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INTRODUCTION

In this report we present our proposed design and analysis plan for a study of Quality Support Coaching in Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) programs, to be implemented during phase 5 of the Universal Preschool Child Outcomes Study (UPCOS-5). The purpose of the study is to provide formative feedback to LAUP that can inform its efforts to enhance quality in the preschool programs in its network. In Section 1 we describe the LAUP Quality Support Coaching model and outline the primary goals of the study. We also include a preliminary logic model that we have developed and used to inform the study design. Our description of the LAUP coaching model and the preliminary logic model are based on interviews with key LAUP staff and a review of materials provided by LAUP on the coaching model. In Section 2 we summarize the overarching findings from the pilot study of Quality Support Coaching completed during UPCOS-4 (from January to June of 2011). In Section 3 we present the specific research questions we expect to address during the UPCOS-5 formative coaching study. The research questions are informed by both the findings of the pilot study and feedback from LAUP leadership and coaching staff on what they hope to learn. Finally, in Section 4 we describe the purpose and content of the activities planned for the formative study including the approach to data analysis. Appendices A and B include data collection instruments developed for the Study of Quality Support Coaching.
SECTION 1: PURPOSE AND GOALS

A. Description of the LAUP Quality Support Coaching Model

LAUP, an entity funded by First 5 LA, seeks to make voluntary, high-quality preschool available to every 4-year old in Los Angeles County. To achieve high quality preschool educational experiences for the children it serves, LAUP provides a number of services to both the center-based and family child care (FCC) programs in its network, including coaching. Coaching can be defined as “an adult learning strategy that is used to build the capacity of a parent or colleague to improve existing abilities, develop new skills, and gain a deeper understanding of his or her practices for use in current and future situations” (Rush and Shelden 2005, p. 1). LAUP differentiates between Starting Points Coaching and Quality Support Coaching, the latter being the focus of the present study.

Starting Points coaches work with programs new to the LAUP network to ensure they meet the standards laid out in LAUP’s quality rating system, the 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System. According to LAUP, the quality rating system serves three purposes: (1) to assist parents and providers in understanding differences in quality for programs; (2) to determine the amount of reimbursement for services; and (3) as a foundation for identifying training and technical assistance needs a program might have. In order to maintain a position in the network programs must achieve at least a three-star rating but can reach up to a five-star rating. Providers must maintain a three-star rating if they are to remain eligible to receive direct funding from LAUP. For center-based preschools, the 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System addresses regulatory compliance history, ratios and group sizes, the learning environment, staff qualifications and administration, staff stability and working conditions, and curriculum. For family child care homes, the system addresses regulatory compliance history, teacher/child relationships as measured by ratios and group sizes, the learning environment, and provider qualifications. Starting Points Coaches typically work weekly with new programs over a period of several months to ensure their administrative structures are in place and to set and work toward goals that will help programs meet the minimum quality standards set by LAUP.

Once programs have achieved a minimum three-star rating, they transition to working with Quality Support coaches in LAUP’s Operations Division. Quality Support coaches are typically experienced early childhood professionals. Their aim is to work directly with classroom teachers to set and then work to achieve goals focused on enhancing classroom quality, although in some instances they work with directors or education coordinators (we refer to the group of potential recipients of coaching as “providers” in the remainder of this report). Quality Support coaches are

---

1 Additional detail regarding LAUP’s 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System is available at http://www.laup.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=36&Itemid=30 in LAUP’s operating guidelines.

2 The learning environment is assessed with the Environment Ratings Scales (ERS). Center-based classrooms are assessed with the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised [ECERS-R, Harms et al. 1998], and family child care programs are assessed with the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale-Revised [FCCERS-R, Harms et al. 2007]. Beginning in the 2011-2012 program year, the 5-Star rating system will also integrate the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS, Pianta et al. 2008). CLASS assessments will be conducted in addition to ERS assessments.

