The Effectiveness of the LAUP Coaching Model

Grecya Lopez, MS Ed.

The Effectiveness of the LAUP Coaching Model

Prepared by Grecya Lopez, MS Ed.
Research and Evaluation Department
Los Angeles Universal Preschool

December 2013

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to provide access to quality preschool to four-year-old children in Los Angeles County. To achieve this goal, LAUP coaches lead teachers and, in some cases, also coaches preschool owners, supervisors, and directors in its network. The LAUP Coaching Model is unique in that all providers in the LAUP network are assigned three coaches: a Program Support Coach, a Fiscal Support Coach, and a Quality Support Coach. Each type of coach targets a specific area of support, but the work of all three coaches is to improve preschool providers' quality so that, in turn, the preschool staff can provide a quality preschool experience to the children they serve.

This study's goal was to describe what all three types of coaching look like and how they are experienced by preschool providers. To reach this goal, we shadowed coaches during their visits with providers and conducted post-visit interviews with both the coaches and providers. We also conducted focus groups to learn more about the tools that Quality Support Coaches use in the field. Data was collected from September 2012 to February 2013.

Coaching preschool providers in the LAUP network is a very personal and complex effort. At its core, it is a service that most providers see as a benefit. There is a certain sense of reassurance that providers get in knowing they have a more experienced and knowledgeable peer available to assist them in their careers as early childhood educators. However, it exists within a high-stakes context—namely, as part of a quality assessment rating system that is tied to funding—and for some coaches, this is perceived as counterproductive to their work of getting providers to make meaningful improvements for children's sake. Some of the most valuable findings are showcased below for quick reference. More information about them is given in the findings section of this report.

Coaches used their specialized training and stylized approaches to deliver customized support to preschool staff. Program Support Coaches spent the bulk of their time in the classroom observing and modeling effective teaching practices during in-person visits with providers. Fiscal Support Coaches spent the bulk of their time outside of the classroom teaching, providing hands-on assistance, and debriefing with providers during in-person visits. Quality Support Coaches spent their visits with providers in the classroom observing, discussing, and in sit-down meetings.

Building and maintaining positive relationships was fundamental to all three types of coaching at LAUP. Evidence of positive, personal, and well-established relationships was apparent across all three types of coaching, and coaches and providers regularly communicated (mostly through email) between in-person visits. Establishing and following up on goals was perceived as highly collaborative by recipients of Program, Fiscal, and Quality Support Coaching. In theory, Program Support Coaching was designed to be collaborative in the establishment and pursuit of goals. Coaches expressed reservations about their ability to enact this part of the model with fidelity; however, the providers that they coached perceived the establishment and pursuit of goals as highly collaborative—more so than did the coaches themselves. Similarly, Fiscal Support Coaching was designed to approach goals and goal-setting in a more prescriptive and less collaborative manner. When asked, Fiscal Coaches also said they had a less collaborative and more directive approach to establishing and working towards goals. However, the providers in the study perceived the fiscal goal-setting process as highly collaborative.

Providers made use of the tools provided by their coaches and considered them to be beneficial. Coaches utilized tools—some tangible and some intangible—to facilitate their coaching efforts with providers. Manuals and trainings on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008) and the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS, ECERS-R; Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2005; FCCERS-R; Harms, Cryer, & Clifford, 2007) were the most integral tools for Program and Quality Support Coaches alike. Besides the CLASS and ERS, Quality Support Coaching involved an array of other tools; Program and Fiscal Support Coaching toolkits were narrower by comparison. For the most part, providers made use of these tools and saw them as beneficial to their preschool program.

Coaches in the field demonstrated fidelity to the LAUP Coaching Model, despite some barriers. All coaches faced barriers in their work with providers. For Program and Quality Support Coaching, lack of child-free time appeared to be the biggest barrier to effective coaching. Barriers to Fiscal Support Coaching included

providers cancelling coaching visits and not following through with goals. However, despite these barriers, we observed evidence of Process Consultation, Appreciative Inquiry, and Servant Leadership enacted in coaches' work with providers.

Recommendations

As LAUP moves toward a national Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) model, we make the following systems-level recommendations based on analysis of the findings in this report:

1. Providers wishing to join the LAUP network currently receive only Program Support Coaching as they are inducted into the network. To help providers understand the goals of Program Coaching, Fiscal Coaching, and Quality Support Coaching, which are essential components of the LAUP model, these three additional types of coaching could be more clearly described to providers before they enter into full contract with LAUP. Further, to encourage cooperation with coaches throughout the year, expectations about a provider's time and participation as a recipient of these coaching services could be more clearly stated and agreed to by all members of the LAUP preschool teaching staff as the program enters or renews a full contract within the LAUP network.

2. Coaches indicated that the current system of funding preschools based on star ratings counteracts their work to offer meaningful and sustainable change. Rather than basing funding on the QRIS, LAUP could consider a set, per-pupil funding model to reduce the heightened and sometimes unproductive focus on a single summative indicator.

3. Because our interviews with coaches and coach supervisors alike indicated that "all providers are different," the coaching "dosage" provided by LAUP Fiscal and Quality Support Coaches (visits per month and number of months/years of coaching) could vary based on the points that providers earn along the QRIS—with more frequent and intense coaching given to providers who score lower along the matrix. Changes in dosage could be considered annually.

4. Because Fiscal Support Coaches indicated that cancellation of coaching visits by providers was a common barrier to their work, a fiscal/business component could be added to the existing QRIS system so that providers are incentivized to work with their Fiscal Support Coach to increase their overall rating. Moreover, a non-monetary stipend could be set (e.g., points earned that can be exchanged for classroom materials, books, toys, etc.) for providers who meet with their coaches as established by the tiered coaching and dosage system.

5. Because we observed unsuccessful attempts to have meaningful verbal exchanges between coaches and teachers while children were present, Program and Quality Support Coaching should continue the practice of observing the teaching team unobtrusively inside the classroom. However, the following practices could be taken outside of the classroom and provided to both the director and all members of the teaching staff when possible: modeling, feedback, debriefing, establishing or following up on goals, and any other discussions about classroom environment and teacher/student interaction.

6. Our findings showed that LAUP coaches make use of the resources and training provided to them by the network. Therefore, LAUP coach supervisors should continue to provide the resources, training, and support that they currently provide to ensure coaches' success in their support of providers.

These recommendations require system-wide changes that would take time to plan and implement. However, when taken together, these changes would promote sustainable and meaningful improvements to ensure the highest-quality early learning experience for children. Further, these changes would allow coaches the freedom to support providers in areas that would most significantly improve their quality, and would help providers approach the type of continuous improvement that places children and families as their top priority.

Introduction

Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to provide access to quality preschool to four-year-old children in Los Angeles County. To achieve this goal, LAUP offers professional development to preschool providers across LA County. One type of professional development offered to preschool providers in the LAUP network is coaching. Coaching is provided predominantly to lead teachers, although in some cases it is provided to owners, supervisors, and directors of preschool programs. The LAUP coaching model is unique in that all providers in the LAUP network are assigned three coaches: a Program Support Coach, a Fiscal Support Coach, and a Quality Support Coach. Each type of coach targets a specific area of support, but the work of all three coaches is to improve the preschool's quality so that, in turn, the preschool can provide a quality experience to the children they serve.

Recently, a largely qualitative study by Mathematica Policy Research (Winston et al., 2012) revealed the complexities of Quality Support Coaching in LAUP. The study left questions about the other two types of coaching in LAUP, namely, Program Support Coaching and Fiscal Support Coaching. This study aims to describe:

- the LAUP Coaching Model,
- the underlying theories behind the LAUP Coaching Model, and
- what each of the three types of coaching looks like when delivered.

This report largely draws from the 2012 Mathematica Study to describe Quality Support Coaching. It fills in the gaps with data collected from the field to describe Program Support Coaching and Fiscal Support Coaching, and to answer additional questions about the Quality Support Coaching tools—both the resources they provide and the intentions behind them. Ultimately, our goal was to meet both the internal and external needs of the LAUP network. Internally, we hope these findings will describe the LAUP Coaching Model to potential funders and providers, and will inform internal efforts as LAUP continues to support preschool centers and family child cares (FCCs). Externally, we hope these findings will contribute to the literature on coaching as a form of quality improvement and professional development in early childhood education—a literature that is in an early stage of development.

A Brief History of LAUP's Coaching Model

When LAUP was founded in 2004, the chief operating officer had a vision for creating quality preschools. He believed that in order to effect positive and sustainable change, we needed to steer away from punitive measures and work to build relationships with preschool providers. He believed that threats and punishment created temporary change. His vision was to get a group of professional, knowledgeable, and experienced individuals to work with preschool providers and coach them towards becoming high-quality programs. This vision of change through positive relationships was the basis for the LAUP Coaching Model, and the model has continued to evolve ever since.

Definition of Coaching

Today, LAUP defines its coaching model as a collaboration between coaches and preschool providers designed to help providers reach their potential by establishing relationships, sharing a wealth of comprehensive services and resources, and making a commitment to high-quality early education. All preschool providers in the network, as well as those providers who meet minimum licensing requirements and intend to join the network, are provided with three types of coaching: Program Support Coaching, Fiscal Support Coaching, and Quality Support Coaching. Each coach utilizes the coaching theories differently based on various factors, including the provider and the task at hand. Although each type of coach serves a different purpose, the ultimate goal of all three types is to help providers improve their preschool's quality, as measured by the LAUP 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System. (See the section titled "5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System" for details.)

Program Support Coaching. After passing licensing requirements, preschool providers intending to join the LAUP network are given a provisional contract for up to ten months. At this point, providers are given Program Support Coaching. The purpose of Program Support Coaching is to ensure that the preschool provider meets the 3-Star minimum (on a 5-Star scale) to transition into a full operational LAUP contract. To do this, the Program Support Coach visits each provider on a weekly basis, working one-on-one with preschool teachers to

observe, model, debrief, and co-create goals with the provider, as well as to offer hands-on assistance, such as helping to set up brand-new classrooms. The Program Support Coach provides professional development for teaching staff on tools such as the Environmental Rating Scales (ERS, ECERS-R; Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2005; FCCERS-R; Harms, Cryer, & Clifford, 2007) and the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008).

Fiscal Support Coaching. Just as the provider works with the Program Support Coach to ensure the quality of her instructional program, the provider is also assigned a Fiscal Support Coach to give financial guidance and oversight. This helps the provider to develop and enhance the financial skills necessary for her use of best business practices and sustainability. Another area of support provided by Fiscal Support Coaching is to help ensure provider fiscal compliance with the LAUP Operating Guidelines. Whereas Program Support Coaches work with classroom teachers, Fiscal Support Coaches tend to work with different point persons (accountants, financial analysts, FCC owners, etc.), depending on the type of provider. Fiscal reporting for an LAUP provider is cyclical and occurs four times a year, in addition to an annual budget submission. Fiscal Support Coaches review and analyze the quarterly report and budget submissions to determine opportunities for coaching. Moreover, in February 2013, LAUP introduced annual fiscal assessments of every agency or provider in the network to evaluate the timeliness, use, and compliance of fiscal reporting and the effectiveness and efficiency of their recordkeeping. Annual fiscal assessments drive the Fiscal Support Coach's development of improvement plan goals for the provider. Communication between Fiscal Support Coaches and providers occurs on-site, over the phone, and/or via email. Fiscal Support Coaches are also available to assist providers who are subject to an Educational Support Review [1] to help them prepare the necessary documentation for the review.

Quality Support Coaching. Once a provider earns a 3-Star minimum rating and transitions into a full contract, they are considered part of the LAUP network. At this point, Quality Support Coaching begins. Several steps are taken to ensure a smooth transition from Program Support Coaching to Quality Support Coaching; steps include a meeting between the two coaches in which pertinent information about the site is discussed, and also include a transition meeting for the provider, in which the Program Support Coach introduces the Quality Support Coach and gives a brief overview of Quality Support Coaching.

Quality Support Coaching is a service given to all providers for as long as they are part of the LAUP network. The purpose of Quality Support Coaching is to ensure that providers either maintain a 3-, 4-, or 5-Star rating or improve to a 4- or 5-Star rating, by building teachers' capacity to improve existing abilities, develop new skills, and gain a deeper understanding of practices for use in the classroom. To do this, the Quality Support Coach conducts monthly on-site observations with teachers, after which they typically debrief and co-create goals for quality improvement. The Quality Support Coach provides additional on-site visits and resources as needed.

Coaches must provide written documentation of the substance of the visit in the form of an activity log, including goals, progress, and next steps; the log is created at the end of each coaching session, or no more than five days after a visit. Goals and activity logs are recorded on a database that is available to all coaches, LAUP administrators, and central staff. See Table 1 for an at-a-glance look at coaching in LAUP.

---

[1] Educational Support Review: A review of financial supporting documentation conducted periodically by an external agency contracted by LAUP.

Table 1. Coaching in LAUP

	Program Support Coaching	Fiscal Coaching	Quality Support Coaching
Who is the coaching provided to?	All providers under provisional contract with LAUP. No opt out.	All providers under provisional contract with LAUP. No opt out.	All providers under full contract with LAUP network. No opt out.
Coach: provider ratio*	1:8	1:50-70	1:19
Typical characteristics of a coach	Female, 35 years old, with strong communication skills, adaptable, flexible, non-controlling, creative, demonstrates a passion for the field, bachelor's degree, 5-6 years of experience in teaching or directing Pre-K program, knowledge of CLASS, ERS, and Pre-K curriculum approved for use within the network.	Male/Female, 35 years old, with a strong accounting and/or finance background, knowledge of financial statements, business and reporting processes, who communicates well with people with or without financial expertise.	Female, 45 years old, articulate, sensitive to needs, reflective, flexible and demonstrates a passion for the field, bachelor's degree, 5-6 years of experience in teaching or directing Pre-K program, knowledge of CLASS, ERS, and Pre-K curriculum approved for use within the network.
Underlying coaching theories	Process Consultation, Appreciative Inquiry, Servant Leadership.	Hybrid between Process Consultation and Monitoring.	Process Consultation, Appreciative Inquiry, Servant Leadership.
What is the main goal?	To ensure that providers who are new to the LAUP network meet the 3-Star minimum to transition into their full contract.	To help ensure fiscal compliance with the LAUP Operating Guidelines and give financial guidance and oversight to develop and enhance financial skills necessary for best business practices.	To build teacher capacity to improve existing abilities, develop new skills, and gain a deeper understanding of practices for use in the classroom.
What is the method of carrying out the main goal?	On-site observation, co-creating goals, and hands-on assistance.	Document analysis of annual fiscal assessment, fiscal reports, and budget submissions; create quality improvement plan goals and measure progress in the areas of best business practices and LAUP compliance; remote and on-site assistance to answer questions and assist providers in completing goals.	On-site observation, debriefing, co-creating goals, and activity logs.
Key roles	Coaches and teachers.	Coaches and: -account manager at school districts -controller or CFO at agencies -director/admin. at small centers -owners and accountants at FCCs	Mostly coaches, teachers, and director/owner/other admin. Sometimes teacher assistants (1/3 of all cases).
Frequency	Weekly for ten months*	As needed for as long as the provider is part of the network.	Monthly (minimum) for as long as the provider is part of the network.
Key coaching tools	ECERS-R manual, FCCERS-R manual, All About [ECERS-R], CLASS manuals, Three Star Checklist, marketing resources, ETO manual.	QuickBooksTM, allocation and cost category examples, funding calculator, break-even analysis and budget versus actual tool (Excel-based), fiscal report and budget examples, fundraising resource guide, business plan resource guide.	ECERS-R manual, FCCERS-R manual, CLASS manual, modeling, video demos, articles, newsletters, books, activity logs.

Note. This information is pulled from interviews with a Program Support Supervisor, two Quality Support Supervisors, and a Fiscal Provider Services Supervisor, conducted in the summer of 2012.
* For 2012-2013.

Theories Underlying the Coaching Model

Generally speaking, coaching is defined as "an adult learning strategy in which the coach promotes the learner's ability to reflect on his or her actions as a means to determine the effectiveness of an action or practice and develop a plan for refinement and use of the action in immediate and future situations" (Rush & Shelden, 2005, p. 1). In early childhood interventions, coaching is intended to provide support and build capacity among practitioners to develop new skills and utilize existing abilities to achieve desired child and family outcomes.

