opportunities are available for School Board X administrators, teachers and ECEs to engage in professional learning about self-regulation? Is there equitable access to professional learning?

• Are educators and administrators aware of the wide range of resources about self-regulation available from the ministry, the board, ETFO and the MEHRIT Centre? Do they know how to access these resources? Is there equitable access for all educators to these resources?

• Are educators choosing to focus on only one or two changes to the Kindergarten program rather than trying to implement all the changes that have been introduced since 2010? If so, what is their current areas of focus?

**Leadership-Focused Vision for Organizational Change**

At School Board X our belief statements include: *All students can achieve high standards given sufficient time and support.* We believe in the potential of our students, staff and families and help them to believe in their own potential. One way we do this is to take an asset stance. An asset stance refers to the stance that educators take in relation to learners. It requires educators to reframe at-risk students as students of mystery (Newman, 2012). The concept of normal is viewed as a construct, not a given, and difference is reconceived as a form of human diversity rather than a pathology. Educators with an asset stance perceive every child as capable and it is the educators’ duty to be responsive to the learner rather than the learners’ responsibility to live up to preconceived norms (Andrews & Lupart, 2015). At a regional meeting with kindergarten educators, ministry officers led learning on how to create report card comments from an asset stance – what has the child learned and what is the evidence of that learning? That does not mean educators ignore the next steps, but they start from what the child can do and not
what they can’t do. This OIP aims to reflect the same asset stance for adults – building from the strengths of our educators and our system rather than focusing on our deficits.

Long ago the Little Grey Book (Gidney, 1999) told Ontario teachers what to teach and when to teach it. Now teachers are expected to reflect on their practice and to articulate what they do and why they do it. The Curriculum Support Department staff encourage educators use their professional judgment based on their knowledge of the curriculum and of their students.

Based on these belief statements, as well as the mission, purpose, goals and values of School Board X, the change vision for this Organizational Improvement Plan is that:

- All kindergarten educators will understand and be able to articulate what self-regulation is and why it is important.
- All kindergarten educators will be able to effectively teach, document, assess, evaluate and report on student self-regulation.
- All kindergarten students will be able to self-regulate, meaning they will be able to identify when they are hyper-aroused or hypo-aroused and have the strategies to return to a state where they are calm, alert and ready to learn.

With this knowledge and practice of self-regulation, educators can create an environment in every kindergarten classroom of School Board X where we can truly live our vision of ‘every child learning every day.’

**Change Drivers** The Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 53-55) is a leadership framework utilizing a combination of process and prescription through four steps – awakening, mobilization, acceleration and institutionalization. In this model, anyone, from any position in the organization has the potential to initiate and lead change, and the authors advise change
leaders to encourage and empower people to become change agents instead of change recipients. Cawsey et al. (2016, p. 245) state that “by demonstrating initiative, presenting ideas, taking action, and attempting to make a difference, potential change recipients can gain power.” Empowering change recipients and embedding leadership throughout the levels of an organization reflects the distributed leadership approach of this OIP. When considering potential change agents and drivers of change, we also need to think about the four different types of change agents (Cawsey et al., 2016) – emotional champion, developmental strategist, intuitive adapter and continuous improver – and ensure that a team is created that will work together and support one another during the setbacks and struggles inherent in the change process.

Potential change agents include contract and occasional teachers, ECEs, administrators, trustees and other central office staff interested in learning more about self-regulation as well as those who are already on their own learning path about self-regulation. These change agents will be identified during the stakeholder analysis and through an email invitation on the district’s electronic communication system. The two unions and the Special Education Department will also be notified and invited to send interested representatives to participate. Bringing these people together will help to build a system-wide understanding what self-regulation is, why it is important, and how to teach, document, assess and report on it. These change agents will be able to share this knowledge of self-regulation with others, building coherence and sustainability in the district (Fullan & Quinn, 2016).

**Organizational Change Readiness**

In this section, School Board X’s change readiness is described using two tools: the Change Readiness Questionnaire (Cawsey et al., 2016) and a proposed review of the School Improvement Plans for Student Achievement and Well-Being (SIPSA, Author, 2017) from each
school. A Force Field Analysis highlights both competing internal and external forces that both oppose and drive the enactment of the self-regulation expectations at School Board X.

**Change Readiness Questionnaire** Cawsey et al.’s (2016) Change Readiness Questionnaire aligns with the distributed leadership approach of this OIP as it acknowledges that leadership can exist throughout the organization, not just at the top of the hierarchy. School Board X scored +16 on the readiness for change questionnaire which would indicate that they are ready for change.

One area that was difficult to score was ‘Previous Change Experiences.’ The roll-out of FDK from 2010-15 was used as a benchmark since this is a recent change experience in School Board X that impacted every kindergarten teacher. While the roll-out was generally positive and most educators report that they feel supported with resources and professional learning, there are some kindergarten teachers who are stressed because of the change in kindergarten class sizes. Prior to FDK, kindergarten classes were capped at 20 students. When FDK was implemented, the ministry set a kindergarten class size average of 26 students with no cap, with ECEs staffed in classes with more than 15 students. Many of our kindergarten classes have 30 or more students, and even with an ECE teaching partner, teachers have struggled to adjust. The Early Years Lead Administrator has been working with the union after almost 20 teachers filed grievances about noise levels in our kindergarten rooms. Kindergarten classrooms that were specifically designed for a limit of 20 students are crowded, noisy and stressful environments for adults and children. Many teachers who have left kindergarten to teach other grades have said that they would have continued teaching kindergarten but preferred the class size cap in primary.

The class size issue links to an item on the questionnaire that asks: do those who will be affected believe they have the energy needed to undertake the change? For some kindergarten educators, the answer would be no. This OIP has addressed this possibility with Guiding
Question 3, wondering if some educators are choosing to focus on only one or two of the changes implemented because of the introduction of FDELK (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010) followed by The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a).

Executive Support and Credible Leadership and Change Champions are areas of strength on the Change Readiness Questionnaire as the Superintendent for Curriculum Support and Professional Learning has directly supported the development of this OIP, and she is a respected, capable leader in the board. Furthermore, when considering the questionnaire categories of Measures for Change and Accountability, in addition to soft data including conversations with educators and observations in classrooms, we can track progress by collecting samples of report card comments from the self-regulation and well-being frame. Our superintendent is fastidious when it comes to stewarding resources and meeting deadlines, and has ensured that her staff are as well, so that is also an area of strength.

**SIPSA Review** A second potential tool to be used for identifying change readiness is a review of individual School Improvement Plans for Student Achievement and Well-Being (SIPSAs). Each school prepares a school improvement plan based on their perceptions of the strengths and next steps for learning for their student population. Goals are aligned with the overall goals in the Board’s Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well-Being. The SIPSAs are submitted to the director who shares them with the superintendent, and the BIPSA and SIPSAs are posted on our board website in the public domain. The Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Leadership creates a summary of the SIPSA goals for each elementary and secondary school, which is used by the consultants and coaches in the Curriculum Support Department to improve precision in providing supports for schools. Analyzing individual school SIPSAs will allow us to identify schools that have chosen school goals related to self-regulation and well-
being. Educators and administrators at those schools may be especially interested in participating in professional learning opportunities on self-regulation and in taking a leadership role in supporting other schools in their learning and growth.

**Force Field Analysis** The Force Field Analysis (Cawsey, et al., 2016) was conducted to explore the forces operating to oppose and drive the enactment of the self-regulation expectations from The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). There are an equal number of opposing forces and driving forces in the force field analysis, illustrated in Figure 1.2. The strongest driving force is the provincial mandate to implement the pedagogy and curriculum expectations from the document beginning in September 2016, and to report on the self-regulation expectations beginning in January 2017. Failure to implement the expectations could have serious consequences for educators such as an ‘unsatisfactory’ rating for a teacher on their Teacher Performance Appraisal, although most administrators in School Board X will offer to provide a range of supports for teachers in danger of receiving an unsatisfactory rating. Likewise, failure to report on the self-regulation expectations on the Kindergarten Communication of Learning would result in consequences from the school administrator.
Figure 1.2 Force field analysis – forces driving and opposing the enactment of the self-regulation expectations from The Kindergarten Program (2016a) at School Board X.

The strongest opposing force is School Board X’s focus on mathematics achievement of students, the quality of mathematics instruction by teachers and the student scores on the grade
three, six and nine provincial standardized math tests. Ryan (2012) notes that “the pressure to raise scores compels teachers to teach knowledge and skills that will be tested, ignoring more complex aspects of subjects, and some subjects altogether” (p.29). In School Board X the focus on mathematics seems to have created pressure for educators and administrators to increase the amount of time and effort spent on mathematics which may decrease the time and energy available for other BIPSA and SIPSA goals including self-regulation.

In conclusion, the release of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) with the inclusion of specific self-regulation expectations, and the implementation of the Kindergarten Communication of Learning template (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b) which requires teachers to report on student achievement of the self-regulation expectations, has underscored the urgency for educators, administrators and other stakeholders to learn more about this important life skill. While there are factors and forces impeding the implementation of the self-regulation expectations, Organizational Change Readiness analysis has shown that School Board X is ready to change and internal data indicates that there are educators who are interested in learning more. The next chapter presents a framework for leading the change process based on theories of change, an organizational analysis, possible solutions and a communication plan for building awareness within School Board X of the need for greater understanding of what self-regulation is and why it is important.
Chapter Two: Planning and Development

Chapter Two establishes a theoretical framework for the Organization Improvement Plan and examines the challenges faced by School Board X in building capacity and understanding for educators in the area of self-regulation. In addition to possible solutions, this chapter includes a leadership framework for understanding change and considers what to change, how to change and how leaders will communicate the need for change to educators.

Frameworks for Leading the Change Process

This Organization Improvement Plan is underpinned by a personal leadership framework of distributed leadership (Gronn, 2010; Harris, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001; Woods & Woods, 2013) and a constructivist orientation to learning (Butler & Schnellert, 2012; Merriam & Bierema, 2014).Aligned with this framework of leadership is an epistemological position that is interpretive in nature (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Hartley, 2010). A distributed perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals and can transcend formal leadership positions (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Interpretivists see the world as an emergent social process which is created by individuals, and their principal concern is understanding the ways in which individuals create, modify and interpret the world. In other words, they seek to understand how people construct meaning (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Mack, 2010). For this OIP, working from an interpretivist paradigm suggests that each person must actively build his or her own understanding of self-regulation and this understanding will be influenced by individual contexts.

Drawing from the work of theorists including Dewey, Piaget and Vygotsky, constructivists see learners not as empty vessels to be filled but as active builders of their own understanding (Driscoll, 2005 in Merriam & Bierema, 2013). My philosophy of education is
most closely aligned with social constructivists such as Vygotsky who believed that social interaction played a fundamental role in this knowledge building. Learning takes place first on the social level and later, on the individual level and the learner is supported by a knowledgeable other or others (Vygotsky, 1978, 1980). In the context of this OIP, as educators interpret information from The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a), they fill the gaps in their understanding with their pre-existing knowledge while constructing their new understanding of self-regulation. The knowledgeable other supporting the educators can be a colleague, a consultant, or other person with a more developed understanding.

Policy enactment such as the enactment of the curriculum expectations and pedagogical approaches in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) does not occur in a vacuum. Within School Board X, each school and each classroom is a unique context and factors within that context will influence how policy is enacted (Braun, Ball, Maguire & Hoskins, 2011; Riveros & Viczki, 2015). Braun, et al. (2011) argue that a framework for policy enactment needs to consider an interrelated dynamic of four different contexts: situated contexts which include location, student demographics and school history; professional contexts such as values, teacher commitment and experiences; material contexts such as staffing, budget and infrastructure; and external contexts which include the degree of local authority support, pressures and expectations from broader contexts such as standardized tests, and legal responsibilities and requirements. Contexts are specific to each school and change and shift both within and outside the school. Braun et al. (2011) view policy as a process which may be contested and subjected to interpretation as it is enacted within the contexts of each school and classroom. Riveros and Viczki (2015) examined professional learning and policy enactment situated in social, cultural and historical contexts. They challenged the traditional assumption
that policy is generated by those in authority and transferred down the hierarchy to be implemented by educators. Educators interpret and translate policy as it is put into practice within each context, therefore educators can be both agents of policy enactment as well as subjects.

This OIP explores an optimal approach to policy enactment at over 50 elementary schools in School Board X, thus the framework for leading change must consider a wide range of situated contexts, professional contexts, material contexts and external contexts. These contexts are discussed in greater detail in Chapter One, but are summarized here. In the situated contexts, our schools range from small rural schools with little staff turnover to core urban schools with growing populations and more frequent staff changes. In the professional context, Braun et al. (2011) note that departments can operate as autonomous units and teachers may work with a few immediate colleagues (p.592). This is often the case for kindergarten teachers whose unique teaching assignment, separate curriculum document, and individual schedule frequently isolates them from their colleagues. Material contexts include budgets for professional learning and resources, which vary from school to school and are different for ECEs than teachers. While there are some external pressures from the ministry for implementation deadlines, kindergarten teachers are not as affected by pressures around standardized testing results and student achievement data as teachers in other grades. There are no grades, no levels and no achievement chart used for reporting on student learning in kindergarten, instead, the focus is on development over time. All of these contexts, situated, professional, material and external, will impact each educator as they construct their understanding of the expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) and each context needs to be considered when creating a plan for leading change for these educators.
Since we are moving from professional development as an event where teachers passively receive information and ideas from ‘experts’ to professional learning as a reflective process where teachers are collaboratively building knowledge, then it may be helpful to use a model such as the heuristic created by Groundwater-Smith and Mockler (2009) when thinking about our work.