3 Elements of curriculum addressed by LAUP include the posting of a formal daily schedule for parents, posted activity plans, a written philosophy statement, and assessment of children’s developmental progress twice per year.
to support providers by working together to identify strategies for achieving goals, modeling techniques that can be used in the classroom/with children, and providing additional resources. According to the model, each LAUP classroom is to have one coaching visit per month, and coaches are to provide written documentation (an “activity log”) of the substance of the visit (goals, progress, next steps, etc.) at the close of the visit. Coaches are to provide additional support as needed (for example, responding to a provider’s requests for support or information between coaching visits or attending parent meetings to support a provider in working with parents).

In order to achieve the primary aim of Quality Support Coaching—enhancing the quality of LAUP classrooms—LAUP trains its Quality Support coaches in the use of process consultation (Schein 1999). Process consultation focuses on the psychological and social processes at play in a helping relationship. According to Schein (1999), an effective helping relationship must focus on process rather than outcomes—in the case of LAUP coaching, on how to achieve goals rather than on a specific goal. A key assumption of process consultation is that “one can only help a human system help itself” (Schein 1999, p. 1); from the perspective of LAUP, if quality in preschool programs is to improve, providers must learn the process of making quality improvements for themselves.

According to the process consultation model, the consultan-client (coach-provider) relationship is central to achieving the aims of the helping relationship. In particular, the relationship must provide a context in which the client (provider) feels comfortable with her own role and to do the work necessary to achieve her goals. Ultimately, the relationship should help the provider feel affirmed and motivated.

To build the relationship, the coach must engage in active inquiry; the coach listens and learns by asking questions about the provider’s situation. Initially questions might focus on a particular classroom situation (pure inquiry) and then extend to the providers’ feelings and thoughts and why the situation is as it is (diagnostic inquiry). With this approach, the coach can help the provider identify her own vision for her classroom and possible areas for growth. Eventually, the coach can begin inserting her own ideas into the questions (confrontive inquiry) as a tool for helping the provider develop her own strategies for addressing issues of concern. Throughout, the coach must also engage in appreciative inquiry: the coach’s questioning should highlight what is working, rather than the problems, to support the provider in building on the existing strengths to get to where they want to be. In theory, this approach will provide the affirmation and motivation necessary for the provider to improve quality without the coach’s guidance.

**B. Study Goals**

LAUP Quality Support Coaching has the potential to transform preschool educational settings by giving providers the skills and resources they need to support high quality environments. However, coaching occurs in a complex environment, and the resources brought to bear on the coaching process, the context in which it takes place, and the complexity of the coaching approach are factors that influence its success. The purpose of this study is to provide formative feedback to LAUP on these factors. Ultimately, we hope that LAUP can use that feedback to inform its efforts to support the center-based and FCC programs in its network. Based on feedback from LAUP and First 5 LA, the UPCOS-5 coaching study has three primary goals:

---

4 Note that providers can choose goals that may ultimately help enhance their 5-Star rating, but work with coaches is not directly linked to the 5-Star rating.
Document and explain the process of Quality Support Coaching, with a particular focus on coaching around the dimensions of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS, Pianta et al. 2008): Classroom Organization, Emotional Support, and Instructional Support. Strengthening an initiative (understanding its successes and the challenges it faces) requires a complete understanding of the initiative and the resources that key parties bring to bear. Thus, we will build on the information gathered during the pilot study to document key processes including relationship building, solidifying roles, setting goals, and working to achieve goals.

Although the study will aim to document the breadth of LAUP’s coaching, there will be an especially strong focus on coaching around the domains of the CLASS. As described above, LAUP’s 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System addresses, among other things, the quality of the learning and developmental environment. Through the 2010-2011 fiscal year, quality ratings were based only on the Environment Ratings Scales (ERS; Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised [ECERS-R, Harms et al. 1998] and Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale-Revised [FCCERS-R, Harms et al. 2007]). The ERS’s seven subscales include Space and Furnishings, Personal Care Routines, Language-Reasoning in the ECCERS and Listening and Talking in the FCCERS, Activities, Interaction, Program Structure, and Parents and Staff/Provider.5 In the 2011-2012 fiscal year, LAUP will also integrate the CLASS into the 5-Star rating system. Although there is some overlap in what the two measures address, the CLASS dimensions are defined differently than the ERS subscales. The Emotional Support domain reflects classroom climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives. Classroom Organization reflects behavior management, the productive use of time, and instructional learning formats. Instructional Support reflects support for concept development, the quality of feedback, and language modeling (Pianta et al. 2008). The timing of the study provides a unique opportunity for LAUP to gather formative feedback on approaches to coaching around the CLASS, as the CLASS is relatively new to most LAUP coaches and providers.