There are two major types of coaching -- "expert coaching" and "peer coaching." The main difference between these two types of coaching is that in expert coaching, a person with more power, experience, or both is responsible for facilitating the coaching process, whereas peer coaching is less directive and more collaborative. The coaching model at LAUP follows the peer coaching approach, as is evident in the three underlying theories upon which its coaching model is built: Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005), Process Consultation (Schein, 1998), and Servant Leadership (Autry, 2001).

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is an organizational development method which focuses on increasing what an organization does well, rather than on eliminating what it does badly. AI involves the collaborative search for the best in people, their organizations, and the world around them. This method involves asking positive questions that strengthen a system's capacity to heighten positive potential; it assumes that every organization and community has many strengths and builds on these, rather than focusing on faults and weaknesses. AI can be broken down into four steps: 1) Discovery - Interviewing and having deep dialogue about strengths, resources, and capabilities with all members of an organization; 2) Dream - Envisioning a better future; 3) Design - Crafting ways towards that better future; and 4) Destiny - Forming teams to carry out the necessary steps.

Process Consultation (PC) is about building a helping relationship. By definition, PC "is the creation of a relationship with the client that permits the client to perceive, understand and act on the process events that occur in the client's internal and external environment in order to improve the situation as defined by the client" (Schein, 1998, p. 20). PC does not provide standard answers or canned solutions, but attempts to involve the client in deciding what will work best to move things forward. The ultimate goal of PC is to pass along the skills so that clients are more able to continue on their own towards improvement. The saying "instead of giving people fish, teach them how to fish" fits this model well.

Servant Leadership (SL) is the idea that managing with respect, honesty, and spirituality empowers employees to be the best they can be. SL recognizes that at the heart of every business, the psychological, emotional, and financial well-being of employees is dependent on leaders, and specifically, on how well leaders create the circumstances and the environment in which they can do their jobs. Autry (2001) identifies five ways to be a Servant Leader: 1) be authentic; 2) be vulnerable; 3) be accepting; 4) be present; 5) be useful. The Servant Leader understands that nothing positive can be accomplished in an organization without the support of those who are to do the "hard work" (p. 116).

Table 2. Theories Behind the LAUP Coaching Model

The LAUP Coaching Model		
Appreciative Inquiry	**Process Consultation**	**Servant Leadership**
Increase what an organization does well rather than eliminate what it does badly.	Instead of giving people fish, teach them how to fish.	Be authentic, be vulnerable, be accepting, be present, be useful.

Sources: Autry, 2001; Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005; Schein, 1998.

Together, these theories are the foundation of the LAUP Coaching Model. In years past, the LAUP Office of Organizational Excellence offered training on each of these theories, but when the office was eliminated,

training on the theories stopped. These theories continue to be enacted, in varying degrees, by Program, Fiscal, and Quality Support Coaches as they work to increase the quality of preschools in the LAUP network.

Coaching in Context

Coaches

During the 2012-13 program year, there were five Program Support Coaches in LAUP, and each had a caseload of about eight preschool providers. The five Program Support Coaches had an average age of 35, and all were female. They were described by supervisors as having strong communication skills, and as being adaptable, flexible, non-controlling, and creative. Program Support Coaches described themselves as patient, tough-skinned, talkative, funny, personable, understanding, flexible, empathetic, creative, caring, organized, passionate, knowledgeable, and broad-shouldered. They believed that these characteristics helped them to do their work and be effective coaches. Program Support Coaches also said that what made them effective in their work was their ability to read people and their gut instincts. These qualities helped them to learn about the providers and "meet them where they are" in order to coach them more effectively. Most Program Support Coaches had: a bachelor's degree (some held higher credentials); 5 to 6 years of experience in teaching and/or directing preschool programs; and knowledge of CLASS, ERS, and various preschool curricula approved for use within the network.

During the 2012-13 program year, there were 19 Quality Support Coaches, and each had a caseload of about 19 providers. These 19 Quality Support Coaches had an average age of 45; all but two were female. They were generally described by supervisors as being articulate, sensitive to needs, reflective, and flexible, and as demonstrating a passion for the field. Most had: a bachelor's degree (some held higher credentials); 5-6 years of experience in teaching and/or directing preschool programs; and knowledge of CLASS, ERS, and various preschool curricula approved for use within the network.

During the 2012-13 program year, there were six Fiscal Support Coaches at LAUP and each had a caseload of between 50 and 70 providers. These six Fiscal Support Coaches had an average age of 35. They were generally described by supervisors as having: a strong accounting and/or finance background; knowledge of financial statements, business, and reporting processes; and the ability to communicate well with people, both with and without financial expertise. Fiscal Support Coaches described themselves as friendly, adaptable to different personalities, and quick to think outside the box when needed.

Coach Resources, Training, and Support

Coaches at LAUP were provided with an abundance of resources, training, and support to ensure that they had what they needed to carry out their work successfully. Coaching policies and procedures were provided to all new and existing coaches. These policies and procedures were updated annually, and included a written description of the role of the coach and coaching procedures for the following:

- enacting the LAUP Coaching Model
- quality support
- establishing goals and entering goals in a database
- activity logs
- conducting quality assurance checks
- coach transition visits

During the last Tuesday of every month, Quality Support Coaches met with colleagues for peer support. During these peer support sessions, Coach Supervisors provided a topic for coaches to discuss amongst themselves. Examples of topics included How to Measure Your Coaching Effectiveness and How to Handle Challenging Situations. Quality Support Coaches discussed, shared practices, and gathered feedback from other coaches, but they were not expected to share what was discussed in groups. The in-office days also provided a chance for coaches to meet with specialists, and for central staff to assist coaches in their work with providers.

Fiscal Support Coaches also offered each other peer support as they reviewed providers' quarterly reports. Once Fiscal Support Coaches reviewed the quarterly reports for providers on their caseloads, they underwent a peer-review process, by which they provided a secondary review of other coaches' quarterly reports. This allowed Fiscal Support Coaches to catch anything that may have been missed and to learn about each other's caseload

in case they needed to assist a provider not currently on their own caseload.

Further, the LAUP Lending Library was available to both providers and central staff. It was a physical space filled with tangible resources (books, brochures, CDs, DVDs, manuals, etc.) within the following categories: Curriculum, English Language Learners, Health and Wellness, Parent Engagement, Special Needs, Social/Emotional, Transition & Articulation, and General Resources. Coaches could borrow resources either for themselves, or on behalf of a provider. As of spring 2013, the Lending Library consisted of just over 1,000 resources. The Lending Library was kept current, and new resources were added annually. Resources in the Lending Library were purchased by the LAUP Program Support Unit and managed by a Program Support Specialist. Focus groups conducted in January 2013 with Quality Support Coaches revealed that the LAUP Lending Library was one major source of the coaching tools that coaches used and offered to providers.

In addition to the Lending Library, an online resource library was created. While the online library was primarily for LAUP coaches, it was also available to all central LAUP staff. It consisted of a series of electronic folders on a shared drive that were accessible to all coaches. As of spring 2013, folders were titled: Curriculum, English Language Learners, Health and Wellness, Mental Health & Special Needs, Parent Engagement, and Transition & Articulation. Each folder included PDF versions of journal articles, flyers, research, checklists, and the like, which coaches could share with providers. Contributions to the lending library were made by specialists, coach supervisors, and coaches themselves whenever they came across a resource that could be scanned and uploaded for later use. Focus groups conducted in January 2013 with Quality Support Coaches revealed that the LAUP Online Resource Library was another major source of the coaching tools that coaches used and offered to providers.

In addition to the tools that LAUP made accessible to its coaches, coach trainings were held every summer for Program, Fiscal, and Quality Support Coaches. The Coach Summer Training Series started in the summer of 2007, when more school district-affiliated preschools stopped functioning on a year-round calendar and coaches were freed from their work in the field. This provided an opportunity to standardize the training that is offered to all coaches. To determine which topics to train coaches on, Coach Supervisors looked at trends in the data that coaches logged during their visits with providers; Coach Supervisors also looked at perceived needs from their Tuesday meetings with coaches, and at the list of needs that they gathered when conducting supervision plans and performance evaluations with individual coaches. Coaches were also trained on changes within the LAUP network (e.g., changes in how Star ratings were calculated). Trainings were full-day (9:00 am to 4:00 pm) and were offered throughout the months of July and August. Since 2008, coaches have been offered training on a range of topics including state licensing for early childhood providers, ERS, CLASS, Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP), and S.M.A.R.T. Goals.[2] (For a full list of training topics since 2008, see Appendix A to this report.) Historically, Fiscal Support Coaches have participated in fewer Coach Summer Training Series sessions than have Program and Quality Support Coaches.

For the most part, coach trainings followed a train-the-trainer model and were delivered by contracted specialists in the field. Specialists were drawn in from across the nation and included university professors, directors, and associates from well-known, established organizations in the field of early education.

Because, as previously mentioned, the LAUP Office of Organizational Excellence was eliminated along with direct training on the LAUP Coaching Model, newly hired coaches were given the following books, one for each of the underlying theories in the model:

• Process Consultation Revisited: Building the Helping Relationship (Schein, 1999)
• Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005)
• The Servant Leader (Autry, 2001)

The LAUP Coaching Model was also woven into various other coach trainings provided throughout the year and during the Coach Summer Training Series. Coaches could learn more about the LAUP model by reaching out to supervisors to support their understanding of the model and by shadowing other coaches to see how they used the LAUP Coaching Model.

[2] Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Tangible (S.M.A.R.T.) Goals: These goals are guides for setting objectives for project management, performance management, or personal development.

Coach Supervision Plan

Coach supervision was slightly different for each coach type. The supervision plan for Program Support Coaching consisted of coach shadows on an as-needed basis, and monthly "case management" meetings with each coach to discuss their caseload and offer them support and supervision.

The supervision plan for Fiscal Support Coaching consisted of quarterly meetings with fiscal coaches, on an individual basis, to discuss providers' goals and progress toward those goals. Also conducted quarterly were supervisory spot-check reviews of each coach's caseload of quarterly fiscal reports. On a monthly basis, case management meetings between supervisors and individual Fiscal Support Coaches were held to discuss all fiscal evaluation visits for the prior month. On a weekly basis, supervisors reviewed each coach's schedule of visits with providers to check for timeliness of the visits and to ensure that all priorities and deadlines, as established by supervisors, were met.

Quality Support Coaches established a three-tiered supervision plan that included the following: 1) data reporting reviews, 2) coach shadows, and 3) provider check-ins. Data reporting reviews were conducted with each coach on a quarterly basis, and as needed to determine the coach's ability to capture markers of quality support and coach's timeliness of documentation (within five days of a visit to a provider). Coaches were shadowed by a supervisor twice a year, and as needed to determine the coach's ability to implement the LAUP Coaching Model using LAUP Coaching Policies and Procedures; feedback was provided after these shadowing sessions. Provider check-ins were conducted once a quarter, and as needed to provide one-on-one support to coaches in the areas of data entry, provider support, and LAUP Coaching Policies and Procedures.

LAUP 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System

LAUP rated preschool providers' classrooms along a 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System. This quality assessment system served three purposes: 1) to assist parents and providers in understanding the differences in quality in the system of early care and education; 2) to determine the amount of reimbursement for services; and 3) as the foundation for identifying training and technical assistance needs in order to improve program quality. The following factors were folded into the ratings:

- Lead Teacher Qualifications
- Other Teacher Qualifications
- CLASS Scores
- ERS Scores

Points were allotted to each of these areas and the points were converted to stars. Only providers with classrooms that earned a 3-Star rating or higher were part of the network. Per-child funding increased with every star—the higher the star, the higher the funding from LAUP. As of February 2013, 27% of provider classrooms had a 3-Star rating, 65% of provider classrooms had a 4-Star rating, and 8% of provider classrooms had a 5-Star rating.

Providers

The LAUP network worked with two major types of providers: center-based (represented by 73% of providers in the LAUP network in 2012-13), and family child care centers (FCC) (represented by 27% of providers in the LAUP network in 2012-13). Within these two types of providers, there several categories, including private, public, school-affiliated, and faith-based programs. Since its inception in 2004, LAUP has funded over 460 different providers. During the 2012-13 program year, the LAUP network consisted of 308 providers. The providers served an ethnically and linguistically diverse group of children. As of February 2013, LAUP providers served 64% Hispanic/Latino, 9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 7% African American, and 7% White children.[3] English was not the primary language of 42% of children served; Spanish was the primary language of 36% of children served and another 6% spoke another primary language.[4] Of these children, 14.1% came from households with an annual income of less than $10,000, 30% came from households between $10,000 and $29,999,

---

[3] Ethnicity not reported for the remaining children.
[4] "Other" languages are: Arabic, Armenian, Bangla, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Cambodian/Khmer, Cantonese, Catalan, Chinese dialects, Farsi, Finnish, French, Fukienese, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hmong, Indonesian, Japanese, Kannada, Kazakh, Korean, Mandarin, Norwegian, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Samoan, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu, Tigrinya, Urdu, and Vietnamese.

13.7% came from households between $30,000 and $49,999, 10.4% came from households between $50,000 and $74,999, and 6.5% came from households with an annual income of $75,000 or more.[5]

Neither providers looking to join the network, nor those already in the network, could decline the coaching services. Providers were typically introduced to the coaching component of the LAUP network during the application process. In the application, providers were to check a box to agree to "participate in LAUP coaching and develop a quality improvement plan" before signing and submitting. Program Support Coaching was temporary (10 months) for providers on a provisional contract who wished to permanently join the network. Fiscal and Quality Support Coaching were provided indefinitely to providers on a full contract, for as long as they were part of the LAUP network. In addition, even though two of the three types of coaching were provided directly to teachers, commitment to join the network, and to be coached, was made at the program level.

For all of these reasons, there was variability in the degree to which providers were willing to cooperate and work closely with LAUP coaches. Providers ranged from easy to difficult to coach. What made providers easy to coach varied for each type of coach. For LAUP Program Support Coaches, easy providers were eager, wanted to figure things out for themselves, had administrators who set a high value on the coaching, and had a good understanding of the ERS and CLASS tools. For LAUP Fiscal Support Coaches, easy providers submitted quarterly reports on time, attended the trainings provided by LAUP Fiscal Provider Services, used QuickBooks[TM] [6], and saw the importance of being financially viable. For LAUP Quality Support Coaches, easy providers were willing to learn, valued children, parents, and their program, and had administrators who set a high value on the coaching.

What made providers difficult to coach also varied slightly depending on the type of coach. Program Support Coaches found programs with back-to-back AM and PM sessions the most difficult to coach, due to the lack of child-free time. Program Support Coaches added that difficult providers included those who had a lot to achieve (e.g., who had an empty classroom with no children), or those who worked under an administration that was unsupportive of coaching or that had a varied understanding of the ERS and CLASS tools. LAUP Fiscal Support Coaches found providers who ran "shoebox accounting" practices and gave low priority to finances and budgeting the most difficult to work with. As one Fiscal Support Coach put it, "Sometimes they tend to get caught up with the teaching aspect of the program and forget the fact that they are running a business." LAUP Quality Support Coaches found that difficult providers were slow to learn and implement, had a lot to figure out, and did not know where to begin. They were careful to point out that it was not the providers themselves who were difficult, but that sometimes their system made coaching them difficult. Difficult systems were sites with back-to-back AM and PM sessions, where child-free time was rare and opportunities for effective coaching were lost.

So far, this report has described the history of the LAUP Coaching Model, including its three underlying theories; policies and procedures for enacting the LAUP Coaching Model; resources, training and support provided to coaches; and the coach supervision plan ensuring that the LAUP Coaching Model is implemented as intended. We have also described the context in which the model exists, the providers in our network, and the children they serve. We turn next to a description of how LAUP Coaching actually looks when enacted and how it is experienced by providers. Our description of Quality Support Coaching will pull largely from the Mathematica Policy Research study (Winston et al., 2012). Our description of Quality Support Coaching tools, Program Support Coaching, and Fiscal Support Coaching will come from our empirical research.