![Heuristic for considering review of teacher’s professional practice](image)

*Figure 2.1* A heuristic for considering review of teacher’s professional practice (Horizontal Axis: purpose; Vertical Axis: location of power) Adapted from: Groundwater-Smith, S., & Mockler, N. (2009). Inquiry as a framework for professional learning: Interrupting the dominant discourse. In *Teacher Professional Learning in an Age of Compliance*, Volume 2

Their tool for understanding different models of reviewing professional practice has two axes - the horizontal axis is linked to the purpose of the exercise and is a continuum from surveillance to development. The vertical axis represents the location of power and ranges from teacher agency to administrator agency. The four quadrants represent four different ways of thinking about reviewing professional practice: 1. Review as Compliance; 2. Review as
Performance Management; 3. Review as Professional Development; and 4. Review as Teacher Formation and Renewal.

In the past, the approach of the Curriculum Support Department staff at School Board X to professional development would have fallen within Review as Performance Management and Review as Professional Development – a one-size-fits-all approach to professional development where the power and control reside outside the school and outside the individual teacher. In Review as Teacher Formation and Renewal, the power is genuinely shared by the school, the system and the teacher. Groundwater and Mockler’s (2009) argument that encouraging teachers to take an inquiry stance and to engage with curiosities about their work will lead to true professional learning can guide the development and consideration of possible solutions to support educator enactment of the self-regulation expectations.

The one-size-fits-all approach to professional learning does not align with what we know about organizations. “Organizations are knotty, multi-faceted entities, populated by complex human beings who introduce an emotional, irrational x-factor ingredient in the organizational change melting pot. Progress therefore required combining and recombining multiple lenses of theoretical changes to improve integrations and avoid more fragmentation” (Smith & Graetz, 2011, p.5). Using Groundwater-Smith and Mockler’s (2009) heuristic for professional learning will help to create a framework that considers the wide range of contexts within which educators will be enacting these ministry expectations across School Board X and honours each educator’s personal and professional growth while supporting policy enactment at the school and system level.

While there are differing views on distributed leadership, the view shared by both Gronn (2010) and Spillane and Diamond (2007) is predominantly interpretative as these authors use
distributed leadership in a descriptive sense to explore leadership as a social phenomenon stretched over the work of more than one person. One common theme across these differing views is that distributed leadership is an emergent property of the organization and it emerges from the interactions between group members (Harris, 2005; Hartley, 2010; Woods, 2004; Woods & Woods, 2013). The individual leader has no ontological status in distributed leadership. Instead the focus is on the interactions from which leadership emerges including interactions between people, institutional structures, ideas, norms and artefacts such as procedures and processes (Hartley, 2010; Woods & Wood, 2013). These interactions will be considered next in the critical organizational analysis.

**Critical Organizational Analysis**

Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) Organizational Congruence Model provides a useful framework for this critical organization analysis. Their model is based on the principle that the more congruence there is between four fundamental elements – tasks, people, formal organization and informal organization – and the more aligned these four elements are with the external environment and the organizational strategies, then the more effectively the organization will be able to perform. (See Figure 2.1)

To analyze inputs, Nadler and Tushman (1989) recommend a PEST assessment as well as an examination of the history and culture of the organization (see Chapter One) and organization resources. A PEST analysis examines political, economic, social, and technological factors that impact School Board X.

**Economic factors:** During the initial roll-out of FDK, robust funding was provided for professional learning. Teachers and ECEs in School Board X received either four half-days or two full days of release time to attend professional learning during the year that their school
implemented FDK. Administrators were also invited to join the professional learning sessions. Since the five-year implementation ended in the 2014-15 school year, ministry funds for professional learning release time for kindergarten staff have been reduced by 75%, and support has been provided by the Curriculum Support Department primarily through voluntary after-school sessions. The Superintendent for Curriculum Support and Professional Learning has been resourceful in finding ways to continue to fund professional learning for kindergarten educators. Since approximately 25% of kindergarten students in School Board X are enrolled in French Immersion programs, the Superintendent has used funds provided by the ministry for professional learning for French Immersion educators to support kindergarten educators in our

*Figure 2.2 Organizational Congruence Model. Adapted from Nadler, D.A. and Tushman, M.L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. *Academy of management executive, III* (3), 194-204.*
immersion programs. She has also combined ministry funds for kindergarten professional learning with collaborative inquiry funds from the ministry for our joint work with the local university.

**Social/Cultural factors:** When considering social/cultural factors, Weller (1998) suggests that educators must think differently about the purpose of schools and education, and that educators’ attitudes, values and knowledge/skills are more important to successful change than relying on policies, procedures and pre-scripted ways of performing work. Building capacity and comprehensive knowledge about the key role of self-regulation for academic success will support educators in examining their roles within the broader purpose of education. Solutions offered in this OIP must be built on view of educators as reflective practitioners who are engaging and empowering students to reach their full potential. These solutions must focus on educators’ attitudes and knowledge rather than creating a prescriptive program to teach discrete self-regulation skills to students.

Educators who are going to engage in leadership opportunities and/or in voluntary professional development will most likely be intrinsically motivated. Some may be laterally ambitious (Avidov-Ungar, 2016) - interested in moving up into leadership roles in the future but many are laterally compelled - interested in pursuing professional learning to increase their professional knowledge and their skills in the classroom. Understanding these motivations will assist the educational leaders in the Curriculum Support Department and I to offer personalized and precise professional learning opportunities for educators.

**Technological factors:** Kotter and Cohen (2002) note that technology is a good tool for reducing information overload and creating a clear channel to get information to the right people (p.91). Technology has changed the way that Curriculum Support Department staff in School Board X
communicate with and provide support to educators and administrators. Online support documents and resources from the Ministry of Education, the MEHRIT centre, School Board X and other community partners and agencies can be quickly made available to all educators at no cost to the board or to recipients. Email provides a means for educators to receive timely answers to their questions and gives Curriculum Support Department staff an insight into the current questions and issues in the classrooms and schools.

The next elements of the Organization Congruence Model (Nadler & Tushman, 1989) are the four components of the transformation process – work, the formal organization, the informal organization and people – which combine to produce the outputs.

**Work:** Work is the tasks carried out by the organization. Depending on the organization, the tasks may be integrated or discrete, require complex skills or require basic skills, and involve sophisticated judgement and decision-making or require people to follow standardized procedures (Cawsey et al., 2016, p.70). For all staff at School Board X, the work is ensuring that all students reach their full potential so that they can participate as socially responsible, active and informed members of society. For kindergarten educators, tasks include teaching students the curriculum expectations using a play-based inquiry approach, while also documenting, assessing, evaluating and reporting on each student’s learning of the expectations. For Curriculum Support Department staff tasks include supporting educators and administrators by planning and delivering a range of professional learning opportunities, seeking appropriate learning resources for educators and students, communicating with all stakeholders, completing ministry reports and submitting budget reports. These are complex, integrated skills requiring professional judgement and ongoing reflection.
From 2009 to 2015, the work of the Curriculum Support Department staff with kindergarten responsibilities focused almost solely on the transition to full day kindergarten. This transition included the introduction of pedagogical documentation, the creation of teacher – ECE teaching teams, classroom renovations and construction, purchasing additional materials each year for the newly constructed classrooms, expansion of school-based child care and the implementation of the expectations and pedagogical approaches in the Full-Day Early-Learning Kindergarten Program document (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a). Since then, the work has changed from the logistics of the initial roll out to the provision of continued support and professional learning for kindergarten educators and school administrators with the policy enactment of curriculum expectations and pedagogical approaches in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a).

**The formal organization:** Once tasks have been determined, the formal organization determines the roles and responsibilities of departments and divisions to ensure the efficient execution of the tasks. The formal structure of School Board X was described in Chapter One and is illustrated in Figure 1.1. Members of the Curriculum Support Department are in a unique position within the formal structure of School Board X. They are located at the central office and work closely with the superintendents, yet are contractually teachers under the collective agreement. However, when consultants and coaches are in schools and working with educators, they are sometimes regarded as being from ‘downtown’ and not part of the teaching cadre. Honig (2012) explored the work practices of central office staff who were providing instructional support to principals. She found predictive conditions of success for central office staff included their perception of their role, their place in the hierarchy of the organization, efforts to protect central office staff
time, and principal readiness to partner with them. The first three, and perhaps all four, of these conditions can be linked to the formal structure of the organization.

**The informal organization:** This is comprised of the informal relationships, informal leadership, the norms, values and beliefs, and the culture of the organization. While the culture of School Board X was discussed in Chapter One, it is important to note that each of the over 50 elementary schools in School Board X has its own culture which may evolve due to changes in administration, educators and changing student demographics.

**People** – The people in the organization perform the tasks within the structures, systems and cultures of that organization. Policy implementation does not begin with a pedagogical blank slate but rather builds on existing policies, previous policies and educators’ experiences and beliefs (Darling-Hammond, 1990). If educators do not understand what self-regulation is and why it is important, or their beliefs about self-regulation are distorted by previous experiences and knowledge, then they may struggle to implement the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2106a). Within each organization, people acting as change leaders or change agents help to move the change vision forward. These change leaders may be people in positions of formal authority or they may be individuals who have been asked or who have volunteered to take up a leadership role in implementing and supporting change (Cawsey et al., 2016; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Potential change agents for this OIP were discussed in Chapter One; the change implementation plan will be addressed in Chapter Three.

**Outputs** Finally, the Organization Congruence Model asks us to consider the organizational outputs (Nadler & Tushman, 1989). What are the services and products the organization provides? What are the mission related goals? What skills and competencies do they wish to
grow and develop in the organization and its members? (Cawsey et al., 2016, p.72). For this OIP, the skills and competencies to be developed include:

- the ability to articulate a common understanding of what is self-regulation and why it is important
- the development of self-regulation skills for students and educators as described in the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016)
- the ability to teach and document student learning of the self-regulation expectations
- the ability to assess and report on student learning of the self-regulation expectations using The Kindergarten Communication of Learning templates from Growing Success, The Kindergarten Addendum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b)

Nadler and Tushman’s (1989) model is based on the principle that the more congruence there is between the fundamental elements, and the more alignment there is between those elements and the external environment and organizational strategies, then the more effectively the organization will perform. This organizational analysis of School Board X illustrates a possible lack of congruence in two areas. Firstly, the work of the Curriculum Support Department team members with kindergarten responsibilities has shifted from the implementation of Full Day Kindergarten to policy enactment of the pedagogical approaches and expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) yet the resources, the people, and the organization do not always reflect this change in the work of the
team. Secondly, while the self-regulation skills and competencies to be developed by the organization’s members, including the kindergarten educators, align with School Board X’s belief in the importance of staff and student well-being, there is no alignment between this outcome and the other elements of the organization. This apparent gap will be addressed in the proposed solutions.

**Four Frames Analysis** Bolman and Deal’s (2013) four frames provides another frame for reflecting on this problem of practice. The structural frame guides us in examining the organizational architecture of the school board. The human resource frame focuses on people in the organization – what is their motivation and is there a fit between the needs of the people and the needs of the organization? The political frame looks at conflict, power and how organizations make decisions about resources and people. Lastly, the symbolic frame focuses on how we make meaning of the world including the world of our work context, and how leaders can shape culture through story, ritual, symbols and ceremony.

In Chapter One, all four frames were used to examine this problem of practice and to consider possible factors which may foster, impair or facilitate change. Bolman and Deal (2013) provide guiding questions for determining which frame may be most helpful in a particular situation (p.311). The score for this Problem of Practice was:

Symbolic/Cultural Frame - 3
Political Frame - 4
Human Resource Frame - 2
Structural Frame – 0
(see Appendix B for detailed scoring)
While this score indicates a need for emphasis on both the Political and the Cultural/Symbolic frames, School Board X’s attention has been on the political frame, focusing on the importance of policy enactment in response to ministry expectations. Bolman and Deal (2013) note that when “assessing any prescription for improving organizations, ask whether any frame is omitted. The overlooked perspective could be the one that derails the effort” (p.320). For this organizational analysis, the symbolic and cultural aspects of building educator capacity for self-regulation are examined.

When considering the cultural/symbolic frame, Weller (1998) contends that educators must think differently about the purpose of schools and education, and that educators’ attitudes, values and knowledge/skills are more important to successful change than relying on policies, procedures and pre-scripted ways of performing work. For this OIP, comprehensive knowledge about the key role of self-regulation for academic and personal success will support educators in examining the broader purpose of education and their role as educators. Weller (1998) also suggests that to reduce change anxiety, a culture must be created in which participants have a voice in planning, designing and implementing the change so that they have a vested interest in its success. The distributed leadership framework employed by this OIP aligns with a culture of participant voice. Since there are currently few board or ministry financial resources to support self-regulation, solutions in this OIP will consider Bolman and Deal’s (2013) advice that when resources are scarce an overarching symbol can help participants to transcend differences and work together (p.312). A symbol could be created by change agents as part of the communication plan, described in greater detail in Chapter 3.

