The Descriptive Study of the Head Start Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative

Volume 2: Appendices

OPRE Report # 2014-5b

January 2014

Descriptive Study of the Early Learning Mentor Coach Grant Initiative Volume 2: Appendices

American Institutes for Research

American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson, NW, Washington, DC 20007

Contract HHSP23320095626WC

Eboni C. Howard
Laura E. Hawkinson
Victoria E. Rankin
Fiona Helsel
Ariana Tuchman
Jonathan Farber

MEF Associates

Mike Fishman
Sharon McGroder
Jessica Wille

Submitted to:
Wendy DeCourcey
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families

*OPRE Report #*2014-05b
January 2014

Suggested Citation

Howard, E.C., Rankin, V.E., Fishman, M., Hawkinson, L.E., McGroder, S.M., Helsel, F.K., et al. (2012). *Descriptive Study of the Head Start Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative Volume 2: Appendices.* OPRE Report #2014-5b; Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

Disclaimer

OPRE Website: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre

Contents

List of Exhibits

Overview of the Appendices

The appendices in this volume are associated with the *Descriptive Study of the Early Learning Mentor Coach Grant Initiative* (Howard et al., 2012) report. They provide additional details related to the study design, the data collection efforts, and data quality assurances. Furthermore, supplemental analyses and findings are presented in these appendices. The topics that the appendices address are as follows:

- Additional background on the ELMC Initiative.
- The initial and final research goals and study questions, the types of analyses, and the data sources.
- The data collection protocols and recruitment procedures, including the incentives provided and the grantees contacted.
- The data quality assurance procedures and interviewer training, as well as quality control measures.
- Additional analyses and findings (i.e., subgroup and bivariate correlation analyses).

For each appendix, we provide a brief summary of the information found therein and, as appropriate, its significance to the study.

Appendix A. Head Start Early Learning Mentor Coach Grantees: List of Original Grantees Awarded Funds

In 2010, OHS funded the ELMC initiative under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act with funds that totaled approximately $25 million. The funds were to be used to hire coaches who would provide on-the-job guidance, coaching, training, and technical assistance to HS/EHS staff. The original goal of the ELMC initiative was to fund HS/EHS grantees to provide coaching, with the overarching goal being to improve teaching practices in HS/EHS programs. With this initiative, the grantees retained the ability to develop their own coaching models or approaches to best meet their unique needs. More than 280 applications were received for the initiative and, originally, 131 grantees were awarded. The grants were awarded in September 2010 for a project period of 17 months. The grant awards ranged from $87,409 to the ceiling amount of $225,000; the average grant award was $215,513. The grants operated from September 2010 to February 2012, with a small number of grantees able to receive no-cost extensions from OHS up to February 2013. The original ELMC grantees are listed in Exhibit A-1.

Exhibit A-1. Grantee Recipients of Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative Funds, by State

Grantee Name	State
CCS Early Learning (aka Chugiak Children's Services)	AK
Rural Alaska Community Action Program Inc.	AK
Dothan City Board of Education	AL
Montgomery Community Action Committee & CDC Inc.	AL
Jefferson County Committee for Economic Opportunity	AL
Mississippi County Arkansas Economic Opportunity Commission	AR
Chicanos Por la Causa Inc.	AZ
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	AZ
Pinal Gila Community Child Services Inc.	AZ
Southwest Human Development Inc.	AZ
Berkeley-Albany YMCA	CA
Child Care Resource Center Inc.	CA
Contra Costa County, EHSD, Community Services Bureau	CA
Los Angeles County Office of Education	CA
Sacramento Employment and Training Agency	CA
San Francisco State University	CA
Santa Clara County Office of Education	CA
The Institute for Human & Social Development Inc.	CA
Tulare County Office of Education	CA
Yolo County Office of Education	CA
Center for Community and Family Services Inc.	CA
Child Start Incorporated	CA
Community Action Marin	CA
Glenn County Head Start	CA

Grantee Name	State
Rancho Santiago Community College District	CA
Wu Yee Children's Services	CA
City of Lakewood	CO
Community Renewal Team Inc.	CT
Education Connection	CT
Centro Nia	DC
United Planning Organization	DC
New Castle County Head Start Inc.	DE
Wilmington Head Start Inc.	DE
University of Delaware	DE
Redlands Christian Migrant Association Inc.	FL
Kids Incorporated of the Big Bend	FL
C S R A Economic Opportunity Authority Inc.	GA
Tallatoona Economic Opportunity	GA
The Sheltering Arms	GA
Maui Economic Opportunity Inc.	HI
Parents and Children Together	HI
City of Chicago	IL
Community Action Agency for McHenry County	IL
Heartland Head Start Inc.	IL
Wabash Area Development Inc.	IL
Community and Economic Development Association of Cook County Inc.	IL
Human Services Inc.	IN
Community Action Inc.	KS
Boyd County Board of Education	KY
Lincoln County Board of Education	KY
Kentucky River Foothills Development Council Inc.	KY
Community Action Agency of Somerville	MA
Family Services Agency Inc.	MD
Child and Family Opportunities Inc.	ME
Baraga-Houghton-Keweenaw Child Development Board	MI
CACS Head Start	MI
Community Action Agency	MI
Genesee County Community Action Resource Department	MI
Michigan Family Resources	MI
Northwest Michigan Community Action Agency Inc.	MI
Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians	MI
Anoka County Community Action Program Inc.	MN
Child Care Resources and Referral Inc.	MN
Kootasca Community Action Inc.	MN
Mahube Community Council Inc.	MN
Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	MN

Grantee Name	State
Parents in Community Action Inc.	MN
Douglass Community Services	MO
Mid-America Regional Community Services Corporation	MO
Missouri Valley Community Action Agency	MO
Youth In Need Inc.	MO
Telamon Corporation	NC
Douglas County School District 001	NE
Southwestern Community Services Head Start	NH
Acelero Learning Monmouth/Middlesex County	NJ
Center for Family Resources Inc.	NJ
Region IX Education Cooperative	NM
Youth Development Inc.	NM
La Clinica de Familia Inc.	NM
Presbyterian Medical Services	NM
NYS Federation of Growers & Processors Assn. Inc.	NY
Opportunities for Otsego Inc.	NY
PEACE Inc.	NY
Yeshivath Kehilath Yakov Inc.	NY
Chautauqua Opportunities Inc.	NY
Kingsbridge Heights Community Center Inc.	NY
Parsons Child and Family Center	NY
Columbus Urban League	OH
Mahoning Youngstown Community Action Partnership	OH
WSOS Community Action Commission Inc.	OH
Lima/Allen Council on Community Affairs	OH
Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes	OK
Washita Valley Community Action Council Inc.	OK
Community Action Project of Tulsa County	OK
Clackamas County Children's Commission	OR
Cen-Clear Child Services Inc.	PA
Community Services for Children Inc.	PA
Greater Erie Community Action Committee	PA
Indiana County Head Start Inc.	PA
Community Action Southwest	PA
Children's Friend and Service	RI
Meeting Street	RI
Darlington County Community Action Agency Inc.	SC
Piedmont Community Actions Inc.	SC
Lancaster County School District	SC
Rosebud Sioux Tribe	SD
University of South Dakota	SD
Douglas-Cherokee Economic Authority	TN

Grantee Name	State
Mid Cumberland Community Action Agency	TN
South Central Human Resource Agency	TN
William Smith Sr. Tri-County Child Development Council	TX
Child Inc.	TX
Head Start of Greater Dallas Inc.	TX
Region X Education Service Center	TX
Rural Utah Child Development	UT
Salt Lake Community Action Program	UT
Davis/Morgan/Summit Head Start Early Head Start	UT
Child Development Resources	VA
United Children's Services Inc.	VT
Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity	VT
Educational Service District #113	WA
Kittitas County Head Start/ECEAP	WA
Neighborhood House	WA
Washington State Migrant Council	WA
Children's Home Society of Washington	WA
Puget Sound Educational Service District	WA
Indianhead Community Action Agency	WI
Raleigh County Community Action Association	WV

Appendix B. Data Collection Procedures and Protocols

This section provides information about the data collection protocols used in the study.

Overview of the Data Collection Protocols

Information for the ELMC study was collected using four data collection protocols: (1) the grantee census survey, (2) the mentor coach census survey, (3) the mentor coach telephone interview, and (4) the staff telephone interview. The surveys collected data from the complete population of grantees and coaches.[1] Questions related to context were developed by reviewing existing national surveys, and questions related to coaching and implementation were developed by reviewing previous studies on the same topic. To ensure that we developed the most appropriate data collection protocols, the protocols were vetted with the study's technical experts, the consultant group (which included practitioners), and federal staff from OHS and OPRE. The data protocols used the working-draft conceptual model as the basis for development.

Survey Data Procedures

We administered the online surveys using a secured, web-based software program (Vovici) and unique links for each grantee and each coach invited to participate. This technology enabled the respondents to complete the survey at a time and place that was most convenient for them and in one or multiple sittings.[2]

- **Grantee census survey.** This 40-question online survey gathered descriptive information from the population of ELMC grantees and required approximately 30 minutes for the responders to complete. It was designed to collect data about the overall approach to professional development used by the grantees (i.e., the professional development context); the goals, the objectives, and the needs for the ELMC initiative; the operation of the ELMC initiative; the coaching approach and implementation; any perceptions about the effectiveness of coaching; any reflections about the challenges of coaching; and the plans for sustaining coaching.
- **Mentor coach census survey.** This 63-question online survey gathered descriptive information from the population of ELMC coaches and required approximately 30 minutes for the responders to complete. It was designed to collect data about the background and the experience of the coaches; preparation for the ELMC initiative; the approach to coaching; the goals and the content for coaching; any perceptions about the effectiveness of coaching; and any reflections about coaching, including challenges to coaching.

[1] Although the ELMC initiative used the term *mentor coach,* for simplicity throughout the appendices we use the term *coach*, except when referring to the data collection protocols when the full name is used.
[2] Additional information about the quality assurance procedures for the telephone interviews and the online survey is included in Appendix D and E, respectively.

Telephone Interview Data Procedures

The interviews were audiotaped, and the interviewers took personal notes directly on the interview protocol, and immediately completed a data capture form at the end of the interview to capture the main themes of the interview. The data capture form was a way for the interviewer to take notes in a systematic manner, and it also provided an efficient and organized way to review the interview data and compose a post-interview narrative that detailed the information stated during the interview.

- **Mentor coach telephone interview.** This 60-minute interview gathered in-depth information from a selected sample of coaches about their experiences in ECE and coaching; their goals and the content for coaching; their coaching approach in general and with two specific staff members whom they coached; and additional reflections about the coaching experience, including elements of perceived success and challenges.
- **Staff telephone interview.** This 45-minute interview gathered in-depth information from a selected sample of staff members who were coached by the interviewed coaches, including information about their work and professional development; their experiences with coaching implementation and approach; the goals and the content of the coaching received; their experiences in a typical coaching session; their perceptions of the coach; their perceptions about the effectiveness of coaching ; and, reflections about the coaching experience, including any challenges.

Draft versions of the protocols were pilot tested with nine HS/EHS staff at three grantees to gather their feedback for the final revisions to the protocols.[3] Copies of these protocols follow.

[3] Earlier versions of the protocols were pilot-tested with HS/EHS staff (grantee census survey, *n* = 2; mentor coach census survey, *n* = 1; administrator telephone interview, *n* = 2; mentor coach telephone interview, *n* = 1; and staff telephone interview, *n* = 3), although the contracting officer's technical representative and the project team made substantial changes to the protocols after piloting.

Grantee Census Survey

[After clicking the survey link, below is the first thing respondents will see]

You are being invited to take this online survey as part of an evaluation of the federal Office of Head Start's Early Learning Mentor Coaches (ELMC) Grant Initiative. This is an evaluation of the ELMC initiative, and *not* an evaluation of you, your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee or its centers.

In the survey, we ask about general professional development at your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee and details of the ELMC grant, such as hiring practices, which centers are participating, and monitoring. Therefore, this survey should be completed by the ELMC grant director, your grantee's primary contact for your ELMC initiative, or someone else who can speak to grantee-level information about your ELMC grant. You can consult with other staff you work with at your grantee if needed.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and you may stop at any time without penalty. You also may skip any questions you don't want to answer. The survey should take approximately 30 minutes to complete, depending on your responses. Completion of this survey is considered an agreement to participate.

All of your responses will be kept private. Your name will not be used in any summary reports that result from this survey and no comments will be attributable to you.

Your participation in this survey will contribute to the development of profiles of mentor-coaching approaches to inform policy, practice, and research. There are no risks to your participation.

Thank you for your time!

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. To be able to look at the Program Information Report data for your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee, we want to make sure we have the correct grantee name. So,
    a. What is the name of the Head Start/Early Head Start grantee you are working for on the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative? [text box; 100 character limit]
    b. How many centers does the grantee run directly? [text box; numerical entry only]
    c. What are the name(s) of any delegate agencies for this Head Start/Early Head Start grantee? [text box]
    d. How many centers do the delegate agencies run? [text box; numerical entry only]

2. And your background basics….
    a. What is your name? [text box; 50 character limit]
    b. What is your job title? [text box; 50 character limit]
    c. Please briefly describe your job role, including any responsibilities you have for the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant [text box; 200 character limit]:

II. GRANTEE OVERALL APPROACH TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

We would like to learn about your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee's professional development activities in general. We consider professional development to include any activities that assist Head Start or Early Head Start staff to reach and exceed required standards and improve professional knowledge. Professional development includes consultants and mentor-coaching, training and workshops, support for attendance at professional conferences, support for continuing education, and similar assistance.

1. Approximately how many hours of professional development are <u>required</u> per year for your classroom staff, home visitors, or family child care staff? (please select one for each response option)
    Classroom teachers [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
    Assistant teachers [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
    Home visitors [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
    Family child care staff [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
    Other staff (please specify) [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]

2. Some grantees provide a range of supports for staff professional development, while others commit their resources elsewhere. Does your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee provide supports or resources to encourage staff to pursue professional development, training, and education?

   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO Q3]

   [IF YES] Please select all that apply:

Paid release time	☐
Unpaid release time	☐
Substitute teachers to cover classrooms	☐
Flexible schedule	☐
Tuition reimbursement	☐
Purchasing course books	☐
Transportation reimbursement	☐
Printed or electronic materials and resources (for example, articles, websites)	☐
Continuing education units (CEUs)	☐
Provide AA (Associate-level) and BA (Bachelor-level) courses onsite	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

3. Does your grantee have any efforts in place to help your staff obtain CDA credentials, AA degrees or BA degrees?

   YES ☐
   NO ☐

4. During your Early Learning Mentor Coach grant, have you received professional development support (such as feedback, resources, training, or problem-solving) from any of the following sources? (please select all that apply). For all sources that you received support from, please indicate how helpful it was.

	Support Received	Helpfulness of Support Received			
		Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful
Office of Head Start	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Regional Head Start Offices	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Early Head Start National Resource Center	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
National Center on Health	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Does your local community have any of the following resources for technical assistance and professional development? Which of these local resources does your grantee use for professional development, materials or trainings? (Please select up to two responses for each of the professional development resources)

	Present In Community	Utilized by Grantee/Centers
Community College(s)/Faculty	☐	☐
Universities/Faculty	☐	☐
Other Head Start/ Early Head Start Programs	☐	☐
Early Childhood Resource and Referral Centers (State-Run or Local)	☐	☐
Community Mental Health Centers/Mental Health Professionals	☐	☐
Other Community Service Organizations (e.g., Domestic Violence or Homeless Shelters)	☐	☐
Immigrant/Cultural Community Organizations	☐	☐
Library	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐

6. Prior to receiving an Early Learning Mentor Coach grant in September 2010, did your grantee offer mentor-coaching to staff?
   - YES ☐
   - NO ☐
   - DO NOT KNOW ☐

   [IF YES] Did the Early Learning Mentor Coaching supplement or replace the previous mentor-coaching efforts? (please select one)
   - SUPPLEMENT ☐
   - REPLACE ☐

7. At the start of the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant in September 2010, did you provide a formal orientation or training to your Early Learning Mentor Coaches?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐

8. Throughout the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant, did you provide any ongoing training to your Early Learning Mentor Coaches?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO SECTION III]

   [IF YES] What was the focus of the ongoing training? (Please select all that apply)

Goals and organization of the grantee	☐
A particular curriculum or curriculum supplement	☐
Particular content domains	☐
Particular assessments (please specify which assessments):	☐
Other topics (please specify):	☐

III. GRANTEE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND NEEDS

1. Have overarching grantee-level goals and objectives been identified for your Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO SECTION IV]

   [IF YES] Over the course of the Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative, what overarching grantee-level goals have been in place for your mentor-coaches? Please read through the list and select up to 5 goals.

	Select Top 5
To improve already established mentor-coaching	☐
To train on improving teaching of school readiness topics (for example, literacy)	☐
To train on behavior management	☐

To train on a particular curriculum or curriculum supplement (please specify):	☐
To support administrative staff/supervisors in their roles	☐
To improve cultural responsiveness	☐
To improve service for dual language learners	☐
To improve service for children with disabilities	☐
To improve the quality of staff practice with their work with children	☐
To improve the quality of staff practice with their work with families	☐
To improve parent engagement	☐
To improve assessed child outcomes	☐
To improve CLASS assessment scores	☐
To improve other assessment scores (for example, ECERS)	☐
To provide training and support for using assessments for practice or program monitoring	☐
To support the use of new technology	☐
To provide support for continuing education and career development	☐
To reduce staff turnover	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

2. How were these goals identified? For example, did you use results from formal assessments or program monitoring, did you have requests from parents or staff, or did you have specific training needs? [text box]

IV. OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE EARLY LEARNING MENTOR COACH GRANT

1. How many of your grantee's centers are receiving mentor-coaching funded by the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant? [enter numerical value, three digits]

2. How did you select centers to receive mentor-coaching from the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant? (please select all that apply)

All centers are participating	☐
All participating centers volunteered	☐
Centers lack current mentor-coaching	☐
Center needs more staff degrees/certifications	☐
Formal assessments of needs of family and/or children	☐
Formal assessment of needs of staff	☐
Staff, child or family needs (no assessments used)	☐
High percentages of dual language learners	☐
Geographic location (close/shorter travel distance)	☐
Other selection approach (please specify) [40 character limit]	☐

3. When did the grantee hire its first mentor-coach for the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative? (select one) [Select MONTH/Select YEAR]

4. Over the whole course of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative (since September 2010), approximately how many mentor-coaches have been hired with Early Learning Mentor Coach funds (include full and part-time)? [drop down menu to select from 0 to 40, 41+]

5. Right now, how many mentor-coaches are currently funded full-time (35 hours or more a week) by the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant? [program numerical value only valid entry]

6. Right now, how many mentor-coaches are currently funded part-time (less than 35 hours a week) by the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant? [program numerical value only valid entry]

7. When you had a mentor-coach job opening, how challenging was it to find qualified personnel to fill that job opening? (please select one)

Hardly ever challenging	☐
Sometimes challenging	☐
Often challenging	☐
Always challenging	☐

8. Some programs found mentor-coaches from staff who were already working for them, while other programs found mentor-coaches from outside their programs. Of all the mentor-coaches that you have hired with Early Learning Mentor Coach funds since September 2010:
   a. How many were already working for your grantee as a mentor-coach? [drop down menu to select from 0 to 40, 41+]
   b. How many were already working for your grantee in some other capacity? [drop down menu to select from 0 to 40, 41+]
   c. How many had worked previously for your grantee in some capacity? [drop down menu to select from 0 to 40, 41+]

9. When hiring mentor-coaches, what minimum education requirements did you have for your mentor-coaches? [text box]

10. What other qualifications were important to your hiring decisions for the Early Learning Mentor Coaches? (please select one for each option)

	Always important/ Necessary	**Often important**	**Sometimes important**	**Never Important/ Not necessary**	**Don't know**
Experience with Head Start/Early Head Start Programs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Experience Training, Teaching, Mentoring, or Coaching Adults	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Familiarity with Center/Staff or Program (worked there previously)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Interpersonal Skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Language and Culture Match (with staff and/or families and children)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other qualifications (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other qualifications (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other qualifications (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

V. MENTOR-COACHING APPROACH AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. Over the whole course of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative (since September 2010), how many of your grantees' staff members have been mentor-coached through the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative? (please indicate the number of staff for each of the staff types)
    a. Classroom teachers: [program numerical value only valid entry]
    b. Assistant teachers: [program numerical value only valid entry]
    c. Home visitors: [program numerical value only valid entry]
    d. Family child care staff: [program numerical value only valid entry]
    e. Administrators (please specify job title): [program numerical value only valid entry]
    f. Supervisors (please specify job title): [program numerical value only valid entry]
    g. Other (please specify staff title): [program numerical value only valid entry]
    h. Other (please specify staff title): [program numerical value only valid entry]

2. How were staff selected to receive mentor-coaching? [text box]

3. Some Head Start and Early Head Start grantees provide direct supervision and oversight of mentor-coaches and their work, while other mentor-coaches work more independently.
    a. Does your grantee have staff assigned to supervise the mentor-coaches' work?
    YES ☐
    NO ☐ [GO TO Q4]

    b. Do the mentor-coach(es) meet with the supervisor(s)?
    YES, regularly ☐
    YES, but not regularly ☐
    NO ☐ [GO TO Q4]

    [IF YES] How often, on average, do those meetings occur per month? [starting with less than one time per month; program numerical value only valid entry per month]

4. Does the Early Learning Mentor Coach grantee administrator or the Head Start grantee leadership receive information about the progress of the mentor coach programs?
    YES ☐
    NO ☐ [GO TO SECTION VI]
    DO NOT KNOW ☐ [GO TO SECTION VI]

[IF YES] How do administrators or grantee leaders receive information about the progress of the mentor-coach programs? (please select all that apply)

Grantee uses management information system to document mentor-coaching	☐
Grantee/centers collect data to indicate progress	☐
Meetings are convened with mentor-coaches	☐
Mentor-coaches provide reports to the grantee	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF MENTOR-COACHING

1. Please rate your mentor-coaches' overall success at training and supporting staff that they mentor-coached (please select one)

Very successful	☐
Moderately successful	☐
Somewhat successful	☐
Limited success	☐

2. Please rate your mentor-coaches' overall success at increasing openness to learning in the staff they mentor-coached (please select one)

Large increase in staff openness to learning	☐
Moderate increase in staff openness to learning	☐
Some increase in staff openness to learning	☐
Limited increase in staff openness to learning	☐

3. Please rate your mentor-coaches' overall success at improving the quality of practice of the staff they mentor-coached (please select one)

Large improvement	☐
Moderate improvement	☐
Some improvement	☐
Limited improvement	☐
Not worked on	☐

4. Please rate your mentor-coaches' overall success at improving and increasing the use of assessment by staff they mentor-coached (please select one)

Large increase	☐
Moderate increase	☐
Some increase	☐
Limited increase	☐
Not worked on	☐

5. Please rate your mentor-coaches' overall success at increasing career development and pursuit of education and training by staff they mentor-coached (please select one)

Large increase	☐
Moderate increase	☐
Some increase	☐
Limited increase	☐
Not worked on	☐

6. If your grantee had overarching grantee-level goals and objectives for your Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative, how successful were the mentor-coaches at meeting those goals? (please select one)

Exceeded	☐
Made substantial progress	☐
Made some progress	☐
Did not make much progress	☐
Not applicable	☐

Please explain your rating [text box]

7. When considering the success of your mentor-coaches for your grantee, please list up to three qualifications of the mentor-coach that were most important for the success of mentor-coaching at your grantee [text box]

VII. REFLECTIONS ABOUT MENTOR-COACHING

1. Over the course of the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant, did you find any of the following factors relating to staff or staffing challenging to the success of the initiative? (please select one for each challenge)

	Never Challenging	Sometimes challenging	Often challenging	Always Challenging
Staff level of openness to self-improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff level of engagement/interest	☐	☐	☐	☐
Basic skill level of staff being mentor-coached	☐	☐	☐	☐
Qualifications, skills, and abilities of mentor-coaches	☐	☐	☐	☐
Number of staff per mentor-coach	☐	☐	☐	☐
Demands on staff time interfering with scheduling	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mentor-coach turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐
Program staff turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other staff challenges to implementation (specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other staff challenges to implementation (specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Over the course of the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant, did you find any other factors challenging to the success of the initiative? (please select one for each challenge)

	Never Challenging	Sometimes challenging	Often challenging	Always Challenging
Level of community buy-in to quality improvement in general	☐	☐	☐	☐
Openness of community to trusting mentor-coach	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to provide Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for participation	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of supplies/resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of space for mentor-coaching meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐
Travel issues (distance between centers where mentor-coaching)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technological barriers (such as internet access)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of substitutes for staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
Grantee-level administrative support and involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐
Center-level administrative support and involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adequacy of financial support and resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adequate supervision for mentor-coaches	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other challenges to implementation (specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other challenges to implementation (specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. From your perspective, please describe up to three of the biggest challenges to the success of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative [text box]

4. What recommendations would you give to Head Start/Early Head Start grantees that are starting mentor-coaching for the first time, especially in regards to hiring, engaging staff, and monitoring/supervision of mentor-coaches? [text box]

VIII. SUSTAINABILITY OF MENTOR-COACHING

1. When the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant funding ends, how likely is it that your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee will continue the mentor-coaching established with the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant? (please select one)

Very likely	☐	
Moderately likely	☐	
Somewhat likely	☐	
Not at all likely	☐	[GO TO Q3]
Don't know	☐	[GO TO Q3]

2. What steps have you taken towards sustaining the mentor-coaching program? (please select all that apply)

No steps have been taken yet	☐
Action plan has been developed	☐
Funding has been secured or budgeted to support ongoing mentor-coaching	☐
Staff has been secured to support ongoing mentor-coaching	☐
Infrastructure has been developed or assigned (such as facilities, meeting space, supplies)	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

3. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make? [text box; 100 character limit]

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey!

Mentor-Coach Census Survey

[After clicking the survey link, below is the first thing respondents will see]

You are being invited to take this online survey as part of an evaluation of the federal Office of Head Start's Early Learning Mentor Coaches (ELMC) Grant Initiative. This is an evaluation of the ELMC initiative, and *not* an evaluation of you, your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee or its centers.