Finding: Observing, modeling, and walk-and-talk are the most prominent activities in Program Support Coaching.

Findings about coaching activities and use of time were informed by direct observation of 21 hours and 48 minutes of LAUP Program Support Coaching. Recall that Program Support Coaching was offered for ten months to providers with a professional contract who were interested in joining the LAUP network. Its purpose was to ensure that the preschool met the 3-Star minimum to transition into a full operational contract. Program

[5] Income not reported for the remaining children.
[6] QuickBooks Online[TM] is a small business accounting software package. It is preferred by LAUP for use by providers in the network because it is user-friendly and has the capacity to offer remote assistance.

Support Coaching occurred mostly with the lead teacher, inside the preschool classroom, while children were present. A typical visit was 3.5 hours. However, Program Support Coaching was delivered for an average of 2 hours and 42 minutes per visit. Classroom visits usually started with a check-in. Check-ins were typically quick, one-question exchanges: "How are things going?" or "How have transitions gone since last week?" One Program Support Coach said, "With the more comfortable ones, I share what my plans for the visit will be." Table 3 shows a breakdown of how Program Support Coaches used their time during visits with providers.

Table 3. Program Support Coaching Use of Time During In-Person Visits

Activity	Average # of Minutes	Average % Time*
Observing	54	33%
Modeling	43	27%
Walk-and-Talk	14	9%
Hands-On	13	8%
Training	12	7%
Debriefing	9	6%
Other	9	6%
Goals	6	4%

Source: Eight shadows with Program Support Coaches, October 2012-February 2013.
* Notes: Out of an average visit with a duration of 2 hours and 42 minutes.

Coaches typically observed after they checked in. Based on data collected by our shadows, Program Support Coaches spent 33% of their time observing (or 54 minutes out of a 2-hour, 42-minute visit). The manner in which the coaches conducted their observations varied by coach, by provider, and by what the coach was observing (teacher/student interaction or the environment). For the most part, Program Support Coaches observed teacher/student interactions by taking a seat near the children, yet removed enough to keep from verbally interacting with them (e.g., behind all the children at story time, or just outside the circle of children at circle time). The coach took notes on paper about what she saw and heard. Less common but still conducted were observations of the classroom environment. Program Support Coaches observed the environment with the ECERS manual and a notepad at hand. During rug or circle time, when classroom centers were not occupied by children, it was common to see the Program Support Coach visit a center (for example, the classroom library), look through and pull out a book, open and flip through it, open and flip through the ECERS manual, jot down notes on their notepad, and move onto another center to repeat. Program Support Coaches shared their observation notes during the debriefing with the teacher (which we will describe in detail later in this report). In addition, they used the notes taken to help them write up the activity log, which they shared with the provider after the visit.

Our shadows of Program Support Coaches reported that coaches spent another 27% of their visit (or 43 minutes out of a 2-hour, 42-minute visit) modeling for the teacher or teaching team. Modeling by Program Support Coaches was subtle and occurred as the coach interacted either one-on-one or with a small group of children. For modeling to be effective, the teacher or other members of the teaching team needed to be in close proximity, in order to see and hear the coach during her interaction with the child(ren). The following excerpt demonstrates how a Program Support Coach modeled the CLASS dimensions of concept development and quality of feedback with three boys:

(Program Support Coach pulls up a chair to join the teacher and 4 children (3 boys and 1 girl) at a table. They are about to make slime. The teacher is silently helping the only girl in the group to put on a smock. The three boys are waiting for help with their smock.)

Program Support Coach: Can I help you with your smock?
Boy: He is my friend.

(Continues on next page…)

Program Support Coach:	How is he your friend? What does he do to be your friend?
Boy:	He helps me.
Program Support Coach:	What else does he do?

(Coach continues to chat with the boy as she helps him with his smock.)

In this example, the coach also modeled ways to keep transitions productive; she engaged the boys in talk while they waited for the teacher to come around and help them with their smocks. Modeling by Program Support Coaches was never announced and appeared to be unplanned or to occur when the opportunity presented itself. As one Program Support Coach put it during our interview, "We do modeling whether they ask or not. Sometimes it's spontaneous." Other Program Support Coaches are more intentional about modeling, as reflected in the following quote from an interview with a Program Support Coach who was not shadowed: "I tell teachers to try and observe me when I'm interacting with the kids because it may not seem like it but everything I do is intentional." Nonetheless, during our shadows, Program Support Coaches always made it a point to refer back to their interactions with children and frame them as models of certain CLASS-related techniques or strategies.

Our shadows of Program Support Coaches show that coaches spent another 9% of their time (14 minutes out of a 2-hour, 42-minute visit) in what coaches referred to as walk-and-talk. This was an activity in which the teacher continued her normal work, interacting with and offering hands-on assistance to children who were typically engaged in individual or group work/play, while the coach followed the teacher, staying close enough to have a meaningful, verbal exchange. In the following example, the coach used walk-and-talk to teach about the ECERS items of space for gross motor play, gross motor equipment, and supervision of gross motor activities as the teacher supervised outdoor play:

Program Support Coach:	How high is this structure?
Teacher:	I don't remember. I will have to check.
Program Support Coach:	It needs a certain number of inches of sand depending on the height of the structure… you need to ensure that they are using the equipment correctly. Lori[7] just came over and I tried to demonstrate to her how to use her hips to keep the hula hoop spinning around her body. That's one thing that they look for. You helping them learn how to apply their gross motor skills—it helps them learn.

Based on our coach shadows, teachers appeared receptive to walk-and-talk as a method of coaching. In the following example, the teacher encouraged the coach to continue with the walk-and-talk as she was being pulled in many directions by children in the classroom:

(The Program Support Coach walks over to the art table where the teacher is wrapping hand-made holiday gifts that the children have made and will take home.)

Program Support Coach:	I know you only have two more days [before the holiday break] but the one thing you can work on when you come back in January is the handwashing.

(The Program Support Coach notices that the teacher is busy walking back and forth from the art table to the closets near the back of the room.)

Program Support Coach:	I'm just gonna follow you.
Teacher:	Please. Keep talking. I'm listening.
Program Support Coach:	You can talk to the TA about this but handwashing needs to be supervised and it needs to be for 20 seconds or more. You can do hand sanitizer, but if you use it, make sure you are following directions.

(Continues on the next page…)

---

[7] We have replaced the real names of people and places with pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality.

(The teacher continues to listen and periodically nods to agree and says, "Right," to the Program Support Coach to let her know that she is listening as she continues to cut paper and yarn and travels back and forth between the art table and the supply closet in back of the room.)

Teacher:	It's so hard!
Program Support Coach:	I know.
Teacher:	I don't know what else to do. So what else? There's the handwashing but that's always an issue!
Program Support Coach:	Yeah so talk with [the TA]…

During walk-and-talks, coaches followed up on goals or strategies that may have been suggested for use in an earlier visit, offered suggestions, asked questions, or engaged in another discussion with the teacher. In essence, any aspect related to coaching that could not be conducted during a sit-down meeting was conducted during a walk-and-talk.

Our shadows of Program Support Coaches show that coaches spent an average of 8% of their time (13 minutes out of an average 2-hour, 42-minute visit) delivering hands-on assistance to the teacher. Hands-on assistance, in essence, was when the coach took on the role of a Teacher's Assistant. The types of hands-on assistance observed during our coach shadows included, but were not limited to:

• Rolling up children's sleeves for handwashing
• Putting children's coats on for outdoor play on cold days
• Redirecting children to other centers when centers reached their maximum occupancy
• Mediating minor disputes between children
• Writing children's names on their work
• Fixing toys that were not working properly

For coaches, delivering hands-on assistance was a way to maintain their relationship and build trust with the provider. Coach Supervisors saw it as an inevitable part of coaching and as a means of establishing a helpful relationship and being a Servant Leader.

Out of eight shadows with Program Support Coaches, one training was observed. The training ran for 1 hour and 45 minutes, during which the Program Support Coach trained the lead teacher and two other teachers in the classroom, focusing on the CLASS or the ERS. Training took place in the classroom once children were sent home. The coach and the teachers sat around a table with a manual at hand (CLASS or ERS) and used a computer to stream video online. Unlike other Program Support Coaching activities covered so far, training did not typically occur during every coach visit.

Our shadows of Program Support Coaches show that coaches spent an average of 6% of their time (9 minutes out of an average 2-hour, 42-minute visit) debriefing with the teacher, and 4% of their time (6 minutes out of an average 2-hour, 42-minute visit) discussing, establishing, or following up on open goals. Debriefing was typically child-free, and occurred at the end of the visit in all but one of our eight shadows with Program Support Coaches. Debriefing was sometimes combined with discussion of goals, as captured in the following excerpt:

(All children have been picked up and the teacher begins to return various pieces of furniture back to their place. The Program Support Coach approaches the teacher and asks her a question.)

Program Support Coach:	Do you have time to debrief?
Teacher:	Yes! Yes! I'm ready when you are.
TA:	Should I come too?
Teacher:	Yes. You need to listen too. If I get in trouble it's your fault. It's always your fault. *(Joking tone.)*

(Teacher, Program Support Coach, and TA pull up a chair and sit facing each other in a small circle.)

(Continues on the next page…)

Program Support Coach:	*(To Teacher)* So I was observing for open goals. I was looking at your transitions and using them for learning opportunities. I noticed you just called names. You can think of quick ways to do for example, 'If you're wearing blue…' so you use transitions for learning opportunities. Be more specific, not just, 'good job.' I heard a lot of that. The actual goal was to ask three why or how questions during free play. While I was looking at interactions, I heard a lot of those questions which is good. I heard, 'How is this a power ranger?' 'How did you do that?'
Program Support Coach:	*(To TA)* You also gave them choices when the girls were dancing you asked them to choose a song and that's good.
TA:	Oh good because I'm still learning.
Program Support Coach:	That's great teacher Nora![8]
Teacher:	What about today for example? We had the assembly and we couldn't go out because of the rain.
Program Support Coach:	The one hour, ten minutes of free play is a must. So maybe you could use the journal as a center. Ask them, your journals are also here if you want to draw in them.
Teacher:	Because that's one I didn't know.
Program Support Coach:	When you did the bean bags and hoop toss, that was good. I also observed lots of language modeling. You used other words to describe new words and that's really good. Just another thing I want to point out is directives. 'Don't do this, don't do that.' I want to steer away from that. Instead, start with why. 'Let's try to be safe.' Saying it in a more positive way.

In this example of debriefing, the coach took time to share what she had observed in the classroom that day as it related to the goals that had been established at a prior visit. The coach balanced her feedback by both highlighting what the teacher did well and making suggestions for what needed improvement. The coach always referenced the notes that she took during her observation as evidence of what was "good" and what needed improvement. And the teacher had opportunities to ask questions or get clarification during this debriefing session—an indicator that this time to debrief was beneficial for her. During our interviews with all Program Support Coaches, we gathered that the debriefing session and discussion of goals was conducted differently by different coaches. In fact, during our interviews with Program Support Coaches, they used the word "debrief" as a catch-all for an array of activities including: feedback, checking the status of goals, teaching based on where providers are along the goal, and establishing new goals.

The remaining time (6%) was spent on a variety of other activities, most of which can best be described as administrative tasks. One coach described, "If they have a question about LAUP we spend time on that so, 'Who do I give this to?' – type of stuff." We observed the following administrative tasks during our shadows of Program Support Coaches:

- Collection of Child Enrollment Forms
- Correcting ETO (attendance system) errors during visits
- Computer and internet set-up in preparation for training
- Typing up activity logs during visits
- Scheduling future visits

On average across the eight visits, Program Support Coaches spent 36% of their time talking with teachers, 10% of their time talking with TAs, and 10% of their time talking with a director, owner, or other administrator. The coaches spent 37% of their time talking with students. This appears rather high (notably, one percentage point higher than their interaction with teachers); the high percentage of student talk is mainly due to the Program Support Coach style of modeling for the teacher, which coaches typically performed by verbally interacting with children.[9]

---

[8] We have replaced the real names of people and places with pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality.
[9] The remaining 7% of time was non-verbal.

Finding: One Program Support Coach said "There is a lot of trust involved in this work" when asked about building and maintaining relationships with providers. All Program Support Coaches agreed about the need to establish a relationship with their providers in order to be an effective coach.

Program Support Coaches saw trust as the foundation upon which their work was built. Establishing rapport and a good and friendly relationship were perceived as leading to trust, which they saw as necessary for providers in taking risks, trying new strategies, and implementing change in their program. One coach said, "They need to trust us and step outside the comfort [zone] in trying different strategies that they're not accustomed to." Some saw it as necessary not only for the recipient of the coaching (the provider) but for themselves, in terms of customizing their approach with each provider. Another Program Support Coach said, "Working together to implement change can be personal. You learn how to share information with each provider so they're receptive to implement the feedback you provide." Another echoed, "When you have a good relationship, I'm more comfortable in giving suggestions, and they're more receptive to it."

Program Support Coaches felt, and providers confirmed, that they had a good relationship with providers. We asked Program Support Coaches to rate their relationships with their providers (overall) on a 5-point scale where "Poor"= 1 and "Excellent"= 5. No coach rated her relationship with her providers as poor; relationships ranged from "Between Fair and Good" to "Excellent," with an average of 4.1. Similarly, providers rated their relationships with coaches as positive, with an average of 3.75 on the same 5-point scale. Moreover, teachers reported many positive aspects about their relationships with their Program Support Coaches. See Table 4 for findings of our interviews with four teachers about their relationships with their Program Support Coaches.

Table 4. Program Support Coaching Use of Time During In-Person Visits

	Number of Providers Who Responded…			
	Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Always True
I feel free to discuss classroom challenges with my Program Support Coach				4
My Program Support Coach is someone I trust				4
My Program Support Coach truly wants to help me			1	3
My Program Support Coach shows me respect				4
My relationship with my Program Support Coach motivates me to improve classroom practice			1	3

Source: Interviews with four providers, November 2012-March 2013.

All teachers indicated that it was "always true" that they felt free to discuss classroom challenges with their coach, that their coach was someone whom they could trust, that their coach showed them respect, and that their relationship with their coach was strictly professional. Most teachers (75%) indicated it was "always true" that their program support coaches truly wanted to help them; one teacher (25%) indicated it was "sometimes true" that her program support coach truly wanted to help her. Most teachers (75%) indicated it was "always true" that their relationships with their program support coaches motivated them to improve their classroom practice; one teacher (25%) indicated it was "sometimes true" that her program support coach motivated her to improve her classroom practice.

We started to shadow Program Support Coaches well into the program year, when relationships had been established, and "getting to know you" meetings and conversations had already occurred. Thus, the data we captured did not reveal how relationships between a coach and provider were established. However, our data

did allow us to see examples of how these relationships were maintained. One indicator of a positive relationship is the degree to which people communicate about personal, non-work-related matters. Our shadows of Program Support Coaches revealed that coaches and providers communicated about personal, non-work-related matters often, but for brief periods at a time. Some of these brief, personal conversations were initiated by the coach, and some were initiated by the provider. Below are two examples of personal conversations reported by coach shadows.

Example of a Coach-Initiated Personal Conversation:

(Teacher and Coach overhear two girls acting out Spanish language soap operas or Telenovelas in the dramatic play area.)

Teacher:	These girls always act out their Telenovelas.
Coach:	I don't watch [tele]novelas anymore. I used to as a kid because that is all my grandma watched on TV.
Teacher:	I don't watch either. My son won't let me. He'll say, "This is a girl's program."

Example of a Provider-Initiated Personal Conversation:

(Coach and TA start a side conversation while waiting for kids to join the rug.)

TA:	*(To Coach)* When my daughter was a little girl, I asked her, "Do you speak Spanish?" And she said, "No. I speak normal."

(Coach and TA laugh out loud.)

TA:	She's all grown up now. She's in college. She volunteers here when she's off. She's studying child development too. I think you met her one day. She was the young skinny girl who was here that one time working with…

The frequency in communication about personal matters varied by coach, the provider with whom they met, and the purpose of the visit. Out of two coaches who were shadowed, one coach initiated more personal conversations than the other coach (6 vs. 4), but together, Program Support Coaches initiated more personal conversations (10) than providers (6). Coaches also used other methods for maintaining relationships with their providers, including hugging members of the teaching team upon entering the classroom and keeping in touch with providers between weekly meetings. All five Program Support Coaches who were interviewed said that they kept in touch mostly via email.