In summary, while all four frames have relevance for this OIP, an emphasis on the cultural/symbolic frame focusing on educator attitudes, values and knowledge rather than
policies and procedures, the use of symbols and the importance of teacher voice and participation in the process will complement School Board X’s current emphasis on elements from the political frame and support educators in School Board in enacting the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a).

Leadership approaches to change

This examination of leadership approaches to change considers how a shift from heroic leadership to distributed leadership can support enactment of the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016). The approach to leadership and change in the Curriculum Support Department at School Board X is often a ‘great man’ or ‘hero’ approach (Gronn, 2000). One person is the consultant for The Arts, one for Science, one for Math, and so on, and all change in that subject area is led by that consultant. Research is clear that the model of the solitary dynamic leader and a focus on positional leaders is inadequate (Harris, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001). In my own experience as a consultant for School Board X since 2005, for many years most of my work was done on my own or with other educators in formal leadership positions such as consultants and coaches. More recently, our board has begun to include teachers and ECEs on planning and implementation teams. Intentionally moving to a distributed leadership framework will provide support for expanding leadership beyond formal leadership roles and offer an alternative to School Board X’s current approach to change which often relies primarily on the leadership of one person per subject area (Woods, 2004). The Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 53 - 58) will provide a structure for educational leaders of School Board X to implement change while balancing process and prescription (see Figure 2.3).
Awakening

1. Identify a need for change and confirm the problems or opportunities that incite the need for change through the collection of data
2. Articulate the gap in performance between the present and the envisioned future state and spread awareness of the data and the gap throughout the organization.
3. Develop a powerful vision for change.
4. Disseminate the vision for change and why it’s needed through multiple communication channels

Mobilization

1. Make sense of the desired change through formal systems and structures and leverage those systems to reach the change vision.
2. Assess power and cultural dynamics at play and put them to work to better understand the dynamics and build coalitions and support to make the change.
3. Communicate the need for change organization-wide and manage change recipients and various stakeholders as they react to and move the change forward.
4. Leverage change agent personality, knowledge, skills and abilities, and related assets (e.g. reputation and relationships) for the benefit of the change vision and its implementation.

Acceleration

1. Continue to systematically reach out to engage and empower others in support, planning, and implementation of the change. Help them develop needed new knowledge, skills, abilities and ways of thinking that will support the change.
2. Use appropriate tools and techniques to build momentum, accelerate and consolidate progress.
3. Manage the transition, celebrate small wins and the achievement of milestones along the larger, more difficult path of change.

Institutionalization

1. Track the change periodically and through multiple balanced measures to help assess what is needed, gauge progress towards the goal and to make modifications as needed and mitigate risk.
2. Develop and deploy new structures, systems, processes and knowledge, skills and abilities, as needed, to bring to life the change and new stability to the transformed organization.

*Figure 2.3 The Change Path Model, (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 53 - 58)*
Bolman and Deal’s (2013) description of the team structure in baseball aptly describes the structure for kindergarten educators in School Board X – individual efforts are mostly autonomous or may involve only two or three players at a time, distances separate players, and players and managers come and go without seriously disrupting team play. In some schools the implementation of FDK resulted in the kindergarten teachers and ECEs forming a much tighter specialty team, which is more like the football analogy. This section examines which leadership approaches to change will support School Board X in moving from the isolation of the baseball analogy to a model like basketball or soccer (known as football everywhere but North America) where offensive players can become defense in a quick transition, the efforts of individuals are reciprocal, each player depends on the performance of the others, and anyone can handle the ball or attempt to score (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 105).

As noted in Chapter One, the ability to self-regulate aligns with School Board X’s BIPSA goal of mental wellness since self-regulation is key to children’s long-term physical, behavioural and educational well-being (Blair & Diamond, 2008; Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Florez, 2011; Shanker, 2013). As an educational leader, I recognize that the board’s vision of engaging and empowering a wide range of people to achieve their BIPSA goals is best supported by a distributed leadership approach which recognizes that tapping into the ideas, creativity, skills and initiative of many people in an organization “unleashes a greater capacity for organizational change, responsiveness and improvement. …. In short, it empowers the many eyes, ears and brains in the organization, rather than the few” (Woods, 2004, p.5).

Datnow and Park (2009) utilize a co-construction framework to examine the dynamics of policy implementation and large-scale educational change. Co-construction builds on the idea of
multi-directionality of causality – multiple levels of the educational system foster or impair policy implementation and not only from a top-down direction. The idea of multi-directionality of causality aligns with the principles of distributed leadership and the idea that anyone in the organization can be a change leader or a change implementer.

When considering the multi-directionality of the implementation of the requirements of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a), there are many levels that can be addressed including teachers, ECEs, the unions for both the teachers and the ECEs, principals and vice-principals, trustees, superintendents, students, parents and interested community members as well as our child-care partners and ministry officials. For this OIP, the focus is on teachers and ECEs with consideration given to administrators as well. In the future, other levels will need to be included. Datnow and Park (2009) note that it is “the intersection of culture, structure and individual agency across contexts that helps us better understand how to build positive instances of large-scale educational change” (p.218). In School Board X, there are formal as well as informal leadership roles as well as formal and informal communication links in each of these different stakeholder groups. Awareness of these roles and linkages is an important part of the change process so that they can be leveraged throughout the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al, 2016).

There are many different change philosophies and each one impacts how we view the organizational context and how we approach implementing change. Most change leaders use more than one philosophy, depending on the situation. Smith and Graetz (2011) recommend a multi-philosophy mix because “a commitment to a single change philosophy or theory fails to
account for a non-linear, recursive and multi-level reality” (p.5). This OIP is underpinned by both the institutional and the psychological philosophies of organizational change.

The institutional philosophy of organizational change examines how organizations adapt to pressures from new regulatory, financial or legal conditions; in this case, the Ministry of Education’s release of The Kindergarten Program (2016a). The management focus in the institutional philosophy is on reaching standards and benchmarks. For this OIP, that would be the enactment of the self-regulation expectations. Artifacts used to monitor progress could include teachers’ comments in the self-regulation frame on the Kindergarten Communication of Learning template (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b), educators’ pedagogical documentation of students’ learning of self-regulation skills (Wien, 2011) and references to well-being and/or self-regulation in each school’s Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well-being (SIPSA). However, the institutional philosophy does not encompass educators’ beliefs and attitudes about self-regulation and that is why this OIP also approaches the Problem of Practice from the psychological philosophy of organizational change.

The psychological philosophy of organizational change focuses on individual experiences as organizations enact change (Smith & Graetz, 2011) which aligns with the constructivist approach of this OIP, acknowledging that the nature of change is embedded within the mind of each educator (Vygotsky, 1978, 1980). The focus in this paradigm is on managing employee transitions and psychological adjustments to change. Leaders must identify and remove impediments to change by reducing fear, alleviating anxiety, and reducing the uncertainties accompanying the change (Weller, 1998). The distributed leadership approach of this OIP to change implementation and policy enactment of the self-regulation expectations in The
Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) can help to address the fears, anxieties, and uncertainties of the change process by giving educators an opportunity to engage as change agents. The specific roles and actions of educators in this approach will be addressed in the change implementation plan in Chapter Three.

**Possible Solutions to Address the Problem of Practice**

All improvement plans and leadership strategies require resources to implement them and since resources are limited, a key leadership question is how to use our resources effectively, and efficiently (Ontario Ministry of Education, Winter 2013-14). When exploring possible solutions, educational leaders in School Board X must consider what resources already exist at the classroom, school, board, ministry and community level to support educators in developing and deepening their understanding of self-regulation. The list of tangible resources includes resources purchased by the district for schools, including the book Calm, Alert and Learning (Shanker, 2013) as well as resources created by Curriculum Support Department staff such as ‘Take A Closer Look At Self-Regulation’ (see Appendix C). Tangible resources already available to educators online or in their schools also include the book and video series Think, Feel, Act – Lessons from Research About Young Children (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013), videos and resources available through online links to The Kindergarten Program document (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a), a range of kindergarten resources on the EduGAINS website (Ontario Ministry of Education), How Does Learning Happen? (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014), and free self-regulation resources available online from The MEHRIT Centre (2017). Financial resources, such as ministry funding, union professional learning funds and community grants are also tangible resources to be considered.
For intangible resources, human assets and intellectual capital need to be considered. Who are the educators, administrators or other stakeholders who are already invested in learning more about self-regulation? Are there educators in our board who have already enrolled in MEHRIT Centre online courses or attended their seminars to learn more about self-regulation? What opportunities for collaborative learning exist in our board that could be utilized for learning more about self-regulation? How can existing partnerships with the local college and university be leveraged to support capacity building around self-regulation in our system? These resources, both tangible and intangible, could be employed in a variety of ways for capacity building at the school and system level.

A comparative analysis of three possible strategies for ensuring that kindergarten educators can enact the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) follows, examining the train the trainer model, school–based professional learning communities (PLCs), and the creation of a Self-Regulation Leadership Team.

**Train the trainer model:** The train-the-trainer (TTT) model, which has also been called pyramidal training, triadic training, and helper model training (Suhrheinrich, 2011) focuses on bringing one lead teacher from each school to workshops at the central office and training them in specific skills, and then sending them back to their school to train their colleagues (p.1). This model has been used by School Board X previously; most recently, it was used in the 2014 – 2015 school year to support a joint effort between the special education department and curriculum support department staff on Response to Intervention (RTI) for primary reading.
Pancucci (2007) notes that a major limitation of the TTT model is that:

it does not provide the time for teachers to assimilate the knowledge, skills, philosophies, and concepts that are essential for a deep understanding and appropriate application of the training provided. … Consequently, it is possible that the lead teachers are not prepared to deliver the training to their school colleagues because they are unable to understand the needs of their team and/or because they do not have a deep understanding of the material. (p.598).

Other limitations with TTT are cost and kindergarten staff sizes. During TTT projects in School Board X in the past, educators were released for three full days of training, spread over several months. The cost of supply coverage, food, and materials for more than 50 teachers for three days would be over $50,000. Some of our larger schools have almost 20 kindergarten educators; to expect one educator to attend a few workshops and then support the diverse learning needs of such a large group of colleagues may be unreasonable.

**School-based Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** Sagor (2010) defines a professional learning community as “any organization in which it has become the norm for the professionals to collaborate with others for the express purpose of enhancing understanding and improving student learning. Membership in a professional learning community implies routine engagement in professional learning with others who share common interests” (p. 8). Riveros et al. (2012) observe that the PLC approach to school improvement is “arguably the most ubiquitous strategy currently used in Canada” (p. 205).
PLCs have been a professional learning model used in School Board X for more than ten years. With funding provided by the ministry and supplemented by the board, teachers receive release time during the school day to attend a professional learning session with their colleagues. The agenda may be determined by the school administrator or may be based on teacher interests arising from their observations of student learning strengths and areas for growth. Through repeated investigations and engagement in learning, members of the PLC are expected to build more sophisticated and powerful teaching skills, construct common understandings and develop common goals (Supovitz in Katz, 2010).

Although PLCs are already established in all elementary schools in School Board X, there are several reasons why this solution is problematic. Firstly, without organizational support and intentional facilitation, research shows that PLCs do not transform teacher practice (Katz, 2010; Riveros et al., 2012). With over 50 schools, it is not possible for the three Curriculum Support Department staff supporting kindergarten educators to facilitate all the kindergarten PLCs in School Board X.

Secondly, only teachers receive supply coverage to attend PLC meetings; ECEs do not participate in this learning. This would create an inequity in access to learning. Since ECEs are also responsible for teaching and documenting student achievement of the self-regulation expectations, it is important that they have equal access to professional learning that is part of this Organization Improvement Plan.

Thirdly, PLCs vary widely from school to school in School Board X. As early as 2004, Dufour noted that the term PLC has been used “describe every imaginable combination of individuals with an interest in education—a grade-level teaching team, a school committee, a
high school department, an entire school district, a state department of education, a national professional organization, and so on. In fact, the term has been used so ubiquitously that it is in danger of losing all meaning” (p.6). In School Board X, PLCs are enacted in a range of ways. In some schools in School Board X, teachers identify areas of professional interest and connect with other interested teachers in the school, regardless of grade, to learn more. In other schools, teachers are assigned to PLCs according to their grade or division. One teacher described her monthly 50-minute PLC with her primary colleagues as “not effective or productive. I would have preferred to choose my group and then be given the time to collaborate on something we were passionate about learning. We were given a template to fill out to keep us accountable which felt like a make-work project and only added to the stress” (Dee, S. personal communication, August 21, 2017).

Lastly, PLCs in School Board X are exclusively done at the school level. Stoll (2009) notes that school to school learning networks give educators an even wider range of ideas and choices and moves good practice around the system. She argues that sustainable change requires people with diverse roles throughout the system coming together to learn from one another. This type of cross-school networked learning creates alignment through the system. As policy enactment is a system level and not just a school level problem of practice, a school-based PLC is not a feasible solution.