In the survey, we ask about you, your grantee and your mentor-coaching. This survey should be completed by Early Learning Mentor Coaches.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and you may stop at any time without penalty. You also may skip any questions you don't want to answer. The survey should take approximately 30 minutes to complete, depending on your responses. Completion of this survey is considered an agreement to participate.

All of your responses will be kept private. Your name will not be used in any summary reports that result from this survey and no comments will be attributable to you. Identifying information is requested solely for the purposes of matching information to other surveys and interviews and to the Head Start/Early Head Start PIR data.

Your participation in this survey will contribute to the development of profiles of mentor-coaching approaches to inform policy, practice, and research. There are no risks to your participation.

Thank you for your time!

I. YOUR BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE

To start with, we would like to ask some questions about your work, background, and experience.

1. What is the name of the Head Start/Early Head Start grantee you are working for on the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative? [text box; 100 character limit]

2. What is your name? [text box; 50 character limit]

3. What is your job title (when mentor-coaching)? [text box; 50 character limit]

4. Please briefly describe your job role. [text box; 200 character limit]

5. Do you also currently hold another job position at your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO Q6]

   [IF YES] What is that job title? [text box; 50 character limit]

6. How many years of professional experience do you have with teaching, training, and/or facilitating groups of adults? [drop down menu to select from 0, less than 1 year, each of 1 through 40, 41+]

7. How many years of experience do you have in early childhood education (include any work with infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and families of young children)? [drop down menu to select from less than 1 year, each of 1 through 40, 41+]

8. When you think ahead three years from now, do you picture yourself working within the early childhood care and education field?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐

9. How many years have you been a mentor-coach, providing professional support to early care and education staff? Please include any mentor-coach experience that you had before the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative. [drop down menu to select from less than 1 year, each of 1 through 40, 41+]

10. How many hours per week are you paid to work as a mentor-coach for this Head Start/Early Head Start grantee? [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]

11. If known, how many of those hours per week are paid for by the Early Learning Mentor Coach grant? [drop down menu to select from 'do not know,' each of 0 through 40; 41+]

12. How many hours per week do you work at your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee in other work (not mentor-coaching)? [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]

13. What is your employment status as an Early Learning Mentor Coach? (please select one)

Permanent Head Start/Early Head Start employee	☐
Temporary Head Start/Early Head Start employee	☐
External consultant (non-employee)	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

14. Will you continue to work with this grantee as a mentor-coach after February 2012? (please select one)
    - YES ☐
    - NO ☐
    - DO NOT KNOW ☐

15. Do you use any formal assessment tools in your mentor-coaching work?
    - YES ☐
    - NO ☐ [GO TO SECTION II]

    a. [IF YES] Which of the following assessment tools have you been formally trained in? (please select all that apply)

Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)	☐
Early Language & Literacy Classroom Observation (ELLCO)	☐
Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI)	☐
Teacher-Pupil Observation Tool (T-POT)	☐
Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS)	☐
Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale (ITERS)	☐

Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale (FCCERS)	☐
Child/Home Early Language and Literacy Observation (CHELLO)	☐
Home Visit Rating Scales (HOVRS)	☐
Other (specify):	☐

b. Of the tools that you have been formally trained in, which are you currently using in your mentor-coaching work? [text box]

II. PREPARATION FOR THE EARLY LEARNING MENTOR COACH GRANT

We would like to know about the training you received specifically for the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative.

1. When was your start date as an Early Learning Mentor Coach? [Select Month/Select Year]

2. Did you receive an orientation from your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee as a part of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative?

   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO Q5]

   [IF YES] What was the focus of the orientation or training? (please select all that apply)

Overall grantee structure and organization	☐
Overall goals for mentor-coaching	☐
Staff roles and training needs	☐
Mentor-coaching structure and implementation (for example, how frequently to meet with staff)	☐
Mentor-coaching strategies (for example, modeling, providing feedback)	☐
Content area domains (for example, literacy development)	☐
Assessments and observation tools	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

3. How satisfied were you with the quantity of the initial training/orientation you received? (please select one)

Very satisfied	☐
Moderately satisfied	☐
Somewhat satisfied	☐
Not at all satisfied (could have used more)	☐
Not at all satisfied (could have used less)	☐

4. How satisfied were you with the content of the initial training/orientation you received? (please select one)

Very satisfied	☐
Moderately satisfied	☐
Somewhat satisfied	☐
Not at all Satisfied	☐

5. Have you received ongoing training from your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee as a part of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative?
   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO Q6]

   [IF YES] What was the focus of the ongoing training? [text box; 100 character limit]

6. What additional training would be helpful for your work? [text box; 100 character limit]

7. During your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, have you received professional development support (such as feedback, resources, training, or problem-solving) from any of the following sources? (please select all that apply). For all sources that you received support from, please indicate how helpful it was.

	Support Received	Helpfulness of Support Received			
		Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Somewhat helpful	Not helpful
Office of Head Start	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mentor-coaching trainers	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
State early childhood education specialist	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Regional program specialist, T/TA	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other Head Start/Early Head Start staff (please specify):	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other resources (please specify):	YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

MENTOR-COACHING APPROACH

1. How many centers are you working in as a mentor-coach? [text box; numerical entry only]

2. Please identify how many of the following staff you are formally mentor-coaching as a part of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative? (please select one for each response option)
   Early Head Start lead teachers [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Early Head Start assistant teachers [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Head Start lead teachers [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Head Start assistant teachers [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Home visitors (Head Start and Early Head Start) [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Family child care staff [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Administrators (specify job title): [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Supervisors (specify job title): [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Other administrators (specify job title): [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Other (please specify): [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]
   Other (please specify): [drop down menu to select from 0 through 40; 41+]

3. Do you mentor-coach staff that speak a language other than English when working with children and families? (please select one)
   YES ☐
   NO ☐ [GO TO Q4]

   a. [IF YES] What language? [text box; 20 character limit]
   b. Do you speak this language fluently?
      YES ☐
      NO ☐

4. Do you ever mentor-coach staff teams together (such as teachers with the assistant teachers or family care provider teams)? (please select one)

Frequently	☐
Sometimes	☐
Seldom	☐
Never	☐

5. How often over a typical month do you use the following formats to interact with the staff you mentor-coach? Please indicate the average number of times you use these for each individual staff person. (select one response for each type of contact)

	Never	About once a day	More than once a day	About once a week	About every other week	About once per month
Phone call	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Face-to-face meeting (individual)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Face-to-face meeting (group)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Email	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Online messaging (instant messenger, chat room)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Texting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Virtual meeting (such as Skype,	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

GoToMeeting)						
Social media (such as Facebook, Twitter)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Video camera (such as flip camera)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The next set of questions is to help us learn about the strategies you use while mentor-coaching. There are a variety of strategies that you could use while mentor-coaching and it is possible that you have used some, all, or none of the strategies listed below. Our goal is to find out your mentor-coaching strategy profile, so please check the list carefully.

6. Please briefly list your most common goals that you strategies in your mentor-coaching. [text box; 200 character limit]

7. On average, how often do you use the following *observation, feedback,* and *discussion* strategies in a typical month with each staff person that you mentor-coach? (please select one response for each strategy)

	Never	**1 to 2 times**	**3 to 4 times**	**More than 4 times**
Conduct live on-site observation (with or without tool)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Watch a video of staff member's work	☐	☐	☐	☐
Watch with staff, video of other staff members' work	☐	☐	☐	☐
Video journal	☐	☐	☐	☐
Arrange for staff to observe peer	☐	☐	☐	☐
Provide verbal feedback based on live observations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Provide verbal feedback based on discussion with staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
Provide written feedback on paper	☐	☐	☐	☐
Provide written feedback via text, email, or other online method	☐	☐	☐	☐
Introduce new skills, practices, or strategies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reflect on skills, practices, or strategies	☐	☐	☐	☐
Set and re-assess goals for individuals	☐	☐	☐	☐

Facilitate group discussion	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff shares mistakes/challenges in their work	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other observation/feedback/discussion strategy (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. On average, how often do you use the following *practice and modeling* strategies in a typical month with each staff person that you mentor-coach? (please select one response for each strategy)

	Never	1 to 2 times	3 to 4 times	More than 4 times
Demonstrate/model skills and strategies while in work-setting (in the classroom, home visit, or child care room)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Demonstrate/model skills and strategies while not in work-setting (not in classroom, home visit or child care center)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Work with staff to role play a skill or strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ask staff that you are mentor-coaching to practice skill and report back	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mentor-coach "on the fly" (e.g., unplanned, unscheduled, "on the run," or in a hurry)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other practice and modeling strategy (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

9. On average, how often do you use these other *supportive strategies* in a typical month with each staff person that you mentor-coach? (please select one response for each strategy)

	Never	1 to 2 times	3 to 4 times	More than 4 times
Problem solve with staff on personal issue	☐	☐	☐	☐
Provide emotional support	☐	☐	☐	☐
Work on stress reduction	☐	☐	☐	☐
Share materials and resources	☐	☐	☐	☐

Conduct/arrange an on-site workshop or training	☐	☐	☐	☐
Help with preparation, administration, scheduling	☐	☐	☐	☐
Work as an assistant in classroom, home visit or child care room (such as help manage a child)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other supportive strategies (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Of all of the strategies that you use with the staff that you mentor-coach, what would you say are the three most effective mentor-coaching strategies for changing staff practices? [text box; 200 character limit]

11. Would you say that your strategies for mentor-coaching sessions vary depending on the staff you are mentor-coaching?

Almost always consistent across staff	☐
More consistent across staff than varying	☐
More varied across staff than consistent	☐
Almost always vary across staff	☐

12. Thinking across all your work as a mentor-coach, how often do you take on the following 'roles'? (please select one rating for each role)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Teacher/Instructor for adults	☐	☐	☐	☐
Crisis Intervention	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advocate	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technical expert	☐	☐	☐	☐
Problem-solver	☐	☐	☐	☐
Collaborative partner	☐	☐	☐	☐
Supervisor	☐	☐	☐	☐
Emotional supporter	☐	☐	☐	☐

Logistical supporter	☐	☐	☐	☐
Assistant to the staff that you are mentor-coaching	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Are you a formal supervisor of any program staff?
    YES ☐
    NO ☐ [GO TO SECTION IV]

[IF YES] Are you a supervisor of program staff for whom you mentor-coach?
YES ☐
NO ☐ [GO TO SECTION IV]

[IF YES] How helpful or challenging is it to your mentor-coaching work to also be working as a supervisor? (please select one)

Mostly helpful	☐
Somewhat helpful	☐
Neither challenging nor helpful	☐
Somewhat challenging	☐
Mostly challenging	☐

14. Do you report to somebody about overall progress that you staff are making in mentor-coaching?
    YES ☐
    NO ☐

[IF YES] What is the job title of the person you report to? [text box; 50 character limit]

IV. MENTOR-COACHING GOALS AND CONTENT

The next set of questions is to help us learn about the content of your mentor-coaching sessions. There are a variety of topics that you could focus on in mentor-coaching and it is possible that you have focused on many, some, or none of the topics we list here. Please take your time to check the whole list, so we can get an accurate picture of your mentor-coach profile.

1. Please briefly list your most common goals that you target in your mentor-coaching. [text box; 200 character limit]

2. How do you gather information about the needs of staff you mentor-coach? (please select all that apply)

Staff self-identifies needs	☐
Staff's supervisor identifies needs on performance review	☐
Results from child assessment data	☐
Results from classroom and teacher observational assessment tools	☐
Observations without formal assessment	☐
Office of Head Start on-site monitoring review	☐
Grantee administration chose targets that apply to all staff	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

3. In your mentor-coaching, how often do you work to increase staff's professional knowledge in each of the following areas? (please select one response for each area)

	Frequently	**Occasionally**	**Hardly Ever**	**Never**
Developmental domains (such as literacy, social emotional)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Needs of children with identified disabilities or other special needs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Behavior management	☐	☐	☐	☐
Needs of culturally diverse *families*	☐	☐	☐	☐
Needs of Dual Language Learner *children*	☐	☐	☐	☐
CLASS scores	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other knowledge areas (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. In your mentor-coaching, how often do you work to increase or improve staff's skills and strategies in each of the following areas? (please select one response for each area)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Hardly Ever	Never
Instructional practices for specific developmental domains (please identify):	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff use of language with children	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff responsiveness to children	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teacher-child interactions	☐	☐	☐	☐
Encourage parent-child interactions	☐	☐	☐	☐
Engaging parents	☐	☐	☐	☐
Implementation of specific curricula	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other skills and strategies (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. In your mentor-coaching, how often do you work to improve structure and organization in each of the following areas? (please select one response for each area)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Hardly Ever	Never
Classroom or center organization	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use or display of materials (center or elsewhere)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Home organization, management, and safety	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of books and other educational materials (center or elsewhere)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Content and organization of home visit	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other structure and organization (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. In your mentor-coaching, how often do you work to increase and improve the use of assessment or technology in each of the following areas? (please select one response for each area)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Hardly Ever	Never
Overall use of technology (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ongoing child assessment for tailoring instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ongoing child assessment for ongoing program quality assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other assessments or technology (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. In your mentor-coaching, how often do you work to encourage staff personal growth in each of the following areas? (please select one response for each area)

	Frequently	Occasionally	Hardly Ever	Never
Positive interactions with colleagues (for example: teaching assistants, administrators)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Self-efficacy, motivation, and empowerment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Enrollment in professional development (such as training to improve qualifications)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Enrollment in college coursework in pursuit of a degree, certificate, or credential	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. In which of the areas identified in questions 3 through 7 do you feel you need additional training, resources, and support to be able to bring about positive change in program staff? [text box]

9. Would you say that your goals or targeted topics for staff are consistent or vary, depending on the staff you are coaching? (please select one)

Almost always consistent across staff	☐
More consistent across staff than varying	☐
More varied across staff than consistent	☐
Almost always vary across staff	☐

V. EFFECTIVENESS OF MENTOR-COACHING

1. Thinking over your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, please rate your success at increasing openness to learning in the staff you worked with. (please select one response)

All staff more open to learning	☐
Many staff more open to learning	☐
Some staff more open to learning	☐
Few staff more open to learning	☐

2. Thinking over your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, please rate your success at improving the quality of practice of the staff you worked with. (please select one response)

All staff improved practice	☐
Many staff improved practice	☐
Some staff improved practice	☐
Few staff improved practice	☐
Not worked on	☐

3. Thinking over your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, please rate your success at increasing the appropriate use of assessment. (please select one response)

All staff increased their assessment use	☐
Many staff increased their assessment use	☐
Some staff increased their assessment use	☐
Few staff increased their assessment use	☐
Not worked on	☐

4. Thinking over your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, please rate your success at increasing staff focus on career development and pursuit of education and training. (please select one response)

Very successful	☐
Moderately successful	☐
Somewhat successful	☐
Limited success	☐
Not worked on	☐

[IF ANYTHING BUT "NOT WORKED ON"] Please briefly explain your rating [text box]

5. Thinking over your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, please rate your overall success as a mentor-coach. (please select one response)

Very successful	☐
Moderately successful	☐
Somewhat successful	☐
Limited success	☐

Please briefly explain your rating [text box]

6. What single topic or goal area did you address most successfully as a mentor-coach? [text box]

VI. REFLECTIONS ABOUT MENTOR-COACHING

1. In your opinion, what top three qualifications are most important for a mentor-coach to be successful?

	Select top 3
Degree in early education or related field	☐
Background in working with families	☐
Background in teaching	☐
Background in early childhood education and care	☐
Background in clinical work (such as counseling)	☐
Background in management work (such as administration)	☐
Experience training, teaching, mentoring, or coaching adults	☐
Experience with Head Start/Early Head Start Programs	☐
Experience with Home Visitors	☐
Familiarity with Center/Staff or Program (worked there previously)	☐
Time management skills	☐
Interpersonal skills (such as ability to establish relationships)	☐
Experience with reflective practice or supervision	☐
Ability to provide constructive feedback	☐
Knowledgeable about adult learning strategies/principles	☐
Language and Culture Match (with staff and/or families and children	☐
Other (please specify):	☐

2. Thinking across all the staff you mentor-coach, in general what staff characteristics have been challenging to your success as a mentor and coach? (please select one for each response option)

	Never challenging	Sometimes challenging	Often challenging	Always challenging
Level of openness to self-improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐
Level of engagement/interest	☐	☐	☐	☐
Level of effort	☐	☐	☐	☐
Level of ability to engage in self-reflection	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability of staff to share mistakes	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability of staff to use feedback	☐	☐	☐	☐
Basic skill level of staff members being mentor-coached	☐	☐	☐	☐
Level of community buy-in to quality improvement in general	☐	☐	☐	☐
Openness of community to 'trusting' mentor-coach	☐	☐	☐	☐
Relationship quality between you and staff you mentor-coach	☐	☐	☐	☐
Match (such as personality, age, experience) between you and staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. To what extent are these systems features challenging to you as an Early Learning Mentor Coach? (please select one for each response option)

	Never challenging	Sometimes challenging	Often challenging	Always challenging
Number of staff per mentor-coach (such as case load size)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Consistency of messaging across mentor-coaches	☐	☐	☐	☐
Methods for identifying staff mentor-coaching needs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Variation in staff needs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Demands on staff time interfering with scheduling	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of language match between you and staff, children or families	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job demands from work you are doing besides mentor-coaching	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. To what extent are the following logistics factors challenging to you as an Early Learning Mentor Coach? (please select one for each response option)

	Never challenging	Sometimes challenging	Often challenging	Always challenging
Language of staff, children, and families	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for staff being mentor-coached	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of supplies/resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of space for mentor-coaching meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐
Travel issues (distance between centers where mentor-coaching)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technological barriers (such as internet access)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of substitutes for staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. To what extent are the following contextual factors challenging to you as an Early Learning Mentor Coach? (please select one for each response option)

	Never challenging	Sometimes challenging	Often challenging	Always challenging
Level of support from Head Start/Early Head Start director	☐	☐	☐	☐
Level of support from other mentor-coaches	☐	☐	☐	☐
Program staff turnover	☐	☐	☐	☐
Families' comfort with mentor-coach in their homes	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Using your responses to questions 2 through 5, what is the biggest challenge to the success of mentor-coaching? [text box]

VII. ABOUT YOU

Lastly, we'd like to gather some information about you so that we are able to describe the mentor-coaches who were a part of the ELMC initiative.

1. In what year were you born? [Select Year]

2. What is your ethnicity? (please select one)

Hispanic or Latino	☐
Non-Hispanic or non-Latino	☐

3. What is your race? (please select all that apply)

American Indian or Alaska Native	☐
Black or African American	☐
Asian	☐
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	☐
White	☐

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (please select one)

Up to 8th grade	☐
9th to 11th grade	☐
12th grade but no diploma	☐
High school diploma/GED/or equivalent	☐
Voc/Tech diploma after high school	☐
Some college, but no degree	☐
Associate's Degree (AA)	☐
Bachelor's degree (BA or BS)	☐

Graduate or professional coursework, but no degree	☐
Master's Degree (MA or MS)	☐
Doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)	☐
Professional degree after bachelor's degree (MD, DDS, MBA, JD, LLB)	☐

5. Do you have any of the following certificates or licenses? (please select all that apply)

Mentor-coach certification	☐
State-awarded teaching certificate	☐
State-awarded early childhood or preschool certificate	☐
Child Development Associate (CDA) credential	☐
Special education teacher degree	☐
Social work, psychology, or counseling license	☐
Teaching certificate or license	☐
Other (please specify):	☐
None of the above	☐

6. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make? [text box; 100 character limit]

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey!

Mentor-Coach Interview

Interview Date:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
ELMC Grantee:

[INTERVIEWERS: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING TO YOUR INTERVIEWEE]

Hello, my name is [insert your name] and I am part of the research team evaluating the federal Office of Head Start's Early Learning Mentor Coaching initiative (known as the ELMC for short). This interview is part of this evaluation. This is an evaluation of the ELMC initiative, and *not* an evaluation of you, your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee or its centers.

The responses you provide will contribute to the development of profiles of mentor-coaching approaches to inform policy, practice, and research. There are no risks to you for participating, you may decline to participate or may stop at any time you wish, and your responses will remain private. Comments or quotes, if selected from your interview, will be reported anonymously to ensure that they cannot be attributed to either you or your grantee.

The interview will take about one hour.

Do you have any questions?

If you understand this information and agree to participate, please let me know and we'll get started.

I'd like to ask for your permission to record this interview so that I get everything you say. May we have your permission to record this interview? [START RECORDING ONLY IF PERMISSION IS GIVEN, AND VERBAL CONSENT IS GRANTED.]

I. ABOUT YOUR WORK AND EXPERIENCE

First, we would like to learn a little more about your work. You may recall that you already answered a number of questions in the survey, and don't worry, we have those responses recorded. In our time today, we would like to hear more about your thoughts and opinions than we can get on the survey.

1. To start, tell me how long you have worked as a mentor-coach for [INSERT GRANTEE NAME]?
   a. Prior to being hired as a mentor-coach, had you previously worked for this grantee?
      - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] In what capacity did you work for this grantee?
      - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Was a permanent role at this grantee repurposed for mentor-coaching?
   b. Have you worked as a mentor-coach prior to your current position?
      - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] In what type of programs did you provide mentor-coaching?
        - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** Was your mentor-coaching for other Head Start/Early Head Starts, or early childhood programs, or elementary schools?

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** What are the experiences and skills that you have that are valuable to your work as a mentor-coach?

3. Tell me about any initial training or orientation you received from your grantee to start your work as a mentor-coach.

4. What additional training, support, or resources would benefit your role as a mentor-coach?

5. What people or resources that you used for advice and strategies have been the most helpful? Tell me more about how they have been helpful to you.
   - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** grantee administrative or leadership staff, other mentor-coaches, supervisors, online resources, library, local college, Office of Head Start (ECLKC), National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning.

II. MENTOR-COACHING APPROACH

Now, we have a number of questions about your mentor-coaching approach. We'd like to learn more about your personal approach to mentoring and coaching staff.

1. What types of staff do you mentor-coach?
   - ➢ ***Optional Probe***: Do you mentor-coach classroom teachers, assistant teachers, home visitors, family child care workers, supervisors, others?
   - ✓ [IF HOME VISITORS] Tell me more about your mentor-coach approach with home visitors. Do you go on home visits to observe home visitors at work? Do you use videotaped home visits for discussion and feedback?

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Some grantees may require mentor-coaches to complete a certain number of sessions per month for each staff, while other grantees allow mentor-coaches to pursue their own format, scheduling and structure depending on staff needs. What about you? What is the typical format and structure for your mentor-coaching work?
   - ➢ ***Optional Probes***: For example, how do you describe what you do on a daily basis? Do you work one-to-one advising staff? Do you organize staff group sessions? Do you develop materials, lead or attend meetings, lead peer

discussion groups? How often do you meet with staff? Are you more likely to work with individuals or teams?

3. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Mentor-coaches play a lot of different roles, ranging from providing emotional support to being a supervisor to providing expert technical advice. What roles would you say you take on in your mentor-coaching work?
    - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** teacher/instructor, crisis intervention, advocate, technical expert, problem-solver, collaborative partner, supervisor, emotional supporter, logistical supporter, assistant to the staff you are mentor-coaching.
    - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED] As a mentor-coach, would you say that you ever tackled the role of crisis intervention?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Tell me more about this role as crisis interventionist.
        - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** How frequently do you need to take on this role? Is it a consistent part of your mentor-coach work?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] How do you think this role affects your overall ability to work as a mentor-coach?

4. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Some mentor-coaches use technology such as texting, social networking, emails, or virtual meetings in their mentor-coaching, while others do not. What about you? What role does technology play in your work as a mentor-coach?
    - ✓ [IF USED, ASK] Tell me about why you use these technologies.
    - ✓ [IF USED, ASK] How often do you use these technologies?
    - ✓ [IF USED, ASK] What technologies are most successful to providing mentor-coaching?
    - ✓ [IF USED, ASK] Tell me about any challenges about using technology to provide mentor-coaching.

5. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Some mentor-coaches use video recordings of staff in their mentor-coaching work, while others do not use that technique. What about you?
    - ✓ [IF USED, SAY] Tell me more about how you typically use video and how often you use it.
    - ✓ [IF USED, ASK] Overall, what is most successful about using video?
    - ✓ [IF USED, ASK] Tell me about any challenges using video to provide mentor-coaching.

6. On average how many hours per week do you spend doing your mentor-coaching work (including planning time, organizing, scheduling, etc)?
    - ✓ How many of those hours per week are you paid to be a mentor-coach?
        - ➢ ***Optional Probe:*** full time = 40 hours per week.

7. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Some mentor-coaches are serving centers scattered over large geographical areas, while others are located in a single center. How about you?
    - ➢ ***Probe:*** Are you mentor-coaching staff in more than one center?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] How geographically scattered are the staff that you are mentor-coaching? ***Optional Probes:*** less than 5 miles, 5 to 10 miles, 10-20 miles, 20-30 miles, more than 30 miles.
    - ✓ **[PRIORITY QUESTION]** Tell me about the benefits and challenges to mentor-coaching staff working in different centers.

8. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Tell me about the supervision you receive in your role as a mentor-coach as a part of the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative.
    - ➢ ***Probe:*** Who supervises you?
    - ➢ ***Optional Probes****:* Is it an education coordinator, center director, senior mentor, or someone else?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] How often and in what format do you report to your supervisor?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] What is the level of support you get from your supervisor?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Is your supervisor a resource for your work as a mentor-coach? Do they help you decide on mentor-coaching approaches?

9. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Tell me about any formal supervisory responsibilities you have with the staff you mentor-coach.
    a. Do you report any information to the supervisor of the staff you mentor-coach regarding their progress?
        - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] How do you think having supervisory responsibilities affects the way you mentor-coach?
        - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] How do you think having supervisory responsibilities affects the way staff respond to mentor-coaching?

III. MENTOR-COACHING GOALS AND CONTENT

Now we would like to learn about your grantee's goals for the Early Learning Mentor Coaching.

1. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** In your opinion, does your Head Start/Early Head start grantee have clear overarching goals for their Early Learning Mentor coach initiative?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] What are the grantee's main goals for the Early Learning mentor-coaches?
    - ✓ [IF YES, SAY] Some grantees set center-level goals, others focus on individual level goals, and others have a combination. What about your grantee?

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** There are a number of ways that goals, topics, and activities could be chosen for the staff you mentor-coach. Describe for me how you choose what to work on with your staff.
    - ➢ ***Probe:*** Do you decide or does the staff decide? Please describe who contributes to the choice of activities.
    - ➢ ***Optional Probe***: Does anyone else influence what you work on, like the staff person, administrators, or supervisors?
    a. Tell me about any observational or direct <u>assessment tools</u> you use to inform the selection of mentor-coaching goals, topics, or activities?

IV. TYPICAL MENTOR-COACHING

Before we ask about your mentor-coaching with a specific staff person, we would like to know about your typical mentor-coaching across the staff that you mentor-coach. Please think generally about your mentor-coaching. We'd like to get a general sense of the types of work that you pursued with the staff that you mentor-coached.

1. Do you offer feedback to the staff that you mentor-coach?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Tell me more, how do you do that?
        - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** What is the feedback based on? Do you engage in observation and provide verbal or written feedback?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Tell me more, how does that approach work for you?

- ***Optional Probe:*** Do staff seem able to use this feedback?

2. Do you try and get the staff that you mentor-coach to change their practice or learn new skills?
   - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Tell me more, how do you do that?
     - ***Optional Probes:*** How do you help them understand what they should change? How do you help them apply those changes to their work? Do you do things such as reflecting on skills *or* presenting handouts *or* modeling a skill or strategy *or* offering an opportunity to practice a skill or strategy?

3. Some mentor-coaching sessions vary a lot across different staff they mentor-coach, and others tend to be the same. What about you? Tell me a little more about how your sessions vary across staff.
   - ***Optional Probe:*** How you individualize your mentor-coaching sessions?

V. MENTOR-COACHING WITH [STAFF PERSON A]

We are now going to ask you about two staff you mentor-coach that we randomly selected to talk to you about. We would like to know your experiences working with each of them, to help us gain a more detailed understanding of the processes of mentor-coaching. First, let's talk about [staff person A].

1. What is [staff person A's] position at this center?
   - ***Probe:*** Is he/she a classroom teacher, assistant teacher, home visitor, family child care staff, administrator, or supervisor?

2. How long have you been working with [staff person A]?

3. Approximately how many times have you met with [staff person A] for mentor-coaching? How often do you currently meet with [staff person A]?

4. In what language(s) was mentor-coaching conducted for [staff person A]?

5. Thinking back to when you first started working with [staff person A], what was his/her <u>initial</u> attitude towards mentor-coaching?
   - ***Optional Probe:*** Some staff may be reluctant or concerned when starting mentor-coaching, while others maybe enthusiastic. What about [staff person A]?
   - ***Optional Probe:*** Would you describe him/her as more or less accepting, engaged or open to your mentor-coaching?

6. Thinking of [staff person A], how would you describe his/her <u>current level of openness and engagement?</u>
   - ***Optional Probes:*** For example, is s/he willing to examine her/his own work and look for areas for improvement? On a scale of one to 10, with 1 being not open or engaged and 10 being very open and engaged, where would [staff person A] rate? Tell me more about that.

7. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Tell me about [staff person A] training needs or professional development goals.

8. Please think back to your last mentor-coaching session with [staff person A]. Please briefly describe what happened during the mentor-coaching session. [ASK QUESTIONS A THROUGH F AS NEEDED TO GET AT DETAILS]
   a. Where and when did this mentor-coaching take place?
   b. In this last mentor-coaching session, who was present?
   c. What kind of things did you do?
      - ***Optional Probes:*** Did you conduct observations of the staff person you were mentor-coaching? Did you review videotapes with staff? Did you provide opportunities to practice new skills? Did you model a recommended approach? Did you explain a new concept?
   d. Did you use videotape?
   e. In this last mentor-coaching session, what major issues or topics did you focus on?
   f. To what extent does this last mentor-coaching session represent a typical session for you and staff person [A]?

9. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Overall, over the course of your entire time working with [staff person A] how effective was your mentor-coaching at addressing the goals and priorities that you identified for [staff person A]?
   a. How do you know this?

VI. MENTOR-COACHING WITH [STAFF PERSON B]

Now let's talk about [staff person B].

1. What is [staff person B's] position at this center?
   - ***Probe:*** Is he/she a classroom teacher, assistant teacher, home visitor, family child care staff, administrator, or supervisor?

2. How long have you been working with [staff person B]?

3. Approximately how many times have you met with [staff person B] for mentor-coaching? How often do you currently meet with [staff person B]?

4. In what language(s) was mentor-coaching conducted for [staff person B]?

5. Thinking back to when you first started working with [staff person B], what was his/her initial attitude towards mentor-coaching?
   - ***Optional Probe:*** Some staff may be reluctant or concerned when starting mentor-coaching, while others maybe enthusiastic. What about [staff person B]?
   - ***Optional Probe:*** Would you describe him/her as more or less accepting, engaged or open to your mentor-coaching?

6. Thinking of [staff person B], how would you describe his/her current level of openness and engagement?
   - ***Optional Probes:*** For example, is s/he willing to examine her/his own work and look for areas for improvement? On a scale of one to 10, with 1 being not open or engaged and 10 being very open and engaged, where would [staff person A] rate? Tell me more about that.

7. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Tell me about [staff person B] training needs or professional development goals.

8. Earlier in this interview you described for me a recent mentor-coaching session with [staff person A]. Think back to your most recent session with [staff person B]. Did it vary much from the session you described with [staff person A]?
   - ✓ [IF YES, SAY] Please describe some of those differences.

   a. To what extent does this recent mentor-coaching session represent a typical session for you and staff person [B]?

9. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Overall, over the course of your entire time working with [staff person B] how effective was your mentor-coaching at addressing the goals and priorities that you identified for [staff person B]?
   a. How do you know this?

VII. REFLECTIONS ABOUT MENTOR-COACHING

I'd like to get your reflections about the mentor-coaching initiative.

1. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** What are the characteristics of successful mentor-coaching?
   a. Do you find that relationship factors between you and the staff you mentor-coach are important to mentor-coaching?
      - ✓ [IF YES, SAY] Please describe what factors are necessary to effective mentor-coaching relationships.

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** Was the program environment supportive of developing and improving new skills?
   a. Were administrators supportive?
   b. Was other staff supportive?
   c. Has the level of support changed since the Early Learning Mentor Coach initiative first started at your grantee?
   d. Would you say, in your center(s), that the staff felt safe openly discussing their work problems with their peers and supervisors?

3. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** What were the challenges to the success of your mentor-coaching at your grantee?
   a. Were there any challenges that really undermined your work with individuals or with the center?
      - ➢ ***Optional Probe:*** What was frustrating to you as a mentor-coach***?***
      - ➢ ***Optional Probe:*** Were there…any staff problems? …any administrative challenges? …any other resource issues?

4. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Thinking across all your work as an Early Learning Mentor Coach, what were the areas where you feel that your mentor-coaching directly made the biggest improvements in staff?

5. If you could target your mentor-coaching efforts to specific types of staff members, who do you think would benefit the most from mentor-coaching?
      - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** Where is the greatest potential for mentor-coaching: new teachers/home visitors *or* experienced teachers/home visitors *or* teaching assistants *or* education coordinators *or* other staff?

6. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make?

Thank you very much for participating in this interview!

Staff Interview

Interview Date:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:

[INTERVIEWERS: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING TO YOUR INTERVIEWEE]

Hello, my name is [insert your name] and I am part of the research team evaluating the federal Office of Head Start's Early Learning Mentor Coaching initiative (known as the ELMC for short). This interview is part of this evaluation. This is an evaluation of the ELMC initiative, and *not* an evaluation of you, your Head Start/Early Head Start grantee or its centers.

The responses you provide will contribute to the development of profiles of mentor-coaching approaches to inform policy, practice, and research. There are no risks to you for participating, you may decline to participate or may stop at any time you wish, and your responses will remain private. Comments or quotes, if selected from your interview, will be reported anonymously to ensure that they cannot be attributed to either you or your grantee.

The interview will take about one hour.

Do you have any questions?

If you understand this information and agree to participate, please let me know and we'll get started.

I'd like to ask for your permission to record this interview so that I get everything you say. May we have your permission to record this interview? [START RECORDING ONLY IF PERMISSION IS GIVEN, AND VERBAL CONSENT IS GRANTED.]

I. ABOUT YOUR WORK AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I'd like to start with a few questions about your work at this center and professional development activities.

1. Just to confirm, have you been working with [NAME OF MENTOR-COACH] as your mentor-coach? [IF NO, ASK] Who have you been working with?

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** What is your position at this center?
   a. What is your job title? [IF UNCLEAR, ASK] Are you a classroom teacher, assistant teacher, home visitor, family child care staff, administrator, or supervisor?
   b. How long have you worked in this position?
   c. How long have you worked at this Head Start/Early Head Start grantee?
   d. How many children do you work with directly?
   e. What ages of children do you work with?

3. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** How long have you worked in the early childhood education and care field?
   a. When you think ahead three years, do you picture yourself still working in the early childhood education field?

4. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** About how often do you participate in required technical assistance or training activities provided by your grantee?
      - ***Optional Probes:*** About weekly; a couple of times a month; monthly; every few months; once a year or less.

5. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** Are you <u>interested in pursuing</u> additional classes or trainings beyond these requirements?
   a. In the last year or so, have you <u>taken</u> any additional classes or trainings?
      - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] What have they been about?
      - ✓ [IF NO, ASK] Do you know if any additional trainings or classes are available locally?

6. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Does your program offer any support that you know of for taking additional classes or trainings?
      - ***Optional Probes:*** Such as encouraging you to take the classes? Or paying for the classes, materials or paying for a substitute?

II. EARLY LEARNING MENTOR COACHING AND MENTOR-COACH APPROACH

Now I have a number of general questions about the Early Learning Mentor Coaching that you have been participating in.

1. Prior to being contacted for this interview, did you know that the mentor-coaching you received was funded by an Early Learning Mentor Coach grant from the Office of Head Start?

2. How long have you received mentor-coaching from [NAME OF MENTOR-COACH]?

3. How were you selected to receive mentor-coaching?
      - ***Optional Probes:*** Were assessments used to select staff for mentor-coaching? Did you volunteer or express an interest?

4. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** Since September 2010, approximately how many different mentor-coaches have you had?
   [IF MORE THAN ONE, ASK] How was the transition to a new mentor-coach?
   - ***Optional Probe:*** What helped with the transition to a new mentor-coach?

5. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** On average, how often do you have face-to-face contact with your mentor-coach?
   a. How long does each face-to-face contact tend to be?
   b. Is this time formally scheduled?
   c. Are there other less formal contacts used as a part of the mentor-coaching you receive, such as phone calls, texting, or emails?
   d. Is scheduling a time for mentor-coaching easy or challenging?

6. Would you say the amount of contact with your mentor-coach over the last year has been too much, just about right, or too little?
   - ✓ [IF NOT 'just about right', ASK] How could it have been improved? Please explain.

7. Think back to when you started being mentor-coached. What, if any, initial expectations did you have about the mentor-coaching process?
   a. What were your initial expectations? What did you hope mentor-coaching would do for you?
      - ***Optional Probe:*** For example, did you expect the mentor coach would help you to grow as a professional?
   b. Did you have any concerns about mentor-coaching?
      - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] What were those concerns?
   c. Before you started meeting with your mentor-coach, were you looking forward to receiving mentor-coaching? Please explain why.
      - ***Optional Probe:*** Did you think they would help you a great deal or hardly at all?

8. Sometimes professionals feel they need to improve their work skills and others feel their skill level is quite high. What about you? How do you feel about your level of expertise?
   - ***Optional Probe:*** Would you say you have room for improvement or is work going just fine for you?

III. MENTOR-COACHING GOALS AND CONTENT

The next set of questions is about the content of your mentor-coaching sessions, including how goals and topics were chosen for your mentor-coaching sessions and what those goals and topics were.

1. Thinking over the mentor-coaching you have received, what are the goals and topics of your mentor-coaching work? Please list as many as you can think of that you have tackled in mentor-coaching.
   - ***Optional Probes:*** Any others? Such as…improving instructional practices, strategies, and skills (e.g., literacy practices, behavior management); increasing or improving use of assessment or technology (e.g., improving scores on the CLASS); personal development (e.g., enrollment in college coursework, improving staff interactions with colleagues, stress reduction).
   a. [IF GOAL(S) IDENTIFIED, SELECT ONE AND SAY] Please give me an example of how your mentor-coach worked with you on [INSERT SELECTED TOPIC].
   b. Have you had the same goals throughout your mentor-coaching?

2. Has your mentor-coach provided materials for you or your [classroom, center, or for families that you home visit]? [IF YES, SAY] Please describe.
    a. How useful were those materials?

3. Has your mentor-coach ever given you 'homework'?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] How often?
    - ✓ [IF YES, SAY] Please provide an example.
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Was the homework helpful?
    - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] In what way?

4. Does your mentor-coach provide feedback to you? [IF YES, ASK FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS]
    a. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Can you give me an example of feedback provided by your mentor-coach?
    - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** By feedback, we mean does your mentor-coach offer you comments or suggestions about your work, such as identifying your strengths and weakness?
    b. How often do you receive feedback from your mentor-coach?
    - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** Would you say you receive feedback every session, most sessions, occasional sessions, or seldom?
    c. Is the feedback based on live observations of your work, videotape, or both? Is it written or verbal feedback, in person or by email?
    d. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION**] [IF FEEDBACK RECEIVED] How helpful do you find the feedback in improving your work? Please explain.

IV. TYPICAL MENTOR-COACHING SESSION

We would like to know about a typical mentor-coaching session for you. Please think back to the last mentor-coaching session that you participated in.

1. Please briefly describe what happened during the mentor-coaching session. [ASK QUESTIONS A THROUGH F AS NEEDED TO GET AT DETAILS]
    a. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Where and when did this mentor-coaching take place?
    b. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** In this last mentor-coaching session, who was present?
    c. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** What kind of things did you do?
        - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** Did your mentor-coach conduct observations of you? Did your mentor-coach review videotapes with you? Did your mentor-coach provide opportunities to practice new skills? Did your mentor-coach model a recommended approach? Did your mentor-coach explain a new concept?
    d. Did your mentor-coach use videotape?
    e. In this last mentor-coaching session, what major issues or topics did you focus on?
    f. To what extent does this last mentor-coaching session represent a typical session for you and staff person [A]?

    - ✓ Is there anything else you want to add to your description of this recent session?

    [ASK QUESTION G WHEN DESCRIPTION OF 'TYPICAL SESSION' IS DONE]
        g. Do your mentor-coaching sessions vary a lot, or do they tend to be the same in terms of timing and who is there?
    - ✓ [IF THEY VARY, SAY] Please describe how they vary.

V. PERCEPTIONS OF MENTOR-COACH

I now have a few questions about your perceptions of your mentor-coach.

1. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** How would you describe your relationship with your mentor-coach?
   - ➢ ***Optional Probe***: Would you say your working relationship with your mentor-coach is comfortable and easy or sometimes challenging? Please explain what it is like to work with him/her.

   a. What feedback would you give your mentor-coach about his/her strengths and weaknesses?
   b. What should s/he be working on?
   c. What are her/his strengths?

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Are you fully comfortable discussing your work mistakes with this mentor-coach, to receive feedback and support?

3. Mentor-coaches can take on a number of roles, depending on their personalities, skills and the topic being worked on. What roles would you say your mentor-coach takes on?
   - ➢ ***Optional Probes:*** For example, most mentor-coaches work in the role of a teacher for staff, but they might also be an advocate, an emotional supporter or a personal assistant…what different roles does your mentor coach take on?

   - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED, ASK] Has your mentor-coach ever been an advocate for you?
     - ➢ ***Optional Probe:*** With your coworkers or administrators?
   - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED, ASK] Has your mentor-coach ever acted as an assistant to you in your work (like an assistant teacher)?
   - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED, ASK] Does your mentor-coach ever provide you with emotional support? [IF YES, ASK] How does your mentor-coach provide emotional support?
   - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED, ASK] What about crisis intervention; would you say your mentor-coach ever provides crisis intervention?

4. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Overall, is your mentor-coach <u>skilled and knowledgeable</u> in areas helpful to you?
   - ✓ [IF YES, SAY] Please provide an example.
   - ✓ [IF NO, ASK] What areas would you like to learn more about?

5. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Does your mentor-coach provide supervision for you or report to your supervisors?
   - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Did you find that the mentor-coach being involved in supervision <u>interfered</u> with the effectiveness of the mentor-coaching, or did it <u>facilitate</u> the effectiveness of the mentor-coaching? Please explain.

VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF MENTOR-COACHING

I'd like to ask just a few more questions to get your sense of how effective you think the Early Learning Mentor Coaching has been.

1. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Overall, on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being low and 10 being high, how would you rate the quality of the mentor-coaching you receive from your program? Briefly tell me why you rated the quality of mentor-coaching this way.

2. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Some staff have told us their work has changed a lot as a result of mentor-coaching, while other staff said there has been little change as are result of mentor-coaching. What about you? Has your work changed as a direct result of mentor-coaching?
   - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Tell me more. Please provide an example.
   - ✓ [IF YES ASK] What did your mentor-coach do to cause those changes?
   - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED, ASK]: Have you increased your use of assessments in your work as a direct result of mentor-coaching?

   - ✓ **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** What about your work as it relates to the ways you work with children, family and other staff? Some staff have told us this type of work has changed as a result of mentor-coaching, while other staff have said there has been little change in how they work with children, family and other staff. How about you?
   - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] Please provide an example.
   - ✓ [IF YES, ASK] What did your mentor-coach do to cause those changes?
   - ✓ [IF NOT MENTIONED, ASK]: Have your instructional practices changed as a result of mentor-coaching? Have your strategies or interactions with parents changed as a result of mentor coaching? Has your ability to manage children's behavior changed as a result of mentor-coaching?

3. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTION]** Since September 2010, have you pursued college coursework, a degree, certification or a credential?
   - ✓ [IF YES, AND NOT MENTIONED IN RESPONSE TO Q2, ASK] Did the mentor-coaching you experienced provide direct encouragement to pursue college coursework or a degree, certificate, or credential? Please explain.

4. **[☎PRIORITY QUESTIONS]** Given the opportunity, would you like to continue your work with your mentor-coach?
   a. What will you miss about the mentor-coaching?

VII. REFLECTIONS ABOUT MENTOR-COACHING

I'd like to get your reflections about the mentor-coaching initiative.

1. What was the best thing about the experience of having a mentor-coach?

2. What was the most challenging thing about the experience of having a mentor-coach?

VIII. ABOUT YOU

I'd like to end with a few questions about you. We are asking a few basic demographic questions, so we can describe who received mentoring-coaching under this initiative.

1. What is the highest level of education you have completed? [CODE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER USING THE RESPONSE OPTIONS BELOW. DO NOT READ RESPONSE OPTIONS TO RESPONDENT; PROMPT IF NECESSARY]:

Up to 8th grade	☐
9th to 11th grade	☐
12th grade but no diploma	☐
High school diploma/GED/or equivalent	☐

Voc/Tech diploma after high school	☐
Some college, but no degree	☐
Associate's Degree (AA)	☐
Bachelor's degree (BA or BS)	☐
Graduate or professional coursework, but no degree	☐
Master's Degree (MA or MS)	☐
Doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)	☐
Professional degree after bachelor's degree (MD, DDS, MBA, JD, LLB)	☐

2. What certificates or licenses do you have? [CODE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER USING THE RESPONSE OPTIONS BELOW. DO NOT READ RESPONSE OPTIONS TO RESPONDENT; PROMPT IF NECESSARY]:

Mentor-coach certification	☐
State-awarded teaching certificate	☐
State-awarded early childhood or preschool certificate	☐
Child Development Associate (CDA) credential	☐
Special education teacher degree	☐
Social work, psychology, or counseling license	☐
Teaching certificate or license	☐
Other (please specify):	☐
None of the above	☐

3. Do you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino *or* do you consider yourself to be non-Hispanic or non-Latino?

Hispanic or Latino	☐
Non-Hispanic or non-Latino	☐

4. What is your race? [CODE RESPONDENT'S ANSWER USING THE RESPONSE OPTIONS BELOW. DO NOT READ RESPONSE OPTIONS TO RESPONDENT; PROMPT IF NECESSARY]

American Indian or Alaska Native	☐
Black or African American	☐
Asian	☐
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	☐
White	☐

5. Do you have any other comments that you would like to make? [text box; 100 character limit]

Thank you very much for participating in this interview!

INTERVIEW DATA CAPTURE FORM AND INTERVIEWER NOTES - MENTOR-COACH INTERVIEW

Grantee Name: _____ Date: _____

Grantee ID: _____ Interviewer: _____

Mentor-Coach ID: _____ Start Time: _____

End Time: _____

Check the boxes that apply to this interview:

I. Mentor-Coach Work Experiences	
This mentor-coach….	**Mentor-coach was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Previously worked for this Grantee before ELMC grant b. ❒ Works full-time as a mentor-coach for this grantee	c. ❒ Initial training received from their grantee d. ❒ experiences and skills that are valuable to their work as a mentor-coach
II. Mentor-Coaching Approaches	
This mentor-coach….	**Mentor-coach was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Describes a crisis interventionist role b. ❒ Works in a several centers c. ❒ Mentor-coaches' *only* classroom teachers d. ❒ Has formal supervision responsibilities e. ❒ Mentor-coaches' *only* home-visitors	f. ❒ The role they take on as a mentor coach g. ❒ Using technology in their mentor-coaching h. ❒ Using video in their mentor-coaching
III. Goals and Content	
This mentor-coach….	**Mentor-coach was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Defines clear goals b. ❒ Focuses only on individual-level goals	c. ❒ Using assessment tools to inform their mentor-coaching
IV. Coaching Staff	
This mentor-coach….	**Mentor-coach was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Describes a typical way they provide mentor-coaching b. ❒ Targets their mentor-coaching to specific teachers/home visitors or staff	c. ❒ How mentor-coaching staff A and B were different d. ❒ How they were effective working with staff A and/or B
V. Reflections about Mentor-Coaching	
This mentor-coach….	**Mentor-coach was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Feels their program environment is supportive to their work b. ❒ Believes their mentor-coaching made improvements	c. ❒ Successes of mentor-coaching at their grantee d. ❒ Challenges of mentor-coaching at their grantee

INTERVIEWER NOTES

GENERAL NOTE: To protect the confidentiality of interview respondents DO NOT use the respondent's name when writing summary notes from interview. Instead use words such as "respondent" or "R."

Use descriptive words, NOT interpretive words in the sections below. Convey what you were actually told in the interview rather than conceal what happened by adding your interpretation or impressions of what you heard. Save impressions for the "INTERVIEWER THOUGHTS AND QUESTIONS" section below OR offset your own questions and interpretations with [brackets].

SUMMARY OF THE MENTOR-COACH MODEL

Describe the ELMC model at the grantee in a few summary sentences. Provide an overview of what type of staff the mentor-coach worked with, major focal areas and/or goals of the model (e.g., literacy, family engagement, classroom management, teaching skills, etc), how often they see staff, the format of their ELMC (e.g., in person meetings, phone calls, Skype), what terms they use to describe themselves and the staff they mentor-coach model (e.g., coach, mentor, protégé, protégées advisors, lead coach).

I. MENTOR-COACH WORK AND EXPERIENCES

Describe the mentor-coach's experience at the grantee. Detail the mentor-coach's account of his/her prior experiences as a mentor-coach, initial training s/he received from the grantee, and the resources and supports that helped him/her in the role.

a. What experiences and skills did s/he find were valuable in his/her work as a mentor-coach?

II. MENTOR-COACHING APPROACH

Describe the mentor-coaching approach by this respondent. Describe the format, schedule, and structure of the mentor-coaching sessions (how often, where they occur, the mode).

a. ***How did the mentor-coach describe his/her role?***

b. ***Describe what, why, and how the mentor-coach used technology:***

c. Describe what, why, and how the mentor-coach used video recordings:

d. Describe the supervision the mentor-coach provides and also receive (who and how often):

III. MENTOR-COACHING GOALS AND CONTENT

Describe the grantee's main goals for the ELMC Initiative. Were the goals clear to the mentor-coach, did the goals focus on the individual, the program, or a combination?

a. ***Describe how the mentor-coach selects goals, topics, and activities for the staff s/he works with. (E.g., are goals driven by the staff, the mentor-coach, supervisor, others, etc)***

b. Describe what assessment tools, if any, are used by the mentor-coach:

IV. TYPICAL MENTOR-COACHING

How did the mentor-coach describe his/her "typical" mentor-coaching, including the feedback s/he gives to staff, if s/he tries to get staff to change their practice, and if s/he varies a lot depending on the staff s/he works with?

V. MENTOR-COACHING WITH STAFF A

How did the mentor-coach describe his/her experiences working with Staff A? Include information related to needs, attitudes toward mentor-coaching, engagement, openness, quality of the relationship, frequency of contact, etc.

a. What professional development did the mentor-coach believe staff A needs?

b. How did the mentor-coach rate staff A's level of engagement, on the scale of 1 to 10?

c. *In what ways did the mentor-coach feel s/he was effective with staff A?*

VI. MENTOR-COACHING WITH STAFF B

How did the mentor-coach describe his/her experiences working with Staff B? Include information related to needs, attitudes toward coaching, engagement, openness, quality of the relationship, frequency of contact, etc.

a. What professional development did the mentor-coach believe staff B needs?

b. How did the mentor-coach rate staff B's level of engagement, on the scale of 1 to 10?

d. In what ways did the mentor-coach feel s/he was effective with staff B?

In what ways did the mentor-coach describe experiences working with staff A and B as similar?

In what ways did the mentor-coach describe experiences working with staff A and B as different?