Overall, all four providers involved in our shadows of Program Support Coaches felt free to discuss challenges with their Program Support Coach and felt that their Program Support Coach was someone they could trust and who showed them respect.

Finding: Program support goal-setting was a collaborative process.

During our shadowing of Program Support Coaching, we observed six goals being established and 15 occurrences of the coach following up on an open or previously established goal. Our shadows also showed that goals and goal-setting were often combined with the debriefing session with providers, typically at the end of the visit when children had all been picked up. The time spent discussing goals was very brief and occurred in snippets. Our interviews with Program Support Coaches showed that discussion of goals and goal-setting occurred differently across coaches and that this often depended on the provider.

Program Support Coaches were asked to rate a series of sentences about goals and goal-setting on a 4-point scale from "never true" to "always true" (see Table 5). All statements were worded in a positive tone and all represented some aspect of the AI, PC, and SL theories of coaching.

Table 5. Program Support Coaches' Views on Establishing Goals

	Number of Coaches Who Responded…			
	Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Always True
I consider providers' views when setting goals			2	3
I take time to understand my provider, their circumstances, and the goals they want to achieve			2	3
I understand that my providers have existing knowledge and experience and help them build on that			1	4
I identify the good in my provider			3	2
My providers' goals are manageable			1	4

Source: Interviews with five program support coaches, November 2012.

All coaches found the statements to be "sometimes" or "always true" with regard to how they established goals. Although the majority of coaches found it "always true" that they considered providers' views when setting goals, a few found the statement "sometimes true." One coach explained that it was sometimes true because, she said, "I ask them to think of their goals first and I also guide them or shine the light on areas where they need help on [sic]." Similarly, although the majority of coaches found it "always true" that they took time to understand their provider, their circumstances, and the goals they wanted to achieve, some coaches found the statement to be "sometimes true." One coach explained:

> *"It's hard. So many goals are non-negotiable because it's about meeting baseline requirements to be part of the network. I sympathize, but I have to do my job and this is what you and I have to do together."*

Providers were asked to rate a series of sentences about goals and goal-setting, very similar to those we posed to Program Support Coaches, on a 4-point scale from "never true" to "always true." Of the four providers interviewed, one abstained from answering these questions because she had just been assigned as the official lead teacher to the LAUP classroom and had inherited the goals that had been established between the coach and the temporary teacher who was there prior to her arrival. Like the coaches, all providers found goal setting to be a collaborative process and found the statements to be "sometimes" or "always true" with regard to how they established goals.

Table 6. Program Support Coaches' Views on Establishing Goals

	Number of Providers Who Responded…			
	Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Always True
My Program Support Coach considers my views			3	
My Program Support Coach takes time to understand me, my circumstances, and the goals I want to achieve				3
My Program Support Coach understands my existing knowledge and experience and helps me build on that			2	1
My Program Support Coach identifies good practices I do			2	1
The goals we set for this year are manageable				3

Source: Interviews with four providers, November 2012-March 2013. One provider did not answer these questions.

All teachers who responded said it was "always true" that the Program Support Coach took time to understand them, their circumstances, and the goals they wanted to achieve. All teachers who responded said it was "always true" that the goals they set for the year were manageable. All teachers who responded said it was "sometimes true" that the Program Support Coach considered their views when working together to set goals. Two teachers indicated it was "sometimes true" and one teacher said it was "always true" that their Program Support Coach understood their existing knowledge and experience and helped them to build on that when establishing goals. Two teachers indicated it was "sometimes true" and one teacher said it was "always true" that their Program Support Coach identified their good practices when setting goals together.

Program Support Coaches were asked to identify the statement that best applied to them in terms of setting goals. The statements were as follows: 1. The goals we set were a result of my direction primarily and did not take into account my providers' views; 2. The goals we set were a result of my providers' direction primarily and did not take into account my views; and 3. The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my providers. Three of the five Program Support Coaches said that the statement "The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my providers" best applied to them in their approach to setting goals. As one coach put it, "If they don't feel they were part of goal making they won't own it or work towards it." One Program Support Coach considered their approach to setting goals to be a combination of the first and the third statement. The final Program Support Coach said that setting goals was a combination of the last two statements. In summary, all Program Support Coaches thought, some more than others, that goal setting was a collaborative process.

For the most part, providers agreed with Program Support Coaches that goal setting was a collaborative process. The four providers involved in our Program Support Coach shadows were given parallel statements and asked to select the statement that they agreed with the most. The statements were as follows: 1. The goals we set were a result of my coach's direction primarily and did not take into account my views; 2. The goals we set were a result of my own direction primarily and did not take into account my coach's views; and 3. The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my coach. Three of the four providers interviewed selected, "The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my coach" as the statement that best applied to their experience. The fourth provider selected, "The goals we set were a result of my coach's direction primarily and did not take into account my views" as the statement that best applied to her experience. The teacher elaborated, "Because I never set the goals. I was more or less told what they would be." This statement was made by the same teacher who had just been assigned as the official lead teacher to the LAUP classroom, who had inherited the goals that had been established between the Program Support Coach and the temporary teacher who was there prior to her arrival.

Finding: Program Support Coaching tools were perceived as "very useful" by providers.

One Program Support Coach stated, "I always try to leave them with resources. Even if it's just ideas for activities for circle time or the science center I give them new ideas to spark their interest if I notice that they are having a hard time." As of November 2012, after Program Support Coaches had been working with providers for three months, Program Support Coaches had collectively used the following tools with providers:

- Articles
- Books
- Directions on how to make (a school garden, crafts, etc.)
- Information about the Teacher Institute and other trainings
- List of outdoor materials
- Literacy packs
- Manual: CLASS
- Manual: ERS
- Open-ended question lists
- Personal experiences
- Strategies for enhancing circle time
- Strategies for incorporating cooking into the classroom
- Strategies for incorporating open-ended questions
- Strategies for incorporating science into the classroom
- Strategies for literacy and language development
- Suggestions for materials to use in different centers
- Training: CLASS
- Training: ERS
- Training: ETO (web-based system for taking attendance)

Program Support Coaches named both tangible and intangible tools in their toolkit. Most of the tangible tools were obtained from various sources, including the LAUP Lending Library, the LAUP Resource Library, and various websites.

The four providers we shadowed were asked how useful they had found the tools to be. All four providers said they found the tools to be "very useful" on a 3-point scale ("not useful," "somewhat useful," "very useful"). When providers were asked to describe how they utilized the tools provided to them by their Program Support Coach, all providers mentioned a change they had made in their classroom environment based on the ERS tool. One preschool provider said, "In the art area I bought a table, we got things out of the cabinet and put them in shelves to make them accessible to the kids," while another preschool provider said, "We added a pillow for one child that was having a hard time sitting during circle time."

Finding: Lack of child-free time was the biggest barrier to effective Program Support Coaching.

During our shadowing of Program Support Coaches, lack of child-free time appeared as the biggest barrier to coaching. We observed ten occasions where Program Support Coaching was interrupted by children. In the following example, the coach attempted to have a walk-and-talk session and the teacher had to pull herself away from it in order to tend to the children:

Program Support Coach:	The reason she has these here is because these are considered hollow blocks…let [the site supervisor] know that at the very least we can flip this out.
Teacher:	Want me to be honest? I don't like the science area there…I mean, I'd like to take it there because they know how to come here for blocks. We'll have this conversation with [the site supervisor].
Program Support Coach:	Another thing is…

(Continues on next page…)

(Teacher walks over to the dramatic play area.)

Teacher: Boys and girls, how many people are allowed in here at once? How many people?

(Coach attempts to try to keep talking about the room configuration in preparation for the ECERS assessment. However, the coach is once again interrupted by the teacher who wants to make sure that children are taking turns in the dramatic play center.)

In the next example, the children were at free play at various centers throughout the room. The Program Support Coach and the TA were sitting down at one center, brainstorming ways to ensure proper health routine practices – namely, handwashing:

Program Support Coach: One thing is to use the sanitizer... and then after snack….
Boy: *(To TA)* He punched my stomach!

(TA stands up and goes to rug where the accused boy is sitting. TA never returns to continue the conversation with the Program Support Coach.)

In this last example, children are at free play at various centers throughout the room, and the coach approaches the teacher, who is at one center:

Program Support Coach: Do you have any questions about CLASS? You guys are already doing a very good job with transitions and telling them, "This is what we're going to do."
Teacher: No. I can't think of anything.
Boy: Teacher I can't find this–

(The boy points to a noodle maker that comes with the play dough kit. It is missing a part. The teacher stands to help him find it. And the conversation between the teacher and coach is over.)

Lack of child-free time was not only identified as a barrier to effective Program Support Coaching; it was also identified as the most difficult aspect of Program Support Coaching by two of the five coaches during our interviews with them. The three other coaches had the following to say about the most difficult part of their job:

"This is not true for me right now, but when we do a new site so much is needed in a short period. Learning [LAUP] operating guidelines, ECERS, visits, lots to teach them. Our caseload is very tight. There's a lot to do. But it's doable. I mean, our job is getting them ready to go. But, it's a lot."

"One of the difficult aspects of Program Support Coaching is having a variety of providers; no two are the same, so it can be challenging to be individualized and meet all of their needs to the best of my ability."

"I have two sites where I feel the teachers are holding back. As a coach I'm offering feedback stemming from ECERS, CLASS, [LAUP] Operating Guidelines. Teachers hold back because they're being told to run their program differently. They want to follow their program and their guidelines and we're coming in telling them something different, so it's almost like they feel stuck."

This difference in philosophy between the preschool programs and the LAUP teachings (as informed by the CLASS, ERS, and LAUP Operating Guidelines) was observed several times during our coach shadows. The excerpt below is one example:

(The Program Support Coach and owner sit in an empty classroom to debrief.)

(Continues on next page…)

Program Support Coach:	I don't see the 70 minutes of free choice. You've got to cut either before or after circle time to get in some free time.
Owner:	How about 15 minutes after circle time then they go back?
Program Support Coach:	That still takes you up to only 45 minutes.
Owner:	So, are you saying that they get too much instruction and need more play? *(Owner looks in shock. Eyes wide open.)*
Program Support Coach:	In a nutshell, yes.
Owner:	Ok… *(Still looks in shock.)*

Finding: Program Support Coaches showed fidelity to the LAUP Coaching Model despite barriers.

There was a sense of urgency in having only ten months to get providers ready to meet the requirements necessary to be part of the LAUP network, and Program Support Coaches thought this worked against them in terms of their ability to be true to the theories of AI, PC, and SL. One Program Support Coach said about the providers in her caseload and her work with them, "It's difficult because they're starting points. They rely a lot on us. We have to get them done. They'll ask, 'Well what do you think I need to work on?' They kind of want you to tell them." The difficulty of being truly collaborative in the coaching process emerged in our interviews with Program Support Coaches and their providers. Recall that when Program Support Coaches were asked to identify the statement that best applied to them in terms of setting goals, some coaches (and one provider) saw goal setting as less cooperative than others.

As difficult as the Program Support Coaches said it was to enact the model with fidelity, we did find examples throughout our shadows of how Program Support Coaches enacted the theories of Appreciative Inquiry, Process Consultation, and Servant Leadership. Table 7 captures a few examples from the field:

Table 7. LAUP Coaching Model in Action; Program Support Coaching

In Theory Theoretical Principles	In Action Examples From the Field
Appreciative Inquiry Increase what an organization does well rather than eliminate what it does badly.	*"Do you have any questions about CLASS? You guys already do a very good job with transitions and telling them 'This is what we're going to do.'"* *"You are already doing connections to the real world. What can you work more on?"* *"Let's talk about what you are already doing to get us to how you can get up to 70 minutes."*
Process Consultation Instead of giving people fish, teach them how to fish.	*"Logical relation is tricky. Pose a question a little differently. For example, when you shared a picture of a caterpillar, you said, 'What does the caterpillar look like?' You know that they know the caterpillar looks like a worm. What you could ask is, 'How do you know?' Ask them to explain their reasoning."* *"And again, my role is to offer suggestions but it's ultimately your goal."* *"I was looking at your transitions and using them for learning opportunities. I noticed you just called names. Think of quick ways to do, for example, 'If you're wearing blue…' So you use transitions for learning opportunities."*
Servant Leadership Be authentic, be vulnerable, be accepting, be present, and be useful.	*"How are you? Are you stressed?"* *"I may be wrong. I'll go back and check and keep you posted."* *"And if you need resources for any of the goals, I can look in our database for them. I'm going to bring examples of ideas for instructional opportunities during transitions for you."*

Source: Shadows with Program Support Coaches, October 2012 – February 2013.

Finding: Our interviews with two fiscal supervisors indicated that Fiscal Support Coaching varied based on the need of the provider. Our interviews with two Fiscal Support Coaches revealed the same theme.

In making a comparison between Fiscal Support Coaching and other types of coaching in LAUP, one Fiscal Support Coach explained, "Every visit is different…we are much more purposeful, and purposes are different." She described the difference between "fiscal report visits," which are compliance-driven, quarterly, and involve sharing of resources, and "QuickBooks systems visits," which are hands-on and happen if coaches notice excessive errors on the provider's end.

For the most part, Fiscal Support Coaching was done remotely, but in some cases it did warrant an in-person visit. In-person Fiscal Support Coaching took place on preschool grounds but outside preschool classrooms, typically in an office or a room removed from the presence of children. Fiscal Support Coaches also met with different people during in-person visits, depending on the type of center; for family child cares (FCCs), this person was always the owner, while at centers or districts, it was an accountant or fiscal director. To see what these in-person visits looked like, we shadowed two Fiscal Support Coaches during a visit with one provider on each of their caseloads. One provider was an FCC, and the other provider was a center.

The Fiscal Support Coach's visit to the center was at the request of the center's Financial Director. The center had recently undergone many changes and had become underfunded. Thus, the center had requested the Fiscal Support Coach's help with clarifying their funding, including a few adjustments that were made when the center's Star rating fell, when their attendance rate fell, and when they switched children from subsidized to unsubsidized status. The Fiscal Support Coach's visit to the FCC was also at the owner's request. The owner had recently switched over to a new computer, and needed assistance with transferring over her electronic financial files and with launching QuickBooks™ on her new computer.

Both the visit to the center and the visit to the FCC were about 1 hour long (65 minutes and 50 minutes, respectively). Table 8 shows a breakdown of how Fiscal Support Coaches used their time during visits with providers.

Table 8. Fiscal Support Coaching Use of Time During In-Person Visits

Activity	Coaching				Average	
	Center		FCC			
	# Min.	% Time	# Min.	% Time	# Min.	% Time
Teaching	40	61	10	20	25	43
Debriefing	15	23	10	20	13	22
Hands-On	5	8	20	40	13	22
Admin Tasks	5	8	5	10	5	9
Other	0	0	5	10	2	4
Total	**65**	**100**	**50**	**100**	**58**	**100**

Source: Shadows with two Fiscal Support Coaches, Fall 2012.

The Fiscal Support Coach spent 62% of her visit to the center (40 minutes out of a 65-minute visit) on teaching the preschool center's Financial Director. With a calculator, a pencil, and a blank sheet of paper at hand, the Fiscal Support Coach took the provider step-by-step in explaining how payments were allocated, how payments had changed based on children's switch from subsidized to unsubsidized status, and what financial consequences were associated with the fall in Star rating and low attendance. The fiscal director with whom she met sat quietly, jotting down notes as the Fiscal Support Coach explained.