Identify successes, challenges, and lessons learned. Knowledge about successes and challenges, coupled with ideas for how to capitalize on successes and address challenges, will inform LAUP staff about how to best support preschool providers through coaching. The study will be particularly focused on addressing the strategies with which coaches and providers are finding success in setting, working toward, and achieving goals related to the CLASS.

Define the logic model for LAUP Quality Support Coaching. Below we present a draft logic model constructed for the purpose of guiding our evaluation design. However, the logic model is preliminary and primarily reflects messages from LAUP about the coaching model. As described below, pilot study findings indicate variability in how coaching is enacted in the very diverse programs in the network. A key task of the study will be to work closely with LAUP as we collect and interpret data during UPCOS-5 in order to refine the logic model so that it fully reflects Quality Support Coaching. The logic model can ultimately be a tool for internal planning but also for describing the LAUP coaching approach to external practitioners, researchers, and other stakeholders.

5 Although the subscales for the ECERS-R and FCCERS-R are roughly parallel, items do not exactly match. Research on the ECERS-R indicates that typically two factors emerge from the seven subscales: Teaching and Interactions primarily addresses the emotional and educational quality of interactions and encouragement of language development and Provisions for Learning primarily addresses space and materials available to children in the environment (Clifford et al. 2010).
Although the primary purpose of this study is to provide formative feedback to LAUP, it can also contribute to the broader literature on coaching. Researchers have attempted to highlight factors that may influence the efficacy of coaching efforts. Studies have identified time; the degree of consistency across coaches in how they implement coaching; the presence of a respectful, collaborative relationship between coaches and providers; the active engagement and involvement of providers in acquiring, developing and using new knowledge; and the specificity of coaching elements (Trivette et al. 2009). This study will document how LAUP aims to address these issues in a very complex environment: diverse program types from varied auspices, all aiming to support the development of low-income children in language-diverse settings.

C. Evaluation Framework (Preliminary Logic Model)

We propose using the framework provided by a logic model to structure and guide study activities and research questions. A basic logic model follows a linear path from left to right, illustrating the assumptions undergirding a program or initiative; the activities and resources (inputs) needed to achieve them; the units or aspects of service delivery (activities); the immediate consequences of those activities (outputs); and the ultimate purpose (outcomes). The preliminary logic model is based on interviews with key LAUP staff and a review of materials provided by LAUP on the coaching model. Note that the model is not intended to suggest that this is the best or most effective approach to coaching that LAUP might use. It simply reflects the theory underlying the practices that LAUP has put in place through Quality Support Coaching.

Beginning at the left-hand side of the model, we outline the inputs (resources) into the coaching process. Central are the Quality Support coaches themselves, and the experience and motivation they bring with them. However, the coaches are supported by both the Coach Supervisors and the Director of Provider Operations. The Coach Supervisors support the work of the coaches through reflective supervision, shadowing coaches on their visits to programs, reviewing and approving goals, and providing any additional support requested by coaches. The Director of Provider Operations oversees all activities related to quality support coaching for providers and coordinates with other departments as necessary. Moving down the inputs box, both the ERS and the CLASS can serve as tools for the coaches as they work with providers to set goals. Although they are elements of the 5-Star rating system, they also provide a focus for the work that coaches and providers do together. Finally, the Quality Support coaches have additional supports from LAUP including the Starting Points coaches; Specialists with expertise in areas such as parent and family engagement, supporting children who are English language learners (ELLs), and curriculum; and additional resources such as Teacher Institutes or materials that might be of use to programs (for example, information for parents, materials that can be used in the classroom, information on community resources and events).