VII. REFLECTIONS ABOUT MENTOR-COACHING

What thoughts did the mentor-coach have about the characteristics of successful mentor-coaching? What did the mentor-coach say were the challenges to the success of mentor-coaching at the grantee?

a. What areas did they mentor-coach feel their mentor-coaching made the biggest improvements in staff?

b. What thoughts did the mentor-coach have about the greatest potential for mentor-coaching?

VIII. OTHER SALIENT ISSUES

Include any important information that was very salient in the interview. Think about issues, topics, or thoughts the respondent felt were very important and/or repeated during the interview. Think about the most important thing you learned that has relevance to understanding the way their ELMC model functioned-both challenges and successes. Include any direct quotes that you think would be useful in the final report.

IX. INTERVIEWER THOUGHTS AND QUESTIONS

Please include any questions or comments you have about the interview. For example, what things were unclear? What is your impression of the interview? How did things go? What are your own feelings, reactions, and reflections about what you learned in the interview? This is the section to document analytical and interpretive thought you have about the interview and/or the respondent:

INTERVIEW DATA CAPTURE FORM AND INTERVIEWER NOTES - STAFF INTERVIEW

Grantee Name: _____ Date: _____

Grantee ID: _____ Interviewer: _____

Staff ID: _____ Start Time: _____

End Time: _____

Check the boxes that apply to this interview:

I. Work and Professional Development Experiences	
This staff….	**Staff was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Is a classroom teacher ❒ Is NOT a classroom teacher (e.g., assistant teacher, home visitor, administrator, etc) b. ❒ Worked in the early childhood field for 5 years or more c. ❒ Rarely/seldom participates in technical assistance or training activities d. ❒ Is Interested in pursuing additional classes or professional development	e. ❒ Additional classes or trainings taken
II. Early Learning Mentor Coaching and Mentor-Coach Approach	
This staff….	**Staff was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Knew that the mentor-coaching was funded by the ELMC grant b. ❒ Had more than ONE (1) ELMC mentor-coach c. ❒ Felt s/he needed to improve his/her work skills	d. ❒ Frequency of face-to-face contact with mentor-coach e. ❒ Expectations s/he had about the mentor-coaching process
III. Mentor-Coaching Goals and Content	
This staff….	**Staff was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Receives feedback from his/her mentor-coach b. ❒ Found the feedback from his/her mentor-coach helpful in improving his/her work	c. ❒ How the mentor-coach worked with on a specific goal d. ❒ How the mentor-coach provided feedback
IV. Typical Mentor-Coaching Session	
This staff….	**Staff was able to provide**

		examples of…
a. ❒ Mentor-coach used videotape in sessions	b. ❒Mentor-coaching sessions vary a lot	c. ❒ The last mentor-coaching session
V. Perceptions of the Mentor-Coach		
This staff….		**Staff was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Is comfortable discussing his/her mistakes with mentor-coach b. ❒ Feels his/her mentor-coach is skilled and knowledgeable in areas helpful to him/her	c. ❒ Mentor-coach provides supervision for him/her or reports to his/her supervisors	d. ❒ His/her relationship with his/her mentor-coach
VI. Effectiveness of Mentor-Coaching		
This staff….		**Staff was able to provide examples of…**
a. ❒ Rated the quality of the mentor-coaching as a _____ [*insert #]* b. ❒ Feels his/her work changed as a direct result of mentor-coaching c. ❒ Feels his/her work changed in how s/he works with children, family and other staff as a direct result of mentor-coaching	d. ❒ Pursued college coursework, a degree, certification or a credential since September 2010 e. ❒Would like to continue to work with their mentor-coach	f. ❒ How mentor-coach caused changes in the staff member's work g. ❒ How mentor-coach caused changes in the staff member's work with children, family or other staff
VIII. About You		

1. Highest level of education completed:

Up to 8th grade	☐
9th to 11th grade	☐
12th grade but no diploma	☐

High school diploma/GED/or equivalent	☐
Voc/Tech diploma after high school	☐
Some college, but no degree	☐
Associate's Degree (AA)	☐
Bachelor's degree (BA or BS)	☐
Graduate or professional coursework, but no degree	☐
Master's Degree (MA or MS)	☐
Doctorate degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)	☐
Professional degree after bachelor's degree (MD, DDS, MBA, JD, LLB)	☐

2. Certificates or licenses:

Mentor-coach certification	☐
State-awarded teaching certificate	☐
State-awarded early childhood or preschool certificate	☐
Child Development Associate (CDA) credential	☐
Special education teacher degree	☐
Social work, psychology, or counseling license	☐
Teaching certificate or license	☐
Other (please specify):	☐
None of the above	☐

3. Ethnicity

Hispanic or Latino	☐
Non-Hispanic or non-Latino	☐

4. Race

American Indian or Alaska Native	☐
Black or African American	☐
Asian	☐
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	☐
White	☐

INTERVIEWER NOTES

GENERAL NOTE: To protect the confidentiality of interview respondents DO NOT use the respondent's name when writing summary notes from interview. Instead use words such as "respondent" or "R."

Use descriptive words, NOT interpretive words in the sections below. Convey what you were actually told in the interview rather than conceal what happened by adding your interpretation or impressions of

what you heard. Save impressions for the "INTERVIEWER THOUGHTS AND QUESTIONS" section below OR offset your own questions and interpretations with [brackets].

I. WORK AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES

Describe the staff's work and professional experience at the grantee. Detail the staff position, length of employment, training they received from the grantee, and interest in additional education:

II. EARLY LEARNING MENTOR COACHING AND MENTOR-COACH APPROACH

Describe the staff's experience with mentor-coaching, including length received it, how they were selected, number of coaches worked with since the ELMC initiative started, and their initial expectations for mentor-coaching.

a. Describe how often staff has face-to-face contact with mentor-coach, including length, frequency, scheduling, and use of other contacts (e.g., texts, emails, etc):

III. MENTOR-COACHING GOALS AND CONTENT

Describe the staff's perceptions about the content of their mentor-coaching, including types of goals and topics covered, types of materials used, etc:

a. Describe how mentor-coach provides feedback to staff and how helpful staff felt the feedback has been:

IV. TYPICAL MENTOR-COACHING SESSION

Describe the staff's perceptions about what a typical mentor-coaching session is for him/her, including where it took place, who was present, what kind of things that were done, etc:

V. PERCEPTIONS OF MENTOR-COACH

Describe the staff's relationship with his/her mentor-coach, including how comfortable the relationships is, challenges, the mentor-coach's strengths and weaknesses, role the mentor-coach takes on, etc:

VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MENTOR-COACHING

Describe the quality of the mentor-coaching staff received from his/her program, if s/he would want to continue, and his/her overall feelings about the ELMC mentor-coaching s/he received:

a. Describe if staff feels his/her work has changed as result of mentor-coaching, how, and why:

VII. REFLECTIONS ABOUT MENTOR-COACHING

Describe what the staff said was the best thing about the experience of having a mentor-coach; describe what the staff said was the most challenging thing about the experience:

VIII. OTHER SALIENT ISSUES

Include any important information that was very salient in the interview. Think about issues, topics, or thoughts the respondent felt were very important and/or repeated during the interview. Think about the most important thing you learned that has relevance to understanding the way their experience with the ELMC model functioned-both challenges and successes. Include any direct quotes that you think would be useful in the final report.

IX. INTERVIEWER THOUGHTS AND QUESTIONS

Please include any questions or comments you have about the interview. For example, what things were unclear? What is your impression of the interview? How did things go? What are your own feelings, reactions, and reflections about what you learned in the interview? This is the section to document analytical and interpretive thought you have about the interview and/or the respondent.

Appendix C. Sampling and Recruitment Procedures

Sampling Procedures

To select a sample of 65 grantees from the population of 130 grantees, we relied on a three by four (rural or urban classification by grantee size) stratified sample design (see Exhibit C-1). Because we selected a stratified random sample of 65 grantees, we have a large (50 percent) sampling fraction. It is also important to reemphasize that the purpose of this study is to describe the implementation. We cannot draw conclusions about the effects of coaching—either on the whole population or parts of the population—therefore the issues of sampling are lessened. Exhibit C-1 shows the population and sample sizes within each stratum of the design. The design selects with certainty all grantees in the four shaded (certainty) strata and all grantees with American Indian/Alaska Native (AIAN) or migrant seasonal HS (MSHS) programs in the unshaded strata, for a total of 15 grantees in all. The design allocates the remaining sample of 50 grantees across the unshaded strata in proportion to the number of grantees within each stratum that were not selected with certainty (referred to as noncertainty grantees).

Exhibit C-1. Sample Design for the Early Learning Mentor Coach Initiative

		Population Size (Number of Noncertainty Grantees) Sample Size [Number Selected Randomly, Number Selected With Certainty]				
		Size				Total
		Less Than 400 Funded Children	400 to 1,000 Funded Children	1,001 to 5,000 Funded Children	More Than 5,000 Funded Children	
Rural/urban classification	Metro area with one million or more residents (large urban)	17 (15) 8 [6, 2]	15 (14) 7 [6, 1]	22 (22) 10 [10, 0]	3 (0) 3 [0, 3]	57 (51) 28 [22, 6]
	Metro area with less than one million residents (small urban)	7 (7) 3 [3, 0]	11 (11) 5 [5, 0]	20 (18) 10 [8, 2]	1 (0) 1 [0, 1]	39 (36) 19 [16, 3]
	Rural area	20 (17) 10 [7, 3]	12 (12) 5 [5, 0]	2 (0) 2 [0, 2]	1 (0) 1 [0, 1]	35 (29) 18 [12, 6]
Total		44 (39) 21 [16, 5]	38 (37) 17 [16, 1]	44 (40) 22 [18, 4]	5 (0) 5 [0, 5]	131 (116) 65 [50, 15]

In summary, two main variables were used to classify the grantees into strata: rural or urban classification and grantee size. We used three variables to sort the records for the systematic sampling procedure: (1) English language learner (ELL) classification (50 percent or more ELL; less than 50 percent ELL), (2) program options (center based only and other), and (3) program type (EHS, HS, EHS/HS, MSHS, and AI/AN). To select the sample within each unshaded stratum, we relied on a systematic sampling procedure. The procedure sorted the records of all the noncertainty grantees within each unshaded stratum by program type (EHS, HS, and EHS/HS), the proportion of children who were ELLs, and program options (whether the program is entirely center based or offers other options, such as family or home-based child care) before the sample of noncertainty grantees was drawn. See Exhibits C-2, C-3, and C-4 for the base weights and sample counts for these three variables. For each grantee, we applied the selection

probability—or the probability of selection into the sample for each member in the grantee population (i.e., selected with certainty and not selected with certainty). Lastly, we determined the base weight for each grantee, which for all grantees not selected into the sample was zero and for all grantees selected into the sample was the inverse of the selection probability for sample members. This sampling procedure ensured that the sample of noncertainty grantees within each unshaded stratum was balanced across these background characteristics.

Exhibit C-2. Sample Counts and Base Weights for Program Type

	Program Type (updated and recoded)	Base Weight Sum	Sample Count
1	AIAN	4.00	4
2	EHS	17.10	7
3	EHS/MSHS	3.00	3
4	HS	18.54	8
5	HS/EHS	86.36	41
6	MSHS	2.00	2
Sum		131.00	65

Exhibit C-3. Sample Counts and Sum of the Base Weights by ELL Classification

	ELL Classification	Base Weight Sum	Sample Count
1	50% or more ELL	29.22	16
2	Less than 50% ELL	101.78	49
Sum		131.00	65

Exhibit C-4. Sample Counts and Base Weights for Program Options

	Program Options	Base Weight Sum	Sample Count
1	Other	93.51	46
2	Center based only	37.49	19
Sum		131.00	65

Sampling Coaches and Staff

After the grantees were selected, AIR received the coach contact information from the grantees and randomly selected one coach for interviewing, who received a letter that (1) provided information about the coach census survey, (2) requested contact information of all the staff that he or she coaches, and (3) indicated that he or she would be asked for an interview. The link to the coach census survey was sent to all coaches, and an interview request was sent to each coach who provided staff information.

Staff recruitment was initiated through the receipt of staff contact information from the selected coaches. We randomly selected two staff per coach and sent them a letter informing them that they would be asked for an interview. Again, to encourage a high rate of participation, we sent reminder e-mails and made follow-up telephone calls to schedule the interviews.[4]

Recruitment Procedures

To initiate the recruitment process, OHS provided the contact list of the 130 ELMC grantees. Prior to approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), OHS sent an introductory e-mail to the grantees to notify them about the ELMC study. OHS also sent a post-OMB approval letter to the grantees to inform them that AIR would contact them and their coaches regarding data collection. Finally, OHS included information about the study in their monthly newsletters. The study team obtained grantee contact information through Program Information Report (PIR) data (an administrative data system used by HS and EHS), searching grantee websites, and assistance from OHS.

All of the grantees received a recruitment e-mail letter from AIR requesting that they (1) confirm grantee contact information, (2) provide advance notification about the grantee census survey, and (3) request contact information (names and e-mail addresses) of all the coaches. The grantees selected to participate in the telephone interviews were asked the same information as the nonselected grantees, but they were informed that a selected number of staff would be interviewed.

The study team sent the coaches (N = 455) an e-mail with a unique link that would connect them to the online coach census survey to complete. If he or she were a coach within a selected grantee (n = 65), we randomly selected one coach to participate in an interview. We then contacted the selected ELMC coaches who agreed to participate in the telephone interview for a contact list of the staff they work with (n = 130). Finally, we randomly selected two teachers from the selected coaches list and asked them to participate in the telephone interview.

Incentives for Participation

The ELMC study used gift certificates instead of cash because all of contacts were over the Internet and by telephone. The ELMC study provided electronic gift certificates to the following to boost the response rate and compensate for the respondents' time. For respondents who could not receive electronic Amazon gift cards, we mailed the gift cards to specific the specific addresses they provided. The respondents and corresponding gift card amounts were as follows:

- **Grantee Census Survey.** Respondents did not receive an incentive.
- **Mentor-Coach Census Survey.** Each respondent received a $20 electronic gift certificate.
- **Mentor coach telephone interview.** Each respondent received a $25 electronic gift certificate.
- **Staff telephone interview.** Each respondent received a $25 electronic gift certificate.

[4] We experienced difficulty in contacting the staff via e-mail; telephone calls were more effective. In some cases, when follow-up calls were made, some staff members refused to participate. Data collection was further impacted when staff members who indicated that they were no longer with a particular grantee were deemed ineligible to participate in the study.

Appendix D. Interview Data Quality Assurance Procedures, Interviewer Training, and Data Analysis Procedures

In this appendix, we discuss the procedures and the processes used to ensure quality and quality control of the telephone interview data, both during data collection and data analyses. In addition, it provides details regarding training given to interviewers. Finally, we summarize the analyses procedures used for the interview data.

Interviewer Training

We conducted a one-day training for the three interviewers, which was led by the project director and facilitated by the project manager, with involvement from senior consultants at MEF, to ensure consistent collection of accurate and reliable interview data from the ELMC grantees and respondents. We used experienced data collectors who had foundational knowledge of the key interview techniques and had conducted interviews in other studies. One interviewer was a bilingual English/Spanish interviewer to ensure the collection of accurate information from respondents whose first language was Spanish.

The interviewers received a package of materials prior to the training, which provided several handouts, including overviews of the grant and the study, the interview protocols, the data capture forms for recording information from the interviews, interview techniques and common interview issues, and the QA process. During training, in addition to providing overviews of HS/EHS, the ELMC grant, the ELMC study, the interview protocols, and the timeline for the study, the interviewers also spent substantial time practicing with the protocols. Practice continued after training, including mock interviews. Although all of the interviewers were well versed in interviewing techniques, the trainers reviewed a variety of techniques to think about while interviewing as well as some commonly encountered issues that happen during interviewing.

Quality Assurance Procedures

The project director, the project manager, and MEF staff conducted quality control reviews of two initial coach interviews and two initial staff interviews for each interviewer, as well as 10 percent of the remainder of the coach and staff interviews for each interviewer. In addition, the study's lead interviewer and data manager reviewed an additional 18 interviews and data capture sheets. Our quality control procedures relied on listening to the original recording of the interview and comparing/reviewing against the data capture form using a quality control review form, which enabled the quality assurance (QA) reviewer to document comments about the following:

- Interview initiation and rapport
- Whether all questions were asked and the respondent was on track
- Question delivery
- Interviewer etiquette

- Time management
- Handling of problems with participant responses and refusals
- Accurate completion of the data capture form

Both the quality and the accuracy of the interviewing was high, so additional quality control reviews were not warranted.

Interview Data Analysis

To analyze the interview data, thematic analyses were conducted to code data in the interview data capture sheets. The interviewers used a data capture form immediately after they completed their interviews with both coaches and staff. The data capture forms provided preliminary codes and interview notes using a standardized structure across the interviewers. The data capture sheets were systematically coded on topics not covered by the survey to identify and categorize qualitative data that represent predominant and important themes about the experiences and perspectives of the ELMC grantees, the coaches, and program-level staff. The interview data analysis process involved four major steps:

1. **Cleaning and organizing the text data.** Each data capture sheet was formatted for importing into Atlas.ti, a qualitative analysis software program. After importation, the data capture was organized into document families (e.g., sampling subgroups).
2. **Developing major code lists.** The study team created major codes that align with the headings in the data capture sheets. We coded all of the text data into these major codes.
3. **Developing secondary and tertiary code lists.** Within each major code, we created secondary codes to search for themes and patterns within a topic area. The conceptual model and the survey findings drove the development of the secondary coding.
4. **Analysis of the coding and illustrative cases.** After coding and organizing the data into major and secondary categories, emergent themes and patterns were described.

The categories were counted (e.g., the number of times a particular theme appeared), converged (e.g., several categories were combined together to represent a larger theme), or diverged (e.g., large themes were separated into more specific ideas and concepts). Frequencies and counts of the thematic categories for the population and the subgroups are reported here, and illustrative quotes from the interviews are included. After the coding was completed, the research team member securely sent the codes and the coded text to a member of the study team for a quality control (QC) review. In the process, the research team member reviewed the text and the codes to see if there was agreement with the categorization of the text. For areas of disagreement, the research team members discussed the differences to arrive at a final code. Exhibit D-1 shows, by thematic code, the number of codes that changed during the QC process and the rate of agreement between the reviewers prior to their discussion of the coding. As noted within Exhibit D-1, before discussion among the reviewers, the rate agreement for all thematic coding ranged from 69 percent to 100 percent. After discussion, a 99 percent or higher agreement rate was achieved.

Exhibit D-1. Thematic Code, Number of Codes Changed During Quality Control Process, and the Quality Control Agreement Rate

Thematic Code	Number of Codes Changed During QC Process	Percentage of QC Agreement Rate (Prior to Discussion)[a]
MC perceptions of staff engagement[a]	8	92%
Staff perceptions of MC effectiveness	8	90%
Staff perceptions of relationship with MC	21	74%
MC goals and content	11	69%
Staff goals and content	16	80%
Staff change in work	13	84%
MC change in staff	8	85%
MC perceptions of MC effectiveness	13	88%
Challenges to mentor coaching	1	98%
MC supervision of staff (1)	3	94%
MC supervision of staff (2)	5	89%
MC_training	1	98%
Mentor coaches working in multiple locations	1	97%
Selection of staff to receive mentor coaching	0	100%
Supervision mentor coach receives	4	92%
Type of coachee code	1	99%
VII_MC success_personality-interpersonal skills breakdown	1	98%

[a]MC = mentor coach.

Appendix E: Grantee Census Survey Data Quality Assurance Procedures and Additional Data Analyses Tables

Appendix E includes a summary of the quality control review undertaken to ensure the quality of the survey data collected and analyzed.

This appendix also includes the results of the exploratory analyses of the grantee census survey data and the mentor coach census survey data, and more detail on the subgroup analyses is presented in this appendix. Bivariate subgroup analyses (cross-tabulations with significance testing) were conducted to describe the group differences in coaching, with subgroup sets defined for both grantees (according to grantee characteristics and contextual variables) and coaches (according to coaching features). Subgroup analyses were conducted with independent variables representing the grantee context, features of coaching, implementation of the ELMC initiative, and successes or challenges. We conducted a planned set of subgroup analyses for each subgroup based on a priori assumptions about which aspects of the ELMC implementation were expected to vary for each subgroup. The subgroup analysis results are summarized in the main body of the report along with univariate summary statistics for each dependent variable. Additional detail about the subgroup definitions and analyses are provided in this appendix, organized by respondent type and then by subgroup set.

In addition to the subgroup analyses, some bivariate correlations were conducted to identify the implementation factors that were correlated with coach perceptions of the success of the ELMC initiative and are also presented in this appendix.

Quality Assurance Procedures

For processing and monitoring the two census surveys, Vovici survey software was used. Through Vovici, individualized links to the surveys were sent to the respondents, and a team member regularly tracked the status of the survey responses. When Vovici indicated that participants had completed the survey, they were marked accordingly in a database used to track survey completion. If the surveys were not completed (unopened or never started), we were able to selectively call or e-mail the respondent to ask them to complete the survey. For surveys that were partially completed, we called respondents to ask them to complete the survey. The completion rates were high for both the grantee census survey (93 percent) and the mentor coach census survey (84 percent).

Prior to undertaking the analyses, a research analyst conducted a quality control review of the survey data to ensure that the data were coded correctly. The analyst also checked for and corrected, where possible, implausible values and ensured the accurate identification of item nonresponse as being either a valid skip (based on survey skip patterns) or missing data. After preliminary analyses of the survey data were complete, a senior researcher, external to the ELMC project, reviewed the data analytical approaches. Overall, the QC review confirmed that the analytical approach used in the analyses of survey data was appropriate.

Subgroup-Level Analyses

To gain a better understanding of how the ELMC initiative within the context of the HS/EHS programs was implemented, we considered how the implementation varied according to grantee characteristics that were expected to influence the ELMC coaching programs. These characteristics include the same ones that we used for stratification in sampling the grantees for the telephone interviews, including the following:

- **Grantee urbanicity.** Urban versus rural
- **Grantee size.** Small versus large
- **Percentage of children who are ELLs.** Half or more children as ELLs versus not
- **Program option.** Center-based services only versus other program options
- **Program type.** HS only versus EHS only versus other program types
- **Program type.** MSHS or AIAN versus other program types

The grantee characteristics data was taken from PIR. More detailed subgroup definitions are provided for each subgroup set. The subgroups are mutually exclusive categories within each subgroup set, and all of the grantee respondents were categorized into one of the categories for each subgroup set.

Analysis Methods

The subgroup analyses are descriptive comparisons of ELMC implementation data for each subgroup set. We conducted statistical tests of unadjusted subgroup differences for the urbanicity, grantee size, proportion of ELL, and program option subgroup sets. Statistical tests were not conducted for the subgroup comparisons in the AIAN/MSHS or HS/EHS subgroup sets because the subgroup sample sizes were too small to permit statistical tests. Exhibit E-1 presents the specific analysis approach used for each type of dependent variable in the subgroup analyses.

Exhibit E-1. Analysis Approach Used for Different Types of Dependent Variables for the Descriptive Subgroup Analyses

Type of Dependent Variable	Descriptive Comparison	Statistical Test of Subgroup Differences
Binary categorical	Cross-tabulations	Pearson's χ^2 or Fisher's exact test (FET) if any cell count was less than 5
Ordinal categorical	Cross-tabulations	Kruskal-Wallis test, a nonparametric version of analysis of variance
Continuous	Comparison of unadjusted means	Student's *t*-test if equal variance, or Welch's *t*-test if Levene's test indicated unequal variance

Note. Statistical tests of subgroup differences are conducted only for the subgroup sets with sufficient sample size in each subgroup: the urbanicity, grantee size, proportion of ELL, and program option subgroup sets. Each of these subgroup sets includes two subgroup categories.

The results of the descriptive subgroup comparisons are presented in the following subsections and are organized by subgroup set. At the beginning of each subgroup set section, we present a table summarizing the planned subgroup analyses and results, followed by a written description of the findings. To reduce the reporting length for this appendix, we present tables only for

selected analysis results with statistically significant ($p < .05$) or marginally significant ($.05 < p < .10$) findings that are also meaningful. We report findings with marginal statistical significance for the grantee subgroup analyses because of the small cell counts for some analyses based on the sample size of grantees, and relatively large percentage point differences (10 percent to 20 percent) often were not significant at the .05 alpha level.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Urbanicity Subgroup Set

The urbanicity subgroup set includes two subgroups: rural and urban. The rural category includes grantees that are located in a rural area ($n = 32$) according to PIR data. The urban category includes grantees that are located in metropolitan areas with less than one million residents or in metropolitan areas with more than one million residents ($n = 88$). Exhibit E-2 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the urbanicity subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption. We then summarize each topic and include tables with selected significant results.

Exhibit E-2. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Hypotheses, and Findings for the Grantee Urbanicity Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Dependent Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Staffing issues	Rural grantees may have more challenges in hiring or other staffing issues.	• Grantee rating of challenges with hiring coaches (ordinal) • Grantee rating of challenges with coach turnover (ordinal) • Months it took for the grantee to hire first coach (continuous) • Number of coaches hired from within grantee (continuous)	There was no evidence that rural grantees had more challenges, compared with urban grantees, with hiring or other staffing issues with the coaches. Rural grantees reported hiring a marginally significant higher average number of coaches who previously worked for the grantee. There were no other significant or marginally significant results.	No
Type of staff receiving coaching	Rural grantees may be more likely to coach staff members who were not lead or assistant teachers.	Whether grantee provides ELMC coaching to six types of staff (binary)	There were no significant differences between urban and rural grantees in the type of staff to whom they provided coaching.	No

Topic	Assumption	Dependent Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Prior grantee support for professional development	Rural grantees may draw on fewer professional development resources to support staff and also may have access to fewer resources in their communities.	• Whether grantee had received professional development from any of seven national professional development resources (binary) • Whether grantee had access to any of eight local resources for technical assistance and professional development in their community (binary)	Rural grantees were significantly less likely to have access to cultural or immigrant community organizations, compared with urban grantees, and were somewhat less likely to have access to other HS/EHS programs or early childhood resource and referral centers with marginal statistical significance. There were no other significant differences between rural and urban grantees in the availability of community resources to support professional development, and there were no significant differences in the number of professional development supports the grantees offered.	Partly
Sustainability of coaching	Rural grantees may face larger challenges in continuing the coaching program.	• Grantee rating of likelihood of continuing coaching after the ELMC grant ends (ordinal) • Grantee report of taking any of the four steps to sustain coaching or having taken no steps yet (binary)	Rural grantees were less likely, compared with urban grantees, to have taken any steps toward sustaining the coaching program and were less likely to have developed an action plan to sustain coaching, although there were no significant differences in other steps taken or in grantee rating of the likelihood of continuing coaching after the grant.	No

Staffing Issues. We found no evidence to support the assumption that rural grantees have more challenges in hiring or other staffing issues. Our subgroup analyses found no significant differences between rural and urban grantees on (1) the grantee rating of challenges with hiring coaches or coach turnover or (2) the number of months it took the grantees to hire their first coaches after the ELMC grant started. However, there was sparse data in some cells of the cross-tabulations for the challenges with hiring and turnover variables, and exact tests could not be run for these analyses, so the results should be interpreted with some caution. As illustrated in Exhibit E-3, rural grantees reported hiring a slightly larger number of coaches in each of the three types of prior employment with the grantee compared with urban grantees, although none of the differences were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. However, the difference in the number of coaches who worked previously for the grantee in some capacity was marginally significant (p = .075). However, this does not support the assumption that rural grantees have more difficulty compared with urban grantees in staffing or hiring coaches.