The Fiscal Support Coach spent another 23% of her visit to the center (15 minutes out of a 65-minute visit) on debriefing with the preschool center's Financial Director. Debriefing occurred at the end of the visit and was more relaxed. There was no calculator or writing involved; the LAUP Fiscal Support Coach and the center's fiscal director brainstormed ways to work with a decreased budget going forward. The following is an excerpt from

the 15-minute debrief session:

LAUP Fiscal Support Coach:	So what are you going to do? Are you going to cut expenses?
Center Financial Director:	We may increase the number of kids we have in [the other preschool funder]. Their rate of pay is $743 so I'll look into it. We haven't talked about it to be perfectly honest. One thing is we have state funding for one center, downstairs, there is no state funding there. So one way of looking at it is as the percentage for staff. Look at how we can switch off or shift personnel because of the change to a full unsubsidized classroom. [The other preschool funder] may be the only way to absorb the costs…Just some tweaking with regards to how to manage costs.
LAUP Fiscal Support Coach:	Hopefully things this year go better. Last year you got a CLASS review, and next year will be ECERS. Your CLASS score will be with you for two years. So you have…..
Center Financial Director:	We looked into it and the appeals process is not worth it.
LAUP Fiscal Support Coach:	I've heard.

Note that fiscal goals were not established or discussed during the Fiscal Support Coach's debrief.

Further, the Fiscal Support Coach spent another 8% of her center visit (five minutes out of a 65-minute visit) on giving hands-on assistance, and 8% on discussing administrative issues. Hands-on assistance by the Fiscal Support Coach appeared at mid-visit, when the Fiscal Support Coach was teaching the director about budget allocation. She drew a table representing a visual for the Financial Director to keep for herself for further reference. The table showed the number of children multiplied by the pay rate and looked like Figure 1 below:

Figure 1. Table Drawn and Provided to a Center by Their Fiscal Support Coach

	Subsidized	Unsubsidized		
4 Star	14 x 129	0	=	1806
4 Star	14 x 129	0	=	1806
4 Star	14 x 129	5 x 429	=	3435

The Financial Director was very appreciative of the table and the way in which the Fiscal Support Coach explained as she filled in the cells. The time spent on discussing administrative issues occurred near the start of the Fiscal Support Coaching visit, and the administrative topics discussed were:

• Who would be participating in the visit
• An email address clarification
• Who (from the center) the coach should CC on fiscal-related emails

Overall, the activities in which the Fiscal Support Coach and the center's Financial Director engaged during the visit and the amount of time spent on each activity were driven by the purpose of the visit. The center's Financial Director asked for an explanation of the budget allocation and the Fiscal Support Coach delivered it via one-on-one teaching.

The purpose of the Fiscal Support Coach's visit to the FCC was to assist with setup of financial files and QuickBooks, while the purpose of the visit to the center was to review changes in student funding. For that reason, the Fiscal Support Coach and FCC owner engaged in different activities and allocated different amounts of time to these activities. The Fiscal Support Coach spent 40% of her visit to the FCC (20 minutes out of a 50-minute visit) on giving hands-on assistance to the FCC owner. Recall that the FCC owner had recently switched her accounting to a new computer and had asked for the Fiscal Support Coach's help with transferring files and running the QuickBooks™ system on the new computer. The Fiscal Support Coach sat on the FCC owner's

living room sofa with the FCC owner's new laptop computer, and made sure all financial files were transferred from a flash drive to the new computer. Meanwhile, the FCC owner sat beside the Fiscal Support Coach and looked on, asked questions, and took notes intermittently. Further, installing and running QuickBooks™ on the new computer required the set-up of a username, password, and a security question and answer. To do this, the Fiscal Support Coach typed on the FCC Owner's computer as the FCC Owner dictated. The following is an excerpt of the nature of the hands-on assistance that predominated during the coaching visit:

Fiscal Support Coach:	Okay, so security questions. Mother's maiden name? What is the name of your first high school? What is the name of your first elementary school? What is the name of your first pet? You pick.
FCC Owner:	Let's do first high school. No! Let's do first elementary school. That's easy. 19th Street School.[10] Simple.

(Fiscal Support Coach is typing the answer to the security question. Fiscal Support Coach enters all the fields to register FCC Owner onto QuickBooks™ because her trial run is about to expire. FCC Owner sits and looks on and jokes around a lot.)

The Fiscal Support Coach spent 20% of her visit to the FCC (or 10 minutes out of a 50-minute visit) on teaching the FCC Owner. While on the computer, after the installation of QuickBooks™, the coach taught the FCC Owner where to find certain reports she was looking for, and taught her which two reports on the system should match as an indicator that her account was balanced and expenses had been entered correctly. The following is an example of the teaching that was provided by the Fiscal Support Coach to the FCC owner:

Fiscal Support Coach:	Okay. You're registered. So what are you looking for?
FCC Owner:	You know when you can compare and see where my money is going to?
Fiscal Support Coach:	Like budget vs. actual?
FCC Owner:	Yeah!
Fiscal Support Coach:	So you click here. Budget vs. actual and you'll see for July you spent $782 but you over budgeted because you budgeted $1,100. Does that make sense to you? You'll have to study it.
FCC Owner:	Remember. Baby steps.
Fiscal Support Coach:	Did you want to look at it by month or for the whole quarter?
FCC Owner:	By month is better.
Fiscal Support Coach:	Okay, so you'll see here, July's income is dead on but you created a TA position and copies here that you didn't budget for so my suggestion is, your liability insurance is still due correct?
FCC Owner:	I thought I paid that.
Fiscal Support Coach:	No. You paid worker's comp. Who is the vendor?
FCC Owner:	Allstate.
Fiscal Support Coach:	Go to vendors… *(Fiscal Support Coach is navigating through QuickBooks™ on the FCC Owner's computer.)* So you paid them $194 so you were $57 over budgeted. So you did pay it but you put it in for September. So your month is off but the quarterly report should be fine.

The Fiscal Support Coach spent 20% of her visit to the FCC (or 10 minutes out of a 50-minute visit) on debriefing with the FCC Owner. During the debriefing session, the computer that was on during the visit had been turned off, and the coach appeared to be gathering her belongings to leave. The topic of the debriefing session was about the CLASS review, the CSP[11] review, the drop in the FCC's star rating, and what expenses

---

[10] We have replaced the real names of people and places with pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality.
[11] The California Child Signature Program (CSP), formerly known as Power of Preschool (POP) is a First 5 California initiative intended to give a subset of preschool providers additional resources to enhance quality via instructional strategies and teacher-child interactions, social-emotional development, and parent involvement and support.

could and could not be submitted for reimbursement. It was a relaxed conversation, but was informative to both the owner and the coach, as is evident in the following excerpt:

Fiscal Support Coach:	Did you get the CSP visit? How did you do on that?
FCC Owner:	I'm all ready for that. I've been doing that for years. I don't even prepare for it. I'm good to go. And with CLASS, I'm telling all the providers what I learned [at the CLASS training] because I don't want their money going away like mine did. Now I feel real bad for them because they dropped down to a 3 [-Star]!
Fiscal Support Coach:	You can expense the [CLASS training] registration.
FCC Owner:	Can I expense my hotel?
Fiscal Support Coach:	No and you better not put gas! Where was it?
FCC Owner:	San Clemente. I was just kidding. I know I can't and I don't even put gas on my taxes!
Fiscal Support Coach:	*(Joking tone.)* If I see gas on there, I don't know what I'd do.

Further, the Fiscal Support Coach spent another 10% of her visit to the FCC (five minutes out of a 50-minute conversation) on administrative tasks (e.g., reinforcing the importance of periodically backing up files on the new computer) and another 10% on "Other" tasks—namely, personal conversations.

Finding: Fiscal Support Coaches found it was important to establish relationships with providers in order to demystify misconceptions about their role as "Big Brother" and to define their role as helpers.

The Fiscal Support Coaches we interviewed thought it was very important to build relationships with providers in order to be effective Fiscal Support Coaches. One coach said, "If you can relate to them you have an understanding of each other, not only can I adapt teaching them but I can understand what I can expect of them." Another Fiscal Support Coach said it was important to establish a relationship to earn the provider's trust because: "They think we are bad, especially at first, they think we're like the IRS, they don't see how we are here to help." Fiscal Support Coaches and the two providers involved in our shadows with Fiscal Support Coaches were asked to rate their relationship. We asked Fiscal Support Coaches to rate their relationship with their providers (overall) on a 5-point scale where "Poor"= 1 and "Excellent"= 5. Both coaches rated their relationships as "Very Good." Both providers rated their relationships with coaches as "Excellent."

Providers were asked what they valued the most about their Fiscal Support Coach, and both said that what they valued the most was their Fiscal Support Coach's knowledge about finance. Further, both providers said it was "always true" that they felt free to discuss challenges with their Fiscal Support Coach, that their Fiscal Support Coach was someone whom they could trust, that their Fiscal Support Coach was someone who showed them respect, and that their relationship with their Fiscal Support Coach motivated them to continuously improve upon business practices. See Table 9 for full results.

Table 9. Providers' Views about Their Relationships with Their Fiscal Support Coaches

	Number of Providers Who Responded…			
	Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Always True
I feel free to discuss fiscal challenges with my Fiscal Coach				2
My Fiscal Coach is someone I trust				2
My Fiscal Coach truly wants to help me				2
My Fiscal Coach shows me respect				2
My relationship with my Fiscal Coach motivates me to continuously improve upon business practices				2
My relationship with my Fiscal Coach is strictly professional			2	

Source: Interviews with four providers, November 2012-March 2013. One provider did not answer these questions.

Providers were reluctant to find it "always true" that their relationship with their Fiscal Support Coach was strictly professional. One provider explained, "She's my friend now and we established a personal relationship, so I know she has [children] so I'll ask about them and we know each other well enough, so that it's not strictly professional."

One Fiscal Support Coach had been working for several months with the provider whom she visited during our shadow of her; the other had been working with her provider for several years. In both cases, we saw evidence of an established relationship on a personal and a professional level. On a personal level, just as with Program Support Coaches, we observed personal conversations between coach and provider. The following is one example from a Fiscal Support Coach's visit with an FCC owner:

> *(Speaking to Fiscal Support Coach from the kitchen.)*

> *FCC Owner:*   You know, we had a parent meeting last night and nobody wanted to leave. We did scrapbooking together, and a bunch have newborns and younger kids so we did the first page together. It was so much fun but I'm telling you this because I wanted to offer you food when you got here today and they ate it all. But here are some red velvet cupcakes.

In the next example, a Fiscal Support Coach visited with the Fiscal Director of an LAUP network preschool center. The visit began like this:

> *Fiscal Support Coach:*   So how's it going?
> *Center Fiscal Director:*   Good. I had a good weekend. Did you?
> *Fiscal Support Coach:*   Well both of my kids are sick…
> *Center Fiscal Director:*   Hope [they're] on the road to recovery.

Personal conversations were initiated both by Fiscal Support Coaches and by the providers with whom they met, but overall, providers initiated more personal conversations (11) than did coaches (4). The FCC provider initiated more than the Fiscal Director did (10 vs. 1), but perhaps the fact that the FCC provider was running a business out of her home lent itself to initiating personal conversations.

Overall, providers valued their Fiscal Support Coach's knowledge about finance, and reported that it was always

true that their Fiscal Support Coach was someone whom they could trust, someone who showed them respect, and someone who wanted to help them. Moreover, providers said that their relationship with their Fiscal Support Coach helped them improve upon their business practices. Fiscal Support Coaches communicated with providers between in-person visits; communication typically occurred by phone or email.

Finding: Providers perceived the process of setting and working toward goals as highly cooperative even though, by design, Fiscal Support Coaching was intended to be a hybrid between Process Consultation and monitoring.

During our shadows with two Fiscal Support Coaches, goals were not established. However, we did observe one occurrence of a follow-up to a previously established goal. This occurrence was very brief; captured in its entirety, it was: "I'll send you an activity log for today. We have one budget goal already open and I won't open another budget goal for you. I'll wait and see how that is going."

To better understand fiscal goals and goal-setting, Fiscal Support Coaches were asked to rate a series of statements about goals and goal-setting on a 3-point scale of "never true" to "always true." All statements were worded positively and all represented some aspect of the Process Consultation theory of coaching— which, according to Fiscal Support Coach supervisors, was the theory they followed. See Table 10 for full results.

The two Fiscal Support Coaches that we shadowed reported that it was "always true" that they identified the good in their providers; that they understood their providers had existing knowledge and experience, and helped them build on that; and that they took time to understand their provider, their circumstances, and the goals they wanted to achieve. One coach added, "It's about growth. It's what we're here to help them do." One coach reported that it was "always true" that she considered providers' views when setting goals; the other Fiscal Support Coach said the statement was "sometimes true" because "some views are complaints that we can't change." Further, one coach said it was "always true" that her provider's goals were manageable; the other Fiscal Support Coach said the statement was "sometimes true" and explained, "If you give them too many at once, they can't achieve it. You have to adapt to their personalities, which is why you have to know what's going on with them."

Table 10. Fiscal Support Coaches' Views on Establishing Fiscal Goals

	Number of Coaches Who Responded…			
	Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Always True
I consider providers' views when setting goals			1	1
I take time to understand my provider, their circumstances, and the goals they want to achieve				2
I understand that my providers have existing knowledge and experience and help them build on that				2
I identify the good in my provider				2
My providers' goals are manageable			1	1

Source: Interviews with two Fiscal Support Coaches, Fall 2012.

The providers with whom the Fiscal Support Coaches visited during our shadows were asked to rate parallel statements about setting fiscal goals on a 4-point scale from "never true" to "always true." As did the Fiscal Support Coaches, both providers found goal setting to be a collaborative process and found the statements to be "sometimes" or "always true" with regard to how they established goals. See Table 11 for provider views on establishing fiscal goals.

In terms of setting goals, providers found it was "always true" that their Fiscal Support Coach considered their views; took time to understand them, their circumstances, and the goals they wanted to achieve; understood their existing knowledge and experience and helped them to build on that; and that their Fiscal Support Coach identified good things they did. One provider indicated it was "sometimes true," and the other indicated it was "always true," that their goals were manageable. The coach who found the statement sometimes true explained, "I only say that because sometimes things are out of her control and out of our control, like we can't change our Star rating and so since it's changed, we have to shift things in how much and how we allocate our money." Overall, the providers described a positive, collaborative experience with regard to establishing goals.

Table 11. Provider Views on Establishing Fiscal Goals

	Number of Providers Who Responded…			
	Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Always True
My Fiscal Coach considers my views				2
My Fiscal Coach takes time to understand me, my circumstances, and the goals I want to achieve				2
My Fiscal Coach understands my existing knowledge and experience and helps me build on that				2
My Fiscal Coach identifies good things I do				2
My goals are manageable			1	1

Source: Interviews with two providers, Fall 2012.

Further, Fiscal Support Coaches were asked to identify the statement that best applied to them in terms of setting goals. The statements were: 1. The goals we set were a result of my direction primarily and did not take into account my providers' views; 2. The goals we set were a result of my providers' direction primarily and did not take into account my views; and 3. The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my providers. One Fiscal Support Coach who selected the most collaborative of the three statements explained: "The last one because, at the end of the day, we can't force them. I may have my strict accounting principles but it's not gonna work unless there is collaboration. I have to take into account what they want, as well." The other Fiscal Support Coach said, "It's a combination of one and three. Sometimes when it's a compliance goal these are clearly in the [LAUP] operating guidelines and those are clear goals. But when we work with them to meet those goals we offer options. It's a collaborative [effort]."

Providers considered the goal-setting process to be more collaborative than did their Fiscal Support Coaches. The two providers involved in our shadows with Fiscal Support Coaches were given parallel statements and asked to select the statement that they agreed with the most. The statements were: 1.The goals we set were a result of my coach's direction primarily and did not take into account my views; 2. The goals we set were a result of my own direction primarily and did not take into account my coach's views; and 3. The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my coach. Both providers agreed with the statement "The goals we set were a result of collaboration with my coach." One provider explained, "Because it's my business. I know what I need but she helps me. She doesn't tell me how but directs me. So she guides me but doesn't tell me, 'This is what you have to do.' So, it's a collaboration."

Finding: The Fiscal Support Coaching toolbox is small but perceived as extremely beneficial by providers.