**Self-Regulation Leadership Team:** Creation of a Self-Regulation Leadership Team for School Board X using the Hill Model for Team Leadership (Northouse, 2016, p.367) with a membership of teachers, ECEs, staff from both the Curriculum Support and Special Education Departments, and other interested stakeholders is the preferred solution for this Problem of Practice. A
Leadership Team is “a type of organizational group that is composed of members who are interdependent, who share common goals, and who must coordinate their activities to accomplish these goals” (Northouse, 2016, p. 363). Because this team will have members from across the system, they can address the enactment of the self-regulation expectations from the perspective of their own classroom, their school, and from a system-wide perspective as well.

Leadership Teams have been used by the Superintendents of School Board X in the past. When the ministry first announced the impending implementation of Full Day Kindergarten, an FDK Leadership Team was created in the fall of 2009 with approximately 30 members including consultants, administrators, teachers and representatives from a variety of departments including Human Resources, Transportation, Public Relations, Facility Services, Purchasing, Finance and Special Education. When the team was created, I was the sole Curriculum Support Department staff with kindergarten responsibility and attended the meetings as the co-chair with the Superintendent. For the 2017-18 school year, the Kindergarten team consists of 10 members – two teachers, two ECEs, a speech-language pathologist from the Special Education department, two administrators and the three members of the Curriculum Support Department with responsibility for kindergarten who will meet for three half-day sessions. The purpose and focus of the team is less clear now that implementation of FDK is complete, and since the team now has three leaders rather than one. Conzemius and O’Neill (2002) remind us that “focus is what defines the community – what it is, who it serves, its values and its reason to exist. Without focus, a community attempts to be all things to all people and ends up doing little with any depth” (p. 8). When the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional Learning expressed an interest in proportional reasoning at a ministry regional Kindergarten meeting fall of 2014, the Kindergarten team was charged with creating a video to
demonstrate what teaching, documenting and assessing proportional reasoning could look like in a play-based kindergarten program. The team also contributed promotional ideas for the kindergarten registration and open house period held each year in January and February, and suggested topics for professional development workshops and resources. Without a specific focus, the team seems to be doing many different things with little depth. At the year-end planning meetings with the Curriculum Support Department, the Superintendent has questioned whether the Kindergarten Leadership Team is still necessary. Since the cost is very low (release time for two teachers and two ECEs for three half days), the team has been allowed to continue to date.

For this Organization Improvement Plan, the proposed solution is to disband the FDK Leadership Team and replace it with a Self-Regulation Leadership Team using the Hill Model for Team Leadership (Northouse, 2016). This model aligns with the distributed leadership framework as it does not focus on one person as the leader but instead focuses on the critical leadership skills and responsibilities which creates a structure where these skills and responsibilities can be shared by the team members. It builds on leadership practices already used by School Board X. It would be low cost as it would only require the same amount of release time as the current FDK team and members could utilize the existing professional learning resource materials available from the board, the ministry, and the MEHRIT Centre. As a certified MEHRIT Centre Self-Regulation facilitator, I would work with my former colleagues in the Curriculum Support Department in the creation and support of this team. The implementation plan for the Hill Model for Team Leadership will be developed in greater depth in Chapter Three.
Plan to Communicate the Need for Change

During the Awakening stage of the Change Path Model, Cawsey et al. (2016) suggest that leaders must communicate the vision for the change and why it is needed (p.55). Likewise, Kotter (2011a & b) emphasizes the importance of creating a sense of urgency in an organization prior to launching a change initiative. When communicating the need for change, leaders are often competing with many other priorities that are vying for educators’ attention. To create a sense of urgency around the implementation of the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a), one need only turn to the explosion of media articles and scholarly research on the stress epidemic for children in modern North American society (Bernstein, 2016; Children’s Mental Health Ontario, 2017; Clinton, et al., 2014; Race, 2012; Thompson & Haskins, 2014).

Board-specific data from the Early Development Instrument (EDI; Offord Centre for Child Studies, n.d.) can also be used to create a sense of urgency and to help educators and administrators understand the need for change. The EDI is an evidence-based tool that measures five domains of early childhood development that are known to be predictors of health, education and social outcomes: physical health and well-being; language and cognitive development; social knowledge and competence; emotional health and maturity; and communication skills and general knowledge. The EDI is not an individual diagnostic tool but is used to generate population-level indicators regarding the development of young children in each community. Two domains – social knowledge and competence, and emotional health and maturity - contain questions that relate directly to the self-regulation expectations. The social knowledge and competence domain includes questions about a child’s knowledge of acceptable public behaviour, their ability to control their own behaviour and their ability to play and work
with other children. The emotional health and maturity domain examines the child’s ability to deal with their feelings in an age-appropriate manner and if they have a balance between being too fearful and too impulsive.

All kindergarten teachers in School Board X completed the electronic EDI survey for every senior kindergarten student in February of 2005, 2008, 2012 and 2015. EDI data is collected and analyzed by the Offord Centre at McMaster University. Children who fall below the 10th percentile are deemed to be in the ‘vulnerable’ category; students from the 25 – 50th percentile are at risk and those scoring 50th percentile and above are considered on track. Children who are not on track are more likely to fall behind in later grades in their academic achievement (Calman & Crawford, 2013).

Table 2.2
Comparison of Four EDI Cycle results for District X.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low on at least one domain</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on 2 or more domains</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills &amp; General Knowledge</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Health &amp; Maturity</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Cognitive Development</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Health &amp; Well-being</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The results shared in here are for children in all four school boards in School Board X’s district – Public, Catholic, French Language Catholic, French Language Public - to ensure anonymity of the board’s results.

The most recent data shows 24.9% of Senior Kindergarten children in our district are at risk on at least one domain and 11.8% are at risk on two or more domains. While scores for Communication Skills and General Knowledge and Language and Cognitive Development have improved over time, more students are at risk in the areas of Emotional Health and Maturity; Physical Health and Well-being; and Social Knowledge and Competence – the domains aligned with the self-regulation expectations [Regional website].

To communicate the need for change in School Board X, the Curriculum Support Department Kindergarten team and I will create a brief presentation about the EDI data and the change implementation plan. The presentation will include information on how a focus on self-regulation will address these at-risk areas, emphasize the positive outcomes possible, and explain how focusing on self-regulation will impact student learning and improve student achievement. The Superintendent for Curriculum Support and Professional Learning will share this presentation in August with principals, vice-principals, superintendents and the director during the annual district-wide leadership meeting and at the Education Committee meeting with trustees and representatives of the teacher and ECE unions.

On the Friday of the first week of school in September, all kindergarten educators in School Board X attend a full day of professional learning at a local banquet hall. School-based child care providers, trustees, and professors from the local college and university are also invited to attend. At this meeting, the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional
Learning will again present the EDI results and the action plan with attendees, as it is her custom to lead off the morning with a ‘status report’ on kindergarten education in School Board X. An expert from the MEHRIT Centre will be the keynote speaker for the morning with a focus on self-regulation and the impact it has on student learning and success. Breakout sessions in the afternoon, lead by myself and other educational leaders from the Curriculum Support and Special Education Departments, will allow attendees to explore self-regulation in smaller groups which more precisely meet their personal and professional learning needs.

The next chapter presents a change implementation plan and communication plan as well as a description of how the change process will be monitored and evaluated. Chapter Three will also explore ethical challenges and considerations as they apply to this OIP.
Chapter 3: Implementation, Evaluation and Communication

Since self-regulation is central to a child’s capacity to learn and provides the underpinnings for essential skills needed throughout life (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010a), there is a need for an organization improvement plan to determine how the Curriculum Support Department staff of School Board X can provide the leadership to build capacity and ensure educators understand and can teach, assess, evaluate and report on students’ self-regulation skills in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). My leadership role in this plan is twofold. As the recently retired Curriculum Support Department Consultant for Kindergarten to Grade 3, I mentor and advise the three current department staff with kindergarten responsibilities, as only one has kindergarten teaching experience. Furthermore, as a trained MEHRIT Centre Self-Regulation Facilitator, I can share my expertise regarding self-regulation for adults and students.

Change Implementation Plan

The implementation plan for this OIP outlines the proposed action steps, stakeholder responsibilities, implementation strategies and potential limitations in alignment with the stages of the Change Path Model – awakening, mobilization, acceleration and institutionalization (Cawsey et al., 2016). The goal of this plan is that every kindergarten educator will understand what is self-regulation and why it is important, and will be able to teach, document, assess, evaluate and report on the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016). The proposed solution to the problem of practice is the creation of a Self-Regulation Leadership Team in the 2018-2019 school year. This action plan includes the steps required to create and lead the proposed team.
Awakening In the awakening stage (Cawsey et al., 2016), the Curriculum Support Department staff will conduct an inventory of self-regulation resources already available to educators in schools and online. Working together with the staff of the Media Centre, they will create an annotated bibliography of these resources. An electronic copy will be available on the Kindergarten Page of the School Board X’s online email and messaging centre. The electronic copy will be updated by the Curriculum Support Department staff as new resources are made available.

Table 3.1

Overview of Change Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awakening</th>
<th>Mobilization</th>
<th>Acceleration</th>
<th>Institutionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td><strong>July &amp; Aug.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sept.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct. &amp; Nov.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan summer institutes</td>
<td>Host summer institutes</td>
<td>Kindergarten Professional Learning Day</td>
<td>Form SR Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present at Summer System Leaders meeting with SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Kdg Contact at each school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin Professional Learning Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin distribution of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In June 2018, prior to the summer break, the Curriculum Support Department team will meet with the Superintendent to create the vision of self-regulation in School Board X. This
vision will be shared with administrators at the Summer System Leaders meeting which is held and attended by all school principals, vice principals, superintendents and the director. At this meeting, the Superintendent will share the self-regulation vision as part of the Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well-Being (BIPSA), outline the supports and resources that are available to administrators and educators to assist them in enacting the board’s self-regulation vision, and distribute copies of the annotated bibliography as well as the link to the online resource list. Connecting the self-regulation vision to the BIPSA ensures this change becomes part of the board’s culture, and a change that is congruent with the established organizational culture has a high probability of success (Mento, Jones & Dirndorfer, 2002).

Curriculum Support Department staff offer a range of free one- to three-day summer institutes on a range of topics that are open to all board staff and past summer institutes for kindergarten educators have been well-attended. A two-day summer institute Shanker Self-regulation® will be offered to any interested staff.

All kindergarten teachers and ECEs attend School Board X’s annual September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day. Each year, the day begins with a welcome from the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional Learning, then a morning keynote address by a guest speaker followed by a range of afternoon break-out sessions. For September 2018, the focus of the Kindergarten Professional Learning Day will be self-regulation. The Superintendent will begin the day by sharing the vision of self-regulation in School Board X as well as outlining the resources and supports available for educators and distributing print copies of the resource bibliography, just as she will have done with the administrators in August. This ensures that the educators and administrators are getting the same message delivered by the same person and reduces the chance of misinterpretation. Before introducing the morning keynote
speaker from the MEHRIT Centre, the superintendent will announce the creation of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team and outline the expectations for members as well as the application and selection process. The afternoon break-out sessions will cover a range of topics linked to self-regulation. Just as at past events, participants will select and register for their choice of afternoon sessions in advance using School Board X’s online registration system.

**Figure 3.1:** School Board X Organizational Chart – Self-Regulation Leadership Team
When change is presented as solving a problem, Mento, Jones and Dimdorfer (2002, p.49) found that the energy to change is an extrinsic energy that comes from the desire to escape an unpleasant status quo. When the problem begins to diminish, the energy for the change diminishes as well. However, when leaders share a vision of what they want to create, the energy that drives the change tends to be intrinsic and as change begins to happen, the energy for change increases. By sharing the vision of self-regulation with administrators in August and then with educators in early September, the Superintendent and the staff of the Curriculum Support team will strive to create energy and enthusiasm for this vision and establish a clear, compelling purpose for the Self-Regulation Leadership Team (Hackman, 2012, p.437).

**Mobilization** Moving into the mobilization phase, Cawsey et al. (2016) advise educational leaders to leverage existing systems and structures to reach the change vision (p.55). The Self-Regulation Leadership Team can leverage the existing structures in School Board X by aligning with the staff of the Curriculum Support Department. (Figure 3.1). When selecting team members, the Curriculum Support Department leaders need to ensure that the team contains the right mix of members to accomplish all the tasks of the team. However, just because team members are knowledgeable and/or enthusiastic about self-regulation does not mean that they have the skills necessary to accomplish the team’s goals. To work effectively as a group, participants must share ideas, take turns, disagree with and listen to others, and generate and reconcile points of view (Blumenfeld, Marx, Soloway & Krajcik, 1996). Teachers frequently work alone in their classroom and putting them together as a group does not guarantee that they will be able to learn together cooperatively. Educators often need training and information to become effective team members (Hackman & Walton in Northouse, 2016).
The Curriculum Support Department team members will need to create and sustain a culture of collaboration for the Self-Regulation Leadership Team. Culture is defined as ‘the way we do things around here’ and culture is widely recognized as a key influence on the success of professional learning initiatives (Fullan, 2001; Cawsey et al., 2016; Schein, 2010). In an analysis of research on teacher leadership, York-Barr and Duke (2004) observed that ‘promoting instructional improvement requires an organizational culture that supports collaboration and continuous learning and that recognizes teachers as primary creators and re-creators of school culture’ (p. 260; italics in original). The authors organized the conditions that influence teacher leadership and collaboration into three categories which will assist us to build a culture of collaboration on the Self-Regulation Leadership Team:

**Culture and context:** Schools with a strong focus on learning and inquiry, encouragement for taking initiative and an expectation for teamwork, shared responsibility, and an expectation of professionalism were schools in which teacher leadership could flourish.

