WORKING TOGETHER TO INCLUDE ALL CHILDREN IN THEIR EARLY YEARS

RUBEN FUKKINK – WORKSHOP 8
Transforming autonomous and often fragmented children’s services into an integrated service is a typical issue in several countries. The advent and growth of inclusive early childhood care and education (ECEC) for young children has also made the interprofessional collaboration (IPC) between childcare, primary education and youth care an important theme.

→ growing interest in role of multidisciplinary teams in community-based settings for young children
Individual staff and/or team perspective

**individual staff**
- Inclusion of diverse population
- Allround curriculum
- Allround professional

**team**
- Inclusion of diverse population
- Integrated care for different families
- Interprofessional collaboration
THIS WORKSHOP: 3 RELATED PARTS

Introducing Inter-Professional Collaboration (IPC)

1. Your professional development & profile: IPC

2. Your team: IPC

3. Ongoing literature review: Effective ingredients for IPC
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PERSONAL IPC PROFILE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues from other disciplines believe that they could not do their jobs as well without the assistance of social workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with colleagues from other disciplines leads to outcomes that we could not achieve alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues from other disciplines and I collaborate in various ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues from all professional disciplines take responsibility for developing treatment plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discuss with professionals from other disciplines the degree to which each of us should be involved in a particular case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 items selected from 5 IIC subscales:

- **Interdependency**
  My colleagues from other disciplines believe that they could not do their jobs as well without the assistance of social workers.

- **Newly created professional activities**
  Working with colleagues from other disciplines leads to outcomes that we could not achieve alone.

- **Flexibility**
  My colleagues from other disciplines and I collaborate in various ways.

- **Collective ownership of goals**
  Colleagues from all professional disciplines take responsibility for developing treatment plans.

- **Reflection on process**
  I discuss with professionals from other disciplines the degree to which each of us should be involved in a particular case.
Growth during PACT project: IIC measure (18-24 months)

See Balledux, Doornenbal, Fukkink, Spoelstra, van Verseveld & van Yperen (2017). Inclusie door interprofessionele samenwerking; Resultaten van de proeftuinen van PACT samen werken voor jonge kinderen. Utrecht/Groningen/Amsterdam: PACT; See Fukkink & Van Verseveld (submitted)
From Stepans, Thompson, & Buchanan (2002)

Team building

Transdisciplinary team building through role release and collaboration

4 ECEC centres in 4 European cities
What does your team look like?

IPC typology of Boon et al. (2004)

Process:
More collaboration and interactions

Philosophy:
From specialist → to holistic

Structure:
Less hierarchical from 1 → 7
WHAT DOES YOUR IPC TEAM LOOK LIKE?
Pilots from Dutch PACT project

Groningen
Almere
Amsterdam
Middelburg
Apeldoorn
Eersel
Lent

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317664333_Inclusie_door_interprofessionele_samenwerking_Resultaten_van_de_proeftuinen_van_PACT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver (day-care)</td>
<td>Centre for Youth and Family staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver (afterschool care)</td>
<td>Youth care staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special educational needs coordinator – (childcare)</td>
<td>Child protection staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of childcare centre</td>
<td>Social nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teacher</td>
<td>Remedial educationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial teacher</td>
<td>Youth health care staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special educational needs coordinator – (school)</td>
<td>Director of special education school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special care coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper school coordinator care and advisory team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positions in Dutch ECEC teams (0-6 yrs)
IPC sociogram for pilot Eersel (start of project)

See Balledux, Doornenbal, Fukkink, Spoelstra, van Verseveld & van Yperen (2017). Inclusie door interprofessionele samenwerking; Resultaten van de proeftuinen van PACT samen werken voor jonge kinderen. Utrecht/Groningen/Amsterdam: PACT.
IPC sociogram Apeldoorn (start of project)

See Balledux, Doornenbal, Fukkink, Spoelstra, van Verseveld & van Yperen (2017). Inclusie door interprofessionele samenwerking; Resultaten van de proeftuinen van PACT samen werken voor jonge kinderen. Utrecht/Groningen/Amsterdam: PACT.
See Fukkink & Van Verseveld (submitted), *Inclusive Early Childhood Education and Care: A Longitudinal Study into the Growth of Interprofessional Collaboration*.

**Note.** Red squares represent actors from child care, purple squares represent actors from primary schools; green squares represent actors from youth care; blue represents the manager of the ECEC (not sector-related); Arrow indicates directional (→) or (bi)directional path (↔) between professionals; Core with selection of key figures is highlighted with circle.