Fiscal Support Coaches were asked about the typical coaching tools that they used with providers. Together, they mentioned the following tools: quarterly trainings, spreadsheets for break-even analysis, funding calculator, "budget vs. actual" tools, IRS website, and words of encouragement. The Fiscal Support Coach said

more about her words of encouragement as a tool: "Because some are scared to try because they lack computer skills and they're afraid they're going to break something." One Fiscal Support Coach added to the list of tools:

> "We have an intro folder that has all of the tools plus FAQs, a fiscal report template, how to categorize things, how to prepare a budget, [and] calendar of deadlines. Different pieces of the folder are used during visits depending on the situation. For FCCs we typically always do a business use of home so they know how much of the utilities, for example, to claim on their taxes for running a small business from their home."

Overall, Fiscal Support Coaches named mostly tangible tools and one intangible tool.

The two providers involved in our shadows with Fiscal Support Coaches were asked how useful they found the tools provided to them this year to be. Both found the tools to be beneficial. One provider said, "Training [and] workshops help me stay sharp with my budgeting skills." The other elaborated:

> "The payment history log…has been extremely beneficial. Learning about it, learning that I have access to it is beneficial as well. I didn't know that. I've always completed the quarterly fiscal reports but [my Fiscal Support Coach] provides a better understanding of the report itself. One more example, and I'm not sure if it's a tool, but I manage multiple contracts and one thing that is extremely wonderful is that I didn't understand the calculation of the budget with regards to subsidized and unsubsidized rates based on star ratings. Now I know. Again, it's not really a tool but I've gained knowledge of that and how that works."

Finding: During our shadows with Fiscal Support Coaches, we did not observe barriers to effective coaching.

The visits appeared to run smoothly, with the exception of one brief wireless internet hiccup that occurred at the FCC when the Fiscal Support Coach was setting up QuickBooks™ on the owner's new computer. To understand the nuanced barriers to Fiscal Support Coaching that we did not see, we asked the two Fiscal Support Coaches and the two providers they visited about barriers to Fiscal Support Coaching. One Fiscal Support Coach said:

> "I think the biggest one is at the end of the day, you can't force them. It's realizing that you gotta do something else if it isn't working. The ones that are not on top of it how do you get them to be on top of this? Those are kind of bummers. It's a small few but there are some like that."

The inability to force providers to take their suggestions and the ability to "merely suggest" are similar to the barriers faced by other coaches in LAUP (e.g., by LAUP Program Support Coaches).

Barriers that appeared to be unique to Fiscal Support Coaching were best stated by one Fiscal Support Coach who said:

> "We are not a priority to providers. The program side is their priority, but that has changed a lot thanks to relationships we've built. Also, for some… LAUP is only a small portion of their entire funding, they have multiple funding sources so they don't give us the time of day. And they will compare us. 'We get so much more money from so-and-so and they don't have half as many requirements as you.'"

We gave Fiscal Support Coaches a list of common barriers that were obtained from the Winston et al. (2012) study on Quality Support Coaching in LAUP. We asked Fiscal Support Coaches to indicate if any of the common barriers were barriers for them in their work with providers. Barriers for both coaches this year have been: 1) provider cancellation of coaching visits, and 2) providers not following through with goals. Lack of attention from providers while on-site was not a barrier to either coach. The other common barriers received mixed results—that is, they were only a barrier to one coach and not the other. The one coach who found child-free time a barrier explained: "It is a little barrier. Most try to cut out time for us. It is less of a barrier than timing and scheduling." Moreover, the coach who found frequency of visits to be a barrier clarified that she found her

Fiscal Support Coaching visits to be "too few." Table 12 shows our complete findings. We gave the providers with whom the Fiscal Support Coaches visited during our shadows a list of barriers that were parallel to the list that we gave to their Fiscal Support Coaches. Overall, providers did not report as many barriers as did their Fiscal Support Coaches (see Table 13 for our full results).

Table 12. Barriers to Fiscal Support Coaching as Reported by Fiscal Support Coaches

Common Barrier	Coach 1	Coach 2
Time/Scheduling	Yes	No
Lack of "child-free" time	Yes	No
Lack of attention from provider while on site	No	No
Frequency of visits	Yes	No
Communication	No	Yes
Cancellation of coaching visits (by provider)	Yes	Yes
Providers not following through with goals	Yes	Yes

Source: Interviews with two LAUP Fiscal Support Coaches, Fall 2012.

Table 13. Barriers to Fiscal Support Coaching as Reported by Providers

Common Barrier	Provider A	Provider B
Time/Schedule	No	No
Lack of "child-free" time	Yes	N/A
Lack of attention from coach while on site	No	No
Frequency of visits	No	No
Communication	No	No
Cancellation of coaching visits	No	No
Coach not responsive to your needs	No	No

Source: Interviews with two LAUP Providers, Fall 2012.

When providers were asked if there were any other barriers outside of this list that we may have missed, they reported none, and took the opportunity to begin to describe how helpful and beneficial their Fiscal Support Coaches had been to them so far.

Finding: Despite coaches' large caseloads, fidelity to the LAUP Coaching Model was observed during in-person Fiscal Support Coaching visits with providers.

Fiscal Support Coaching was intended to follow a hybrid approach between Process Consultation and monitoring. The monitoring portion of the work was designed to ensure provider fiscal compliance with the LAUP Operating Guidelines. Fiscal Support Coaches monitored providers' quarterly reports from the office. When necessary, goals were established by Fiscal Support Coaches on behalf of providers, based on their reviews of providers' quarterly reports. According to the Director of Fiscal Provider Services, "[Fiscal Coaches] do not audit, but they do ask questions and ask about the report to establish goals." The director added, "Non-compliance-related goals are also established. Examples of non-compliance goals are: improvement in business management, break-even analysis, [and] QuickBooks implementation." The Process Consultation portion of the Fiscal Coach's work was evident in the options that they presented to providers for how to achieve the goal.

We learned from findings presented earlier in this report that the two providers we interviewed viewed the goal-setting process as more of a collaborative process than did their Fiscal Support Coaches. The sense that Fiscal Support Coaches felt they were not being true to the Process Consultation part of their hybrid model surfaced again when Fiscal Support Coaches were asked about the toughest part of their work. One Fiscal Support Coach replied, "Sometimes it's challenging because of the large caseload to give them as much attention as they'd like. Some require a lot more coaching. You have to prioritize. We also have a lot of work

outside of coaching. We're in the office a lot. Much more than other types of coaches. We can't allocate three days a week to the field." For Fiscal Support Coaches, the large caseload was an impediment to enacting the Process Consultation portion of their work.

As difficult as the Fiscal Support Coaches said it was to follow the LAUP Model with fidelity, we did find examples of it in their visits with providers. Table 14 shows a few examples that were captured during our shadows with Fiscal Support Coaches.

Table 14. LAUP Coaching Model in Action; Fiscal Support Coaching

In Theory Theoretical Principles	In Action Examples From the Field
Hybrid between Process Consultation and Monitoring	*"I'll send you an activity log for today. We have one budget goal already open and I won't open another budget goal for you. I'll wait and see how that is going."* *"So what are you going to do? Are you going to cut expenses?"* *"The rules are in our [LAUP] operating guidelines and we send a schedule to show how it works. It's a little confusing but if you have your attendance data we can go over it together."* *"The QuickBooks application. It says you have 21 days to register or it will kick you out but you have to be connected to the internet to register. You have Wi-Fi? You want me to register you?"* *"You paid for the training out of pocket? I don't see it expended. Why didn't you expend that?"*

Source: Shadows with Fiscal Support Coaches, Fall, 2012.

Quality Support Coaching is extremely varied, and is customized to each preschool provider.

Winston et al. (2012) found that Quality Support Coaches generally, though not always, visited classrooms at least once a month (p. 17). Coaches and providers in the case studies reported that the length of visits varied, with coaches spending anywhere from less than an hour to six hours on-site, observing and talking with teachers and administrators. According to the documentation that Quality Support Coaches included in their logs, the average visit appeared to be about 3.3 hours (p. 41). Generally, visits consisted of three components: observations, discussions, and sit-down meetings, although how these components were used and combined varied by program (p. 42).

Observations in the case study sites ranged from about 20 minutes to several hours in length, depending on the particular visit, the topics to be addressed, and the provider's and coach's schedules. The approach that coaches took toward observing varied. Some coaches were seen observing, talking and modeling with the teachers on the spot; interacting with the children; and taking notes actively. Meanwhile, others were unobtrusive, having discussions with providers largely after the observation.

Providers often, though not always, indicated that they did not have sufficient time for discussions with their coach, which they valued highly. Winston et al. (2012) quoted one teacher's description of the lack of time:

> *"I always feel like we don't have sufficient time with the coach, to be honest. I feel like I learn best through discussion. That's kind of what I like, back-and-forth feedback and questioning. There is more that I wanted to talk about but because of time there were certain things that were touched on but not everything I needed to talk about." (p. 45)*

Some discussions were held in the classroom during observations, or in a quiet area while the children were

otherwise occupied, or when they were napping. Walk-and-talk meetings were other ways of sharing what the coach observed.

Further, Winston et al. (2012) found that sit-down (child-free) meetings were short and ranged from 10 to 30 minutes, because they typically occurred on the teacher's own time or when children were napping. Where coaches and teachers were not able to talk individually, the coaching process was sometimes constrained. In addition to observation, discussion, and sit-down (child-free) meetings, trainings during coach visits were particularly common in the fall, although they occurred throughout the year as well (Winston et al., 2012, p. 45).

Winston et al. (2012) found that Quality Support Coaches largely worked with classroom teachers, but that in some cases, their primary relationships were with directors or other administrators.

In a few case study sites, the coach's primary working relationship appeared to be with an administrator. Quality Support Coaches used a range of strategies to build relationships and maintain them over the years. Some spent more time than others in initial visits on "get to know you" conversations about the programs and providers' priorities and interests. Some Quality Support Coaches stressed the importance of being reliable, with one coach saying: "I can't say that it helps [yet] early on, but my intention was to make sure I followed up on what I said I would do because I wanted her to know that I was there to help her and I would help her quickly and promptly as I said I would." (Winston et al., 2012, p. 17)

Further, Winston et al. (2012) found that some Quality Support Coaches identified and worked toward goals in tandem with relationship-building. In other words, some Quality Support Coaches started to work with providers on goals from the beginning of the relationship; in those cases, the coaches appeared to view the process of working toward goals as potentially strengthening the relationship. Quality Support Coaches stressed the importance of maintaining relationships as a means of improving classroom quality. Case study respondents suggested that positive, respectful, professional, and responsive relationships were central to effective coaching. Winston et al. (2012) quoted one teacher's end-of-program-year summary as follows:

> "Relationships are really important in working together, and also for the reflections to take place. So instead of just providing the answers to everything, [the coach can] kind of guide us into thinking on our own. I think that first if [the relationship] is established, other things can become more successful as well." (p. 11)

Where teachers and Quality Support Coaches had consistent contact for discussions outside the classroom, as well as during observations, the coaching relationships appeared strong. In some programs, however, coaches and teachers had limited access to each other for a range of reasons explored in detail in the full Mathematica study (Winston et al., 2012). In such programs, the coaches had strong relationships with administrators but limited relationships with teachers.

Quality Support Coaches typically started the program year by working with teaching teams—lead teachers and/or assistant teachers—in some capacity right away, according to the Winston et al. (2012) case study data. They also worked with the director, owner, or other administrators from the start. This appeared to have been motivated, at least in part, by the new LAUP requirement for the CLASS review, which entailed assessing both lead and assistant teachers and carried high stakes for the program. In some programs, the coach began the program year with an orientation and CLASS overview training for teachers, and continued observing and talking with the lead teacher (and sometimes also the assistant teachers) over the program year.

At the end of the program year, Winston et al. (2012) found that most relationships remained strong. The case study teachers and administrators perceived their relationships with their coaches as professional, respectful, and supportive, and usually indicated that they felt comfortable with their coaches and their coaches' approach. The coaches were described as attentive and responsive, as demonstrated in the following quote:

"Everything is excellent. I love the way s/he works because s/he comes to my level, and helps me with what I need. The relationship that we have is very enriching and I like it. When I need something from [my coach], the next day, if possible earlier than that, I have it in my hands and I get the tools that I need, suggestions or whatever I asked for. I call and [my coach] answers right away. Having a relationship with [coaches] is the number one tool." (Winston et al., 2012, p. 15)

Quality Support Coaches took different approaches to working with providers towards goals.

A key part of the coaching process was the selection by providers (with assistance from coaches) of goals to be pursued over the program year. In the case studies carried out by Winston et al. (2012), the coaches took different approaches to working with providers on their goals. This appeared to be driven in part, but not only, by whether a program was a new or ongoing one for the Quality Support Coach. Goal-setting with ongoing programs typically picked up where it had left off the previous year. In these cases, coaches and providers discussed performance on past goals, whether or not to carry them over to the current year, and whether and how to create new goals. In general, for preexisting coach-provider relationships, goal-setting tended to start right away. For a few preexisting relationships, however, the coaches observed and talked with the providers for two or three months before turning to setting goals.

Winston et al. (2012) found that some coaches appeared to take a highly analytical approach to working with providers on selecting and pursuing goals—eliciting and understanding the provider's priorities and needs, defining longer-term formal goals to address them, breaking these goals into manageable steps, and working with the provider over the program year to make concrete, measurable progress on these steps and goals. When the goals were viewed as accomplished by both teacher and coach, they moved on to new goals. Winston et al. (2012) quoted one Quality Support Coach's description of this process:

> *"Goals should be co-created and driven by the teachers….It usually starts as an idea and then we transition that to a goal with manageable action steps, and then I do my quality support visits to check on the goal and measure the goal and see if there are some resources or other types of supports that she might need to meet the goal."* (p. 28)

How coaches and providers in the case studies co-created goals varied by coach, program, and subject matter. Some goals were clearly provider-driven while other goals were more coach-initiated, typically flowing from coaches' suggestions based on their observations, experience, and expertise. Still others were something of a hybrid: provider-selected, but from a menu of goal options originating with the coach, the Teacher Institute[12], and/or Project RENEW. [13] Winston et al. (2012) captured a teacher's description of this hybrid approach:

> *"S/he asked us if there was an area that we thought we could improve with the children. I told [the coach] we could work on increasing vocabulary words with the children. S/he gave us ideas of what we could select."* (p. 31)

Coaches often prompted providers to set goals by asking questions that helped the provider identify an area for improvement, or by talking with providers about an area for growth and helping the teacher or administrator decide how to address that area more specifically through a goal.

The number of goals reported by Winston et al. (2012) in the case studies of Quality Support Coaching also varied substantially, ranging from one to five goals per provider as of May 2012. Examples of the specific goals set by focus group sites in the Winston et al. (2012) study were:

[12] Teachers Institute (TI): a multiday professional development training about effective teaching practices held annually by LAUP. Teachers were required to select and pursue one goal from their participation in TI.
[13] Renew Environments for Nutrition, Exercise, and Wellness (RENEW): an initiative to reduce childhood obesity by teaching preschool providers and parents about and encouraging healthy eating and exercise.

- "to provide high quality concept development"
- "the teachers will provide students [with] feedback that expands their learning and understanding"
- "to ask five open-ended questions during circle time every day"
- "to use the learning bridge to help children turn-and-talk and encourage communication"
- "to offer parents resources and strategies to support children's physical activity levels to contribute to the achieved 120 minutes per day"
- "to provide more multicultural material in the classroom"
- "to have assistant teacher take on role of co-teacher"
- "to have back-and-forth exchanges" (p. 34)

The CLASS was the source of the majority of goals, although other factors also influenced goal selection. Some teachers and administrators were explicitly focused on maintaining or achieving a certain score, or otherwise being prepared to do well on their CLASS review. Winston et al. (2012) quoted one teacher as saying: "We want to be prepared when CLASS comes around" (p. 33). The selection of goals related to the CLASS by other providers appeared to be based on an independent desire to improve teaching interactions or behavior management, and was not necessarily based on success on the assessment itself.

Winston et al. (2012) found that in addition to the CLASS review, selection of goals reflected other sources: programs' goals from the previous year, ERS review results or impending ERS reviews, programs' participation in Project RENEW, and teachers' attendance at the Teacher Institute. Some programs selected goals based on overarching institutional priorities that applied to each of a program's classrooms, including but not limited to those participating in LAUP. One teacher described her program's institutional emphasis: "We always have a focus, as staff [and] as a program—the director, myself, and the staff development officer in the office. We all choose something to work on [together]." (Winston et al., 2012, p. 33)

Quality Support Coaches used a range of tools in their work with providers.