**Roles and relationships:** Important factors in this area included high degrees of trust amongst peers and with administrators, colleagues recognizing and supporting one another, and teachers given leadership opportunities that are aligned to the learning process as opposed to administrative or management tasks.

**Structures:** School-based, participatory structures that support learning and leading and are embedded in teachers’ daily work.

In addition, each school will be asked to select one Kindergarten Contact Educator. Any electronic workshop notices or emails, as well as any resources distributed through the School Board X’s courier system, will be sent to the Kindergarten Contact Educator, with the
expectation that they will share the resources and information with the other kindergarten educators at their school.

**Acceleration** During this phase, members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will continue to implement and refine their policy enactment plan while using a range of strategies to build momentum and accelerate the progress (Cawsey et al., 2016). The address by the Superintendent and the break-out sessions at the Kindergarten Professional Learning Day will establish enthusiasm for professional learning about self-regulation. Mento et al. (2002) note that continued effective communication is essential. To be effective, communication must increase the organization’s understanding and commitment to change, reduce confusion and resistance, and prepare employees for the effects of the change (p.55). Specific strategies for ongoing communication are discussed later in this chapter in the Change Process Communication Plan.

Another strategy for building and maintaining momentum is the display of appreciation from senior administration, specifically the superintendent, director and/or trustees (Mento et al., 2002, p. 55). For the Self-Regulation Leadership Team these displays of appreciation could include senior administration stopping into Self-Regulation Leadership Team meetings, attending one of the professional learning events, a thank you email, or an announcement on the boards’ internal message system or external webpage about the team’s work.

The members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will be encouraged to explore different strategies for using School Board X’s internal electronic communication system to build and maintain momentum. One possibility is the creation of an electronic forum where educators can share success stories of educators and students successfully using self-regulation strategies at home and at school. At the beginning of the school year, members of the team may
have to post stories themselves and encourage others to share to ensure that at least once a week a ‘good news self-reg story’ is posted. Another possibility at the beginning would be to post links to ‘good news self-reg stories’ from schools in other boards to provide further examples of the positive benefits for educators and students of this policy enactment. Lastly, to build and maintain momentum, the Self-Regulation Leadership Team should ensure that ongoing professional learning opportunities and the distribution of self-regulation resources are spread throughout the year to maintain momentum rather than releasing everything in September.

**Institutionalization** While it will likely take more than one school year to reach the institutionalization phase of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016), during this phase the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will continue to track the policy implementation of the self-regulation expectations using a variety of measures described in the Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation section of this chapter. At this stage, the Superintendent and the Curriculum Support Department members will meet to determine if new structures, systems, skills or knowledge are needed. It may be time to reconsider the purpose of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, and to review the team membership.

Throughout the change process, the Self-Regulation Leadership Team members will need to anticipate possible resistance. “People resist change because they fear they will not be able to develop the new skills and behaviour that will be required of them…Organizational change can inadvertently require people to change too much, too quickly.” (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008, p.4). Since the roll-out of Full Day Kindergarten in Ontario from 2010 to 2015, kindergarten educators have been dealing with a myriad of changes – inquiry-based learning, pedagogical documentation, team teaching with an ECE, moving from a half day or alternate day program to
a full day, every day program, larger class sizes as well as the release of two program documents (Ontario Ministry of Education 2010a, 2016a) and a new reporting template (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b). The constant changes in kindergarten programs since 2010 along with increased class sizes has led to change fatigue for some kindergarten educators and in these conditions Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) found that “because of people’s limited tolerance for change that individuals will sometimes resist a change even when they realize it is a good one” (p.5).

Collaboration has been found to be an effective strategy for decreasing change fatigue and re-energizing educators when implementing mandated curriculum reforms (Dilkes, Cunningham & Gray, 2014, p.60). Likewise, Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) advise that “participation leads to commitment, not merely compliance” (p.6). When designing professional learning opportunities for educators, the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will need to consider how to support collaboration and authentic participation by educators.

Another strategy for dealing with resistance from educators is to listen and provide support. When viewing the change process through a self-regulation lens, we can see that change is a significant stressor across multiple domains. What other stressors can be reduced for educators at the school and the system level? This may vary from school to school, and from classroom to classroom. Providing educators with resources to support their learning is one strategy for reducing stress (Dilkes et al., 2014).

One of the strengths of this proposed implementation plan is that it aligns with the distributed approach to leadership used in the past and present by School Board X including the FDK Implementation Team which guided the five year roll out of Full Day Kindergarten from September 2010 to June 2015. As a result, formal leaders in School Board X including trustees,
the director and superintendents, are familiar with the model of creating a leadership team to support policy enactment with educator members being led and supported by staff from the Curriculum Support Department. This plan also builds on long-standing annual events in School Board X including summer institutes, the Summer System Leaders Meeting and the September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day.

Another strength is the historical participation of kindergarten educators in professional learning activities provided by the Curriculum Support Department. In the past, many summer institutes geared to an audience of junior, intermediate or secondary teachers have had to be cancelled due to an enrolment of less than eight participants. On the other hand, summer institutes and after-school workshops for kindergarten educators and primary teachers are usually well-attended. At times the demand has been so great that we have had to create waiting lists and offer repeat sessions of workshops to accommodate all interested participants.

An underlying assumption of this implementation plan is that kindergarten educators will continue to be willing and eager participants in professional learning, and specifically in learning about self-regulation. Since 2018-2019 is not a collective bargaining year, there is an assumption that professional learning will not be impacted by any work to rule actions such as mandates not to plan or provide any professional learning experienced during previous negotiations. There is also an assumption that funding will continue to be provided by the ministry specifically designated for kindergarten educators, and that the director and superintendent will continue to support the Curriculum Support Department staff in designing and delivering this professional learning.

Limitations for this implementation plan include financial, human resources, and political factors. The professional learning budget provided by the ministry changes each year
and is not announced until June. Occasionally the funding changes during the school year, after
plans are already in place. Any reduction in funds provided for kindergarten professional
learning will have an impact on this OIP. Also, the implementation plan assumes that the funding
will continue for the Early Years Lead administrator position. Since the Early Years Lead is a
seconded principal, her formal leadership role sometimes gives her greater influence and
credibility with administrators than the consultants in the Curriculum Support Department.
Reduced or eliminated funding would increase the workload for the other members of the
Curriculum Support Department kindergarten team and may reduce their influence with school
administrators. The Self-Regulation Leadership Team will include two teachers, two ECEs and
two administrators which means the team will have representatives from only 6 of over 50
elementary schools in School Board X. Identifying a Kindergarten Contact Educator at each
school will help to address this limitation.

Three anticipated obstacles to the implementation plan include reduced funding, lack
of support from senior administration due to the board’s current focus on student achievement
and teacher instruction in mathematics, and educator resistance to change. The Self-Regulation
Leadership Team requires very little funding for release time, and the members will use the
budget provided by the ministry and the superintendent when planning professional learning
opportunities for educators. Use of free resources from the MEHRIT Centre, after-school
workshops and online supports are only a few of the low-cost strategies team members could use
to provide support for educators. Two of the three members of the Curriculum Support
Department Kindergarten team are also on the Math Task Force. Making connections between
self-regulation, reducing student and teacher anxiety about math, and increasing student
achievement in mathematics will help build support for the work of the Self-Regulation
Leadership Team. Some strategies for overcoming educator resistance to change that could be used by the Self-Regulation Leadership team include using the Kindergarten Professional Learning Day in September to build awareness, excitement and momentum, regular communication from the Self-Regulation Leadership Team to school Kindergarten Contacts, displays of appreciation from senior administration and school principals, (Mento et al., 2002, p. 55), ongoing professional learning activities and distribution of self-regulation resources spread throughout the school year, and the use of social media and board electronic communication to share success stories of educators and students successfully using self-regulation strategies at home and at school.

In conclusion, this implementation plan has been designed using a distributed leadership model to support kindergarten educators and administrators enacting the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). The role of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team beyond the 2018-2019 school year would be dependent upon continued funding from the ministry, support from the Superintendent, and analysis of the feedback gathered during the monitoring and evaluation process.

**Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation**

To create a plan to monitor and evaluate change and progress during the enactment of the Change Implementation Plan, the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) has been layered with the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle (Moen & Norman, 2009). The use of the PDSA method at each stage of the Change Path Model creates opportunities to quickly assess the impact of the implementation plan while preserving the flexibility to respond to the needs of educators and other stakeholders if necessary. Moen and Norman (2009) suggest that leaders document their observations and track the effectiveness of the change initiative while the
changes are being implemented. The implementation plan can then be modified based on an analysis of data collected during implementation. PDSA allows the educational leaders of the Curriculum Support Department and the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team to adapt their plans based on the data collected to more precisely meet the professional learning and support needs of the kindergarten educators in School Board X. It is difficult to predict how long each stage will take and it is unlikely that we will reach institutionalization in the first year. The timelines for each stage of the Change Process Model will need to be revised as the change process unfolds.

Table 3.2
Organization Improvement Plan Data Collection Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback forms</td>
<td>Feedback forms</td>
<td>Feedback forms</td>
<td>SIPSA goals</td>
<td>Collection of KCOL self-reg comments – term 2</td>
<td>Collection of KCOL self-reg comments – term 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot questions</td>
<td>Parking lot questions</td>
<td>Applications for SR Leadership Team</td>
<td>Professional Learning Attendance lists</td>
<td>Student documentation samples – term 2</td>
<td>Student documentation samples – term 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance lists</td>
<td>Attendance lists</td>
<td>Attendance lists</td>
<td>Lists of presenters and their roles</td>
<td>Professional Learning Attendance lists</td>
<td>Professional Learning Attendance lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback forms</td>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>Lists of presenters and their roles</td>
<td>Lists of presenters and their roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cawsey et al. (2016) advise change leaders to collect two kinds of data – hard data and soft data. Hard data includes formal data that is usually numeric such as customer retention, profitability and absenteeism rates. For this OIP, hard data includes workshop attendance data, survey responses, SIPSA goals, and data from feedback forms. Soft data is intuitive information gathered from observations and conversations with critical stakeholders. Observations and conversations at schools, workshops and presentations, phone calls and emails from educators and administrators are some soft data that will be used to monitor progress of the enactment of the self-regulation expectations.

**Awakening (Appendix D)** During the awakening phase of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) the goals are to identify the need for change, to articulate the gap between the present and the preferred future state, and to develop and share a vision for the change. The specifics as to how and why this awakening will occur have been discussed elsewhere in this OIP. My role, along with the educational leaders in the Curriculum Support Department, will be to monitor and evaluate progress in the awakening phase by collecting both soft and hard data. Soft data includes observations and conversations with educators and other stakeholders during summer institutes and the September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day as well as with administrators and superintendents during the Summer System Leaders Meeting. Feedback forms used at these events can be designed to provide hard data to guide planning for subsequent months and stages in the Change Path Model. Attendance lists at the summer institutes and for
the break-out sessions at the September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day will allow educational leaders to measure the possible level of interest in the topic of self-regulation in general as well for more specific areas such as reducing stressors in the classroom environment, documenting self-regulation, and other topics.

When the superintendent shares the board’s vision for the enactment of the self-regulation expectations and the creation of the Self-Regulation Leadership team at the September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day, the Curriculum Support Department leaders and I will be able to collect additional soft data by gauging the response of the attendees to the vision through observation and conversation. Hard data will include the number of kindergarten educators who express an interest in and apply for the leadership team, as well as the attendance numbers at the various breakout sessions. This triangulation of data will provide a basis for the team to create a plan to move into the mobilization stage of the Change Path Model.

**Mobilization (Appendix E)** In the mobilization stage, the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, including this author, will create and begin to enact an action plan for term one and two of the 2018-2019 school year. Hard data used to monitor and evaluate this stage of the Change Path Model will include information from professional learning sessions including PLCs held during the school day and after-school sessions. Members of the team can use the attendance lists to determine how many educators are attending, what are the roles of the attendees – teachers, ECES, child care providers, administrators and others – and who are the presenters at the workshops. If there is an imbalance, for example more teachers and few ECEs attending, then this information will be used to review and revise future professional learning opportunities.

Another source of information to monitor and evaluate the enactment of the self-regulation expectations will be an examination of the well-being goals in each school’s School
Improvement Plan (SIPSA). In the past, consultants and coaches have coded data from other documents to identify patterns and trends in professional learning. Using this same technique, members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will code data from the SIPSAs to look for patterns and trends in the well-being goals across the system. At an individual school level, the SIPSA goals will be used to determine which schools may be interested in other self-regulation initiatives and resources. Members of the team will follow up with those schools as part of the mobilization and acceleration phase of the Change Path Model.

