

Last reviewed: September 2021

Intervention website: <http://www.cyfs.unl.edu/research/projects-page.php?id=5ddcdd323d04cb9d68aa08c495fd47c1>

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Getting Ready

Please note that in the ‘Intervention summary’ table below, ‘child age’, ‘level of need’, and ‘race and ethnicities’ information is **as evaluated in studies**. Information in other fields describes the intervention as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Intervention summary	
Description	Getting Ready is an early learning approach for parents with a child attending preschool or nursery in disadvantaged communities. It is delivered by professionals who work in early childhood (infant/toddler and preschool) classrooms and occurs primarily during interactions with families. Getting Ready is delivered over the course of two years through six meaningful contacts per year in addition to the incidental interactions that occur with parents as part of their child’s attendance. During these contacts, parents received advice on supporting their child’s school readiness and engagement in school.
Evidence rating	2+
Cost rating	N/A
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supporting children’s mental health and wellbeing<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved social and emotional development.• Enhancing school achievement & employment<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved speech, language and communication.
Child age (population characteristic)	3 to 5 years

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Intervention summary	
Level of need (population characteristic)	Targeted Selected
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• African American/Black• Hispanic/Latino• White.
Type (model characteristic)	School-based/home
Setting (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Early years setting• Primary school• Home.
Workforce (model characteristic)	Early childhood professionals who work in early childhood (infant/toddler and preschool) classrooms
UK available?	No
UK tested?	No

Model description

Getting Ready is an early learning approach for parents with a child attending preschool or nursery in disadvantaged communities. Getting Ready is not a curriculum or a packaged, stand-alone intervention but is a process of interacting with families that occurs during all exchanges with the aim of supporting parental engagement and helping them support their child's school readiness skills.

Getting Ready is delivered by professionals who work in early childhood (infant/toddler and preschool) classrooms and occurs when practitioners are interacting with families. During these interactions, practitioners provide advice on how to support their child's early learning through daily activities that they can implement in the home and community.

Getting Ready is also delivered through six 'meaningful contacts' that are scheduled during the course of the school year in addition to the incidental interactions that occur with parents while their child attends school. During these contacts, parents receive more detailed and tailored advice

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

for supporting their child's early learning needs. These contacts can take place in the child's school, but also in the family home.

Practitioners are supported to offer this advice through the following flexible and responsive strategies aimed at supporting a positive 'triadic' relationship between the practitioner, parent, and child:

1. Establish parent–child and parent–professional relationship
 - Establish a context for parent–child interaction
 - Listen, respond to parent priorities, concerns, challenges.
2. Share observations/knowledge of child over time
 - Share/seek information about child's progress
 - Affirm parents' insights and competent observations.
3. Identify mutually agreed-upon developmental expectations for child
 - Focus parents' attention on child strengths and developmental needs
 - Share developmentally appropriate information.
4. Share ideas and brainstorm methods for helping child meet expectations
 - Mutually identify natural learning opportunities in the home
 - Identify current and potential parent behaviours that can support targeted learning
 - Make suggestions when necessary.
5. Observe parent–child interactions and provide feedback
 - Observe parent and child in meaningful context
 - Identify current strengths related to developmental expectations
 - Provide developmental information
 - Model/suggest on-the-spot when necessary to support parent interactions with their child.
6. Monitor the child's skill development and determine directions for continued growth
 - Engage parent in noting child's progress and measuring progression towards individualised developmental expectations
 - Discuss needed adjustments in interactions and/or learning opportunities
 - Cycle to new developmental expectations and learning opportunities as needed.

The strategies are used in a fluid manner and are not intended to be practised in any sequence or order and they work together to support parents and children as they prepare for lifelong learning. The Getting Ready strategies are used across various contexts where parent and child learning occurs. Unstructured contexts include any chance encounters that educators may have with parents or settings that are social or informal. Structured contexts or settings are where formal educational discussions and planning occur between an educator or educator and parent.

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Target population

Age of child	3 to 5 years
Target population	Parents and children living in disadvantaged communities

Please note that the information in this section on target population is as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.