Functions are indicated with numbers: 1 = Caregiver day-care; 2 = Caregiver afterschool care; 3 = Special educational needs coordinator childcare; 4 = Manager of childcare centre; 5 = Primary school teacher; 6 = Remedial teacher; 7 = Special educational needs coordinator school; 8 = Coordinator of the lower primary grades; 9 = Primary school director; 10 = Special education teacher; 11 = Special care coach; 12 = Parental coach; 13 = Upper school coordinator care and advisory team; 14 = Centre for Youth and Family staff member; 15 = Youth care staff member; 16 = Child protection staff member; 17 = Social nurse; 18 = Remedial educationalist; 19 = Youth health care staff member; 20 = Social worker; 21 = Director of special education school; 12, 13 and 14 were not included in this ECEC team.
Effective & efficient structure in community service ECEC

Example from PACT project: Middelburg (end of project)

[Diagram of core-periphery structure]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Core%E2%80%93periphery_structure
SOME CONCLUSIONS PACT PROJECT

Network → participant-governed networks
  → with modest level of density: about 15% of all possible ties
  → With relatively small distances: maximum distance (diameter) is <4 persons
  → reciprocated dyadic relationships: ≈ 80% ”two-way relationships”
  → With outdegree centrality: ≈ average .50

→ Close collaboration between professionals from different sectors (‘care axis’) with relatively high IIC levels

For example: close collaboration between

Special educational needs coordinator from childcare &
Special educational needs coordinator from primary school &
Remedial educationalist from youthcare
ONGOING RESEARCH:

FIRST REPORT ON REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES INTO INTERPROFESSIONAL COLLABORATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE
# CATEGORIES OF BARRIERS/FACILITATORS IPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Your personal IPC experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOME EVIDENCE-BASED MECHANISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative mechanisms</th>
<th>Positive mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust, negativity</td>
<td>Trust, positivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td>Adequate support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low levels professional development / IPC skills</td>
<td>High levels of PD / IPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different opinions about professional role</td>
<td>Agreement about professional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity about roles/tasks: Who</td>
<td>Clarity about roles/tasks: Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity about roles/tasks: What</td>
<td>Clarity about roles/tasks: What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of job autonomy</td>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demands high, resources: Low</td>
<td>Job demands OK, resources: adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress high</td>
<td>Job stress adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interprofessional education (IPE) : low/none</td>
<td>Interprofessional education (IPE): adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication</td>
<td>Communication: adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROLE AMBIGUITY/DEFERRAL/DISCREPANCY

‘Social workers indicated a desire for greater clarity in their roles.’
‘Role ambiguity is indeed a grand challenge for social workers.’
Bolin, Rueda, & Linton (2017)

to minimize professional role discrepancy and to foster the development of positive interprofessional relationships Agresta (2006)

unrealistic expectations and perceptions of the other professional grouping and its facilities to support children Timonen-Kallio et al. (2017)

mental health practitioners’ attitude in collaboration focuses slightly on delivering psychiatric knowledge and expertise into residential child care work rather than sharing professional responsibility Timonen-Kallio et al. (2017)

Transdisciplinary team building through role release and collaboration Stepans et al. (2007)

‘boundary crossing’: Social workers can act as mediators and consultants “on the borders” between two systems Timonen-Kallio, Juha Hämäläinen & Eila Laukkanen (2017)
‘Individuals’ perceptions of greater power disparity were correlated with lower ratings of interprofessional collaboration’ Cole (2018)

‘When asked whether there was a hierarchy in the SART, a small number of participants referred to professionals devaluing the contributions of volunteer advocates’ Cole (2018)

‘The code of status included comments around high-status jobs and lower-status jobs. In particular, the difficulties of having a high status within a when team members appeared to value someone’s expertise over their own’ Rose (2011)
COMMUNICATION & RELATIONS

‘It is becoming quite apparent that in terms of relationships with other professionals, one of the key areas of focus for the child and youth worker discipline is communication and reporting skills’ Gharabaghi (2008)

‘Communication between professionals is also a prominent factor that impacted collaboration’ Weglarz-Ward (2016)

‘Ineffective communication strategies hinders collaboration among professionals’ Weglarz-Ward (2016)

‘communication between different child protection agencies is essential for collaborative practice but often difficult to navigate’ O'Reilly (2011)

‘Time to build a culture of trust in transdisciplinary consultation is a “behind the scene” activity that organisations may be reluctant to fund outside of consumer-paid direct service provision time’ Evans (2017)

‘Develop formal and informal relationships between agencies and across service systems conflict resolution skills’ Cole (2018)

‘conflict between professional cultures, reinforcing an ‘us and them’ culture … bureaucracy was in effect a catalyst for conflict’ Simpson et al. (2017)
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

‘showcase specific collaboration strategies to implement in order to improve service delivery’ He & Phillips (2017)

‘importance of providing interdisciplinary training’ Bressem et al. (2016)

‘good supervision, adequate time for preparation’ Banach & Couse (2012)

‘blend of formal and experiential knowledge in relation to interprofessional practice’ Hood et al. (2016)
OTHER: SELECTION OF THEMES

colocation of staff He & Phillips (2017)

everyone in the same region, who also works with children, is so familiar with the professional, that they will not hesitate to call when they suspect maltreatment Visscher & van Stel (2017)

participation of data managers and medical informaticians is also of critical importance Gilbert & Downs (2015)

... and coordination of services has played a vital role in the health promotion, health protection, and disease prevention in this group of socially complex and vulnerable children Katz et al. (2007)

Desirable horizontal and less desirable vertical task transfer elements Evans (2017)

to communicate the limits of their service provision to prospective service users Evans (2017)
SELECTION OF REFERENCES: IPC IN ECEC CONTEXT


See also https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ruben_Fukkink