An additional tool for monitoring and evaluating educator understanding and enactment of the self-regulation expectations during the mobilization stage, and again at the end of the school year, is a voluntary anonymous online survey (Appendix F) which was previously distributed by School Board X for this author and used successfully for a MEHRIT Centre Facilitator’s Course assignment (April 2017). Following the principles of questionnaire design (Brooke, 2017), the survey begins with a demographic question followed by a mix of six Likert Scale questions and three open-ended questions with most of the open-ended questions at the end of the survey. A consistent four-point scale has been used for each Likert question and each question addresses only one topic. The survey is brief and avoids using yes/no questions (Brooke, 2017). Redistributing the survey in the fall of 2018 will provide the Self-Regulation Leadership Team with information on educators’ current understanding and beliefs around self-regulation and provide a baseline for comparison later in the school year. Using a web-based survey has several advantages including shorter transmitting time, less data entry time, quick data analysis, and quick survey submission time (Fan & Yan, 2010). The survey will be distributed to all kindergarten teachers and ECEs in School Board X through our board email system. The protocol for this type of survey distribution in School Board X is that an system
email will be sent by the Superintendent to the administrators who will forward it to their kindergarten teams. Once the email has been sent to principals, the Curriculum Support Department team can email the Kindergarten Contacts at each school to inform them about the survey so they are expecting the email from the administrators.

The self-regulation survey response rate in 2017 was approximately 21%. Research suggests several strategies that can be used to increase response rates. One strategy is to design an invitation, in this case an email from the Superintendent, that identifies the task clearly, provides a realistic estimate of time needed to complete the survey, and provides contact information for further information (Appendix G; Cook, Heath & Thompson, 2000; Crawford, Couper & Lamias, 2001). Another strategy is the use of pre-notification and reminders (Cook et al., 2000; Crawford et al., 2001). Pre-notification will be provided the Superintendent during her welcoming address at the September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day and email reminders will be sent from the Curriculum Support Department staff after the initial survey distribution. Additionally, social exchange theory suggests that participants are more likely to respond to a self-administered survey when they believe the expected rewards of responding outweigh the costs (Dillman, 2007 in Fan & Yan, 2010). According to this theory, those “designing and implementing surveys should aim at increasing perceived rewards, reducing the perceived costs for responding, and building up the trusts that the promised rewards will be fulfilled (Fan & Yan, 2010, p.136).” For this self-regulation survey, the perceived costs are low as the survey is brief and information is submitted anonymously online. In the invitation email, it the Superintendent explains that the results of the survey will be used to develop professional learning opportunities and resources which is ‘the promised reward.’ Members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team must consider how they will make the links between the survey and
the provided resources and learning opportunities clear to educators. A final strategy to increase participation is to include union representatives from ETFO and OSSTF in the design, distribution, and promotion of the survey.

**Acceleration (Appendix H) and Institutionalization (Appendix I)** During the acceleration stage, the goal is to continue to empower others to support and implement the change and to build momentum while in the institutionalization stage leaders continue to gauge progress toward the goal and bring stability to the new knowledge and skills acquired by members of the organization (Cawsey et al., 2016, p. 55). During both stages, the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will continue to collect data about the professional learning attendees – which sessions are best attended? What models of professional learning are preferred? Are ECEs and teachers accessing the professional learning sessions and resources in an equitable manner? Who is presenting at the professional learning sessions? Is the leadership distributed to a range of stakeholders or concentrated in the members of the Curriculum Support Department staff?

In addition, working together with ETFO and the IT department, the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will collect a random sample of comments from the Self-regulation and Well-being frame of the Kindergarten Communication of Learning (KCOL) from both Term Two and Term Three reports. This will provide information on which overall and specific expectations are being evaluated and reported on by teachers (ECEs do not complete KCOL comments) and which expectations are not yet addressed. This information can be used to determine where teachers may need more support, guidance or resources. Educators are expected to teach, document, and assess all specific expectations in The Kindergarten Program and to report on all overall expectations over the span of the two-year program. As a result, in one year we would not expect to see every overall expectation appear in the KCOL comments for Self-
regulation and Well-being, but if some expectations are not appearing at all, this may warrant further investigation and conversation.

To summarize, the plan to monitor and evaluate change and progress during the enactment of the Change Implementation Plan layers the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) with the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle (Moen & Norman, 2009). PDSA allows the education leaders of the Curriculum Support Department and the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team to assess the progress of the implementation plan throughout the process, adapt their plans and timelines based on the data collected, and to quickly meet the emerging professional learning and support needs of the kindergarten educators in School Board X.

**Leadership Ethics and Organizational Change**

Using a distributed leadership approach in this OIP raises several ethical considerations and challenges throughout the change process. For some educators and administrators there may a clashing of codes when the educators’ personal beliefs about classroom management and student behaviour clash with the self-regulation expectations in the ministry document (Frick, 2009). When looking at student behaviour through a self-regulation lens, we ask ourselves, “Is this stress behaviour or is this misbehaviour? What are the stressors that are causing this behaviour? How can we reduce them?” (Shanker, 2012). If it is a stress behaviour, then the educator’s role to help the child learn how to recognize and reduce stressors. The overall goal is to return to a state where the child is calm, alert, and ready and able to learn. The focus of a behaviourist approach is on increasing positive behaviours and decreasing negative behaviours often through the use reward and consequence systems such as sticker charts, token economies and point systems (Field, 2007; Skinner, 1973) as well as stressing the importance of self-control rather than self-regulation. Since the ministry has included self-regulation expectations in The
Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a), this approach to student behaviour is non-negotiable. When building capacity and educator understanding of the self-regulation expectations, one strategy will be to ensure educators understand the science behind self-regulation and why it works. The scientific underpinnings of self-regulation create a foundation for educators as they construct an understanding of self-regulation and grapple with the conflict between their current beliefs about student behaviour management and the self-regulation expectations. This support for educators as they develop and deepen their understanding of self-regulation aligns with this OIP’s constructivist approach to leadership and education.

A second ethical dilemma inherent in the Leadership Team approach selected as the solution for this OIP is the issue of consent (Orb, Eisenhauser & Wynaden, 2000). Those educators who consent to lead and/or participate in capacity-building in their school or at a system level should know how our learning will be shared and with whom. Orb et al. (2000) suggest that participants give their consent for use of quotations in publications and reports. School districts that receive ministry funding for professional learning are required to submit a written report at the end of the academic year. In the past, the reports for School Board X were written by the educational leaders in the Curriculum Support Department, including this author, and then submitted to the ministry, with copies sent to the administrators at the schools that participated to be shared with the educators. This strategy reflects the ‘great man,’ sole leadership style of the past and does not reflect the distributed leadership approach of this OIP. In more recent years, participants were informed at the first meeting that the group would be working together to prepare a final report for the ministry at the end of the year. At each meeting, observations, conversations and teacher comments were collected to document our learning as a
group. At the final meeting, the group created the outline for the ministry report together. This author then took all the ideas and put them together in a final document, which was shared again with all members of the group for final input before being submitted. This collaborative approach goes beyond merely giving consent for use of quotations in reports and publications, reflecting the distributed leadership model used in this OIP for the Self-Regulation Leadership Team.

Likewise, when inviting educators to share their success stories in an online forum, the educational leaders must make clear with whom these stories will be shared and in what manner. One possibility would be to post an agreement explicitly explaining the purpose and audience of the sharing page and assuring educators that their stories will not be shared beyond this page without their express written consent (Appendix J). This agreement would also ask educators to ensure the anonymity of students, parents and colleagues. When collecting data from educators during any part of the change process monitoring and evaluation, the educational leaders of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team must make it clear to educators how the data will be used and with whom it will be shared.

Another ethical consideration for the educational leaders in the Curriculum Support Department who are supporting the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team is that of equitable access to professional learning opportunities and resources for teachers and ECEs in the classroom and specifically for those that are members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team. Teacher/ECE learning teams were launched in public school boards across Ontario from 2010 to 2015 as Full Day Kindergarten was implemented. Although the intent was for early learning teams to be equals, the differences in their classroom responsibilities, education and contracts have created a less-than-level playing field (Hoffman, 2013). Results from a multi-year
survey of teachers and ECEs in Peel region suggests that teachers and ECEs have differing views on how the sharing of roles and responsibilities is unfolding in classrooms. Only 48% of surveyed teachers felt that their partnership was a hierarchy, yet 81% of ECEs felt that the partnership was hierarchical and ECEs (32%) were much more likely than teachers (12%) to say that their status in the hierarchy was a concern (Hoffman, 2010). As discussed previously in Chapters One and Two, teachers and ECEs in School Board X have differing access to professional learning resources and opportunities at the school, board and provincial level due to their different collective agreements with different unions. Both the Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession (Ontario College of Teachers, 2017) and the Code of Ethics for Registered ECEs (College of Early Childhood Educators, 2017) articulate the importance of building trusting relationships with colleagues by demonstrating respect, openness, integrity and honesty. These fundamental values need to act as the foundation for the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team.

Lastly, Gross and Shapiro (2004) suggest that the degree of turbulence in a school or system also has an impact on how educational leaders approach ethical issues that may arise in their practice. They found that schools involved in innovations over a period of several years experienced a degree of turbulence which could be light, moderate, severe or extreme. Light turbulence is associated with ongoing issues with little to no disruption in the work environment and only subtle signs of stress. Moderate turbulence is related to specific issues that are widely recognized and where there is a consensus that a solution is needed. Moderate turbulence leads to action and strong communication. In times of severe turbulence there is a feeling of crisis and a fear of failure of the reform; in extreme turbulence, the collapse of the reform seems likely (Gross & Shapiro, 2004, p.59).
Kindergarten programs in Ontario have been under constant change since the introduction of Full Day Kindergarten in September 2010. For five years, FDK was gradually rolled out in all schools and teachers transitioned from half-day or alternate day programs to full day, every day kindergarten. Kindergarten teachers were learning to co-teach with ECEs, moving from theme-based to inquiry-based learning, learning about pedagogical documentation and self-regulation, and sharing their space with school-based child care programs. Kindergarten classrooms were being renovated or constructed, and some classrooms were displaced to libraries and gymnasiums while construction was underway. The 2014-2015 school year was the final year for the roll-out of FDK and then June 2016 marked the Ontario Ministry of Education’s release and mandatory immediate implementation of The Kindergarten Program and Growing Success: The Kindergarten Addendum.

Using Gross and Shapiro’s definition (2004), kindergarten teachers and ECEs are in a state of moderate turbulence. There is widespread awareness of the new documents, originating from the ministry and the board; physical and emotional stress exist, and support is required. When developing and deepening educators’ understanding of what self-regulation is and why it is important, the educational leaders of the Curriculum Support Department in School Board X need to keep in mind that some of these educators have been in an ongoing state of moderate turmoil since September 2010. This knowledge of multiple ethical issues as well as turbulence theory provides important additional considerations for this Organization Improvement Plan.

**Change Process Communications Plan**

The strategies in this communication plan have been chosen to align with the goals of each stage of organizational change in the Change Process Model (Cawsey et al., 2016). The communication plan is designed to be ongoing and reciprocal. Not only do the educational
leaders of School Board X need to communicate with the kindergarten educators, they need to create structures and strategies to monitor reactions and obtain feedback from educators. Thus, the strategies for communication consider the needs of the various stakeholders involved, including the leadership team, endeavoring to move the work forward. More details on the strategies and structures to obtain feedback are described in the Monitoring and Evaluation section of this OIP.

Table 3.3

*Change process communication plan (Cawsey et al., 2016)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awakening</th>
<th>Mobilization</th>
<th>Acceleration</th>
<th>Institutionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- communicate the vision for change</td>
<td>- build and sustain momentum</td>
<td>- continue to reach out to engage and empower others</td>
<td>- share measurements of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- build momentum</td>
<td>- monitor reactions from stakeholders</td>
<td>- obtain feedback</td>
<td>- celebrate achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- create awareness</td>
<td>- clarify new structures and/or systems</td>
<td>- celebrate small wins and achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reassure employees</td>
<td>- engage change agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Superintendent and Self-Regulation team leaders share the vision of self-regulation in School Board X with administrators at the Summer System Leaders Meeting and with educators at the September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day, these two events will create initial momentum for the policy enactment of the self-regulation expectations. Sharing the board’s vision, the inventory of current resources, the plans for the Self-Regulation Leadership
Team, and information about upcoming professional learning opportunities and resources so early in the school year will help to reassure administrators and educators that there will be a range of differentiated supports available for the enactment of this self-regulation vision. Each school’s Kindergarten Contact will be the communication link from the central office to the school. Any resources sent to the school via board courier will be sent to the Kindergarten Contact. Copies of system emails, workshop notifications, and other electronic communications will be sent to school administrators and each school’s Kindergarten Contact, who will be asked to forward the communication to all kindergarten staff at their school.