Exhibit E-3. The Mean Number of Coaches Hired From Within the Grantee, by Grantee Urbanicity

Coach Employment History With Grantee at the Start of the ELMC Grant	Rural (*n* = 25–29)	Urban (*n* = 79–82)
The number of coaches already working for grantee as coaches	0.69	0.52
The number of coaches already working for the grantee in other capacity	1.52	1.09
The number of coaches who worked previously for grantee in some capacity	0.96	0.52^

Note. Independent *t*-tests were used to compare subgroup means.
^$p < .10$.

Type of Staff Receiving Coaching. We found no evidence to support the hypothesis that rural grantees are more likely to coach staff members who are not lead or assistant teachers. There were no significant or marginally significant differences between rural and urban grantees in their rates of providing coaching to classroom teachers, assistant teachers, home visitors, family child care staff, administrators, or supervisors. However, there is a lot of nonresponse for some of these variables (up to 50 percent missing data for the rural subgroup and up to 35 percent missing data for the urban subgroup), so the results should be interpreted with some caution because of the high rates of missing data.

Prior Grantee Support for Professional Development. There is some support in our analyses for the assumption that rural grantees may draw on fewer professional development resources to support staff and also may have access to fewer resources in their communities, compared with urban grantees. As shown in Exhibit E-4, we found that rural grantees (34.4 percent) are significantly less likely to have access to cultural or immigrant community organizations compared with urban grantees (65.5 percent, $n = 120$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 9.549$, Fisher's exact $p = .002$). Rural grantees are also somewhat less likely to have access to other HS/EHS programs (43.8 percent) or early childhood resource and referral centers (68.8 percent), compared with urban grantees (61.4 percent and 84.1 percent, respectively), with marginal statistical significance ($n = 120$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 2.97$, Fisher's exact $p = .085$; and $n = 120$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 3.45$, Fisher's exact $p = .063$ respectively). There were no significant differences between rural and urban grantees in the availability of other community resources to support professional development (community colleges, universities, mental health resources, other community service organizations, or libraries), and there are no significant differences in the number of professional development supports the grantees offered from a list of 11 supports.

Exhibit E-4. The Percentages of Grantees With Access to Professional Development Resources in Their Communities, by Grantee Urbanicity

	Rural (*n* = 32)	Urban (*n* = 88)	*p*
Immigrant/cultural community organizations	34.4%	65.9%	**
Other HS/EHS programs	43.8%	61.4%	^
Early childhood resource and referral centers (state run or local)	68.8%	84.1%	^
Community college(s)/faculty	84.4%	89.8%	
Universities/faculty	78.1%	90.9%	
Community mental health centers/mental health professionals	93.8%	90.9%	
Other community service organizations (e.g., domestic violence shelters)	93.8%	89.8%	
Libraries	90.6%	88.6%	

Note. Statistical significance is indicated by Pearson's χ^2 test of pairwise differences between rural and urban grantees for each staff type, but Fisher's exact test is used if any cell count in a comparison is five or less.

^$p < .10$. **$p < .01$.

Sustainability of Coaching. The subgroup analyses support the assumption that rural grantees may face larger challenges in continuing the coaching program, as shown in Exhibit E-5. Rural grantees (14.8 percent) are more likely compared with urban grantees (2.7 percent, $n = 102$, Fisher's exact $p = .041$) to report that they have not taken any steps toward sustaining the coaching program. Also, rural grantees (33.3 percent) are less likely compared with urban grantees (56.0 percent, $n = 102$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 4.080$, Fisher's exact $p = .043$) to have developed an action plan to sustain coaching, although there are no significant differences in other steps taken or in the grantee rating of the likelihood of continuing coaching after the grant.

Exhibit E-5. The Percentages of Grantees That Report Taking Different Steps to Sustain Coaching After the ELMC Grant Ends, by Grantee Urbanicity

	Rural (*n* = 27)	Urban (*n* = 75)	*p*
No steps have been taken yet	14.8%	2.7%	*
Action plan has been developed	33.3%	56.0%	*
Funding has been secured or budgeted to support ongoing coaching	44.4%	38.7%	
Staff has been secured to support ongoing coaching	29.6%	40.0%	
Infrastructure has been developed or assigned (such as facilities, supplies)	25.9%	29.3%	

Note. Statistical significance is indicated by Pearson's χ^2 test of pairwise differences between rural and urban grantees for each staff type, but Fisher's exact test is used if any cell count in a comparison is five or less.

*$p < .05$.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Grantee Size Subgroup Set

The grantee size subgroup set includes two subgroups: small and large. The small category includes grantees serving less than 400 children ($n = 43$), according to PIR data. The urban category includes grantees that serve more than 400 children ($n = 77$, which is subdivided as follows: 34 grantees serve 400 to 1,000 children, 42 grantees serve 1,001 to 5,000 children, and 1 grantee serves more than 5,000 children). Exhibit E-6 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the grantee size subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests

of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption. Then we provide a summary of each topic and include tables with selected significant results.

Exhibit E-6. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Hypotheses, and Findings for the Grantee Size Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Staffing issues	Small grantees may have more staffing challenges.	• Grantee rating of challenges with hiring coaches (ordinal) • Grantee rating of challenges with coach turnover (ordinal) • Months it took for the grantee to hire the first coach (continuous) • Number of coaches hired from within the grantee (continuous)	There were no significant differences between small and large grantees in hiring challenges, and small grantees actually reported fewer challenges with coach turnover compared with large grantees.	No
Type of staff receiving coaching	Small grantees may provide coaching to fewer types of staff.	Whether grantee provides coaching to six types of staff (binary)	A higher percentage of small grantees offered coaching to home visitors, compared with large grantees, with marginal statistical significance. There were no significant differences between small and large grantees in coaching provided to other staff types.	No
Prior grantee support for professional development	Small grantees may have fewer professional development resources offered to staff.	Number of professional development supports grantee offered from a list of 11 types of supports (continuous)	There were no significant differences between small and large grantees in the number of professional development supports they offered.	No
Sustainability of coaching	Small grantees may face larger challenges in continuing the coaching program compared with large grantees.	• Grantee rating of likelihood of continuing coaching after the ELMC grant ended (ordinal) • Grantee report of taking any of four steps to sustain coaching or having taken no steps yet (binary)	Small grantees were more likely, compared with large grantees, to report that they were not at all or only somewhat likely to continue coaching after the ELMC grant ended and were also more likely, compared with large grantees, to report that they had not taken any steps to sustain coaching after the grant ended.	Yes

Staffing Issues. We found no evidence to support the assumption that small grantees have more challenges in hiring or other staffing issues compared with large grantees. There are no significant differences between small and large grantees on the grantee report of challenges in hiring a coach, the date when the grantee first hired a coach, and whether the grantee hired from within. However, as shown in Exhibit E-7, small grantees actually report fewer challenges with coach turnover compared with large grantees (n = 117, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 4.306, Fisher's exact

p = .038). This suggests the opposite of our assumption, that small grantees had fewer challenges with staffing. However, there are several small or null cell counts in the cross-tabulations for the challenges with hiring and turnover variables, and exact tests could not be run for these analyses, so the results should be interpreted with some caution.

Exhibit E-7. The Percentages of Grantees Reporting Each Level of Challenge With Coach Turnover, by Grantee Size

	Small Grantee (n = 43)	Large Grantee (n = 74)
Never challenging	76.7%	59.5%
Sometimes challenging	20.9%	27.0%
Often challenging	0.0%	8.1%
Always challenging	2.3%	5.4%

Note. Subgroup differences are statistically significant (p = .038), as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Type of Staff Receiving Coaching. We found no evidence to support the assumption that small grantees tended to provide coaching to fewer types of staff. In fact, we found that small grantees were somewhat more likely to provide coaching to home visitors (64.5 percent) compared with large grantees (44.8 percent, n = 89, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 3.136, Fisher's exact p = .077), with marginal statistical significance. There were no significant differences between small and large grantees on providing coaching to classroom teachers, assistant teachers, family child care staff, administrators, or supervisors. However, there was a lot of nonresponse for some of these variables (up to 47 percent missing data for the rural subgroup and up to 34 percent missing data for urban subgroup), so the results should be interpreted with some caution because of the high rates of missing data.

Prior Grantee Support for Professional Development. We found no support for the assumption that small grantees may have fewer professional development resources offered to staff. There are no significant differences between small and large grantees in the number of professional development supports they offer, from a list of 11 support types.

***Sustainability of Coaching*.** We found support for the assumption that small grantees may face larger challenges in continuing the coaching program compared with large grantees. As shown in Exhibit E-8, there is a significant difference between small and large grantees in their responses to the likelihood of continuing coaching after the ELMC grant ends (n = 113, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 3.962, Fisher's exact p = .047). Large grantees tended to report a higher likelihood of continuing coaching, whereas small grantees were more likely to report a low likelihood of continuing. Also, as shown in Exhibit E-9, small grantees (14.7 percent) were more likely compared with large grantees (1.5 percent, n = 102, Fisher's exact p = .015) to report that they had not taken any steps toward sustaining the coaching program. However, there were no significant differences between the percentages of small and large grantees that had taken specific steps, such as developing an action plan, securing funding and staff, and developing an infrastructure for future coaching.

Exhibit E-8. The Percentages of Grantees Reporting the Likelihood of Continuing Coaching After the ELMC Grant Ends, by Grantee Size

	Small Grantee (*n* = 40)	Large Grantee (*n* = 73)
Not at all likely	15.0%	8.2%
Somewhat likely	27.5%	12.3%
Moderately likely	15.0%	21.9%
Very likely	42.5%	57.5%

Note. Subgroup differences are statistically significant (p = .047), as indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Exhibit E-9. The Percentages of Grantees That Reported Taking Different Steps to Sustain Coaching After the ELMC Grant Ends, by Grantee Size

	Small Grantee (*n* = 34)	Large Grantee (*n* = 68)	*p*
No steps have been taken yet.	14.7%	1.5%	*
An action plan has been developed.	47.1%	51.5%	
Funding has been secured or budgeted to support ongoing coaching.	32.4%	44.1%	
Staff has been secured to support ongoing coaching.	32.4%	39.7%	
Infrastructure has been developed or assigned (such as facilities and supplies).	20.6%	32.4%	

Note. Statistical significance is indicated by Pearson's χ^2 test of pairwise differences between rural and urban grantees for each staff type, but Fisher's exact test is used if any cell count in a comparison is five or less.

*p < .05.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Proportion of English Language Learners Subgroup Set

The proportion of ELL subgroup set includes two subgroups: less than 50 percent and 50 percent or more. The less than 50 percent category includes grantees in which less than 50 percent of the children are ELLs (*n* = 89), according to PIR data. The 50 percent or more category includes grantees in which 50 percent or more of the children are ELLs (*n* = 31). Exhibit E-10 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the proportion of ELL subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption. Then we summarize the results for each topic. No tables are provided because no interesting meaningful significant results were found.

Exhibit E-10. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Hypotheses, and Findings for the Grantee Proportion of English Language Learner Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Staffing issues	Grantees with high concentrations of ELLs may focus more on language and cultural matches in hiring and may have more challenges in hiring coaches.	• Grantee rating of challenges with hiring coaches (ordinal) • How much grantees prioritize a language and culture match in hiring coaches (ordinal)	There was no evidence of differences in hiring challenges or prioritizing language and cultural matches in hiring based on ELL subgroup.	No

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Goals of coaching	Grantee goals for the ELMC initiative are more likely to focus on services for dual-language learners and cultural responsiveness among grantees with high populations of ELLs.	Grantee selection of goals that include improving services for dual-language learners and improving cultural responsiveness (grantees may select up to 5 goals from a list of 18 goals; binary)	There were no differences between grantees with 50% or more ELLs and less than 50% ELLs in terms of grantee goals for the ELMC initiative that focus on improving services for dual-language learners or improving cultural responsiveness.	No

Staffing Issues. Our analyses did not support the assumption that grantees with high concentrations of ELLs may focus more on language and cultural matches in hiring and may have more challenges in hiring coaches. There are no significant or marginally significant differences between grantees with 50 percent or more ELLs and grantees with less than 50 percent of ELLs in their ratings of hiring challenges or the importance of language and culture matches in hiring decisions. However, there were sparse data in some cells of the cross-tabulations for the importance of language and culture matches, and exact tests could not be run for these analyses, so the results should be interpreted with some caution.

Goals of Coaching. We did not find evidence to support the assumption that grantee goals for the ELMC initiative are more likely to focus on services for dual-language learners and cultural responsiveness among grantees with 50 percent or more ELLs. There are no significant or marginally significant differences between grantees with 50 percent or more ELLs and less than 50 percent of ELLs in terms of grantee goals for the ELMC initiative that focus on improving services for dual-language learners or improving cultural responsiveness.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Program Option Subgroup Set

The program option subgroup set includes two subgroups: center based only (n = 31) and other program options (n = 89), according to PIR data. Exhibit E-11 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the program option subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption. Then we summarize each topic and include a table with selected significant results.

Exhibit E-11. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Hypotheses, and Findings for the Grantee Program Option Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Type of staff receiving coaching	Center-based-only grantees may provide coaching to fewer types of staff compared with grantees with other program options.	Whether grantee provides coaching to six types of staff (binary)	There was a large and significant difference between grantees that were center based only and other program options on the percentage that provided coaching to home visitors; no center-based-only grantees did so. Center-based-only grantees were somewhat more likely to provide coaching to supervisors with marginal significance. There were no other significant differences in coaching to staff types by program option subgroup.	Partly
Prior grantee support for professional development	Center-based-only grantees may have more professional development resources offered to staff.	Number of professional development supports grantee offered from a list of 11 options (continuous)	There were no differences in the number of professional development supports offered by center-based-only and other grantee types.	No
Goals of coaching	Center-based-only grantees may have different goals for the ELMC initiative compared with grantees with other program options.	Grantee selection of 18 goals for the ELMC grant (grantees may select up to 5 goals from the list; binary)	There were no significant differences between center-based-only grantees and other grantee types in their ELMC goals, except that center-based-only grantees were less likely, compared with other grantee types, to report that improving already established coaching was a primary goal. However, there was no obvious reason to interpret that finding as meaningful, so it should be interpreted with caution.	No

Type of Staff Receiving Coaching. We found partial support for the assumption that center-based only grantees may provide coaching to fewer types of staff compared with grantees with other program options. Unsurprisingly, none of the center-based-only programs provided coaching to home visitors, whereas 59.7 percent of the grantees with other program options did (n = 89, Fisher's exact p = .000), as shown in Exhibit E-12. There was also a marginally significant difference between center-based-only grantees (81.0 percent) and those with other program options (57.7 percent, n = 92, Fisher's exact p = .072) on coaching for supervisors. There were no significant differences between center-based-only grantees and other program options and coaching for other staff types (classroom teachers, assistant teachers, family child care providers, and administrators).

Exhibit E-12. The Percentages of Grantees Providing Coaching to Different Staff Types, by Grantee Program Option

	Center-Based-Only Option (*n* =88)	Other Program Option (*n* = 32)	*p*
Coaching for classroom teachers	100.0%	97.7%	
Coaching for assistant teachers	92.0%	91.0%	
Coaching for home visitors	0.0%	59.7%	***
Coaching for family child care staff	16.7%	12.5%	
Coaching for administrators	53.3%	34.9%	
Coaching for supervisors	81.0%	57.7%	^

Note. Statistical significance is indicated by Pearson's χ^2 test of pairwise differences between rural and urban grantees for each staff type, but Fisher's exact test is used if any cell count in a comparison is five or less.

^$p < .10$. ***$p < .001$.

Prior Grantee Support for Professional Development. We did not find support for the assumption that center-based-only grantees may have more professional development resources offered to staff. There are no significant or marginally significant differences in the number of professional development supports offered by center-based-only grantees and other types.

Goals of Coaching. We found no evidence to support the assumption that center-based-only grantees may have different goals for the ELMC initiative compared with grantees with other program options. Center-based-only grantees (10.0 percent) were less likely compared with grantees with other program options (28.2 percent, $n = 115$, Fisher's exact $p = .048$) to report that improving already established coaching was a primary goal, although there is no obvious reason that this would be the case, so caution should be used in interpreting this result. There were no significant differences between the program options subgroups in their endorsement of 17 other listed goals for the ELMC grants.

Subgroup Analyses Results: American Indian/Alaska Native and Migrant/Seasonal Head Start Subgroup Set

The AI/AN and MSHS subgroup set includes two subgroups: AIAN/MSHS and other program types. The AI/AN and MSHS category ($n = 8$) includes three program types that were used for stratification: AI/AN ($n = 3$), MSHS ($n = 2$), and EHS/MSHS ($n = 3$), according to PIR data. The other program type category ($n = 112$) includes the three remaining program types: HS ($n = 23$), EHS ($n = 13$), and HS/EHS ($n = 76$). Because the sample size for the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup is very small, we did not conduct any statistical tests of subgroup differences for the descriptive analyses presented in this subsection. Exhibit E-13 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the nonstatistical comparisons of unadjusted subgroup differences, and whether the nonstatistical results support each assumption. Then we summarize each topic and include tables with interesting results.

Exhibit E-13. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Hypotheses, and Nonstatistical Findings for the AIAN/MSHS Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Nonstatistical Findings	Assumption Supported
Staffing issues	AI/AN and MSHS grantees may focus more on language and cultural matches in hiring and may have more challenges in hiring coaches.	• Grantee rating of challenges with hiring coaches (ordinal) • How much grantees prioritize language and culture matches in hiring coaches (ordinal)	The results were descriptive and did not include significance testing because of the small number of grantees in the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup. AI/AN and MSHS grantees faced much greater difficulty in finding qualified coaches compared with other program types. AI/AN and MSHS grantees also appeared to be more likely to report that language and culture matches were important in hiring.	Yes (no significance test conducted)
Goals of coaching	Grantee goals between the AI/AN and MSHS grantees for the ELMC initiative may be more likely to focus on cultural responsiveness and also on services for dual-language learners.	Grantee selection of goals that include improving services for dual-language learners and improving cultural responsiveness (grantees may select up to 5 goals from a list of 18 goals; binary)	The results were descriptive and did not include significance testing because of the small number of grantees in the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup. AI/AN and MSHS grantees appeared slightly more likely to report that improving cultural responsiveness was a goal for the ELMC initiative but less likely to report that improving services for dual-language learners was a goal.	Partly (no significance test conducted)

Staffing Issues. Our nonstatistical subgroup comparisons provide support for the assumption that AI/AN and MSHS grantees may focus more on language and cultural matches in hiring and may have more challenges in hiring coaches. There were large differences between the AI/AN and MSHS grantees and other program types in grantee report of hiring challenges: one half of the AI/AN and MSHS grantees reported that hiring ELMC coaches was always challenging, compared with just 9.5 percent of other program types, as shown in Exhibit E-14. Exhibit E-15 shows that a somewhat higher percentage of AI/AN and MSHS grantees (37.5 percent) report that language and culture matches are always important in hiring decisions, compared with other grantees (26.5 percent).

Exhibit E-14. The Percentages of Grantees Reporting Each Level of Challenge With Hiring Coaches, by Grantee Type (AI/AN or MSMS or Not)

	AIAN or MSHS Grantees (*n* = 8)	Other Types of Grantees (*n* = 105)
Hardly ever challenging	37.5%	40.0%
Sometimes challenging	0.0%	38.1%
Often challenging	12.5%	12.4%
Always challenging	50.0%	9.5%

Note. Statistical testing was not conducted for subgroup comparisons because of the small number of grantees in the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup.

Exhibit E-15. The Percentages of Grantees Reporting Importance of Language and Culture Matches in Hiring Coaches, by Grantee Type (AI/AN or MSMS or not)

	AIAN or MSHS Grantees (*n* = 8)	Other Types of Grantees (*n* = 102)
Never important/not necessary	0.0%	2.9%
Sometimes important	12.5%	29.4%
Often important	50.0%	41.2%
Always important/ necessary	37.5%	26.5%

Note. Statistical testing was not conducted for subgroup comparisons because of the small number of grantees in the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup.

Goals of Coaching. Our nonstatistical subgroup comparisons provide partial support for the assumption that grantee goals for the ELMC initiative may be more likely to focus on cultural responsiveness and on services for dual-language learners, among AI/AN and MSHS grantees. As shown in Exhibit E-16, a slightly higher percentage of AI/AN and MSHS grantees (12.5 percent) report that improving cultural responsiveness is a goal for the ELMC initiative compared with other program types (6.5 percent), which is consistent with the assumption. However, no AI/AN and MSHS grantees reported that improving serviced for dual-language learners is a goal, compared with 20.6 percent of other program types, which is the opposite of the assumption.

Exhibit E-16. The Percentages of Grantees Reporting the Importance of Goals Related to Cultural Competency, by Program Type (AI/AN or MSMS or not)

	AIAN or MSHS Grantees (*n* = 8)	Other Types of Grantees (*n* = 102)
To improve cultural responsiveness	12.5%	6.5%
To improve services for dual-language learners	0.0%	20.6%

Note. Statistical testing was not conducted for subgroup comparisons because of the small number of grantees in the AI/AN and MSHS subgroup.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Head Start and Early Head Start Subgroup Set

The HS and EHS subgroup set includes three subgroups: HS only, EHS only, and combination or other program types. The HS only category (*n* = 23) includes the HS program type used for stratification, according to PIR data. The EHS-only category (*n* = 13) includes the EHS program type used for stratification. The combination or other program type category (*n* = 84) includes the four remaining program types: HS/EHS (*n* = 76), AI/AN (*n* = 3), MSHS (*n* = 2), and EHS/MSHS (*n* = 3). Because the sample sizes for the HS-only and EHS-only subgroups are small, we did not conduct any statistical tests of subgroup differences for the descriptive analyses presented in this subsection. Exhibit E-17 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the HS/EHS subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the nonstatistical comparisons of unadjusted subgroup differences, and whether the nonstatistical results support each assumption. Then we summarize each topic and include tables with interesting results.

Exhibit E-17. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Hypotheses, and Nonstatistical Findings for the HS/EHS Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Nonstatistical Findings	Assumption Supported
Type of staff receiving coaching	EHS-only grantees may be more likely to provide coaching to home visitors and less likely to provide coaching to classroom staff, compared with HS-only grantees or combination or other program types.	Whether grantee provides coaching to six types of staff (binary)	The results were descriptive and did not include significance testing because of the small number of grantees in the EHS-only and HS-only subgroups. As hypothesized, most EHS-only grantees provided coaching to home visitors, whereas few HS-only grantees did. However, there were no major differences in coaching supports for classroom and assistant teachers between the grantee types. HS-only grantees appeared to be more likely to offer coaching to supervisors and administrators.	Partly (no significance test conducted)
Goals of coaching	Grantee goals for the ELMC initiative may be different between EHS-only grantees and HS-only grantees or combination or other program types. For example, EHS-only programs might be less likely to focus on a specific curriculum or school readiness and more likely to focus on the quality of staff practices generally.	Grantee selection of goals that include improving services for dual-language learners and improving cultural responsiveness (grantees may select up to 5 goals from a list of 18 goals; binary)	The results were descriptive and did not include significance testing because of the small number of grantees in the EHS-only and HS-only subgroups. EHS-only grantees tended to differ from both HS-only and other program types grantees in the goals they prioritized for the ELMC initiative, whereas there were few notable differences between HS-only and other program types. EHS-only grantees appeared to be more likely to select goals focused on improving practices with children generally and improving work with and sensitivity toward families, which might indicate a greater need to work closely with parents while providing care for very young children. EHS-only grantees appeared to be less likely to select goals focused on assessing children and improving school-readiness skills, which makes sense given that these goals are more developmentally appropriate to focus on with preschool-aged children.	Yes (no significance test conducted)

Type of Staff Receiving Coaching. Our nonstatistical subgroup comparisons provide some support for the assumption that EHS-only grantees may be more likely to provide coaching to home visitors but do not support the assumption that EHS-only programs are less likely to provide coaching to classroom staff. As shown in Exhibit E-18, there are some apparent differences between program types in the types of staff that receive coaching. In particular, a very high percentage (83.3 percent) of EHS-only programs provide coaching to home visitors, whereas a fairly low percentage (16.7 percent) of HS-only programs do and about one half (53.3 percent) of other program types do. However, there are no major differences between program types in offering coaching to classroom and assistant teachers. Also, HS-only and EHS-only programs appear more likely to offer coaching to family child care providers compared with other program types. HS-only programs also appeared considerably more likely to offer coaching to administrators and supervisors compared with EHS-only or other program types.