The central components of the coaches' toolkit were visits, observations while on-site, discussions in the classroom, sit-down (child-free) meetings, activity logs, individual or group training, communication with sites between visits, and the provision of resources (such as written or other materials or referrals), both from LAUP and other sources (p. 40). The Winston et al. (2012) study sparked many questions for Quality Support Coach Supervisors about the coach's toolkit, namely: Where do they get the tools? Why do they choose the tools they use? How do they present them to providers? How do providers respond to the tools? How do they know that the tools were effective? We conducted focus groups with Quality Support Coaches to find answers to these questions.

In order to facilitate the discussion, we asked the coaches to reflect on tools that they have used with providers during the current (2012-13) program year. We asked that coaches jot down the names of three to five of the coaching tools and reflect on these tools to answer the larger "how" and "why" questions. For purposes of the study, coaching tools were defined to coaches as: a resource (printed or not) intended to aid providers in their delivery of a high-quality preschool experience for children. Once submitted, the coaching tools served as a sample of the types of tools used by Quality Support Coaches. The sample included 60 coaching tools, listed in Appendix D to this report. Our analysis split the 60 tools into two classes: tangible tools and intangible tools. The majority of the tools named by the coaches were tangible (46 of 60, or 77%); the rest of the tools were intangible (14 of 60, or 23%). Tangible tools included: articles, books, cards, checklists, handouts, manuals, pictures, posters, and videos. Intangible tools included: discussions, the coach's experience, modeling, referrals to specialists, trainings, and trips.

Typically, either providers requested the tools or coaches offered the tools after observing a need for them. Selection of tools was also guided by LAUP policies on provider assessments like the CLASS and ERS. Less common was selection of tools based on the coach's initiative (e.g., "I thought it was kind of useful information so I printed it out for everybody, and I've been giving it to all of my providers") or selection of tools because they were based on goals established between coaches and providers.

The following quote from one Quality Support Coach resonated with many coaches at the table:

"We have some compliance concerns, some contractual, some mandated, things that we have to address with a provider so you choose tools based on that. Then you choose tools based on what you, as a coach, think that a provider may need. And then you select tools based on what the provider says they actually need."

Quality Support Coaches indicated that most tools got a favorable reaction from providers. Neutral reaction to the tools was minimal, and unfavorable reaction to the tools was also minimal.

Trainings provided by LAUP, the LAUP Lending Library, and the LAUP (online) Resource Library were the main sources for many of the tools that coaches used with providers. Other sources included websites, the coach's personal collection, and trainings that the coaches attended independently of LAUP. A few of the tools were created or adapted from their original form by the coaches themselves.

To present these tools, Quality Support Coaches sometimes simply handed tools over to providers; sometimes provided training around the tool; and sometimes watched or read along with the provider, if the tool was a video or book. Discussing or highlighting important parts of texts were other ways in which coaches presented tools to providers. Less common were the practices of modeling the use of tools, mailing the tools, or emailing the tools. The most common practice was for coaches to present the tools to lead teachers. Some tools were provided to both the LAUP lead teacher and one or more administrator(s) at the site (e.g., director, owner, site supervisor). Some tools were provided to the entire LAUP teaching staff (lead teacher and teacher assistant(s)) as well as the director/owner. Rarely were tools provided to administrators only and not to a member of the teaching staff.

According to Quality Support Coaches, most of their tools were used by providers. Uncertainty about whether or not some tools were used was minimal, and non-use of tools was rare. Quality Support Coaches knew about the use or non-use of tools either because they followed up, because providers told them, or because they observed evidence of the tools' use inside the classroom. Providers also knew about the use or non-use of tools because they established goals around their use, and were able to track their use during their monthly visits.

To make sure the tool accomplished what they intended, the majority of Quality Support Coaches had observed providers, or planned to observe and/or follow up with providers. Few Quality Support Coaches had measured or planned to measure whether the tool accomplished what was intended by specifically checking the progress of the goal or via an action plan. Quality Support Coaches rarely reviewed child outcomes or ERS/CLASS assessment results in order to measure whether the tool accomplished what was intended.

When asked what, if any, barriers they faced when selecting tools to use with providers, Quality Support Coaches named barriers that fit into the following categories: provider lack of time, differences in philosophy between provider and LAUP, contradictions within LAUP, variety of providers, LAUP policy/provider policy, books/copyright/updates, and other. Provider lack of time was the most frequently named barrier when selecting which tools to use. One Quality Support Coach explained her criteria for selecting tools, which resonated with other coaches around the table:

"I always like to make sure that articles are short and concise. I don't like to bombard them with these huge articles. As it is, they sometimes don't even have that planning time. They might skim through it or they might not even read it. So it's not so much about the quantity, but the quality of the article. If I can get a really good one-pager, I'm happy with that."

In essence, providers' lack of time made it difficult for Quality Support Coaches to determine which tools would increase the likelihood of use. Further, a few Quality Support Coaches experienced difficulty in selecting tools for use across multiple providers on their caseload, because providers were so unique. This difficulty was best captured in the following statement made by one Quality Support Coach:

"All the providers in the network are all on different levels, you have to adjust your tools based on their particular skills or you have to be concise. With one particular teacher, she is a new teacher, she needs things to be really, very specific. When things are open, she doesn't understand what I'm talking about. Even in my coaching I have to be very specific, consider her level of education and her understanding of the field."

Another filter that providers put into place when selecting tools to use with providers involved sensitivity to philosophy—both to, the provider's philosophy and to the LAUP philosophy about what constitutes a quality preschool experience. One coach explained her filter for being sensitive to a program's philosophy this way:

> "Sometimes the program philosophy is different from a best practice that I'm trying to bring to the table and it might be their curriculum. Reggio approach has certain tools and if we're talking ECERS they might ding those tools as being unsafe. Or another example is with conflict resolution. Philosophies might be different than what I might bring."

One other coach explained her filter for being representative of the LAUP philosophy when selecting which tools to use with providers:

> "Pre-read it to make sure it's appropriate and that there is nothing in there that conflicts with LAUP philosophy or ECERS or CLASS or anything like that. That it's in line with what we are trying to do or the information that we give."

Discussion of barriers when selecting tools for Quality Support Coaching tapped into general barriers to Quality Support Coaching in the LAUP network, as described in the next section.

Beyond the filters and criteria that Quality Support Coaches needed to put into place when selecting which tools to use, coaches also revealed a general sense of frustration with the LAUP 5-Star Rating and funding system. 0

As one Quality Support Coach stated:

> "We mention ECERS and CLASS a lot and that's because they're good tools but also because that's what our funding is based on and our star rating system. So I think part of the challenge of using some of the tools and the resources is, it's really very challenging to do things at a high level with CLASS or ECERS when money is linked to it. There is a lot of pressure and a lot of stress about [it], and the motives can be about getting a higher score and the money attached to it rather than having a more relaxed conversation of doing this for the children. 'What do I need so I can get a high score and get money? I need to be able to purchase materials and serve families.' I think that plays into it too."

Some LAUP Quality Support Coaches believed that coaching in the context of a high-stakes, incentivized system like the LAUP 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System was counterproductive to their work of increasing the quality of services provided to preschool children. This barrier appeared to be applicable to Quality Support Coaches who had established a relationship with their providers. Establishing relationships with providers also involved barriers of its own.

Winston et al. (2012) found that the main inhibitor of relationships among the case study programs appeared to be a lack of direct coach-teacher discussion and communication after classroom observations. A few teachers suggested this had limited their relationship; their coaches agreed that this was a challenge to their work together. Winston et al. (2012) also found that where more distant coach-teacher relationships were present at the start of the year, they generally remained relatively distant at the end. Winston et al. (2012) captured what one teacher said of her relationship with her coach:

> "Well, you know, we make it through. She does a good job of informing us about what we need to know and maybe in the future we could continue to build a relationship where we could be more open to discussion." (p. 17)

Winston et al. (2012) found that Quality Support Coaches used a range of coaching approaches; they typically, but not always, reflected the Servant Leadership and Process Consultation approach of the LAUP Coaching Model.

Teachers and administrators indicated that their coaches frequently used AI in ways consistent with the LAUP model (Winston et al., 2012). They quoted an LAUP preschool director's description of this approach:

"The coach always presents his/her ideas in a way that is like 'Here's an alternative to consider…' It's up to us to absorb it or implement it. S/he does a lot of cognitive coaching. S/he asks a question and puts the hard work back on the staff. That is something I appreciate from [the coach.] We have been fortunate with the last three coaches we have had that they have taken the same approach. S/he is also very effective in making us feel confident, capable, and empowering us.…This comes from his/her affirmations, praise. S/he works to empower the teachers. Ultimately they [the coaches] leave, and it's on us." (p. 22)

The use of coaching approaches appeared to vary somewhat by coach, by provider, and also by content (certain topics, such as safety, lent themselves to more directive approaches). Winston et al. (2012) found that LAUP Quality Support Coaches sometimes reflected something more similar to an expert model or directive approach. The coaching approach also changed at times over the year as coaches sought to work more effectively with providers to improve classroom quality.

Summary of Findings

This study set out to describe the characteristics of Program, Fiscal, and Quality Support Coaching and how they were experienced by LAUP providers. The following is a summary of our findings.

Coaches used their specialized training and stylized approaches to deliver customized support to preschool staff. Program Support Coaches spent the bulk of their time in the classroom observing and modeling effective teaching practices during in-person visits with providers. Fiscal Support Coaches spent the bulk of their time outside of the classroom teaching, providing hands-on assistance, and debriefing with providers during in-person visits. Quality Support Coaches spent their visits with providers in the classroom observing, discussing, and in sit-down meetings.

Building and maintaining positive relationships was fundamental to all three types of coaching at LAUP. Evidence of positive, personal, and well-established relationships was apparent across all three types of coaching, and coaches and providers regularly communicated, mostly through email, between in-person visits.

Establishing and following up on goals was perceived as highly collaborative by recipients of Program, Fiscal, and Quality Support Coaching. In theory, Program Support Coaching was designed to be collaborative in the establishment of and work toward goals; coaches expressed reservation about their ability to enact this part of the model with fidelity. However, the providers they coached perceived the establishment of and work toward goals as highly collaborative—more so than did the coaches themselves. Similarly, Fiscal Support Coaching was designed to approach goals and goal-setting in a more prescriptive and less collaborative manner. When asked, Fiscal Coaches also said they had a less collaborative and more directive approach to establishing and working toward goals. However, the providers in the study perceived the fiscal goal-setting process as highly collaborative.

Providers made use of the tools provided by their coaches and considered them to be beneficial. Coaches utilized tools—some tangible and some intangible—to facilitate their coaching efforts with providers. The CLASS and the ERS manuals and trainings were the most integral tools for Program and Quality Support Coaches alike. Besides the CLASS and ERS, Quality Support Coaching involved an array of other tools; Program and Fiscal Support Coaching toolkits were narrow by comparison. For the most part, providers made use of these tools and saw them as beneficial to their preschool programs.

Coaches in the field demonstrated fidelity to the LAUP Coaching Model despite some barriers. All coaches faced barriers in their work with providers. For Program and Quality Support Coaching, lack of child-free time appeared to be the biggest barrier to effective coaching. Barriers for Fiscal Support Coaching included cancellation of coaching visits (by providers) and providers not following through with goals. However, despite these barriers, we observed evidence of Process Consultation, Appreciative Inquiry, and Servant Leadership enacted in coaches' work with providers.

Recommended Changes in Practice

Some LAUP Quality Support Coaches believe, as some psychologists do, that coaching in the context of a high-stakes, incentivized system like the LAUP 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System is counterproductive to their work of increasing the quality of services provided to preschool children. The topic of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation and the effects of incentives on human behavior is one that has been extensively researched by both economists and psychologists. It is a central belief in economics that incentives serve as positive reinforcement and promote effort, performance, and other desired behaviors (Gibbons, 1997; Lazear, 2000). Psychologists believe the opposite—that is, they believe that incentives or rewards may actually impair performance, especially in the long run (see Kruglanski (1978) for an account of the debate between economics and psychology about the effects of incentives on human behavior). LAUP should reconsider detaching funding from the rating system as they move onto a QRIS system. Beyond these much larger systems-level changes, the following operational recommendations are made, based on findings in this report:

1. Providers wishing to join the LAUP network receive only Program Support Coaching as they are inducted into the network. Because they are not immediately introduced to Program Coaching, Fiscal Coaching, and Quality Support Coaching, which are essential components of the LAUP model, these coaching services could be more clearly described to providers before they enter into full contract with LAUP. Furthermore, to encourage cooperation with coaches throughout the year, expectations about a provider's time and participation as a recipient of these coaching services could be more clearly stated and agreed to by all members of the LAUP preschool teaching staff as the program enters or renews a full contract within the LAUP network.

2. Coaches indicated that the current system of funding preschools based on Star ratings is counterproductive to their work to offer meaningful and sustainable change. Rather than basing funding on the QRIS, LAUP could consider a set, per-pupil funding model to reduce the heightened and sometimes unproductive focus on a single summative indicator.

3. Because our interviews with coaches and coach supervisors alike indicated that "all providers are different," the coaching frequency (visits per month and number of months/years of coaching) provided by LAUP Fiscal and Quality Support Coaches could vary based on the points that providers earn along the QRIS—with more frequent and intense coaching given to providers who score lower along the matrix. Changes in frequency could be considered annually.

4. Because Fiscal Support Coaches indicated that cancellation of coaching visits by providers was a common barrier to their work, a fiscal/business component could be added to the existing QRIS system, thus incentivizing providers to work with their Fiscal Support Coach to increase their overall rating. Another idea would be to add a non-monetary stipend (e.g., points earned that can be exchanged for classroom materials, books, toys, etc.) for providers who meet with their coaches as established by the tiered coaching and dosage system.

5. Because we observed unsuccessful attempts to have meaningful verbal exchanges between coaches and teachers while children were present, Program and Quality Support Coaching should continue the practice of observing the teaching team unobtrusively inside the classroom. However, the following practices could be taken outside of the classroom and provided to both the director and all members of the teaching staff when possible: modeling, feedback, debriefing, establishing or following up on goals, and any other discussions about classroom environment and teacher/student interaction.

6. Our findings showed that LAUP coaches make use of the resources and training provided to them by the network. Therefore, LAUP coach supervisors should continue to provide the resources, training, and support that they currently provide to ensure coaches' success in their support of providers. Moreover, fidelity to the LAUP Coaching Model can potentially be intensified by reintroducing training that relies directly on the coaching model and its underlying theories.

Implications for Further Research

A literature review conducted by researchers from Child Trends (Isner et al., 2011) summarizes 44 evaluation studies of coaching in early educational settings. Isner et al. (2011) found that coaching, when aimed at improving quality in early childhood classrooms or home-based groups, often does improve early educator

practice, child outcomes, or both. However, the literature review also found that improvements in quality and child outcomes are not universal. Specifically, of the 33 efforts that aimed to improve overall quality, only 27 showed positive effects on quality. In addition, of the 21 studies that looked at assessments of children's development, 16 studies found positive effects on child outcomes, 12 studies found positive language and literacy outcomes, six found positive outcomes on measures of behavioral development, and one found positive outcomes on math skills. Isner et al. (2011) conclude that coaching approaches can have positive effects. However, not all the programs they evaluated showed evidence of improvement through coaching. This literature review, combined with the general lack of research on coaching in early learning settings, suggests many questions: What aspects of coaching have the most influence on program improvement? What aspects of coaching have the most influence on child outcomes? How important is fidelity to a particular coaching model? Findings in this descriptive study add to the much-needed, yet limited, research on coaching in the field of early education. However, this study falls short of indicating which specific elements of coaching are most important to program improvement, teacher practices, and child development. As state and local QRIS systems continue to emerge across the nation, answers to these questions will become increasingly important.

References

Autry, J. A. (2001). *The servant leader.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Brinkerhoff, R. O. (2003). *The success case method.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cooperrider, D., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. L. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13*, 3-21.