Theory of change

Why		Who		How		What
Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Intervention	Short-term outcomes	Medium-term outcomes	Long-term outcomes
School readiness skills (including vocabulary and early self-regulation) during the preschool years are strongly associated with children's later success in primary and secondary school.	An enriching home learning environment during the early years is known to support young children's school readiness.	Low family income negatively impacts parents' ability to provide an enriching home learning environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents receive advice for supporting their preschool child's school readiness skills through their incidental interactions with their child's school • More tailored advice is provided through 12 'meaningful contacts' that take place during preschool and nursery • Parents are supported to improve the quality of the home learning environment • Parents are encouraged and supported to be engaged in their child's school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents are better able to support their child's school readiness • Parents are better able to understand their child's early developmental and learning needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved parent–child interaction • Improved child school readiness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved school achievement in secondary and primary school • Reduced income-related learning gaps • Reduced risk of behavioural and mental health problems as children develop.



Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	Parents with a preschool child living in disadvantaged communities.
How is it delivered?	<p>Getting Ready is delivered by early childhood professionals who work in early childhood (infant/toddler and preschool) classrooms (it can also be delivered on a one-on-one basis via home-visitation programmes) and occurs primarily during interactions with families.</p> <p>Getting Ready is delivered over the course of two years in 12 sessions (six meaningful contacts per year in addition to incidental interactions with families).</p>
What happens during the intervention?	<p>Getting Ready provides early childhood professionals with an approach to working with families to support parent engagement. It is not a curriculum or a packaged, stand-alone intervention but is a process of interacting with families that occurs during all exchanges with them, implemented in coordination with existing interventions. Getting Ready is intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen relationships between the parent and their child, and between the parent and care educator. The purposes of the four relationship-building strategies are to establish the parent as a warm and sensitive adult who is responsive to their child's needs, solidify the attachment between parent and child, and create meaningful connections between the parent and educator. • Build competencies in parents and educators, enabling them to support and scaffold children's positive development and learning. The purposes of the four competency-building strategies are to bolster parents' confidence regarding their parenting practices, gently guide parents in methods for scaffolding their child's learning, and ensure parents have input on how their children's learning can best be encouraged at home and other settings. <p>The strategies are used in a fluid manner and are not intended to be practised in any sequence or order but instead are responsive and flexible, and they work together to support parents and children as they prepare for lifelong learning. The Getting Ready strategies are used across various contexts where parent and child learning occurs. Unstructured contexts include any chance encounters that educators may have with parents or settings that are social or informal. Structured contexts or settings are where formal educational discussions and planning occur between an educator or educator and parent.</p> <p>Collaborative planning is a formal process used in structured contexts. The process establishes the notion that parents and educators are mutually responsible for scaffolding a child's learning and development. The structured, collaborative process allows exploration of important topics, including individual child strengths, goals shared by parents and early childhood educators, plans for helping the child realise their goals across settings, and assessments about whether a child is meeting important goals. Relationship-</p>



	strengthening and competency-building strategies are embedded in the collaborative planning process.
--	--

Implementation requirements (Cont.)

Who can deliver it?	The practitioner who delivers this intervention is an early years teacher/practitioner.
What are the training requirements?	Not available
How are practitioners supervised?	Not available
What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	<p>Intervention fidelity is maintained through the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training manual • Other printed material • Face-to-face training • Booster training • Fidelity monitoring.
Is there a licensing requirement?	No
*Contact details	<p>Contact person: Lisa Knoche</p> <p>Organisation: University of Nebraska-Lincoln</p> <p>Email address: lknoche2@unl.edu</p> <p>Website: http://www.cyfs.unl.edu/research/projects-page.php?id=5ddcdd323d04cb9d68aa08c495fd47c1</p> <p>*Please note that this information may not be up to date. In this case, please visit the listed intervention website for up to date contact details.</p>

Evidence summary

Getting Ready's most rigorous evidence comes from a single cluster RCT conducted in the United States that is consistent with Foundations' Level 2+ evidence strength criteria.

This study observed statistically significant improvements in teacher's assessments of Getting Ready children's social and emotional competence and their expressive and receptive language.



Getting Ready has preliminary evidence of improving a child outcome, but we cannot be confident that the intervention caused the improvement.

Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	2
Studies reviewed	2
Meeting the L2 threshold	2
Meeting the L3 threshold	0
Contributing to the L4 threshold	0
Ineligible	0

Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	Cluster RCT
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	220 children between the ages of 3 and 5 in 28 Head Start classrooms within the public school system in a Midwestern state
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 33% White/non-Hispanic • 25% Hispanic/Latino • 18% African American/Black.
Population risk factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% of child participants had an identified disability • 11% had been referred for multidisciplinary team (MDT) evaluations at the start of the study • Teachers reported developmental concerns for 10% of the children; parents reported concerns for 25% of the children • 98% of the parents in the study received some form of public aid, such as welfare, Medicaid, childcare or housing assistance, food



Study 1	
	<p>stamps, or eligible for the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22% of parents had not completed high school • 36% of the parents had been 18 or younger at the birth of their first child • 39% of the parents were the only person older than the age of 18 living in the home.
Timing	Measurement occurred over a two-year period, at baseline and in the fall and spring for two consecutive years for three cohorts of children and families.
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved interpersonal competencies (teacher report) (Study 1a) • Initiative • Attachment • Reduced anxiety and withdrawal • Improved language and literacy skills (teacher report) (Study 1b) • Improved activity level (researcher observation) (Study 1c).
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	2+
Citations	<p>Study 1a: Sheridan, S. M., Knoche, L. L., Edwards, C. P., Bovaird, J. & Kupzyk, K. A. (2010) Parent engagement and school readiness: Effects of the Getting Ready intervention on preschool children's social-emotional competencies and behavioural concerns. <i>Early Education and Development</i>. 21, 125–156.</p> <p>Study 1b: Sheridan, S. M., Knoche, L. L., Kupzyk, K. A., Edwards C. P. & Marvin, C. A. (2011) A randomized trial examining the effects of parent engagement on early language and literacy: The Getting Ready intervention. <i>Journal of School Psychology</i>. 49, 361–383.</p> <p>Study 1c: Sheridan, S. M., Knoche, L. L., Edwards, C. P., Kupzyk, K. A., Clarke, B. L. & Moorman Kim, E. (2014). Efficacy of the Getting Ready intervention and the role of parental depression. <i>Early Education and Development</i>. 25, 746–769.</p>



Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 220 children between the ages of 3 and 5 in 28 Head Start classrooms within the public school system in a Midwestern state over the course of four years. 51% of child participants were boys. The primary language spoken by 76% of children was English, and 19% spoke primarily Spanish. Arabic or a combination of languages was spoken in 4.5% of child participants' households.

The majority of parents in the study (95%) were mothers. 98% of the parents in the study received some form of public aid, such as welfare, Medicaid, childcare or housing assistance, food stamps, or eligible for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Program. 22% had not completed high school. Approximately 36% of the parents had been 18 or younger at the birth of their first child. 39% of the parents were the only person older than the age of 18 living in the home.

Study design

The study involved 220 children, clustered within 28 Head Start classrooms.

Teachers of each classroom consented to join the study and their classrooms were randomly assigned to the treatment or control conditions. Assignment was made at a building level (where there were classrooms housed in the same building). Child assignment to the treatment or control condition was dependent on teacher assignment to condition, so all children and families with the same teacher were assigned to the same experimental condition. Children and families with a teacher in the control condition received business-as-usual services.

Classrooms taught by 13 Head Start teachers were assigned to the treatment condition, and classrooms taught by 16 teachers were assigned to the control condition. The study did not specify the number of children allocated to the treatment and the control group, but 116 children in the treatment group and 101 children in the control group submitted baseline demographic data.

The study does not report baseline equivalence of the two conditions prior to attrition.

Measurement

Assessment for all measures took place at four timepoints: in the autumn and spring over a two-year period. Time 1 (baseline) was taken in autumn of year 1, and time 4 measurement occurred in the spring of year 2, 18 to 20 months after baseline.

- **Teacher report** measures included the Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA), Social Competence and Behavior Evaluation short form (SCBE-30), and the Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy.
- **Researcher-led assessment** included the Preschool Language Scale (PLS-4).
- **Researcher-led observation** included parent–child observation session coded using the Parent Child Interaction System and child behaviour scales developed by Egeland, Sroufe, and Erickson (1983).
- **Parent report** measures included the Center for Epidemiological Studies–Depression scale (CES-D).