Exhibit E-18. The Percentages of Grantees Providing Coaching to Different Staff Types, by Grantee Type (EHS Only, HS Only, or Other Program Types)

	EHS-Only Grantees (*n* = 7–13)	HS-Only Grantees (*n* = 12–23)	Other Type of Grantees (*n* = 56–76)
Coaching for classroom teachers	100.0%	100.0%	97.4%
Coaching for assistant teachers	100.0%	91.3%	90.3%
Coaching for home visitors	83.3%	16.7%	52.3%
Coaching for FCC staff	28.6%	25.0%	8.8%
Coaching for administrators	37.5%	64.3%	32.1%
Coaching for supervisors	55.6%	82.4%	59.1%

Note. Statistical testing was not conducted for subgroup comparisons because of the small number of grantees in EHS-only and HS-only subgroups.

Goals of Coaching. Our nonstatistical subgroup comparisons provide some support for the assumption that grantee goals for the ELMC initiative may be different between EHS-only grantees and other program types, specifically that EHS-only programs may be less likely to focus on a specific curriculum or school readiness and more likely to focus on the quality of staff practices generally. As shown in Exhibit E-19, EHS-only grantees appear to have different goals for the ELMC initiative compared with HS-only grantees or other program types, whereas HS-only grantees and other program types appear to be similar in endorsement of most goals.

Exhibit E-19. The Percentages of Grantees That Reported Specific Goals for the ELMC Grant, by Grantee Type (EHS Only, HS Only, or Other Program Types)

	EHS-Only Grantees (*n* = 12)	HS-Only Grantees (*n* = 23)	Other Types of Grantees (*n* = 80)
To improve already established coaching	8.3%	21.7%	26.2%
To train on improving teaching of school-readiness topics	33.3%	65.2%	53.8%
To train on behavior management	16.7%	30.4%	25.0%
To train on a particular curriculum or curriculum supplement	25.0%	39.1%	22.5%
To support administrative staff/supervisors in their roles	16.7%	21.7%	8.8%
To improve cultural responsiveness	25.0%	4.3%	5.0%
To improve services for dual-language learners	33.3%	21.7%	16.2%
To improve services for children with disabilities	8.3%	8.7%	5.0%
To improve the quality of staff practices with their work with children	100.0%	78.3%	87.5%
To improve the quality of staff practices with their work with families	41.7%	8.7%	12.5%
To improve parent engagement	16.7%	4.3%	3.8%
To improve assessed child outcomes	33.3%	52.2%	67.5%
To improve Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) assessment scores	8.3%	78.3%	80.0%
To improve other assessment scores (e.g., Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale [ECERS])	41.7%	8.7%	20.0%
To provide training and support for using assessments for practice or program monitoring	8.3%	17.4%	20.0%

	EHS-Only Grantees (*n* = 12)	HS-Only Grantees (*n* = 23)	Other Types of Grantees (*n* = 80)
To support the use of new technology	0.0%	4.3%	12.5%
To provide support for continuing education and career development	33.3%	21.7%	22.5%
To reduce staff turnover	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%

Note. Statistical testing was not conducted for subgroup comparisons because of the small number of grantees in EHS-only and HS-only subgroups.

A higher percentage of EHS-only grantees compared with HS-only grantees or other program types identified improving cultural responsiveness and improving staff interactions with families as goals. Also, a somewhat higher percentage of EHS-only grantees cited improving staff practices in working with children, improving parent engagement, improving services for dual-language learners, and supporting continuing education and professional development for staff as goals. A much lower percentage of EHS-only grantees compared with HS-only grantees or other program types identified improving CLASS assessment scores as a goal, although a higher percentage of EHS-only grantees cited improving other assessment scores as a goal. Also, a lower percentage of EHS-only programs reported improving assessed child outcomes, training staff to use assessments for practice or monitoring, improving the teaching of school-readiness topics, training on behavior management, and improving already established coaching as goals. A higher percentage of HS-only grantees compared with either EHS-only grantees or other program types identified training staff in a particular curriculum as a goal, whereas a higher percentage of combination or other program types identified supporting the use of technology as a goal compared with both HS-only and EHS-only grantees. There were few notable differences between HS-only grantees and the combination or other program types grantees.

Limitations of the Subgroup Analyses

There are some limitations to the subgroup analyses, and the results should be interpreted with these limitations in mind. First, all of the comparisons are bivariate and do not account for potential confounding factors. Also, some of the subgroups had very few grantees, and there were small or null cell counts in some comparisons. Adjustments were made for small cell counts in statistical comparisons of binary dependent variables but not for categorical dependent variables with more than two categories. Additionally, there were some missing data in the survey items included in the analyses, and we did not use statistical procedures to account for the missing data in these analyses.

Subgroup-Level Analyses Related to Coaching Features

To gain a better understanding of how the ELMC grant implementation varied according to the features of coaching, we compared the coaching processes for both the grantees and the coaches with different characteristics and the coaching features that were expected to influence the implementation of the coaching program. These characteristics and coaching features were as follows:

- Grantee characteristics: Grantee professional development context
- Coach characteristics and coaching features
  - Type of staff the coach worked with
  - Coach contact formats with staff
  - Coach education and experience
  - Caseload size

The data on the grantee characteristics were collected in the grantee census survey, and the data on the coach characteristics were collected in the mentor coach census survey. These particular grantee and coach characteristics were chosen as the basis for subgroup analyses because of hypothesized differences in these subgroups. We expected that grantees with different levels of established contexts for professional development might differ in several aspects of implementation. For the coach characteristics and the coaching features, we expected that different levels might be associated with variations in coaching implementation. More detailed subgroup definitions are provided in the following subsections for each subgroup set. The subgroups are mutually exclusive categories within each set, and all of the grantee respondents were categorized into one of the categories for each subgroup set.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Grantee Professional Development Context Subgroup Set

The grantee professional development context subgroup set included four subgroups:

- High professional development supports; coaching prior to the ELMC grant (n = 29)
- High professional development supports; no prior coaching (n = 29)
- Less professional development supports; coaching prior to the ELMC grant (n = 25)
- Less professional development supports; no prior coach (n = 38)

The subgroup definitions included two dimensions: whether the grantee had a coach before the ELMC grant and high/low level of grantee support for professional development. High grantee support (n = 58) was defined as offering 8 or more of the 11 possible types of professional development supports: paid release time, unpaid release time, substitute teachers to cover classrooms, flexible schedules, tuition reimbursement, purchasing course textbooks, transportation reimbursement, printed or electronic materials and resources, continuing education units, providing courses on-site, and having efforts in place to help staff obtain a CDA, AA, or BA. Less grantee support (n = 63) was defined as offering fewer than 8 of the 11 types of professional development supports to the staff. Exhibit E-20 summarizes the a priori assumptions

for the professional development context subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption.

Exhibit E-20. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Assumptions, and Findings for the Grantee Professional Development Context Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Use of national and community resources for professional development	Grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development are more likely to use the national and community resources that are available to them.	• Grantee use of 7 national professional development resources during ELMC initiative (binary) • Grantee use of 8 community professional development resources during ELMC initiative (binary)	There are no meaningful differences among the grantee history of supporting professional development subgroups on the use of national and community resources for professional development during the ELMC initiative.	No
Orientation and ongoing training of coaches	Grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development are more likely to provide an orientation and ongoing training to their coaches.	• Grantee provided an orientation to coaches (binary) • Grantee provided ongoing training to coaches (binary)	There are no significant differences in the percentages of grantees that offered orientation or ongoing training by history of grantee support for professional development subgroups.	No
Grantee goals	Grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may have different goals for the ELMC initiative.	Grantee selection of 18 goals for the ELMC initiative (grantees may select up to 5 goals from the list; binary)	There are a few significant differences in grantee goals by history of grantee support for professional development subgroups, but there are no systematic differences suggesting that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development have different goals.	No
Type of staff coached	Grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may provide coaching to a larger variety of staff types.	Whether grantee provides coaching to 6 types of staff (binary)	Grantees with low professional development and no prior coach are less likely compared with grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development to offer coaching to home visitors or administrators.	Yes
Coach supervision and monitoring	Grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may provide more supervision and oversight of coaching.	• Whether grantees assign supervisors to coaches (binary) • Whether grantees monitor the progress of coaching (binary)	There are no significant differences between the history of professional development subgroups on whether coaches have supervisors or whether the grantee monitors the progress of the ELMC initiative.	No

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Sustainability	Grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development will take more steps to sustain the coaching program.	• Grantee rating of the likelihood of continued coaching after the ELMC grants ends (ordinal) • Grantee steps taken to sustain coaching after the ELMC grant ends (binary)	Grantees with a high level of professional development supports but no prior coach are the least likely of all the subgroups to expect to continue and take steps to sustain coaching after the ELMC grant ends, although there were no significant subgroup differences on specific steps taken. Grantees that had coaches prior to the ELMC grant appear most likely to expect to continue coaching.	Partly

Goals of Coaching. We did not find support for the assumption that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may have different goals for the ELMC initiative. Unsurprisingly, grantees that had coaching prior to the ELMC grant were much more likely to cite improving existing coaching as a goal compared with grantees that did not have prior coaching, regardless of their prior level of professional development support (n = 116, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 21.377, Fisher's exact p = .000), as shown in Exhibit E-21. Grantees that had coaching prior to the ELMC grant also were more likely to focus on improving CLASS scores (n = 116, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 7.937, Fisher's exact p = .047 without Bonferroni adjustment). Grantees with low professional development supports and a coach prior to the ELMC grant were somewhat less likely compared with other grantees to identify support for continuing education and career development as a goal with marginal statistical significance (n = 116, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 7.557, Fisher's exact p = .056), although there is no obvious reason to interpret this relationship as meaningful. Otherwise, there were no statistically significant differences between the grantee history of professional development support subgroups on the goals for the ELMC initiative. There were sparse data in some cells of the cross-tabulations, and exact tests could not be run for these analyses, so the results should be interpreted with some caution.

Exhibit E-21. Grantee Goals, by Level of Professional Development Context

Grantee Goals	Low PD Supports, No Prior Coach (n = 36)[a]	Low PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (n = 23)	High PD Supports, No Prior Coach (n = 28)	High PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (n = 29)
To improve already established coaching*	8.3%	52.2%	7.1%	34.5%
To train on improving the teaching of school-readiness topics	55.6%	52.2%	50.0%	58.6%
To train on behavior management	27.8%	21.7%	32.1%	17.2%
To train on a particular curriculum or curriculum supplement	33.3%	26.1%	28.6%	13.8%
To support administrative staff/supervisors in their roles	11.1%	13.0%	10.7%	13.8%
To improve cultural responsiveness	5.6%	8.7%	14.3%	0.0%
To improve services for dual-language learners	22.2%	21.7%	21.4%	13.8%
To improve services for children with disabilities	13.9%	4.3%	3.6%	0.0%

Grantee Goals	Low PD Supports, No Prior Coach (*n* = 36)[a]	Low PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (*n* = 23)	High PD Supports, No Prior Coach (*n* = 28)	High PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (*n* = 29)
To improve the quality of staff practices with their work with children	88.9%	78.3%	85.7%	93.1%
To improve the quality of staff practices with their work with families	13.9%	8.7%	21.4%	13.8%
To improve parent engagement	8.3%	8.7%	3.6%	0.0%
To improve assessed child outcomes	61.1%	65.2%	57.1%	62.1%
To improve CLASS assessment scores^	63.9%	78.3%	60.7%	89.7%
To improve other assessment scores (e.g., ECERS)	19.4%	17.4%	25.0%	17.2%
To provide training and support for using assessments for practice or program monitoring	11.1%	13.0%	21.4%	27.6%
To support the use of new technology	8.3%	8.7%	3.6%	17.2%
To provide support for continuing education and career development	27.8%	4.3%	35.7%	20.7%
To reduce staff turnover	5.6%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%

Note. χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons indicate marginally significant (^$p < .10$) or significant (*$p < .05$) or differences between the subgroups.

[a]PD = professional development.

Type of Staff Receiving Coaching. Our analyses support the assumption that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may provide coaching to a larger variety of staff types. As shown in Exhibit E-22, grantees with low professional development supports and no prior coach were much less likely (25.0 percent) compared with other subgroups (56.2 percent to 66.7 percent, $n = 90$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 11.505$, Fisher's exact $p = .009$) to offer coaching to home visitors. Also, the percentage of grantees that offered coaching to supervisors appeared to be higher among grantees with low professional development supports (regardless of prior coaching) compared with grantees with high professional development supports, with marginal statistical significance ($n = 93$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 9.917$, Fisher's exact $p = .019$ without Bonferroni adjustment). Coaching for administrators also appeared to be more prevalent among grantees with low professional development supports and a prior coach compared with all the other subgroups with marginal statistical significance ($n = 79$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 7.514$, Fisher's exact $p = .057$), although this difference was difficult to interpret in a meaningful way. There were no differences between the grantee history of support for either professional development subgroups on coaching for classroom and assistant teachers or family child care staff.

Exhibit E-22. The Percentages of Grantees That Provided Coaching to Different Staff Types, by Grantee History of Supporting Professional Development

	Low PD Supports, No Prior Coach (*n* = 26–37)	Low PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (*n* = 13–22)	High PD Supports, No Prior Coach (*n* = 20–29)	High PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (*n* = 18–27)
Coaching for home visitors*	25.0%	56.2%	64.0%	66.7%
Coaching for supervisors^	74.2%	78.9%	38.1%	54.5%
Coaching for administrators*	38.5%	69.2%	23.8%	31.6%
Coaching for classroom teachers	94.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Coaching for assistant teachers	90.9%	100.0%	92.0%	84.0%
Coaching for family child care staff	11.5%	7.7%	15.0%	16.7%

[a]PD = professional development.

^$p < .10$. *$p < 05$.

Sustainability of Coaching. The subgroup analyses support the assumption that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may take more steps to sustain the coaching program. There was a statistically significant difference between the subgroups on the grantee expectation of the likelihood of continuing coaching ($n = 113$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 12.240$, Fisher's exact $p = .007$), as shown in Exhibit E-23. The grantees that had a coach prior to the ELMC grant (regardless of level of professional development supports) were more likely to have high expectations of continuing coaching after the grant compared with those that did not have a coach previously. Grantees with high professional development supports and no prior coach tended to have lower expectations of continuing with coaching and also were somewhat more likely (16.7 percent) compared with other subgroups (0.0 percent to 4.8 percent) to report having taken no steps toward sustaining the program, with marginal statistical significance ($n = 102$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 7.091$, Fisher's exact $p = .069$). There were no significant differences between the grantee history of supporting professional development subgroups in the specific steps taken to sustain the coaching program.

Exhibit E-23. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Likelihood of Continuing Coaching After the ELMC Grant Ended

	Low PD Supports, No Prior Coach (*n* = 35)	Low PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (*n* = 23)	High PD Supports, No Prior Coach (*n* = 28)	High PD Supports, Coach Prior to Grant (*n* = 27)
Not at all likely	11.4%	8.7%	14.3%	7.4%
Somewhat likely	20.0%	4.3%	32.1%	11.1%
Moderately likely	22.9%	17.4%	25.0%	11.1%
Very likely	45.7%	69.6%	28.6%	70.4%

[a]PD = professional development.

Use of National and Community Resources for Professional Development. We found no evidence to support the assumption that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may be more likely to use the national and community resources that are available to them. There were no statistically significant differences between the grantee

history of supporting professional development subgroups in their use of national resources for supporting professional development, including OHS; regional HS offices; the National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness; the Early Head Start National Resource Center; the National Center on Health; the National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement; and the National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning. Only one subgroup difference was statistically significant in the grantee use of community resources for professional development: grantees with less professional development supports with a coach prior to the grant were much less likely compared with all other groups to use community colleges as a professional development resource. However, it is difficult to find any meaningful interpretation of this difference. There were no other significant differences between the grantee history of supporting professional development subgroups in their use of other community professional development resources, including universities; other HS/EHS programs; early childhood resource and referral centers; community mental health centers or mental health professionals; other community service organizations, such as domestic violence or homeless shelters, immigrant or cultural community organizations, and libraries.

Orientation and Ongoing Training of Coaches. We found no evidence to support the assumption that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may be more likely to provide an orientation and ongoing training to their coaches. There were no significant differences between the grantee history of supporting professional development subgroups in the percentage of grantees that offered orientation or ongoing training to the coaches.

Coach Supervision and Monitoring. We found no evidence to support the assumption that grantees with a stronger history of supporting professional development may provide more supervision and oversight of coaching. There were no significant differences between the grantee history of supporting professional development subgroups in the percentage of grantees that have supervisors for coaches or monitor the progress of the coaching program.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Type of Staff Coached Subgroup Set

The type of staff coached subgroup set included four subgroups:

- Lead teachers only (n = 72)
- Lead and assistant teachers (n = 144)
- Home visitors and other staff (n = 74)
- Other/multiple staff types (not including home visitors; n = 94)

The lead teachers subgroup included coaches who worked with lead teachers only and no other staff types. Lead and assistant teachers included coaches who worked with lead teachers and assistant teachers but no other staff types. Home visitors and other staff included coaches who worked with home visitors and any combination of other staff types. Other/multiple staff types included all other coaches who did not work with home visitors but worked with any other combination of staff types, including teachers, administrators, and others. Exhibit E-24 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the grantee history of supporting professional

development subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption.

Exhibit E-24. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Assumptions, and Findings for the Type of Staff Coached Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Interaction formats	Interaction formats may involve more remote interactions for coaches working with home visitors compared with those working with classroom staff only.	Frequency of remote interactions	Coaches working with home visitors reported a higher use of remote interactions compared with coaches who did not work with home visitors.	Yes
Strategies	Strategies may differ by the type of staff coached, with more use of modeling strategies among coaches working with assistant teachers as well as lead teachers and less use of modeling among coaches working with home visitors and other staff types.	Frequency of 26 coaching strategies in 3 strategy domains (observation, feedback, and discussion; practice and modeling; supportive) used with staff in a typical month	There were significant differences in the coaching strategies used by coaches working with different staff types. The most notable differences tended to be for coaches working with home visitors and those working with lead teachers only. Coaches who worked with home visitors (as well as other staff types) reported more frequent use of a number of coaching strategies. Coaches working with lead teachers only and no other staff types reported less frequent use of a number of strategies, particularly supportive strategies.	Yes
Identification of needs	Coaches working with multiple staff types may gather information about staff needs from a wider range of resources.	Whether coach uses any of 7 methods to identify staff needs for coaching	Coaches working with lead teachers only were significantly less likely to report that the staff supervisor identified needs for coaching or that the needs were identified through child assessments, compared with coaches working with other staff types. There were no other significant differences in the methods of identifying staff needs between the subgroups.	Yes
Content of coaching	Content of coaching may differ by the type of staff coached.	Frequency of coaching on 25 topics in 5 content areas (increase staff professional knowledge, increase staff skills and strategies, improve structure and organization, improve use of assessment and technology, encourage staff personal growth)	Content of coaching differed by staff type coached, especially among coaches working with lead teachers only.	Yes

Interaction Formats. The subgroup analyses support the assumption that coaching interaction formats may involve more remote interactions for coaches working with home visitors (and other staff) compared with those working with center-based staff only. As shown in Exhibit E-25, coaches working with home visitors were significantly more likely to report that they engaged in remote coaching interactions (through phone calls, e-mail, or an online format) with staff in comparison with coaches working with all other staff types.

Exhibit E-25. The Percentages of Coaches Who Reported Using Remote Coaching Interactions With Staff an Average of Once per Week or More, by the Type of Staff Coached

	Lead Teachers Only (n = 69)	Lead and Assistant Teachers Only (n = 139)	Home Visitors and Any Other Staff (n = 72)	Other Staff Types, No Home Visitors (n = 89)
Remote coaching once per week or more	50.7%	51.8%	76.4%[a]	53.9%

[a]This column percentage is significantly different from all the other columns ($p < .05$) based on a χ^2 test with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Strategies. Our analyses support the assumption that strategies may differ by the type of staff coached. As shown in Exhibit E-26, several other coaching strategies differed significantly among coaches working with different staff types. The most notable differences tended to be for coaches working with home visitors and those working with lead teachers only. There were significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups with 2 of 14 observation, feedback, and discussion strategies: coach provision of written feedback via text, e-mail, or online (n = 359, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 14.501, Fisher's exact p = .002) and facilitation of group discussion (n = 362, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 36.509, Fisher's exact p = .000). Coaches working with lead teachers only tended to facilitate group discussions less frequently compared with coaches working with other staff types. Coaches working with home visitors tended to use written feedback by text, e-mail, or an online method compared with coaches who did not work with home visitors.

Exhibit E-26. The Percentage of Coaches Reporting Frequency of Specific Strategies, by the Type of Staff Coached (Statistically Significant Results Only)

	Lead Teachers Only (n = 67–71)	Lead and Assistant Teachers Only (n = 131–143)	Home Visitors and Any Other Staff (n = 69–73)	Other Staff Types, No Home Visitors (n = 89–90)
Provide written feedback via text, e-mail, or other online method**				
Never	47.1%	45.0%	23.9%	50.6%
1 to 2 times	36.8%	39.7%	46.5%	32.6%
3 to 4 times	8.8%	9.9%	15.5%	7.9%
More than 4 times	7.4%	5.3%	14.1%	9.0%
Facilitate group discussion***				
Never	49.3%	12.5%	11.4%	18.0%
1 to 2 times	43.3%	65.4%	62.9%	52.8%
3 to 4 times	6.0%	11.8%	15.7%	18.0%
More than 4 times	1.5%	10.3%	10.0%	11.2%

	Lead Teachers Only (*n* = 67–71)	Lead and Assistant Teachers Only (*n* = 131–143)	Home Visitors and Any Other Staff (*n* = 69–73)	Other Staff Types, No Home Visitors (*n* = 89–90)
Demonstrate/model skills and strategies while in work setting (in the classroom, on a home visit, or in the child care room)*				
Never	14.1%	1.4%	8.3%	8.9%
1 to 2 times	52.1%	50.3%	51.4%	56.7%
3 to 4 times	25.4%	30.1%	18.1%	18.9%
More than 4 times	8.5%	18.2%	22.2%	15.6%
Coaching on the fly (e.g., unplanned, unscheduled, "on the run," or in a hurry)**				
Never	45.6%	36.8%	21.7%	42.7%
1 to 2 times	36.8%	42.1%	42.0%	36.0%
3 to 4 times	11.8%	12.8%	21.7%	12.4%
More than 4 times	5.9%	8.3%	14.5%	9.0%
Share materials and resources*				
Never	1.4%	0.7%	0.0%	1.1%
1 to 2 times	51.4%	34.0%	34.2%	42.7%
3 to 4 times	30.0%	35.5%	28.8%	27.0%
More than 4 times	17.1%	29.8%	37.0%	29.2%
Conduct/arrange an on-site workshop or training***				
Never	44.1%	32.1%	13.9%	21.3%
1 to 2 times	48.5%	59.9%	75.0%	60.7%
3 to 4 times	5.9%	5.1%	8.3%	7.9%
More than 4 times	1.5%	2.9%	2.8%	10.1%
Provide emotional support*				
Never	8.3%	1.4%	2.7%	2.2%
1 to 2 times	59.7%	46.9%	45.9%	47.2%
3 to 4 times	16.7%	33.6%	27.0%	29.2%
More than 4 times	15.3%	18.2%	24.3%	21.3%

Note. The results are reported only if at least one subgroup pair difference is statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

*p < .05; **p <.01; ***p < .001 for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test.

There were significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups in two of five practice and modeling strategies: demonstrating or modeling skills and strategies in the work setting (n = 376, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 10.343, Fisher's exact p = .016) and coaching on the fly (n = 359, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.696, Fisher's exact p = .005). Coaches working with both assistant teachers and lead teachers and those working with home visitors as well as other staff tended to report the most frequent use of modeling in the work setting. Coaches working with home visitors tended to report the most frequent use of on-the-fly coaching. There were no significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups on using the following practice and modeling strategies: demonstrate or model skills and strategies while not in the work setting, work with staff to role-play a skill or strategy, and ask staff to practice a skill and report back.

There were significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups in three of seven supportive strategies: share materials and resources (n = 373, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 9.485, Fisher's exact p = .023), provide emotional support (n = 378, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 8.954, Fisher's exact p = .030), and conduct or arrange an on-site workshop or training (n = 366, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 18.756, Fisher's exact p = .000). On-site workshops or training occurred most often among coaches working with home visitors and least often among coaches working with lead teachers only. Coaches working with lead teachers only were least likely to share materials and resources compared with coaches working with other staff types. There were no significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups on using the following supportive strategies: problem solving with staff on a personal issue; working on stress reduction; helping with preparation, administration, and scheduling; and working as an assistant in the classroom, on a home visit, or in the child care room.

Identification of Needs. The subgroup analyses support the assumption that coaches working with multiple staff types may gather information about staff needs from a wider range of resources. As shown in Exhibit E-27, coaches working with lead teachers only were significantly less likely to report that the staff supervisor identified the needs for coaching (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 14.006, Fisher's exact p = .003), or that the needs were identified through child assessments (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 13.964, Fisher's exact p = .003), compared with coaches working with other staff types. There were no other significant differences in the methods of identifying staff needs between the type of staff coached subgroups.

Exhibit E-27. The Percentages of Coaches Who Reported Identifying Staff Needs Through Different Sources, by the Type of Staff Coached

	Lead Teachers Only (n = 72)	Lead and Assistant Teachers Only (n = 144)	Home Visitors and Any Other Staff (n = 74)	Other Staff Types, No Home Visitors (n = 91)
Staff's supervisor identified needs on performance review	31.9%	52.1%	62.2%	49.5%
Results from child assessment data[a]	33.3%	55.6%	62.2%	53.8%
Staff self-identified needs	98.6%	97.2%	97.3%	97.8%
Results from classroom and teacher observational assessment tools	77.8%	84.7%	86.5%	91.2%
Observations without formal assessment	72.2%	77.1%	85.1%	83.5%
OHS on-site monitoring review	12.5%	16.0%	24.3%	24.2%
Grantee administration chose targets that apply to all the staff	13.9%	23.6%	25.7%	26.4%

[a]χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons indicate significant (p < .05) differences between subgroups.

Content of Coaching. We found support for the assumption that the content of coaching may differ by the type of staff coached. As shown in Exhibit E-28**Error! Reference source not found.** the frequency of content coverage in coaching differed by the staff type coached, especially among coaches working with lead teachers only.