Moving right across the model, the next box reflects the activities of coaching, many of which were described above. Coaches use process consultation, active inquiry, and appreciative inquiry to build relationships with providers; to learn about the provider and her program or classroom; to identify and, as they work together to develop strategies to pursue the providers’ goals, focus on the providers’ strengths; to, together, identify the provider’s vision and areas for growth; and to draw solutions and strategies from the provider (rather than having the coach providing all the solutions). Coaches and providers co-create goals consistent with the provider’s vision and potential areas for growth and strategies for achieving those goals in monthly visits by the coach to the program. During those monthly visits, the coach observes the provider in action in the classroom and reflects with the provider on what was seen. The coach is also observed modeling techniques that the
Figure 1. Draft Logic Model: LAUP Quality Support Coaching Model

Inputs

LAUP Quality Support Coaches
- Coach Supervisors
- Director of Provider Operations

Environment Rating Scales (Harms et al. 1998, Harms et al. 2007)

Classroom Assessment Scoring System (Pianta et al. 2008)

Additional Supports
- Starting Points Coaches
- Specialists
- Additional resources

Activities

Relationship building through process consultation, active inquiry, and appreciative inquiry

Co-create goals and strategies in monthly visits

Observation in monthly visits

Additional trainings as needed/requested

Action/practice focused on meeting goals

For coaches:
- Weekly meetings
- Summer Training Series
- Reflective supervision
- Data entry into LAUP Enterprise Operations System (LEO)

Outputs

Positive/strong coach-teacher/provider relationship

Quality Improvement Plan goals set and pursued

SMART goals

Number of coach visits across the year

Number of trainings across the year

Activity log for each coach visit

Analysis of LEO data by LAUP research staff

Outcomes

Proximate outcomes:

Teachers/providers learn to identify key challenges or areas for growth and craft own solutions

Improve program quality

Program/classroom environments and interactions are safe and supportive of learning

End-point outcome:

Children are ready for kindergarten

Context for Coaching:

5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System

Program staff, resources, and structures

Teachers/providers
- Previous experience
- Motivation

Children and their families
- Background
- Engagement

Community
- Culture
- Assets and challenges

Assumptions:

- “One can only help a human system help itself” (key for process consultation) (Schein 1999, p. 1)
- Relationship building is fundamental for any and all organizational improvement
- Teachers/providers possess the capacity to support quality programs
provider might use in the classroom. The coach provides additional trainings as needed, drawing on other LAUP staff as necessary (for example, Specialists). Based on the discussion and/or practice with the coach that occurs in monthly visits, the provider will engage in activities and use practices supportive of meeting goals between the coach’s monthly visits. Each month, the coach provides feedback that aims to build on strengths and that reflects the areas for growth identified with the provider. As part of the feedback, the coach may make recommendations or offer strategies. Finally, the coaches also engage in a number of activities that are intended to support their work including weekly meetings with the whole coaching team, entering data regarding visits and programs into the LAUP Enterprise Operations (LEO) database, a Summer Training Series, and reflective supervision with the Coach Supervisors and Director of Provider Operations.

The next segment of the logic model—outputs—reflects the immediate products of the activities of the coaches and providers. Central to the coaching model is the achievement of a positive and strong relationship between the coach and the provider in which the provider feels affirmed and motivated to work toward her goals as a result of the coach’s listening and learning and a focus on strengths. The second output is the goals themselves; SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely) goals are identified early in the year, integrated into a Quality Improvement Plan, and followed until completed. Goals are likely to evolve to at least some degree over the year. Activities also have several concrete outputs: the number of coach visits across the year, the number of (additional) trainings across the year, an activity log for each coach visit that documents the work toward the goals (and is framed in a manner supportive of change), and an analysis of data entered into LEO by LAUP research staff to inform future coaching interactions. Finally, as a result of ongoing work, Quality Improvement Plan goals will be met across the year resulting in improvements in the environment and the implementation of new strategies in the classroom to support children and families. Each of the four concrete outputs (visits, trainings, activity logs, analysis of LEO data) are produced or driven by the coach; the remaining outputs develop from a partnership between the coach and provider.