Self-regulation is a very broad topic - The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) contains six overall self-regulation expectations and eighteen specific self-regulation expectations which educators must understand, teach, document, assess, and evaluate. Kotter and Cohen (2002) observed that large-scale changes in sizable organizations can lead to attention being scattered in too many different directions. They argue that focus is essential and urge leaders to focus first on tasks where they can quickly achieve unambiguous, visible, and meaningful achievements. These short-term wins serve four important purposes:

- Wins provide feedback to change leaders about the validity of their visions and strategies
- Wins give those working hard to achieve a vision an emotional uplift
- Wins build faith in the effort, attracting those who are not yet actively helping
- Wins take power away from cynics. (p.127)

For the Self-Regulation Leadership Team at School Board X, the initial focus for our key communication messages will be for all kindergarten educators to develop and deepen their understanding of The Five Steps of Shanker Self-Reg®:

1. Reframe the behaviour – is this misbehaviour or stress behaviour?
2. Recognize the stressors – in all five domains: biological, cognitive, emotion, social, and prosocial
3. Reduce the stress
4. Reflect: enhance stress awareness
5. Respond: develop personal strategies to promote restoration and resilience

These five steps will provide the foundation for our professional learning about self-regulation. The self-regulation competencies continuum will be distributed to all kindergarten educators and all school administrators to use as an anchor for our work and our conversations (Shanker, 2016; Appendix K). Although a distributed leadership approach is being used throughout this OIP, the selection of the five steps of self-regulation as the initial focus for the Self-Regulation Leadership Team has been made by this author, in consultation with the Kindergarten members of the Curriculum Support Department, in advance of the formation of the team. The first meeting of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will not occur until early to mid-October. Choosing the focus for the team’s first year in advance will allow the team to move quickly into planning and implementation. In future years, the focus will be determined by all members of the team, in consultation with the superintendent.

Guskey (2000) suggests that “new practices are likely to be abandoned in the absence of any evidence of their positive effects” (p. 141). Likewise, Hord and Hall (2006) pointed out that as educators implement new strategies, they are trying to master the skills required and their initial implementation may be disjointed and superficial. Teachers tend to abandon strategies before they become expert users when they do not see immediate results. To maintain enthusiasm, build momentum, and encourage doubters, Kotter and Cohen (2002) advise
educational leaders to share visible, meaningful, unambiguous wins. The more visible victories are, the more they move the change process forward (p.133).

The leaders of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, including this author, will use School Board X’s electronic email and communication system to make ‘wins’ visible to educators and administrators during the mobilization and acceleration stages of the Change Path Model. This includes the creation of an electronic forum where educators can share success stories of educators and students successfully using the Five Steps of Shanker Self-regulation at home and at school. Members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team may have to post their own stories, and encourage others to share to ensure that at least once a week a ‘good news self-reg story’ is posted early in the implementation process. Another strategy at the beginning will be to post links to ‘good news self-reg stories’ from schools in other boards to provide further examples of the positive benefits for educators and students of this policy enactment. Blog posts such as these about reducing stress by modifying the classroom environment (Cranston, December 2016) and reframing behaviour (Dunsiger, June 2017) are two examples of possible posts for the Self-Regulation Sharing Board about self-regulation at school. My post (Cranston, March 2017) about the connection between self-regulation and procrastination is an example of self-regulation at home. Kotter (2011a & b) notes that the actions and behaviors of leaders are powerful communication tools. By sharing my own blog posts and personal reflections, I can lead by example. The online posts will not be anonymous so that the opportunity is created for interested educators to engage in conversations with the post’s authors, and to assure readers that the posts are authentic.

School Board X has a scrolling news story function on its website which will be used by the leaders of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team to post updates, wins, and milestones in
the Self-Regulation policy enactment change process. In this way, we can share the positive messages with other stakeholders beyond educators to parents, trustees, child care providers and other interested community members. The Kindergarten Contact at each school will be encouraged to share their kindergarten team’s self-regulation learning (while protecting student privacy) on their school’s website and social media accounts.

School Board X’s email and electronic communication system are tools that allow the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team to reach all kindergarten educators across the over 50 urban and rural schools of School Board X. In addition, the team members will provide a range of face-to-face professional learning opportunities throughout the school year including after-school workshops, book talks, and sharing sessions where we can engage as co-learners, developing and deepening our relationships with educators and other interested stakeholders.

Once the change process has moved to the institutionalization phase, the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will use two additional existing structures to share successes and to embed self-regulation in the culture of the organization. The annual Director’s Report details the efforts of the board in the past year to fulfill its mission and achieve its strategic goals. It also includes the vision for the next school year and beyond. In addition, the Director also releases a monthly report with updates on important initiatives and information on progress being made towards our BIPSA goals. Including information on the work of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, kindergarten educators and school administrators on implementation of the board’s vision of self-regulation as well as sharing some personal success stories of self-regulation in action in the Director’s Reports, both annual and monthly, will help to embed self-regulation as part of the culture of School Board X. The leaders of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will need to
work in collaboration with the Director, her administrative assistant and School Board X’s Public Relations Officer to seek permission to include information on the board’s website and in the Director’s Reports.

The New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) is a ministry initiative whereby each new teacher is partnered with an experienced teacher mentor and receives support as well as professional development and training from the Curriculum Support Department consultants and coaches in areas such as literacy, numeracy, classroom management, communication with parents, assessment, and strategies for supporting students with special needs and other diverse learners (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2010b). The Early Years Lead administrator in the Curriculum Support Department, who is one of the leaders of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, is also the lead of NTIP for elementary and secondary teachers, as well as the lead for our mentoring program for newly hired ECEs. She and the other members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team will work together with the members of the NTIP committee to provide professional learning for all NTIP participants and their mentors about self-regulation.

Shanker (2016b) defines self-regulation as “how people manage energy expenditure, recovery and restoration to enhance growth. Effective self-regulation requires learning to recognize and respond to stress in all its many facets.” While new teachers’ needs vary widely, Moir (1999) identified a series of mental and emotional challenges that occur in developmental phases across the first year of practice. The six phases are anticipation, survival, disillusionment, rejuvenation, reflection and anticipation, and while not every NTIP participant will go through this exact sequence, an awareness of these phases can be helpful for new teachers and mentors. New teachers may find it useful to understand that these phases are a normal part of beginning teaching; mentors may find this knowledge helpful as they seek strategies to support the new
teachers. Ganda and Boruchovitch (2018) found that preservice teachers who participated in both theoretical and reflective learning about self-regulation had increased self-efficacy, reduced anxiety and an increase in the use of professional learning strategies. NTIP participants, and their mentors, will be encouraged to use self-regulation not only to reframe the behaviour of their students, the parents with whom they communicate, and their colleagues, but as a strategy for dealing with the stressors present in their own life and work, especially during the survival and disillusionment phases early in the school year.

The NTIP participants and mentors will be invited to share their stories about the impact of self-regulation on student achievement as well as on their own personal and professional well-being on the self-regulation electronic message board. With the cooperation of the NTIP team from the Curriculum Support Department, the Self-Regulation Leadership Team can meet with the NTIP participants throughout the school year and engage in reciprocal dialogue about self-regulation, what is working and what further learning participants would like about self-regulation for themselves and the students they teach.

In summary, this change communication plan is aligned with the stages of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016) and provides a range of strategies that build on existing events and structures in School Board X to ensure that the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional Learning and the educational leaders of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, including this author, can communicate the goals and vision of this OIP to all stakeholders throughout the process. The Change Process Monitoring and Evaluation plan connects with this Communication Plan and provides more detailed information on a range of strategies to ensure that teachers, ECEs and others have multiple and varied opportunities to communicate their thoughts, concerns and questions about self-regulation to the leadership team.
Next Steps and Future Considerations

Moving beyond the initial implementation period for this OIP, the educational leaders in the Curriculum Support Department, the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team and this author need to consider the sustainability, depth and ownership of this change initiative (Coborn, 2003).

**Sustainability:** Schools and school boards that successfully implement changes find it difficult to sustain them when confronted with competing priorities, changing demands, and teacher and administrator turnover (Coborn, 2003; Hargreaves & Fink, 2000; Stringfield & Datnow, 1998). Sustainability is further challenged as the short-term influx of resources and support that often accompany a change initiative such as this dissipate over time and are reallocated to other, newer initiatives (McLaughlin & Mitra, 2001).

Coborn (2003) notes that “teachers are better able to sustain change when there are mechanisms in place at multiple levels of the system to support their efforts” (p.6). The implementation plan for this OIP will create multiple levels of support for educators in School Board X, from the Kindergarten Contact at each school to the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team representing teachers, ECEs, administrators, unions, central office support staff and community members to the Superintendent of Curriculum Support and Professional Learning. Each fall, as the Consultant for Kindergarten and Primary, I offered an after-school fall workshop for teachers and ECEs who were new to kindergarten and/or new to School Board X. I also sent those educators a package of materials including a copy of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a), Growing Success: The Kindergarten Addendum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016b), and several board produced resources on play-based learning and developmentally appropriate kindergarten practice in late June so they would have
them to peruse over the summer. Teachers moving to kindergarten from another grade and ECEs who were previously working in child care settings often find the transition to be overwhelming with the different curriculum, different reporting expectations, and different schedule.

However, very few supports are in place beyond the school level for teachers or ECEs who move into a kindergarten assignment during the school year. One of the responsibilities of the Kindergarten Contact at each school will be to inform the Curriculum Support Department kindergarten team when someone is placed in a kindergarten teacher or ECE assignment during the school year so that the team can provide support to that educator. For example, if a teacher or ECE takes a maternity leave that starts in February, the Kindergarten Contact person will notify the Curriculum Support Department staff, who can then provide the long term occasional teacher or ECE covering the maternity leave with support materials and follow-up visits.

Another strategy that can be effectively used by the members of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team to sustain this change is to look for opportunities to integrate the principles of self-regulation with new initiatives, reforms and policies. This way, when attention shifts to other priorities, self-regulation can continue to be part of the conversation.

Due to the range of no cost and low cost professional learning supports using existing board, ministry and MEHRIT Centre resources, the shift in priorities to funding other projects such as mathematics should not have a major impact on the Self-Regulation Leadership Team.

**Depth** Deep and lasting change requires deep and lasting learning for educators and students. Coburn (2003, p.4) outlines three ways that deep and lasting change occurs: transformational shifts in educator beliefs about how students learn and what constitutes effective instruction, alterations to the norms of social interaction between educators and students, as well as shifts in the underlying pedagogical principles embedded in curriculum.
Because teachers draw on their prior knowledge, beliefs, and experience to interpret and enact reforms, they are likely to “gravitate” toward approaches that are congruent with their prior practices (Spillane, 2000, p.163), focus on surface manifestations (such as discrete activities, materials, or classroom organization) rather than deeper pedagogical principles (Coburn, 2002; Spillane, 2000; Spillane & Callahan, 2000; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999), and graft new approaches on top of existing classroom norms or routines (Coburn, 2002; Cuban, 1993). (Coburn, 2003, p.4).

The depth of implementation of this OIP was considered by this author when selecting tools and strategies for monitoring and evaluating the process. Measuring the depth of change requires going beyond superficial counts of programs implemented or materials purchased and instead asks us to “focus on measures that capture beliefs, norms and pedagogical principles as enacted in the classroom” (Coburn, 2002, p.5).

The open-ended questions on the online survey conducted for this OIP are one possible strategy for measuring depth, as is the analysis of KCOL comments from the self-regulation and well-being frame. In the future, the educational leaders of this policy enactment may want to consider other strategies such as in-depth interviews or focus groups, classroom observation, or classroom discourse analysis. Ongoing collaboration with union representatives from OSSTF for the ECEs and ETFO for the teachers is advised so that the measures are not used or perceived as a tool to evaluate individual educator performance.

**Shift in Ownership** Lastly, Coburn (2003) argues that ownership of the change must shift so it is no longer viewed as an external reform, controlled by a reformer, but instead it becomes an internal reform with “authority for the reform held by districts, schools and teachers who have the capacity to sustain, spread, and deepen reform principles themselves” (p.7). In other words,
the change must move from being “an externally understood and supported theory to an internally understood and supported theory-based practice” (Stokes, Sato, McLaughlin & Talbert, 1997 in Coborn, 2003, p.7). The Curriculum Support Department’s past practice of relying on one person to be the expert in an area, such as kindergarten, led to an approach where that one person, the consultant, worked to develop their own expertise in the reform area, such as new curriculum policy documents, rather than working with schools and educators to have them develop the capacity necessary for them to share ownership of the change. This Organization Improvement Plan is underpinned by a leadership framework of distributed leadership (Gronn, 2010; Harris, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001; Woods & Woods, 2013). A distributed perspective acknowledges that the work of leading and managing schools involves multiple individuals and can transcend formal leadership positions (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). School Board X has been moving toward a more distributed leadership model in the past five years, including the development of the Full Day Kindergarten Leadership Team and the Math Task Force. Shifting to a distributed leadership model, including the creation of the Self-Regulation Leadership Team, will allow the educational leaders of the Curriculum Support Department and this author, to develop a cadre of knowledgeable and confident educators who can support their colleagues and deepen and sustain the implementation of the self-regulation expectations of The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a) for many years to come.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this OIP presents comprehensive strategies for ensuring that the kindergarten educators in School Board X can enact the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). This change initiative seeks to
deepen professional learning through a distributed leadership framework, building on a constructivist view of adult learning. The development of a Self-Regulation Leadership Team, led by the three members of the Curriculum Support Department with kindergarten responsibilities and supported by this author, aligns with the distributed leadership framework as it does not focus on one person as the leader but instead creates a structure where critical leadership skills and responsibilities can be shared by the team members. By distributing leadership to team members from a range of levels throughout the organization, including those with and without formal leadership roles, School Board X can build a strong, diverse, sustainable leadership team to implement this Organization Improvement Plan.