Exhibit E-28. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting Frequency With Which They Covered Specific Topics in Coaching, by the Type of Staff Coached (Statistically Significant Results Only)

	Lead Teachers Only (*n* = 67–72)	Lead and Assistant Teachers Only (*n* = 135–144)	Home Visitors and Any Other Staff (*n* = 69–74)	Other Staff Types, No Home Visitors (*n* = 84–91)
CLASS scores*				
Never	15.5%	11.3%	26.8%	11.5%
Hardly ever	5.6%	7.8%	9.9%	4.6%
Occasionally	26.8%	24.1%	19.7%	18.4%
Frequently	52.1%	56.7%	43.7%	65.5%
Encourage parent-child interactions***				
Never	18.8%	7.1%	0.0%	3.3%
Hardly ever	24.6%	17.9%	12.3%	15.6%
Occasionally	29.0%	43.6%	39.7%	42.2%
Frequently	27.5%	31.4%	47.9%	38.9%
Engaging parents***				
Never	16.4%	4.4%	1.4%	1.1%
Hardly ever	28.4%	21.5%	15.1%	19.3%
Occasionally	32.8%	48.1%	42.5%	39.8%
Frequently	22.4%	25.9%	41.1%	39.8%
Implementation of specific curricula***				
Never	16.2%	7.9%	0.0%	2.2%
Hardly ever	14.7%	7.1%	8.2%	10.0%
Occasionally	35.3%	27.0%	24.7%	21.1%
Frequently	33.8%	57.1%	67.1%	66.7%
Home organization, management, and safety***				
Never	53.6%	42.8%	21.7%	45.3%
Hardly ever	17.4%	29.0%	26.1%	27.9%
Occasionally	21.7%	17.4%	34.8%	17.4%
Frequently	7.2%	10.9%	17.4%	9.3%
Use of books and other educational materials (center or elsewhere)**				
Never	8.6%	1.4%	2.7%	4.6%
Hardly ever	8.6%	6.3%	5.4%	4.6%
Occasionally	41.4%	31.3%	25.7%	27.6%
Frequently	41.4%	61.1%	66.2%	63.2%
Content and organization of home visit***				

	Lead Teachers Only (*n* = 67–72)	Lead and Assistant Teachers Only (*n* = 135–144)	Home Visitors and Any Other Staff (*n* = 69–74)	Other Staff Types, No Home Visitors (*n* = 84–91)
Never	54.4%	45.7%	17.8%	50.0%
Hardly ever	21.1%	30.4%	16.4%	23.8%
Occasionally	19.1%	20.3%	38.4%	19.0%
Frequently	4.4%	3.6%	27.4%	7.1%
Overall use of technology#				
Never	33.3%	17.5%	14.5%	21.2%
Hardly ever	18.8%	22.6%	15.9%	15.3%
Occasionally	31.9%	33.6%	43.5%	37.6%
Frequently	15.9%	26.3%	26.1%	25.9%
Positive interactions with colleagues (e.g., assistant teachers and administrators)*				
Never	8.6%	0.7%	0.0%	2.2%
Hardly ever	10.0%	3.5%	6.8%	3.4%
Occasionally	34.3%	37.1%	24.3%	29.2%
Frequently	47.1%	58.7%	68.9%	65.2%
Self-efficacy, motivation, and empowerment*				
Never	1.4%	2.1%	1.4%	1.1%
Hardly ever	7.0%	4.2%	4.1%	7.7%
Occasionally	43.7%	33.8%	23.2%	20.9%
Frequently	47.9%	59.9%	71.2%	70.3%
Enrollment in professional development (e.g., training to improve qualifications)**				
Never	15.3%	7.1%	2.7%	6.7%
Hardly ever	11.1%	7.8%	4.1%	14.4%
Occasionally	40.3%	35.5%	32.4%	34.4%
Frequently	33.3%	49.6%	60.8%	44.4%
Enrollment in college coursework in pursuit of a degree, certificate, or credential**				
Never	25.0%	7.9%	5.5%	14.4%
Hardly ever	12.5%	10.1%	11.0%	11.1%
Occasionally	34.7%	40.3%	37.0%	37.8%
Frequently	27.8%	41.7%	46.6%	36.7%

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, and ***p < .001 for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. Results are marked # if Kruskal-Wallis is significant, but no subgroup pair differences are statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

There was one significant difference in the frequency of content coverage by the type of staff coached subgroups among six topics related to increasing staff professional knowledge: CLASS scores (n = 370, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 10.691, Fisher's exact p = .014). Not unexpectedly, coaches working with home visitors tended to focus less frequently on CLASS scores compared with coaches who did not work with home visitors. There were no significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups on coverage of the following topics related to increasing staff professional knowledge: developmental domains, the needs of children with identified

disabilities or other special needs, behavior management, the needs of culturally diverse families, and the needs of dual-language learner children.

There were three significant differences in the frequency of content coverage by the type of staff coached subgroups among seven topics related *to* increasing or improving staff skills and strategies: encouraging parent-child interactions (n = 372, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 19.074, Fisher's exact p = .000), engaging parents (n = 363, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 19.489, Fisher's exact p = .000), and the implementation of specific curricula (n = 371, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 25.693, Fisher's exact p = .000). Coaches working with lead teachers only tended to focus less frequently on encouraging parent-child interactions, engaging parents, and implementing specific curricula compared with coaches who worked with other staff types. There were no significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups on coverage of the following topics related to increasing or improving staff skills and strategies: instructional practices for specific developmental domains, staff use of language with children, staff responsiveness to children, and teacher-child interactions.

There were three significant differences in the frequency of content coverage by the type of staff coached subgroups among five topics related to improving structure and organization: home organization, management, and safety (n = 362, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 18.233, Fisher's exact p = .000); the use of books and other educational materials (n = 375, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.479, Fisher's exact p = .006); and the content and the organization of home visits (n = 363, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 45.759, Fisher's exact p = .000). Coaches working with home visitors tended to more frequently focus on home organization, management, and safety and also on the content and organization of a home visit compared with coaches who did not work with home visitors. Coaches working with lead teachers only were less likely to have a frequent focus on the use of books and other educational materials compared with coaches working with other staff types.

There was one significant difference in the frequency of content coverage by the type of staff coached subgroups among three topics related to increasing and improving the use of assessment or technology: the overall use of technology (n = 360, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 8.462, Fisher's exact p = .037). Coaches working with lead teachers only tended to focus somewhat less frequently on the use of technology in general compared with coaches working with other staff. There were no significant differences between the type of staff coached subgroups on the coverage of the following topics related to increasing and improving the use of assessment or technology: ongoing child assessments for tailoring instruction and ongoing child assessments for ongoing program quality assessment.

All four topics related to encouraging staff personal growth had significant differences in the frequency of content coverage by the type of staff coached subgroups: positive interactions with colleagues (n = 376, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 10.909, Fisher's exact p = .012); self-efficacy, motivation, and empowerment (n = 377, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 9.968, Fisher's exact p = .019); enrollment in professional development (n = 377, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 15.648, Fisher's exact p = .001); and enrollment in college coursework in pursuit of a degree, a certificate, or a credential (n = 374, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 13.098, Fisher's exact p = .004). Coaches working with lead teachers only, tended to focus somewhat less frequently on positive interactions with colleagues; self-efficacy, motivation, and empowerment; enrollment in professional

development; and enrollment in college coursework compared with coaches working with other staff types.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Coach Contact Formats Subgroup Set

The coach contact formats subgroup set included four subgroups:

- High in-person and high remote (*n* = 139)
- High in-person and low remote (*n* = 77)
- Low in-person and high remote (*n* = 68)
- Low in-person and low remote (*n* = 81)

The subgroup definitions included two dimensions: high versus low in-person interactions and high versus low remote interactions. High in-person interactions were defined as meeting face-to-face once per week or more, in groups and/or individually, whereas low in-person interactions were defined as meeting face-to-face in either format less than once per week. High remote interactions were defined as interactions once per week or more for any of the following: phone calls, e-mails, online messaging, texting, virtual meetings, or social media, whereas low remote interactions were defined as interactions in these formats less than once per week. Exhibit E-29 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the coach contact formats subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption.

Exhibit E-29. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Assumptions, and Findings for the Coach Contact Formats Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Strategies	Strategies may vary according to the format used, with less observation and feedback reported for coaches who reported less in-person support.	Frequency of 26 coaching strategies in 3 strategy domains (observation, feedback, and discussion; practice and modeling; supportive) used with staff in a typical month	Coaches in the high in-person high remote subgroup and coaches in the high in-person low remote subgroup more frequently used observation, feedback, and discussion strategies and practice and modeling strategies in their work with staff. The frequency of supportive strategies tended to be lowest among the low in-person low remote subgroup and higher among the other subgroups, especially those with high in-person contacts.	Yes
Roles	Coaches offering less in-person support may take on fewer roles in their relationships with staff.	Frequency with which coaches reported taking on 10 different roles in their work as coaches	Coaches in the low in-person low remote subgroup tended to take on a variety of roles less frequently compared with coaches in the other contact subgroups.	Yes
Identification of needs	Coaches with low in-person support may gather information about	Whether a coach used any of 7 methods to identify staff needs for	The low in-person low remote subgroup was less likely, compared with the high in-person high remote	Partly

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
	staff needs from a smaller range of sources.	coaching	subgroup, to use some strategies for identifying staff needs for coaching.	
Content of coaching	Content of coaching may vary across the different format subgroups and may be narrower for coaches with less in-person support.	Frequency of coaching on 25 topics in 5 content areas (increase staff professional knowledge, increase staff skills and strategies, improve structure and organization, improve use of assessment and technology, and encourage staff personal growth)	Coaches who reported less in-person support were less likely, compared with coaches who reported high in-person support, to frequently cover a number of coaching topics, including the needs of children with special needs, the implementation of curricula, improving structure and organization, improving the use of technology and assessment, and positive interactions with colleagues. Coaches in the high in-person high remote subgroup tended to report the most frequent content coverage of these topics.	Yes

Strategies. Our analyses support the assumption that strategies would vary according to the format used, with less observation and feedback reported for coaches who reported less in-person support—with high or low remote utilization. Coaches in the high in-person high remote subgroup and coaches in the high in-person low remote subgroup more frequently used observation, feedback, and discussion strategies and practice and modeling strategies in their work with staff. The frequency of supportive strategies tended to be lowest among the low in-person low remote subgroup and higher among the other subgroups, especially those with high in-person contacts.

As shown in Exhibit E-30, there were significant differences between the coaching contact format subgroups in 13 out of 14 observation, feedback, and discussion strategies: conduct live on-site observation (n = 362, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 71.406, Fisher's exact p = .000); watch a video of a staff member's work (n = 352, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.414, Fisher's exact p = .006); watch with staff a video of the work of other staff members (n = 348, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 15.839, Fisher's exact p = .001); arrange for staff to make peer observations (n = 343, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 21.100, Fisher's exact p = .000); provide verbal feedback based on live observations (n = 363, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 75.006, Fisher's exact p = .000); provide verbal feedback based on discussion with staff (n = 355, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 56.061, Fisher's exact p = .000); provide written feedback on paper (n = 352, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 31.808, Fisher's exact p = .000); provide written feedback via text, e-mail, or other online method (n = 351, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 67.596, Fisher's exact p = .000); introduce new skills, practices, or strategies (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 41.414, Fisher's exact p = .000); reflect on skills, practices, or strategies (n = 361, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 56.619, Fisher's exact p = .000); set and reassess goals for individuals (n = 358, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 38.590, Fisher's exact p = .000); facilitate group discussion (n = 3515, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 40.747, Fisher's exact p = .000); and staff shares mistakes/challenges in their work (n = 355, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 39.585, Fisher's exact p = .000).

Exhibit E-30. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Used Specific Observation, Feedback, and Discussion Strategies, by Coaching Contact Formats

.	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 62–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 131–138)
Conduct live on-site observation (with or without tool)***				
Never	5.1%	10.3%	2.6%	3.6%
1 to 2 times	79.7%	67.6%	31.2%	26.1%
3 to 4 times	6.3%	11.8%	41.6%	42.0%
More than 4 times	8.9%	10.3%	24.7%	28.3%
Watch a video of a staff member's work with the staff member**				
Never	62.3%	46.3%	53.2%	40.5%
1 to 2 times	36.4%	52.2%	37.7%	47.3%
3 to 4 times	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	8.4%
More than 4 times	1.3%	1.5%	2.6%	3.8%
Watch a video of the work of other staff members with the staff member**				
Never	86.8%	82.1%	75.7%	64.9%
1 to 2 times	13.2%	16.4%	18.9%	27.5%
3 to 4 times	0.0%	1.5%	4.1%	5.3%
More than 4 times	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	2.3%
Video journal				
Never	92.0%	90.8%	96.0%	86.7%
1 to 2 times	6.7%	7.7%	2.7%	9.4%
3 to 4 times	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
More than 4 times	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%	1.6%
Arrange for staff to make peer observations***				
Never	68.5%	42.4%	53.4%	35.1%
1 to 2 times	28.8%	48.5%	37.0%	57.3%
3 to 4 times	2.7%	7.6%	6.8%	4.6%
More than 4 times	0.0%	1.5%	2.7%	3.1%
Provide verbal feedback based on live observations***				
Never	7.4%	9.0%	1.3%	0.7%
1 to 2 times	74.1%	56.7%	19.5%	25.4%
3 to 4 times	7.4%	19.4%	51.9%	40.6%
More than 4 times	11.1%	14.9%	27.3%	33.3%
Provide verbal feedback based on discussion with staff***				
Never	7.6%	6.2%	5.3%	2.2%
1 to 2 times	78.5%	57.8%	23.7%	30.9%
3 to 4 times	2.5%	18.8%	46.1%	33.1%
More than 4 times	11.4%	17.2%	25.0%	33.8%

.	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 62–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 131–138)
Provide written feedback on paper***				
Never	19.2%	22.4%	23.3%	9.7%
1 to 2 times	71.8%	59.7%	42.5%	44.8%
3 to 4 times	5.1%	11.9%	24.7%	24.6%
More than 4 times	3.8%	6.0%	9.6%	20.9%
Provide written feedback via text, e-mail, or other online method***				
Never	45.5%	17.9%	78.7%	32.6%
1 to 2 times	50.6%	50.7%	18.7%	38.6%
3 to 4 times	2.6%	22.4%	0.0%	15.2%
More than 4 times	1.3%	9.0%	2.7%	13.6%
Introduce new skills, practices, or strategies***				
Never	2.6%	0.0%	1.3%	0.7%
1 to 2 times	79.5%	69.7%	43.4%	42.3%
3 to 4 times	14.1%	19.7%	32.9%	29.9%
More than 4 times	3.8%	10.6%	22.4%	27.0%
Reflect on skills, practices, or strategies***				
Never	3.8%	1.5%	1.3%	0.7%
1 to 2 times	72.5%	64.2%	24.7%	33.6%
3 to 4 times	17.5%	23.9%	48.1%	38.7%
More than 4 times	6.2%	10.4%	26.0%	27.0%
Set and reassess goals for individuals***				
Never	10.0%	1.5%	3.9%	2.2%
1 to 2 times	86.2%	84.6%	65.8%	59.9%
3 to 4 times	2.5%	6.2%	19.7%	24.1%
More than 4 times	1.2%	7.7%	10.5%	13.9%
Facilitate group discussion***				
Never	39.0%	22.7%	18.7%	11.3%
1 to 2 times	57.1%	66.7%	57.3%	55.6%
3 to 4 times	2.6%	7.6%	14.7%	19.5%
More than 4 times	1.3%	3.0%	9.3%	13.5%
Staff shares mistakes/challenges in their work***				
Never	7.6%	7.6%	2.7%	5.2%
1 to 2 times	78.5%	63.6%	41.3%	43.0%
3 to 4 times	10.1%	22.7%	36.0%	31.9%
More than 4 times	3.8%	6.1%	20.0%	20.0%

Note. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results are marked # if Kruskal-Wallis is significant, but no subgroup pair differences are statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

As shown in Exhibit E-31, there were significant differences between the coaching contact format subgroups in all five practice and modeling strategies: demonstrate or model skills and strategies in the work setting (n = 362, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 49.727, Fisher's exact p = .000), demonstrate or model skills and strategies while not in the work setting (n = 348, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 14.175, Fisher's exact p = .003), work with staff to role-play a skill or a strategy (n = 347, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 16.690, Fisher's exact p = .001), ask staff to practice a skill and report back (n = 361, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 39.057, Fisher's exact p = .000), and coaching on the fly (n = 347, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 40.523, Fisher's exact p = .000). Coaches in the high in-person high remote subgroup and the high in-person low remote subgroup reported more frequent use of practice and modeling strategies, including demonstrating or modeling skills and strategies, role-playing a skill or a strategy, and asking staff to practice a skill and report back. Coaches in these groups were also somewhat more likely to report coaching on the fly.

Exhibit E-31. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Used Specific Demonstration and Modeling Strategies, by Coaching Contact Formats

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (n = 73–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (n = 62–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (n = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (n = 131–138)
Demonstrate/model skills and strategies while in work setting (in the classroom, on a home visit, or in the child care room)***				
Never	12.5%	14.9%	2.6%	1.4%
1 to 2 times	66.2%	65.7%	42.9%	43.5%
3 to 4 times	12.5%	13.4%	33.8%	30.4%
More than 4 times	8.8%	6.0%	20.8%	24.6%
Demonstrate/model skills and strategies while not in work setting (in a classroom, on a home visit, or in the child care center)**				
Never	53.8%	36.5%	33.8%	35.3%
1 to 2 times	42.3%	49.2%	52.7%	40.6%
3 to 4 times	2.6%	7.9%	8.1%	14.3%
More than 4 times	1.3%	6.3%	5.4%	9.8%
Work with staff to role-play a skill or a strategy**				
Never	39.7%	35.9%	23.3%	24.2%
1 to 2 times	52.6%	56.2%	52.1%	50.8%
3 to 4 times	3.8%	4.7%	17.8%	16.7%
More than 4 times	3.8%	3.1%	6.8%	8.3%
Ask staff that you are coaching to practice skill and report back***				
Never	13.8%	7.5%	9.1%	4.4%
1 to 2 times	81.2%	73.1%	51.9%	51.8%
3 to 4 times	2.5%	10.4%	31.2%	29.2%
More than 4 times	2.5%	9.0%	7.8%	14.6%
Coaching on the fly (e.g., unplanned, unscheduled, on the run, or in a hurry)***				
Never	56.4%	48.4%	35.6%	21.6%
1 to 2 times	41.0%	32.3%	37.0%	44.0%
3 to 4 times	1.3%	14.5%	19.2%	19.4%
More than 4 times	1.3%	4.8%	8.2%	14.9%

Note. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001 for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results are marked # if Kruskal-Wallis is significant, but no subgroup pair differences are statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

As shown in Exhibit E-32, there were significant differences between the coaching contact format subgroups in all seven supportive strategies: problem solving with staff on a personal issue (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 13.185, Fisher's exact p = .004); provide emotional support (n = 362, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 32.484, Fisher's exact p = .000); work on stress reduction (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 26.108, Fisher's exact p = .000); share materials and resources (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 48.013, Fisher's exact p = .000); conduct or arrange an on-site workshop or training (n = 352, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 25.594, Fisher's exact p = .000); help with preparation, administration, and scheduling (n = 352, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 57.297, Fisher's exact p = .000); and work as an assistant in the classroom, on a home visit, or in the child care room (n = 352, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 32.492, Fisher's exact p = .000). The frequency of supportive strategies tended to be lowest among the low in-person low remote subgroup and higher among the other subgroups, especially those with high in-person contacts. The high in-person high remote subgroup reported the most frequent use of on-site workshops and training.

Exhibit E-32. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Used Specific Supportive Strategies, by Coaching Contact Formats

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (n = 73–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (n = 62–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (n = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (n = 131–138)
Problem solving with staff on personal issue**				
Never	25.6%	19.7%	20.8%	18.4%
1 to 2 times	66.7%	54.5%	53.2%	46.3%
3 to 4 times	2.6%	15.2%	22.1%	20.6%
More than 4 times	5.1%	10.6%	3.9%	14.7%
Provide emotional support***				
Never	6.2%	6.0%	0.0%	0.7%
1 to 2 times	69.1%	50.7%	46.1%	37.0%
3 to 4 times	16.0%	25.4%	38.2%	34.1%
More than 4 times	8.6%	17.9%	15.8%	28.3%
Work on stress reduction***				
Never	19.0%	11.8%	9.2%	6.0%
1 to 2 times	67.1%	55.9%	47.4%	47.8%
3 to 4 times	7.6%	20.6%	34.2%	29.1%
More than 4 times	6.3%	11.8%	9.2%	17.2%
Share materials and resources***				
Never	1.3%	1.5%	1.4%	0.0%
1–2 times	67.1%	51.5%	29.7%	22.8%
3 to 4 times	20.3%	26.5%	39.2%	37.5%
More than 4 times	11.4%	20.6%	29.7%	39.7%
Conduct/arrange an on-site workshop or training***				
Never	43.6%	37.5%	31.6%	12.7%
1 to 2 times	52.6%	51.6%	55.3%	74.6%
3 to 4 times	2.6%	7.8%	10.5%	6.7%

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 62–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 131–138)
More than 4 times	1.3%	3.1%	2.6%	6.0%
Help with preparation, administration, and scheduling***				
Never	57.0%	39.1%	40.0%	13.4%
1 to 2 times	35.4%	48.4%	45.3%	51.5%
3 to 4 times	3.8%	6.2%	12.0%	13.4%
More than 4 times	3.8%	6.2%	2.7%	21.6%
Work as an assistant in classroom, on a home visit, or in the child care room (such as help manage a child)***				
Never	41.8%	33.8%	38.4%	16.7%
1 to 2 times	44.3%	58.8%	37.0%	43.9%
3 to 4 times	7.6%	2.9%	15.1%	20.5%
More than 4 times	6.3%	4.4%	9.6%	18.9%

Note. The results are marked # if Kruskal-Wallis is significant, but no subgroup pair differences are statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Roles. The subgroup analyses support the assumption that coaches offering less in-person support may take on fewer roles in their relationships with staff. As shown in Exhibit E-33, coaches in the low in-person subgroup reported less frequently taking on various roles, including advocate ($n = 364$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 13.391$, Fisher's exact $p = .004$), problem solver ($n = 361$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 14.503$, Fisher's exact $p = .002$), supervisor ($n = 359$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 34.891$, Fisher's exact $p = .000$), logistical supporter ($n = 354$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 10.306$, Fisher's exact $p = .016$), and assistant to staff ($n = 356$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 17.586$, Fisher's exact $p = .001$), compared with coaches in the other subgroups.

Exhibit E-33. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Took on Specific Roles in Their Work as Coaches, by Coaching Contact Formats (Statistically Significant Results Only)

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 78–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 66–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 134–138)
Advocate**				
Never	6.2%	5.9%	5.2%	4.3%
Rarely	7.4%	8.8%	6.5%	4.3%
Occasionally	54.3%	44.1%	42.9%	33.3%
Frequently	32.1%	41.2%	45.5%	58.0%
Problem solver**				
Never	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Rarely	15.0%	3.0%	5.3%	2.9%
Occasionally	48.8%	46.3%	47.4%	37.0%
Frequently	36.2%	50.7%	47.4%	59.4%
Supervisor***				

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 78–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 66–68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 73–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 134–138)
Never	73.1%	50.7%	59.2%	36.2%
Rarely	12.8%	32.8%	13.2%	14.5%
Occasionally	6.4%	7.5%	10.5%	21.7%
Frequently	7.7%	9.0%	17.1%	27.5%
Logistical supporter*				
Never	10.1%	1.5%	14.7%	6.7%
Rarely	13.9%	18.2%	9.3%	8.2%
Occasionally	53.2%	42.4%	48.0%	43.3%
Frequently	22.8%	37.9%	28.0%	41.8%
Assistant to the staff that you are coaching**				
Never	31.6%	18.2%	24.7%	8.7%
Rarely	17.7%	27.3%	11.0%	20.3%
Occasionally	30.4%	33.3%	37.0%	32.6%
Frequently	20.3%	21.2%	27.4%	38.4%

Note. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results are reported only if at least one subgroup pair difference is statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Identification of Needs. The subgroup analyses partly support the assumption that coaches with low in-person support may gather information about staff needs from a smaller range of sources. As shown in Exhibit E-34, the low in-person and low remote subgroup was less likely, compared with the high in-person and high remote subgroup, to use some of the strategies for identifying the staff needs for coaching, including the results of a performance review ($n = 365$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 19.074$, Fisher's exact $p = .000$), results from child assessment data ($n = 365$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 15.557$, Fisher's exact $p = .001$), and observations without formal assessment ($n = 365$, Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 11.111$, Fisher's exact $p = .011$). Differences were not found in coach use of other methods to identify staff needs, including staff self-identification of needs, results from classroom and teacher observational tools, Office of Head Start monitoring review, and grantee targets for all staff.

Exhibit E-34. The Percentages of Coaches Who Reported Identifying Staff Needs Through Different Sources, by Coaching Contact Formats

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 139)
Staff's supervisor identified needs on a performance review[a]	34.6%	45.6%	49.4%	64.0%
Results from child assessment data[a]	37.0%	45.6%	53.2%	63.3%
Observations without formal assessment[a]	69.1%	73.5%	85.7%	84.9%
Staff self-identified needs	96.3%	97.1%	96.1%	99.3%
Results from classroom and teacher observational assessment tools	88.9%	86.8%	81.8%	87.1%

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 68)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 139)
OHS on-site monitoring review	17.3%	16.2%	14.3%	25.2%
Grantee administration chose targets that apply to all of the staff	25.9%	14.7%	24.7%	23.0%

[a]These percentages are significantly different from other rows, based on a χ^2 test with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Content of Coaching. We found support for the assumption that the content of coaching may vary across the different coaching contact format subgroups and may be narrower for coaches with less in-person support. As shown in Exhibit E-35, coaches who reported less in-person support were less likely, compared with coaches who reported high in-person support, to frequently cover various coaching topics, including the needs of children with special needs, the implementation of curricula, improving structure and organization, improving the use of technology and assessment, and positive interactions with colleagues. Coaches in the high in-person high remote subgroup tended to report the most frequent content coverage of these topics.