Study retention

54% of families were retained through the fourth assessment occasion, which occurred approximately 18 months after the baseline assessment. The difference in attrition rates between the two experimental conditions (control = 47.5%, treatment = 44.8%) was not statistically significant. In addition, remainders and attriters did not differ significantly on key demographic characteristics (such as gender, disability, or child age), or on their baseline assessments for any of the outcome measures used across all three studies. The study does not provide further information on attrition by experimental condition, or attrition by assessment timepoint.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

The study used multilevel modelling (MLM) and hierarchical linear modelling (HLM) to account for clustering. The study design was a four-level complex sampling design (repeated observations nested within each child, children nested within teachers or classrooms, and classrooms nested within schools or programmes).

Findings

Over the two years of the study period, the intervention condition saw a significantly higher increase in some positive measures of interpersonal competence compared to the control condition, including:

- Initiative (as measured by teachers)
- Attachment (as measured by teachers)
- Anxiety/withdrawal (as measured by teachers).

The intervention condition also showed a higher increase in language use, reading, and writing, as measured by teachers.

In addition, children in the intervention condition experienced a significantly greater decline in activity level as measured by researchers, compared to the control condition.

The third paper also tested the moderating effects of maternal depression on the outcomes, and found that maternal depression was found to moderate the effects of the intervention on children's overall positive affect and amount of verbalisations. However, children in the treatment condition with a depressed parent showed significantly greater improvement in positive affect than those whose parent was not depressed than control group children with a depressed parent. There was no intervention effect on overall positive affect and verbalisations for children with parents not demonstrating depression. Depression did not impact the intervention effects for child agency, persistence, activity level, or distractibility.

Limitations

The study does not achieve a higher rating because the outcome measures which showed significant improvement were measured by the practitioners delivering the intervention (teachers).



Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Initiative (Study 1a)	Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA) – initiative subscale (teacher report)	D = 0.56	Yes	206	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Attachment (Study 1a)	Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA) – attachment subscale (teacher report)	D = 0.75	Yes	206	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Anxiety/withdrawal (Study 1a)	Social Competence and Behavior Evaluation short form (SCBE-30) – anxiety-withdrawal subscale (teacher report)	D = -0.74	Yes	205	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Social competence (Study 1a)	Social Competence and Behavior Evaluation short form (SCBE-30) – social competence subscale (teacher report)	D = 0.17	No	205	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Self-control (Study 1a)	Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA) – self-control subscale (teacher report)	D = 0.07	No	206	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Behavioural concerns (Study 1a)	Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA) – behaviour subscale (teacher report)	D = 0.08	No	203	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Anger/aggression (Study 1a)	Social Competence and Behavior Evaluation short form (SCBE-30) – anger/aggression subscale (teacher report)	D = 0.03	No	204	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18- to 0 months post-baseline)
Expressive communication (Study 1b)	Preschool Language Scale – Fourth Edition (PLS-4) – Expressive Communication subscale (child report)	D = -0.64	No	117	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Language use (Study 1b)	Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy (TROLL) – language use subscale (teacher report)	1.11	Yes	117	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Reading (Study 1b)	Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy (TROLL) – reading subscale (teacher report)	1.25	Yes	117	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Writing (Study 1b)	Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy (TROLL) – writing subscale (teacher report)	0.93	Yes	117	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Agency/enthusiasm (Study 1c)	Research assistant observation using Parent Child Interaction System	Not reported	No	39	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Persistence (Study 1c)	Research assistant observation using Parent Child Interaction System	Not reported	No	39	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Activity level (Study 1c)	Research assistant observation using Parent Child Interaction System	Not reported	Yes	39	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Positive affect (Study 1c)	Research assistant observation using Parent Child Interaction System	Not reported	No	39	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Distractibility (Study 1c)	Research assistant observation using Parent Child Interaction System	Not reported	No	39	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)
Verbalisations (Study 1c)	Research assistant observation using Parent Child Interaction System	Not reported	No	39	Baseline (T1) – T4 (18 to 20 months post-baseline)

Other studies

No other studies were identified for this intervention.

—

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to Foundations' terms of reference (or the Early Intervention Foundation's terms of reference), and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the intervention provider.