The final segment on the right-hand side of the model reflects the intended outcomes of coaching. Outcomes are divided into those that are proximate to coaching—that is, those that are expected to be directly linked to coaching activities—and one that is more distant from coaching but is nonetheless a goal of LAUP and providers that coaching can potentially support. The proximate outcomes relate to providers and their classrooms. First, providers will learn how to identify key challenges or areas for growth and how to craft their own solutions or strategies for addressing challenges and making change. Second, program quality will improve in a manner consistent with the provider’s vision. Third, the program and classroom environments and interactions will be safe and supportive of learning. Finally, the end-point outcome focuses on children: the quality programs provided to children should support their readiness for kindergarten. However, various stakeholders may prioritize different aspects of “readiness for kindergarten” and not all aspects will be as closely aligned to the topics addressed in the coaching interactions with the providers.

Along the bottom of the model, we summarize the context within which coaching takes place. The context can have serious implications for the successes and challenges of coaching. (As described in Section 2 of this report, pilot study findings indicate that the context plays a critical role.) First, as part of LAUP, all providers must maintain a three-star rating on the 5-Star rating system if they are to remain eligible to receive direct funding from LAUP. Thus, providers may want their work with the Quality Support coaches to focus on helping them maintain their ratings. Second, the programs themselves have characteristics that are likely to influence the content of the goals that providers set and the capacity of the coach to work with the provider to achieve goals. Relevant program characteristics include: the curriculum in use, additional program staff, additional
resources that are available to providers in a program, the administrative structure (how it influences with whom and how coaches can work), and staff turnover. Third, characteristics of the providers with whom coaches are working—their previous experience and their motivation to improve quality—also influence the process. Fourth, the children and families in a program—their backgrounds, the degree to which families are engaged in children’s learning—may influence the provider’s vision of quality or preferred areas for growth as the needs of children and families are likely to differ across programs. Finally, the culture, assets, and challenges of the community in which the program operates are likely to influence the operation of the program.

Along the bottom of the logic model we summarize key assumptions undergirding the LAUP coaching model. The first two assumptions—that one can only help a human system help itself and that relationship building is fundamental for any and all organization improvement—are drawn directly from the theory of process consultation. The third assumption—that providers possess the capacity to support quality programs—reflects the belief within LAUP that the providers in their network possess strengths upon which coaching can build to improve program quality. Programs need to meet personnel requirements for the teaching staff before entering the network.

Using the logic model framework, a formative study can address:

- What an initiative or program is, and the activities necessary to implement it
- Why this approach is being taken (goals) and why it is expected to work (assumptions, theory)
- What resources (inputs) are necessary for operating the program
- What the program is producing (the outputs)
- Whom the program targets and serves
- What participants gain from the program and their reactions to participation (outcomes)
- The contexts in which the program is operating that may help or hinder change

The research questions outlined in Section 3 of this report convey how each of these topics will be individualized to the study of Quality Support Coaching in LAUP.
SECTION 2: PILOT STUDY FINDINGS

Between January and June of 2011, Mathematica worked with LAUP to conduct a pilot study of Quality Support Coaching. Among the key aims of that study were to document how coaching is enacted in LAUP programs, how various stakeholders perceive the coaching process, and the common and unique elements in the LAUP coaching experience across the different contexts. To achieve those aims, we engaged in four activities including: (1) interviews with key informants, (2) focus groups with coaches and providers, (3) coaching records reviews, and (4) case studies of specific LAUP providers participating in Quality Support Coaching. Atkins-Burnett et al. (2011) provides a detailed overview of results. Here, we summarize the seven overarching findings.

Definitions of quality were individualized to providers. Study participants did not express a unified or shared vision of quality. Coaches and providers identified varied aspects of quality as important. Some focused on one element and some had multi-faceted definitions. Aspects of quality cited include children being encouraged to explore and express, teachers asking open-ended questions, parents being engaged, having an emphasis on process (for example, interactions) rather than product (for example, artwork), a safe environment, use of research-based curriculum, use of a “proper” assessment tool, and teacher credentials, among other things. Providers perceived that coaches shared their definitions.