Exhibit E-35. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Covered Specific Topics in Coaching, by Coaching Contact Formats (Statistically Significant Results Only)

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 76–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 64–67)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 70–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 134–138)
Needs of children with identified disabilities or other special needs*				
Never	3.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.7%
Hardly ever	13.9%	7.5%	10.7%	9.4%
Occasionally	57.0%	44.8%	46.7%	45.7%
Frequently	25.3%	43.3%	42.7%	44.2%
Implementation of specific curricula***				
Never	10.1%	15.4%	3.9%	1.5%
Hardly ever	12.7%	10.8%	13.2%	4.4%
Occasionally	32.9%	26.2%	26.3%	23.4%
Frequently	44.3%	47.1%	56.6%	70.8%
Classroom or center organization***				
Never	11.2%	9.1%	5.2%	0.7%
Hardly ever	13.8%	9.1%	9.1%	3.7%
Occasionally	41.2%	37.9%	39.0%	35.1%
Frequently	33.8%	43.9%	46.8%	60.4%
Use or display of materials (center or elsewhere)**				
Never	11.2%	9.0%	3.9%	1.5%
Hardly ever	15.0%	11.9%	10.4%	6.7%
Occasionally	38.8%	38.8%	49.4%	40.7%
Frequently	35.0%	40.3%	36.4%	51.1%

	Low In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 76–81)	Low In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 64–67)	High In-Person and Low Remote (*n* = 70–77)	High In-Person and High Remote (*n* = 134–138)
Home organization, management, and safety***				
Never	59.2%	31.2%	58.7%	28.9%
Hardly ever	17.1%	32.8%	18.7%	30.4%
Occasionally	13.2%	25.0%	14.7%	28.9%
Frequently	10.5%	10.9%	8.0%	11.9%
Use of books and other educational materials (center or elsewhere)*				
Never	7.4%	6.1%	3.9%	1.5%
Hardly ever	8.6%	9.1%	2.6%	5.1%
Occasionally	24.7%	37.9%	44.2%	25.7%
Frequently	59.3%	47.0%	49.4%	67.6%
Content and organization of home visit***				
Never	54.4%	48.5%	52.9%	28.4%
Hardly ever	25.3%	24.2%	20.0%	29.1%
Occasionally	13.9%	18.2%	24.3%	28.4%
Frequently	6.3%	9.1%	2.9%	14.2%
Overall use of technology***				
Never	23.1%	17.2%	37.5%	12.6%
Hardly ever	24.4%	21.9%	19.4%	14.8%
Occasionally	42.3%	28.1%	30.6%	39.3%
Frequently	10.3%	32.8%	12.5%	33.3%
Ongoing child assessment for tailoring instruction**				
Never	16.7%	9.1%	12.0%	6.5%
Hardly ever	16.7%	13.6%	13.3%	6.5%
Occasionally	25.6%	34.8%	28.0%	23.9%
Frequently	41.0%	42.4%	46.7%	63.0%
Ongoing child assessment for ongoing program quality improvement***				
Never	16.9%	9.2%	9.3%	8.0%
Hardly ever	16.9%	16.9%	17.3%	6.6%
Occasionally	32.5%	35.4%	32.0%	25.5%
Frequently	33.8%	38.5%	41.3%	59.9%
Positive interactions with colleagues (e.g., teaching assistants and administrators)*				
Never	3.8%	5.9%	0.0%	0.7%
Hardly ever	5.1%	13.2%	5.3%	1.4%
Occasionally	41.0%	23.5%	39.5%	28.3%
Frequently	50.0%	57.4%	55.3%	69.6%

Note. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results are reported only if at least one subgroup pair difference is statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

There was one significant difference in the frequency of content coverage by coaching contact format subgroups among six topics related to increasing staff professional knowledge: the needs of children with identified disabilities or other special needs (n = 359, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 9.404, Fisher's exact p = .024). The low in-person low remote subgroup was less likely, compared with other subgroups, to report frequent content coverage in coaching related to the needs of children with identified disabilities or other special needs. There were no significant differences between the coaching contact format coached subgroups on coverage of the following topics related to increasing staff professional knowledge: developmental domains, CLASS scores, behavior management, the needs of culturally diverse families, and the needs of dual-language learner children.

There was one significant difference in the frequency of content coverage by coaching contact format subgroups among seven topics related to increasing or improving staff skills and strategies: the implementation of specific curricula (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 23.099, Fisher's exact p = .000). The high in-person high remote and high in-person low remote subgroups were more likely, compared with the low in-person subgroups, to report frequent content coverage in coaching related to the implementation of specific curricula. There were no significant differences between the coaching contact format subgroups on coverage of the following topics: increasing or improving staff skills and strategies, encouraging parent-child interactions, engaging parents, instructional practices for specific developmental domains, staff use of language with children, staff responsiveness to children, and teacher-child interactions.

All five topics related to improving structure and organization had significant differences in frequency of content coverage by coaching contact formats subgroups: classroom or center organization (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 22.290, Fisher's exact p = .000); use or display of materials (n = 359, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.268, Fisher's exact p = .007); home organization, management, and safety (n = 350, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 22.920, Fisher's exact p = .000); the use of books and other educational materials (n = 360, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 10.491, Fisher's exact p = .015); and content and organization of home visits (n = 349, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 21.580, Fisher's exact p = .000). The high in-person high remote subgroup was more likely, compared with other subgroups, to report frequent content coverage to improve structure and organization, including classroom or center organization; use or display of materials; home organization, management, and safety; the use of books and other educational materials; and content and organization of the home visit.

All three topics related to increasing and improving the use of assessment or technology had significant differences in the frequency of content coverage by coaching contact formats subgroups: overall use of technology (n = 349, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 28.799, Fisher's exact p = .000), ongoing child assessments for tailoring instruction (n = 357, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 15.987, Fisher's exact p = .001), and ongoing child assessments for ongoing program quality assessment (n = 354, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 18.382, Fisher's exact p = .000). The high in-person high remote subgroup was more likely, compared with other subgroups, to report frequent content coverage to increase and improve the use of assessment or technology, including the overall use of technology, ongoing child assessment for tailoring instruction, and ongoing child assessment for program quality assessment.

There was one significant difference in the frequency of content coverage by coaching contact formats subgroups among four topics related to encouraging staff personal growth: positive interactions with colleagues (n = 360, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 11.418, Fisher's exact p = .010). The high in-person high remote subgroup was more likely, compared with the other subgroups, to report frequent content coverage in coaching related to positive interactions with colleagues.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Coach Education and Experience Subgroup Set

The coach education and experience subgroup set included four subgroups:

- High education and high experience (n = 101)
- Less education and high experience (n = 102)
- High education and less experience (n = 70)
- Less education and less experience (n = 107)

The subgroup definitions included two dimensions: high versus less education and high versus less experience. High education was defined as having a master's degree or higher, whereas less education was defined as having less than a master's degree. High experience was defined as having 10 or more years of experience in teaching and 2 or more years of experience as a coach, whereas less experience was having less than 10 years of experience in teaching and/or less than 2 years experience coaching. Exhibit E-36 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the coach education and experience subgroup analyses, the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption.

Exhibit E-36. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Assumptions, and Findings for the Coach Education and Experience Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Preparation for coaching	Coaches with more education and/or experience may feel more satisfied with the quantity and the content of the initial training and orientation they received and also may have received initial training on different topics from less experienced coaches.	• Whether orientation (if provided) covered any of 7 topics • Satisfaction with quantity of orientation (if provided) • Satisfaction with content of orientation (if provided)	There were no significant differences in the orientation experiences between the staff education and experience subgroups.	No
Strategies	Coaching strategies may vary according to the education and experience level of the coaches.	Frequency of 26 coaching strategies in 3 strategy domains (observation, feedback, and discussion; practice and modeling; supportive) used with staff in a typical month	There were no meaningful differences in the use of coaching strategies by the coach level of education and experience.	No

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Roles	Coaches with more experience and/or education may take on fewer "extra" roles, such as assistant or emotional supporter or crisis intervention, but might take on more oversight roles, such as teacher/instructor or supervisor.	Frequency with which coaches report taking on 10 different roles in their work as coaches	There were significant differences in the roles that coaches of different levels of education and experience take on, but the results do not support the hypotheses.	Partly

Preparation for Coaching. The subgroup analyses did not support the assumption that coaches with more education and/or experience may feel more satisfied with the quantity and the content of the initial training and the orientation they received, and they also may have received initial training on different topics from less experienced coaches. There are no significant differences between the coach education and experience subgroups and the topics covered in the coach orientation. There are also no differences between the coach education and experience subgroups and the coach level of satisfaction with either the quantity or content of the orientation.

Strategies. The subgroup analyses did not support the assumption that coaching strategies may vary according to the education and experience level of the coaches. There are no significant differences between the coach education and experience subgroups and the frequency of observation, feedback, and discussion strategies or practice and modeling strategies. Coaches with high education but less experience are less likely—compared with coaches with other education and experience backgrounds—to help with preparation, administration, and scheduling. This difference is difficult to interpret in a meaningful way. There are no other statistically significant differences between the coach education and experience levels and the use of supportive strategies.

Roles. The results partially support the assumption that coaches with more experience and/or education may take on fewer extra roles, such as assistant, emotional supporter, or crisis intervention, but do not support the assumption that coaches with more experience and/or education might take on more oversight roles, such as teacher/instructor or supervisor. As shown in Exhibit E-37, coaches with low education and experience were more likely to take on the role of assistant (n = 371, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 9.515, Fisher's exact p = .023 without Bonferroni correction), although pairwise differences between the subgroups were no longer statistically significant after accounting for multiple comparisons. The hypotheses were not fully supported, however, because there were no significant differences between the education and experience subgroups in the coach roles of emotional supporter, teacher/instructor, or supervisor. There were also subgroup differences in the frequency with which coaches took on the crisis intervention role (n = 372, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 9.644, Fisher's exact p = .022), with the highest crisis intervention by low education and high experience coaches and the lowest crisis intervention by high education and low experience coaches. Coaches with low experience tended to take on the advocate role less frequently compared with coaches with high experience (n = 377, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 11.966, Fisher's exact p = .008). Almost all of the coaches reported taking on the role of collaborative partner, but the coaches with high education and experience were most likely to report doing so frequently (n = 373, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 9.026, Fisher's exact p = .029).

Exhibit E-37. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Took on Specific Roles in Their Work as Coaches, by Coach Education and Experience (Statistically Significant Results Only)

	Low Education and Low Experience (*n* = 104–105)	High Education and Low Experience (*n* = 69–70)	Low Education and High Experience (*n* = 99–101)	High Education and High Experience (*n* = 100–101)
Advocate**				
Never	6.7%	2.9%	3.0%	5.9%
Rarely	6.7%	11.4%	4.0%	4.0%
Occasionally	47.6%	50.0%	36.6%	35.6%
Frequently	39.0%	35.7%	56.4%	54.5%
Crisis intervention*				
Never	19.2%	29.0%	11.1%	16.0%
Rarely	37.5%	30.4%	31.3%	34.0%
Occasionally	35.6%	36.2%	46.5%	41.0%
Frequently	7.7%	4.3%	11.1%	9.0%
Collaborative partner*				
Never	1.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Rarely	6.7%	1.4%	5.0%	4.0%
Occasionally	22.9%	20.0%	26.0%	10.9%
Frequently	69.5%	77.1%	69.0%	85.1%
Assistant to the staff receiving coaching#				
Never	14.7%	24.3%	15.0%	23.2%
Rarely	10.8%	21.4%	22.0%	23.2%
Occasionally	38.2%	27.1%	37.0%	30.3%
Frequently	36.3%	27.1%	26.0%	23.2%

Note. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$ for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results are marked # if Kruskal-Wallis is significant, but no subgroup pair differences are statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Subgroup Analyses Results: Coach Caseload Size Subgroup Set

The coach caseload size subgroup set included four subgroups:

- 1–5 staff coached (*n* = 85)
- 6–10 staff coached (*n* = 91)
- 11–20 staff coached (*n* = 102)
- More than 20 staff coached (*n* = 103)

The coach's staff caseload was the sum of the number of staff coached, including lead teachers, assistant teachers, home visitors, family child care staff, administrators, and supervisors. The four caseload size subgroups represented different caseload sizes across all of the staff types. Exhibit E-38 summarizes the a priori assumptions for the coach caseload size subgroup analyses,

the dependent variables, the findings from the statistical tests of the unadjusted subgroup comparisons, and whether the results support each assumption.

Exhibit E-38. Summary of Descriptive Subgroup Analysis Topics, Assumptions, and Findings for the Coach Caseload Size Subgroups

Topic	Assumption	Variables	Summary of Findings	Assumption Supported
Dosage	Coaches with larger caseloads may provide less frequent mentoring interactions to staff they work with compared with coaches having smaller caseloads.	Average frequency of coaching strategies in 3 strategy domains (observation, feedback, and discussion; practice and modeling; supportive) used with staff in a typical month	There were no significant differences in the dosage of coaching strategies by coach caseload size subgroup.	No
Interaction formats	Coaches with larger caseloads may have fewer individual in-person meetings with staff they work with and may have more group in-person meetings or remote interactions compared with coaches with smaller caseloads.	Frequency of remote interactions	There were no significant differences between the caseload size subgroups on the level of in-person and remote interactions.	No
Individualization and identification of needs	Coaches with larger caseloads may use fewer resources to identify staff needs compared with those with smaller caseloads and may also use more consistent coaching strategies rather than varying coaching to meet individual needs.	• Whether the coach uses any of 7 methods to identify staff needs for coaching • Extent to which the coach varies strategies for different staff • Extent to which the coach varies goals and topics for different staff	Coaches with larger caseloads actually used more resources to identify staff needs, particularly data results such as child assessments, classroom observations, and monitoring review results. There were no differences by caseload size on the individualization of coaching strategies, goals, or topics.	No
Roles	Coaches with larger caseloads may take on fewer extra roles, such as assistant, emotional supporter, or crisis intervention, compared with coaches with smaller caseloads.	Frequency with which coaches report taking on 10 different roles in their work as coaches	There was no evidence to support the assumption. In fact, coaches with larger caseloads reported more frequently taking on several roles, including emotional supporter.	No

Dosage. The subgroup analyses did not support the assumption that coaches with larger caseloads may provide less frequent mentoring interactions to staff they work with compared with coaches with smaller caseloads. There are no significant differences in the average frequency, or dosage, of coaching strategies by the coach caseload size subgroup.

Interaction Formats. The subgroup analyses did not support the assumption that coaches with larger caseloads may have fewer individual in-person meetings with staff they work with, and they may have more group in-person meetings or remote interactions, compared with coaches with smaller caseloads. There are no significant differences between the caseload size subgroups on the level of in-person and remote interactions.

Identification of Needs. The subgroup analyses do not support the assumption that coaches with larger caseloads may use fewer resources to identify staff needs, compared with those with smaller caseloads, and they may also use more consistent coaching strategies rather than varying coaching to meet individual needs. As shown in Exhibit E-39, coaches with larger caseloads actually use more resources to identify staff needs, particularly data results such as child assessments (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 13.610, Fisher's exact p = .003); classroom observations with observational tools (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 14.330, Fisher's exact p = .002) and without formal assessment (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.397, Fisher's exact p = .006); and OHS monitoring review results (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 16.312, Fisher's exact p = .001). The coach caseload size subgroups did not differ in the use of other methods to identify staff needs, including staff self-identification of needs, staff supervisor identifying needs on a performance review, and grantee targets for all staff. There are no significant differences by caseload size in the extent to which the coach varies strategies, goals, and topics for different staff.

Exhibit E-39. The Percentages of Coaches Who Reported Identifying Staff Needs Through Different Sources, by Coaching Caseload Size

	1–5 Staff Coached (n = 85)	6–10 Staff Coached (n = 91)	11–20 Staff Coached (n = 102)	More Than 20 Staff Coached (n = 103)
Results from child assessment data[a]	42.4%	41.8%	60.8%	61.2%
Results from classroom and teacher observational assessment tools*	76.5%	80.2%	88.2%	94.2%
Observations without formal assessment[a]	65.9%	82.4%	85.3%	81.6%
OHS on-site monitoring review[a]	14.1%	12.1%	15.7%	32.0%
Grantee administration chose targets that apply to all the staff	12.9%	25.3%	22.5%	29.1%
Staff's supervisor identified needs on performance review	42.4%	42.9%	51.0%	60.2%
Staff self-identified needs	97.6%	96.7%	100.0%	96.1%

[a]The percentages in this row are significantly different from the other rows, based on a χ^2 test with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Roles. The subgroup analyses do not support the assumption that coaches with larger caseloads may take on fewer extra roles, such as assistant, emotional supporter, or crisis intervention, compared with coaches with smaller caseloads. As shown in Exhibit E-40, the subgroups with larger caseloads were in fact more likely to report frequently taking on the roles of emotional supporter (n = 381, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.650, Fisher's exact p = .005); logistical supporter (n = 369, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 12.059, Fisher's exact p = .007); and teacher/instructor for adults (n = 375, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 10.837, Fisher's exact p = .013) in their work with staff. There were also significant caseload size subgroup differences in other roles, including crisis intervention (n = 373, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 10.080, Fisher's exact p = .018) and problem solver (n = 377, Kruskal-Wallis χ^2 = 7.904, Fisher's exact p = .048), although the pairwise subgroup differences were not significant after accounting for multiple comparisons. There were no significant differences between the caseload size subgroups in the frequency of taking on the following roles: advocate, technical expert, supervisor, collaborative partner, and assistant to the staff receiving coaching.

Exhibit E-40. The Percentages of Coaches Reporting the Frequency With Which They Took on Specific Roles in Their Work as Coaches, by Coach Caseload Size (Statistically Significant Results Only)

	1–5 Staff Coached (n = 81–82)	6–10 Staff Coached (n = 87–90)	11–20 Staff Coached (n = 100–101)	More Than 20 Staff Coached (n = 101–102)
Logistical supporter**				
Never	12.3%	4.6%	11.0%	4.0%
Rarely	16.0%	14.9%	7.0%	9.9%
Occasionally	45.7%	52.9%	47.0%	39.6%
Frequently	25.9%	27.6%	35.0%	46.5%
Emotional supporter**				
Never	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%	0.0%
Rarely	8.2%	3.3%	3.9%	3.9%
Occasionally	45.9%	37.4%	36.3%	26.2%
Frequently	44.7%	58.2%	58.8%	69.9%
Teacher/instructor for adults*				
Never	3.7%	1.1%	3.0%	1.0%
Rarely	7.3%	6.7%	9.9%	5.9%
Occasionally	42.7%	42.2%	22.8%	24.5%
Frequently	46.3%	50.0%	64.4%	68.6%
Crisis intervention#				
Never	19.5%	19.8%	23.0%	11.0%
Rarely	34.1%	31.9%	38.0%	30.0%
Occasionally	37.8%	44.0%	32.0%	46.0%
Frequently	8.5%	4.4%	7.0%	13.0%
Problem solver#				
Never	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%

	1–5 Staff Coached (*n* = 81–82)	6–10 Staff Coached (*n* = 87–90)	11–20 Staff Coached (*n* = 100–101)	More Than 20 Staff Coached (*n* = 101–102)
Rarely	8.3%	5.5%	7.0%	2.9%
Occasionally	47.6%	49.5%	45.0%	36.3%
Frequently	44.0%	45.1%	47.0%	60.8%

Note. $*p < .05$; $**p < .01$; $***p < .001$ for subgroup differences indicated by the Kruskal-Wallis test. The results are marked # if Kruskal-Wallis is significant, but no subgroup pair differences are statistically significant according to χ^2 tests with Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Limitations of the Subgroup Analyses

There are some limitations to the subgroup analyses, and the results should be interpreted with these limitations in mind. First, all of the comparisons are bivariate and do not account for potential confounding factors. Also, there were small or null cell counts in some comparisons, and the statistical tests used for the comparisons could not be adjusted to account for the small cell counts. Additionally, there were some missing data in the survey items included in the analyses, and we did not use statistical procedures to account for the missing data in these analyses.

Correlations Between Coaching Inputs and Coach Ratings of Success

To gain a better understanding of the association between aspects of implementation and the perceived success of the ELMC initiative, we ran bivariate correlations between variables measuring different aspects of implementation and ratings of ELMC success by both the coaches and the grantees. The aspects of implementation included the following:

- Coach report
  - Coaching inputs
  - Features of the coaching approach
- Grantee report: Contextual factors

All of the data were drawn from the surveys collected for this study. More detailed descriptions of the variables used for each aspect of implementation and for the ratings of success are provided in the following subsections. We ran Spearman's rho correlations because most of the data were ordinal.

Correlation Analyses Results: Coaching Inputs and Coach Successes

We ran bivariate correlations to identify whether coaching inputs are linked with coach ratings of successes and challenges, with independent variables including the number of national professional development sources used and coach qualifications (including education level and years of experience teaching or training adults, in ECE, and as an ECE coach) and dependent variables including coach ratings of their success at improving the quality of staff practices, their overall success as a coach, and total number of challenges reported by the coach. As shown in Exhibit E-41, the correlations were very small (all under .15), and none were significantly different from zero. The analyses suggest that these inputs had little influence on coach perceptions of success.

Exhibit E-41. Correlations Between Coaching Inputs and Coach Ratings of Successes and Challenges

	Total Number of Coach Challenges		Success at Improving the Quality of Staff Practices		Overall Success as Coaches	
	ρ	*n*	*ρ*	*n*	*ρ*	*n*
Number of national professional development sources used by coach	.048	319	.134**	382	.108*	380
Coach education level	-.094	317	.002	380	-.021	378
Coach years of experience teaching or training adults	-.015	317	.032	380	.007	378
Coach years of experience in ECE	.040	319	.012	381	-.009	379
Coach years of experience as a coach	.049	318	.001	381	.034	378

Note. Correlations are calculated using Spearman's *ρ*.

*$p < .05$ and **$p < .01$ indicate whether the correlation is significantly different from zero.

Correlation Analyses Results: Features of Coaching Approach and Coach Successes

We ran correlations to identify whether features of the coaching approach are linked with coach ratings of successes and challenges, with independent variables including the hours paid to work weekly as a coach, coach caseload size, average frequency of coaching strategies in three categories, the frequency of face-to-face meetings, the number of different roles the coach took on frequently. and the number of sources used to collect information about staff needs and dependent variables including coach ratings of their success at improving the quality of staff practices, their overall success as a coach, and the total number of challenges reported by the coach.

The correlations were small, as shown in Exhibit E-42, although a few were significantly different from zero. The correlation of the average frequency of observation, feedback, and discussion strategies with success at improving the quality of staff practices was .26, and with overall success it was .31, suggesting that coaches who reported more frequent use of these strategies also tended to rate success more highly, although the relationship was not a strong one, and the correlation does not account for other possible factors that might affect the success ratings. With similar caveats, the correlation of the number of different roles the coach did frequently with success improving the quality of staff practices was .15, and with overall success was .20. The hours paid to work weekly had a small positive correlation (.16) with coach rating of overall success but not with success at improving quality of practice. Other correlations were quite small (under .15), and most were not significantly different from zero. There was a small significant correlation (.12) between coach caseload size and total number of challenges reported by the coach, but this correlation does not adjust for other possible factors that might influence the number of challenges reported.

Exhibit E-42. Correlations Between Features of the Coaching Approach and Coach Ratings of Successes and Challenges

	Total Number of Coach Challenges		Success at Improving the Quality of Staff Practices		Overall Success as Coaches	
	ρ	*n*	*ρ*	*n*	*ρ*	*n*
Hours paid to work weekly as a coach, by range	.022	313	.007	374	.162**	371
Coach caseload size, by range	.118*	318	-.087	380	.083	377
Average frequency of observation, feedback, and discussion strategies	-.064	265	.256**	307	.309**	307
Average frequency of practice and modeling strategies	.077	294	.095	342	.121*	340
Average frequency of supportive strategies	.112	281	.077	333	.133*	330
Frequency of face-to-face meetings with individual staff	.052	308	.061	365	.093	363
Number of different roles the coach did frequently	.081	319	.148**	382	.204**	380
Number of sources used to collect information about staff needs	.021	319	.107*	382	.093	380

Note. Correlations are calculated using Spearman's *ρ*.

*$p < .05$ and **$p < .01$ indicate whether the correlation is significantly different from zero.

Correlation Analyses Results: Contextual Factors and Grantee Successes

We ran correlations to identify whether mesocontextual or macrocontextual factors are linked with the grantee ratings of successes, with independent variables including the number of grantee supports for professional development, the hours of professional development required annually for classroom teachers, the number of national professional development resources used by grantee, the number of local professional development resources used by grantee, and the number of local professional development resources that are available in the grantee community. The dependent variables included the grantee ratings of coach success at training and supporting staff, improving the quality of staff practices, and meeting the grantee's goals for the ELMC initiative. The correlations were small, as shown in Exhibit E-43. The correlation of the number of national professional development resources used by the grantee with grantee ratings of the coach success at meeting the grantee's goals for the ELMC initiative was .20. Other correlations were smaller than .20, and none were significantly different from zero, suggesting that these contextual factors had little relationship with grantee perceptions of coaches' success in ELMC.

Exhibit E-43. Correlations Between Mesocontextual or Macrocontextual Factors and Grantee Ratings of Success in the ELMC Initiative

	Coaches' Success at Training and Supporting Staff		Coaches' Success at Improving Quality of Staff Practices		Coaches' Success at Meeting Grantee's Goals for the ELMC Initiative	
	ρ	*n*	*ρ*	*n*	*ρ*	*n*
Number of grantee supports for professional development, from 11 types of support	-.009	119	.101	119	.075	115
Hours of professional development required annually for classroom teachers, by range	-.171	117	.061	117	.102	113
Number of national professional development resources used by grantee, from 7 types of resources	.008	119	.084	119	.204*	115
Number of local professional development resources used by grantee, from 8 types	-.072	119	.020	119	-.047	115
Number of local professional development resources that are available in the grantee community, from 8 types	-.106	119	-.112	119	-.152	115

Note. Correlations are calculated using Spearman's *ρ*.

*$p < .05$ and **$p < .01$ indicate whether the correlation is significantly different from zero.