Gibbons, R. (1997). *Incentives and careers in organizations*. In D. Kreps & K. Wallis (Eds.), Advances in Economic Theories and Econometrics, Vol. II (Chapter 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Harms, T., Clifford, R. M., & Cryer, D. (2005). *Early childhood environment rating scale– Revised edition (ECERS-R).* New York: Teachers College Press.

Harms, T., Cryer, D., & Clifford, R. M. (2007). *Family child care environment rating scale– Revised edition (FCCERS-R).* New York: Teachers College Press.

Isner, T., Tout, K., Zaslow, M., Soli, M., Quinn, K., Rothenberg, L., & Burkhauser, M. (2011). *Coaching in early care and education programs and quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS): Identifying promising features.* Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Kruglanski, A. (1978). *Endogenous attribution and intrinsic motivation.* In M. R. Lepper & D. Greene (Eds.), The hidden cost of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation (pp. 85-107). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lazear, E. (2000). Performance, pay and productivity. *American Economic Review, 90*(5), 1346-1361.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2011). *Early childhood education professional development: Training and technical assistance glossary.* Retrieved from: http://www.naeyc.org/GlossaryTraining_TA.pdf

Pianta, R. C., La Paro, K. M., & Hamre, B. K. (2008). *Classroom assessment scoring system (CLASS) manual.* Charlottesville, VA: Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning.

Rush, D. D., & Shelden, M. (2011). *The early childhood coaching handbook*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Schein, E. H. (1990). *Process consultation revisited: Building the helping relationship*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Winston, P., Atkins-Burnett, S., Akers, L., Xue, Y., Moiduddin, E., Smith, E., Aikens, N., Lyskawa, J., Mason, R., & Sparchman, S. (2012). *Quality support coaching in LAUP: Findings from the 2011-2012 program year*. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.

Appendices A-D

Appendix A. Study Design

Data collection for this LAUP Coaching Study was conducted by the LAUP Research and Evaluation Department between September 2012 and February 2013. The study aimed to answer the following questions:

- What does Program Support Coaching look like?
- In what activities do coaches and providers engage, and for how long?
- What does the relationship between a Program Support Coach and provider look like?
- How are goals established and followed up?
- What tools do coaches use?
- What are the barriers to effective Program Support Coaching?
- How closely is the LAUP Coaching Model followed?

- What does Fiscal Support Coaching look like?
- In what activities do coaches and providers engage, and for how long?
- What does the relationship between a Fiscal Support Coach and provider look like?
- How are goals established and followed up?
- What tools do coaches use?
- What are the barriers to effective Fiscal Support Coaching?
- How closely is the LAUP Coaching Model followed?

- What does Quality Support Coaching look like?
- In what activities do coaches and providers engage, and for how long?
- What does the relationship between a Quality Support Coach and provider look like?
- How are goals established and followed up?
- What are the barriers to effective Quality Support Coaching?
- How closely is the LAUP Coaching Model followed?
- What tools do coaches use?
- Where do they get them?
- Why do they use them?
- How do they ensure providers use the tools?
- How do they evaluate the effectiveness of the tools they provide?

To answer these questions, we used qualitative methods including interviews, coach shadows, and focus groups. Table 15 lists our data sources.

Table 15. Coaching Study Data Sources

Data Source	Total Responses
Interviews with Coach Supervisors	1 Program Support Supervisor 1 Fiscal Provider Services Supervisor 2 Quality Support Coach Supervisors 1 Director of Fiscal Provider Services
Coach Shadows	2 Program Support Coaches (4 shadows each) 2 Fiscal Support Coaches (1 shadow each)
Interviews with Coaches	5 Program Support Coaches 2 Fiscal Support Coaches
Interviews with Providers	6 Providers
Focus Groups	19 Quality Support Coaches

Interviews with Coach Supervisors were conducted in the fall of 2012. All five Coach Supervisors in the organization were interviewed. Specifically, this included one Program Support Supervisor, the Director of Fiscal Provider Services, the Fiscal Provider Services Supervisor, and two Quality Support Coach Supervisors. These interviews helped to inform our description of the LAUP Coaching Model (described earlier), and they also helped us to identify coaches who would be willing to participate in our coach shadow efforts.

We set out to learn about Program and Fiscal Support Coaching by following the Success Case Study Method (Brinkerhoff, 2003). Coach Supervisors identified two Program Support Coaches and two Fiscal Support Coaches who were considered exemplary coaches, who enacted the LAUP Coaching Model as intended, and who were willing to participate. Table 16 presents details about our coach shadows.

All ten coach shadows were conducted by one researcher trained in qualitative data collection. Detailed notes were taken on what was observed and heard, from the moment the coach entered the preschool classroom, office, or FCC to the moment the coach left. Five-minute time stamps were taken during the visits for later time-on-task analysis. Although the data does not span enough time to construct full case studies, the data does provide rich and descriptive information about what the coaching looked like, what activities the coach and providers engaged in, and how aspects of the LAUP Coaching Model were delivered.

Table 16. Coach Shadowing Sessions

Coach	Provider Type	# of Shadows	Time
Fiscal Support Coach 1	Center	1	Sept 2012
Fiscal Support Coach 2	FCC	1	Nov 2012
Program Support Coach 1	Center Center	2 2	Oct-Dec 2012 Oct-Nov 2012
Program Support Coach 2	Center Center	2 2	Jan-Feb 2013 Jan-Feb 2013

Post-shadow interviews were conducted with all six providers who were coached during the coach shadows to assess how typical the visit we observed was, and to ask questions about their relationship with the coach, goal setting, coaching tools, communication between in-person visits, and any barriers to effective coaching. Most (five out of six) post-shadow interviews were conducted over the phone no more than three days after the coach shadow; one was submitted via email because the provider did not have access to a phone during work hours. Post-shadow interviews with all four of the coaches who we shadowed were conducted for the purpose of triangulation. Interviews with the remaining three Program Support Coaches who were not shadowed were also conducted. All interviews with coaches were conducted in person.

Mathematica's Quality Support Coaching Study (Winston et al., 2012), and specifically the five case studies within the larger study, informed our answers to questions about what Quality Support Coaching looks like. In addition, three focus groups were conducted, during which all 19 Quality Support Coaches answered questions about their coaching toolkit. The focus groups were all conducted in January 2013. Groups of five to seven Quality Support Coaches attended each focus group, and each focus group was about two hours long.

Analysis Methods

Informed by the LAUP Coaching Theories, interviews with Coach Supervisors, and findings from the Winston et al. (2012) report on Quality Support Coaching at LAUP, we developed a list of constructs and activities to begin to explore the empirical data that we gathered. These constructs and activities became an initial code list for analyzing the first wave of field notes from coach shadows.

We followed a Constant Comparative Method of analysis. This method is also known as Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Grounded Theory is a qualitative research method by which data is gathered and immediately analyzed to establish codes. These codes are applied to new data, which in turn is analyzed to

establish new codes or to refine existing codes. We followed this cycle until the data no longer generated new codes and saturation was reached. Once similarities in the data were discovered, text was placed into categories and subcategories, in which blocks of text containing similar concepts were grouped together (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). These categories became the building blocks of our findings.

Coding was conducted using Atlas.ti, a qualitative data analysis software program that allows for quantification of qualitative data. The five-minute time stamps taken during coach shadows allowed for a two-tiered coding of the notes taken. For the first tier of coding, micro codes were applied every time an activity of interest was observed. For the second tier of coding, macro codes were applied to five-minute intervals of data whenever an activity was predominant within the five-minute interval. These macro codes allowed for an analysis of how coaches and providers spent their time during a coaching visit. See Appendix B for our full list of codes.

Limitations
This study had two limitations. First, the coaches and the preschool providers involved were not representative of LAUP coaches and preschool providers. The coaches were identified as success cases and were willing to participate in the study, and the programs in which we shadowed their coaching were selected based on their perceived willingness to participate in the study. Second, our description of Quality Support Coaching drew extensively from Mathematica's case studies (Winston et al., 2012), which themselves were based on self-reported data from coaches and providers and did not include direct observations by Mathematica's research team.

Appendix B. Coach Summer Training Series Topics (2008-2013)

- Activity Logs/Goals
- Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-3) and (ASQ-SE)
- Adult Learners
- Child Abuse Reporting
- Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)
- Conscious Discipline
- Coaching to CLASS
- Dealing with Difficult People
- Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)
- Early Intervention Strategies/Special Needs
- English Language Learner Training
- Environmental Rating Scale (ERS)
- GLAD Training
- Health and Fitness
- How to Defuse Anger and Calm People Down
- LAUP Quality Rating and Improvement System Training/Refresher
- Licensing
- Parent Engagement
- Preschool Gardens
- Preschool Mathematics
- Preschool Science
- Program Administration Scale (PAS) & Business Administration Scale (BAS)
- Relationship-Based and Reflective Coaching
- SMART Goals
- The LAUP Coaching Model

Appendix C. Codebook with Definitions

Area	CODE	Tier*	Definition
Activity	Administrative Tasks	Tier I	Coach is primarily discussing things such as scheduling, phone calls, follow-ups, review dates, etc., typically with the lead teacher.
Activity	Debrief	Tier I	Coach is primarily discussing what she observed during the current or previous visit. The discussion typically occurs with the lead teacher. Sometimes the TA is present, as well.
Activity	Goals	Tier I	Coach is primarily establishing or following up on program goals. The discussion typically occurs with the lead teacher. Sometimes the TA is present, as well.
Activity	Hands-On	Tier I	Coach is primarily providing direct assistance to children with hands-on tasks as a TA would. Types of assistance include: tying children's shoes, taking off or putting on their jackets, washing hands, gluing, taping, etc. Unlike modeling, hands-on tasks involve minimal verbal exchanges between the coach and students, and the teacher is not around to benefit from the coach/student exchange.
Activity	Model	Tier I	Coach is primarily providing verbal examples of meaningful and quality interactions with children, to show the teacher examples of concept development, quality feedback, and language modeling. The teacher is typically in close proximity to the coach to benefit from the modeling.
Activity	Observe	Tier I	Coach is primarily observing child/adult interactions. Sometimes the coach is taking notes on what she sees.
Activity	Other	Tier I	Catch-all.
Activity	Teaching	Tier I	Coach is primarily providing a quick lesson to an adult in the classroom (typically the lead teacher or TA) about something related to CLASS, ECERS, or child development.
Activity	Training	Tier I	Coach is primarily providing a lengthy lesson to one or more adults on either the CLASS or the ECERS tool. There are typically no children in the classroom when the training takes place.
Activity	Walk and Talk	Tier I	Coach is primarily providing direct assistance to teachers or TAs by describing what is being observed, giving praise, offering suggestions, referencing a tool, etc., typically during a child-led activity.
Questions	11- C2P Q	Tier II	Coach to provider question.
Questions	11- Child Closed-Ended Q	Tier II	Child initiates a closed-ended question. Can be directed to another child or adult.
Questions	Child Open-Ended Q	Tier II	Child initiates an open-ended question. Can be directed to another child or adult.
Questions	CI Closed-Ended Q	Tier II	Coach initiates a closed-ended question to child.
Questions	CI Open-Ended Q	Tier II	Coach initiates an open-ended question to child.
Questions	P2C Q	Tier II	Provider to coach question.
Questions	PI Closed-Ended Q	Tier II	Provider initiates a closed-ended question. Can be directed to another child or adult.
Questions	PI Open-Ended Q	Tier II	Provider initiates an open-ended question. Can be directed to another child or adult.
Coach Interaction	Children	Tier I	Coach primarily interacts verbally with children.
Coach Interaction	N/A	Tier I	Non-verbal time.
Coach Interaction	Other Admin	Tier I	Coach primarily interacts verbally with an administrator (not owner/director).
Coach Interaction	Owner/Director	Tier I	Coach primarily interacts verbally with the owner/director.

Appendix C. Codebook with Definitions (continued)

Area	CODE	Tier*	Definition
Coach Interaction	Supervisor	Tier I	Coach primarily interacts verbally with the supervisor.
Coach Interaction	TA	Tier I	Coach primarily interacts verbally with the TA.
Coach Interaction	Teacher	Tier I	Coach primarily interacts verbally with the lead teacher.
Tool	CLASS	Tier II	Coach makes reference to or uses the CLASS manual to debrief, teach, train, set a goal, or remind a provider about a particular domain.
Tool	ECERS/FCCERS	Tier II	Coach makes reference to or uses the ECERS/FCCERS manual to debrief, teach, train, set a goal, or remind a provider about a particular subscale.
Tool	Fiscal Reports/Budget	Tier II	Coach makes reference to a fiscal report or to the provider's budget to debrief, teach, train, set a goal, or remind a provider about a goal.
Tool	Other Intangible	Tier II	Coach makes reference to an intangible tool (e.g., their own teaching experience) to teach, train, set a goal, or remind a provider about a goal.
Tool	Other Tangible	Tier II	Coach makes reference to a tangible tool (not CLASS or ECERS/FCCERS) to debrief, teach, train, set a goal, or remind a provider about a goal.
Relationship	CI-Personal Matters	Tier II	Coach initiates talk with the provider about something personal to her (e.g., her family)
Relationship	PI-Personal Matters	Tier II	Provider initiates talk with the coach about something personal to her (e.g., her family)
Goals	Goal Established	Tier II	Coach and provider establish a goal for quality improvement.
Goals	Goal Follow-Up	Tier II	Coach follows up with provider about a goal set previously by making reference to it, describing observed progress towards the goal, or by discussing plans to meet the goal.
Barrier	Administrative	Tier II	Administrative barriers arise during the coach's visit to the site. These barriers can include administrators inhibiting the coach from working with teachers, or administrators not allowing teachers to make the changes necessary for improvement towards goals.
Barrier	Child-Free Time	Tier II	One or more children are observed either interrupting or inhibiting a coach and provider interaction.
Barrier	Other	Tier II	Examples of other barriers include but are not limited to: teachers quieting children down to lend attention to the coach, difference in philosophy between LAUP and the provider, or a parent interrupting or inhibiting a coach and provider interaction.

* Tier I codes are applied to 5-minute intervals of time. Tier II codes are applied to individual occurrences.

Appendix D. Sample of Quality Support Coaching Tools used in 2012-2013

Coaching Tool Name	Article	Book	Cards	Checklist	Discussion	Experience	Handout	Manual	Modeling	Pictures	Poster	Specialist	Training	Trip	Video	Website	Total
Open-ended questions									1								1
Beginning to Problem Solve		1															1
Beyond Behavior Management		1															1
Blooms Taxonomy	1																1
Car Safety							1										1
Building a School Garden	1																1
CLASS (English)								2							2		4
CLASS (Spanish)								1									1
CLASS Dimensions Guide								2									2
CPIN Workshop													1				1
Creative Curriculum								2									2
Creative Curriculum in Action															1		1
CSEFEL Providing Feedback							1										1
CSEFEL Pyramid	1																1
CSEFEL/vanderbilt.edu																1	1
Designs for Living		1															1
DRDP assessment training													1				1
ECERS All About		1															1
ECERS/FCCERS								6									6
Experience						1											1
FCCERS Materials Checklist				1													1
Field Trips to Other Preschools														1			1
Guiding Children's Behavior		1															1
Handwashing Poster											1						1
Interactive Writing										1							1
LAUP Literacy Packets								2									2
Keeping The Peace		1															1
Open-ended Question Cards			4														4
PEL Guide							1										1
Pictures: Take Home Bags										1							1
Pictures										1							1
Play and Creativity	1																1
Powerful Interactions		1															1
PK G.L.A.D. Strategies									1								1
Rainy Day Schedule					1												1
Role Modeling									1								1
Scribble Stage							1										1
Special Needs Strategies									1								1
Specialist Referral												1					1
Substantial Portion of the Day	1																1
Tools for Success															1		1
Typical Development of 4-Year-Old							1										1
Video Camera															1		1
Working the Reggio Way		1															1
www.asha.org/public																1	1
www.naeyc.org																1	1
Total	**5**	**8**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**5**	**15**	**4**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**5**	**3**	**60**

Source: Focus Groups with 19 Quality Support Coaches, Spring 2013