Using the plan set forth in this OIP, the educational leaders of School Board X, including this author, have an excellent opportunity to effectively engage all stakeholders in policy enactment of the self-regulation expectations in The Kindergarten Program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2016a). The PDSA cycle is an effective strategy for measuring and monitoring the effectiveness of this change initiative as it will allow us as educational leaders to engage in ongoing evaluation throughout the Change Path Model, and adjust our implementation plan and timeline to more precisely meet the needs of kindergarten educators.

Since self-regulation is central to a child’s capacity to learn and provides the underpinnings for essential skills needed throughout life, ensuring that all kindergarten educators understand and can teach self-regulation will help School Board X achieve the vision articulated in their Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and Well-Being: engaging and empowering students, staff, families and communities so that every learner can reach their full potential.
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Appendix A

A comparison of Zones of Regulation® and Shanker Self-Reg®


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Zones of Regulation®</th>
<th>Shanker Self-Reg®</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah Kuypers (MA Ed, OTR/L, ASD Res.) – 2011</td>
<td>Stuart Shanker (DPhil), The MEHRIT Centre – 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What | A systemic, cognitive approach used to teach self-regulation by categorizing all the different ways we feel and states of alertness into four concrete zones. | A method for understanding stress and managing tension and energy; a process rather than a curriculum or a program |

| Definition of self-regulation | “the ability to do what needs to be done to be in the optimal state for the given situation”
A life-long process
Successful self-regulation via three critical neurological components:
• sensory processing;
• executive functioning;
• emotional regulation. | “how people manage energy expenditure, recovery, and restoration in order to enhance growth. Effective self-regulation requires learning to recognize and respond to stress in all its many facets, positive as well as negative, hidden as well as overt, minor as well as traumatic or toxic.” |

<p>| Central Tenets | Aims to teach students how to become more aware and independent in: controlling their emotions and impulses; managing sensory need; improving ability to problem-solve conflicts. In doing so, aims to “teach students to figure out what zone is expected in given | Involves understanding the triune metaphor of the brain, the stress response system, and learning to manage brain-body energy and tension with these guiding values: Shanker Self-Reg® is a universal platform (not a targeted intervention or behaviour management |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools taught and Practiced</th>
<th>Sensory supports</th>
<th>The Shanker Method® Dynamic System of the 5 Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calming techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intended Audience | Two to four students with the same cognitive abilities working with one facilitator or eight to ten students working with two facilitators; from 4 years old at or above average intellect. | Everyone (all ages, cultures, contexts). |

| Delivery | Anyone (parents/teachers/occupational therapists [OT]). | Anyone (all ages, cultures, contexts). |

| How Self-Regulation is Assessed/Tracked | Check-ins (or communication boards) Informal observation of student behaviour | Rubric for Self-Reg Competencies (educators assessing implementation) |
| More formal observation of student behaviour, including data collection and point sheets | Rubric for personal Self-Reg (adults)
*Further assessment tools in process of being created*

| Cognitive Behaviour Management
Central Coherence Theory (Frith, 1989)
Systemizing Theory (Baron-Cohen, 2006)
Social Thinking (Winner, 2000)
The Alert Program (Williams & Shellenberger, 1996)
The Incredible 5-Point Scale (Buron & Curtis, 2004)
“Phases of control” (Kopp, 1982)
Self-management (Dawson & Guare, 2009)
SCERTS Model (Prizant, Wetherby, Rubin, Laurent, & Rydell, 2006)
Theory of Mind (Frith, 1989)
Child development (Greenspan, 1997)
Neuropsychology (Schore, 1994)
Psychophysiology (Porges, 2011)
Psychology of parenting (Baumrind, 1967)
Secondary altriciality (Gould, 1977; Portmann, 1961)
Homeostasis / fight-or-flight (Cannon, 1932)
Dynamic Systems Theory (Fogel, King, & Shanker, 2007)
Canalization (Waddington, 1942)
Coregulation (Fogel, 1993) |

| The Zones of Regulation®: A Curriculum Designed to Foster Self-Regulation and Emotional Control (2011)
www.zonesofregulation.com/
The Zones of Regulation® CD, including 35 full-color and black-and-white reproducibles | Self-Reg: How to Help Your Child (& You)
Break the Stress Cycle & Successfully Engage with Life (2016)
www.self-reg.ca
www.selfregulationinstitute.org |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework/Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Described as “practice based on evidence versus an evidence-based practice” (Retrieved from <a href="http://www.zonesofregulation.com">www.zonesofregulation.com</a>) Two research studies completed and two research studies in progress</td>
<td>Research in progress in five areas: The 5 Domains of Stress Transition Conditions Between Positive &amp; Negative Stressors Reframing Scientific Theories Self-Reg in Practice Review of Self-Reg Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Steps of Framework/Program</strong></td>
<td>18 sequenced lessons, 30–60 min./lesson RED: extremely heightened alertness and intense emotions YELLOW: elevated emotions and alertness GREEN: calm alertness and optimal learning BLUE: low state of alertness and down feelings</td>
<td>The Shanker Method™: Reframe the behavior Recognize the stressors (across the five domains) Reduce the stress Reflect: enhance stress awareness Respond: develop personalized strategies to promote resilience and restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Zones of Regulation® App**
**Exploring Emotions App**

**The Shanker Self-Reg® Tool Kit for Educators**
**Self-Reg Parenting Magazine**
**Consultation for parents and educators**
**Self-Reg eSchool** (Parent Portal, Portal Plus, Foundations Courses, Facilitator’s Courses, Master Classes, webinars, workshops, symposium)
### Appendix B

Choosing A Frame – Guiding Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>If Yes:</th>
<th>If No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are individual commitment and motivation essential to success?</td>
<td>Human Resource Symbolic</td>
<td>Structural Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the technical quality of the decision important?</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Human Resource Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there high levels of ambiguity and uncertainty?</td>
<td>Political Symbolic</td>
<td>Structural Human Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are conflict and scarce resources significant?</td>
<td>Political Symbolic</td>
<td>Structural Human Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you working from the bottom up?</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Structural Human ResourceSymbolic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:
- Human Resource – 2
- Symbolic – 3
- Political – 4
- Structural – 0

Appendix C: A Closer Look at Self-Regulation

Created by Lisa Cranston for School Board X

Read and review:

Choose one of the following readings:

- Early Years Thumbnail Sketch, pages 34-35: Found on the Board Intranet under Staff Resources.
- Think Feel Act, pages 21-26 which can be found online at: https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/childcare/ResearchBriefs.pdf
  - What are the big ideas about Self-Regulation that you gained from this reading?
  - What questions do you still have?

Watch and discuss:

Educators sometimes say that so much time is taken up managing children's behavior that they are left with too little to enrich children's play. However, research done by Dr. Stuart Shanker on self-regulation suggests that children need assistance to develop the ability to self-regulate so that they are able to learn. He stresses that educators need to help children understand how much stimulation they need to be actively focused for learning.

This research suggests that we need to re-think how we look at both the behaviour of the teacher and the children in the classroom. If children are to learn to self-regulate, they need an environment that is intentionally structured to help them to develop the ability to resist impulses, to focus their attention, to stay on task despite distractions, to hold information in their brains and to change their focus when needed.

Go to: From Kindergarten Matters: Intentional Play Based Learning; LNS Webcasts for Educators, 2011. Click on ‘It’s About Self-Regulation’: http://www.curriculum.org/k-12/en/?s=kindergarten

View: What is Self-Regulation? (6:17) and What is the difference between self-regulation and compliance? (2:39)
  - Think about your prior knowledge of self-regulation. How has your thinking been impacted by Dr. Shanker’s message?
  - How might you include parents/caregivers as partners in helping their children develop self-regulation?

OR

View: How does the play-based learning support the development of self-regulation? (3:22) and What can educators do to support students in developing self-regulation? (4:06)
  - What can you change in your school environment to reduce children's stress levels?
  - How can you support children in recognizing when they are under- and over-stimulated?
A CLOSER LOOK AT: Self-Regulation

Share and support:

At the one hour, thirteen minute mark on The Development of Self-Regulation DVD, Dr. Shanker lists five steps to develop self-regulation: reframe behavior, identify stressors, reduce stressors, develop self-awareness, and determine what they need. Share some strategies you are currently using in your classroom/school to help children and adults self-regulate.

- What strategies are you currently using?
- What strategies might you like to try?

Dr. Shanker states that nature is a calming, restorative mechanism.

- In what ways are you using nature, both inside and outside the classroom/school, as a means of helping students to self-regulate?

Reflect and record:

Use the reflection organizer to record your next steps for your own professional practice. Consider what support you might need to move forward in your practice.

For Further Learning:


The Mehrit Centre
http://www.self-reg.ca/

Learn: The Magazine of BC Education

The Society for Safe and Caring Schools
www.safeandcaring.ca
Appendix D

PDSA and the Awakening stage of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016)
Appendix E

PDSA and the Mobilization stage of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016)
Appendix F

Self-Regulation Online Survey

Demographic:

How many years have you been a kindergarten educator?

Please indicate your current understanding of:

The five domains of self-regulation
Emerging; Developing; Applying; Extending

The five steps of self-regulation
Emerging; Developing; Applying; Extending

Teaching self-regulation
Emerging; Developing; Applying; Extending

Assessing and reporting on self-regulation
Emerging; Developing; Applying; Extending

How important is self-regulation for students?
Not at all; Somewhat Important; Important; Very Important

Why?

How important is self-regulation for educators?
Not at all; Somewhat Important; Important; Very Important

Why?

In your own words, how would you define self-regulation?
Appendix G

Survey letter – to be printed on Board letterhead

Dear School Board X Kindergarten Educators:

As you are aware, self-regulation is interwoven throughout the Ontario Kindergarten curriculum and our board has chosen to focus on this important skill so that we can support all learners in reaching their fullest potential.

Below you will find a link to a brief anonymous online survey which should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. As I mentioned in my address at the Kindergarten Professional Learning Day earlier this month, the information from this survey will assist us in gathering baseline data regarding current understandings around self-regulation and will also be used to guide us in developing professional learning opportunities and resources. Completion of the survey is voluntary; if you chose to complete the survey please do so by September 28. (insert URL link here).

If you have any questions, please contact Consultant Lisa Cranston at (insert email address here) or at (insert phone number).

Thanking you in advance for your assistance,

(Insert signature here)

Name

Superintendent of Education – Curriculum Support and Professional Learning
Appendix H

PDSA and the Acceleration stage of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016)
Appendix I

PDSA and the Institutionalization stage of the Change Path Model (Cawsey et al., 2016)

Plan
- planning for next school year
- meet with SO
- revise goals

Do
- documentation of SR learning for 2018/19 school year
- develop plan for summer institutes, September Kindergarten Professional Learning Day

Study
Leaders: Review goals and progress of SR Leadership Team (Northouse, 2016, p.391)
Collection self-reg comments from term 3 KCOL
- Student documentation samples from term 3
- Professional Learning Attendance lists
- Lists of presenters and their roles
- Feedback forms
- Online survey

Act
Consider changes for the team next year - new members? new advisors? new goals?
Appendix J

Online Electronic Sharing Group Agreement

All members, PLEASE READ THIS ENTIRE POST AND COMMENT INDICATING YOU AGREE WITH THE GROUP GUIDELINES before participating in group discussions.

Self-Reg Kindergarten is a closed group. Only kindergarten educators in School Board X may join this group. Please let us know if there is a Long Term Occasional Teacher or ECE in a kindergarten placement at your school so that we may add them to this group.

We hope that you will find participating in this group helpful both personally and/or professionally, and that you will enjoy supporting others in their challenges and successes. Please share your accomplishments, your learning, your challenges and moments of stress. Let us know what you are looking for and how we can support you on your self-reg journey.

If you’re sharing about a student or a colleague, we advise that you do not disclose any identifying information, and be very careful about sharing photos and videos or saying anything that might violate the privacy or safety of others.

Each person’s story is unique, so we ask that you respectfully support others’ learning, and keep your contributions on-topic, constructive and positive. Articles shared here in this group can be shared elsewhere. However, original posts, questions, reflections, and educator created resources are not to be shared without express permission of the content creator/author. The intent is to create a safe, closed space for educators to share and seek feedback.

This is not intended as forum for selling resources or promoting other commercial enterprises.

If you have questions or concerns about something you read here, please try first to address the issue with the person who posted the content. Use the five steps of the Self-Reg model to approach any disagreement or conflict, and send a message to the group administrators if your concerns are not resolved.

The group administrators reserve the right to remove spam, self-promotion, advertising, and off-topic or inflammatory posts or comments and to remove any group member who repeatedly violates these guidelines.

Created by Lisa Cranston (2018)
### Self-Reg Competencies Rubric

**Step 1:** I am learning about self-reg.

**Step 2:** I am learning about different stressors and behaviors.

**Step 3:** I am learning about ways the stressors can be addressed.

**Step 4:** I am reflecting on the effectiveness of my self-reg strategies.

**Step 5:** I am planning and reflecting on personal strategies to address the remaining gaps.

---

**ORGANIZATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**Appendix K**

**Self-Reg Competencies Rubric (public domain at www.self-reg.ca)**

---

**The Self-Reg Rubric is intended for use with students or those who are new to Self-Reg. The rubric can be used to identify and address self-regulation needs.**