In their work with providers, some coaches focused on teaching interactions (including parent engagement) while others spent a considerable amount of time focusing on the environment, particularly health and safety (especially table washing and hand washing). Some coaches appeared to keep an emphasis with their providers on instructional interactions and quality support, even with pressures to focus on the more concrete ERS item-level results. Most providers seemed to value coaches’ emphasis on instructional interactions, and some specifically mentioned this in their focus group comments. There was an apparent tension between ERS-related coaching and coaching for quality broadly. Preparation for the ERS review that is done to determine the program’s 5-Star rating (and ultimately eligibility for LAUP funding) often drove goals and ongoing work. Providers appreciated the support in preparing for the ERS review and in addressing other environmental issues but some wanted more or different types of supports. With the CLASS being integrated in to the 5-Star rating system in the 2011-2012 program year, several coaches and providers saw an opportunity to focus more on instructional interactions, with the CLASS providing the tool, although providers were anxious about its introduction (they were aware that it will be tied to their 5-Star rating and, consequently, funding).

Trusting relationships are an important part of LAUP coaching. Coaches considered the relationship a necessary precondition for effective coaching. Building the relationship could take time (depended on provider, context), but there were many ways to do so. Providers indicated the relationship was important for improving quality and for distinguishing coaching from supervision. They particularly appreciated attentive, responsive coaches.

Focus on process consultation (use of active and appreciative inquiry) was evident and valued by many coaches and providers but many also preferred or utilize more directive approaches. Coaches valued coaching around process (“teaching to fish”—giving providers the tools to address their own challenges and work toward their own vision—rather than “giving a fish”—telling providers what to do), but also talked about the need to “coach heavy” especially if safety was at issue. The use of the model varied across coaches and providers. Providers gave a mix of comments about the value of the process approach (for example, coaches providing new
perspectives on the classroom, posing questions) and more directive approaches (coaches just telling them specifically what to do). Providers often indicated they valued coaches’ expertise and knowledge and some indicated a desire for more directive communication. This was particularly true for preparation for the ERS review; ERS incentives (the fact that it is part of the 5-Star rating) seemed to work against process consultation and appreciative inquiry. In general, providers desired both the process consultation approach and directive communication, depending on the focus of their work.

**Consistent, timely communication (oral and written) was valued by providers and facilitates coaching.** Coaches often communicated successfully in diverse program settings, with providers indicating their communication with their coach was strong. Effective methods cited by providers include consistent visits that are planned in advance; timely email or telephone response and general information sharing; prompt feedback and distribution of activity logs; meeting with all teachers, the supervisor(s), and director; and attentive visits undistracted by phone calls or texting. Providers whose coach visited them monthly generally valued this frequency, indicating that the regularity of visits helped them pursue goals and support their relationship with the coach. Some providers indicated that coaches did not visit them consistently or frequently and they were frustrated by this inconsistency. However, the provider’s perception in some cases may have been shaped by program structure and how that structure determined/limited with whom the coach worked.

**Program structure and scheduling posed challenges to implementing coaching and communicating and resulted in limited contact between coaches and teachers.** Responses from coaches, teachers, and directors indicated that coaches may have been hampered in their attempts to build relationships with or work directly with teachers depending on the programs’ structure or the presence of gatekeepers in programs. Staff schedules and turnover contribute to this problem. Larger centers with more complex communication channels could limit coaches’ ability to work with teachers. Coaches and providers could face difficulties finding “kid-free” time, particularly in FCCs where it is less likely that a substitute or additional assistant could step into the classroom. Activity logs were not always shared among teachers and other key staff in timely fashion (lack of working printers could make immediate distribution difficult). In some sites, coaches were limited to communicating with the director and/or lead teacher or supervisory staff, but providers valued direct coaching with teachers.

**Providers valued many aspects of coaching and generally wanted more of it.** Providers identified many aspects of coaching as valuable including:

- Consistency and reliability from the coach
- Coach’s ability to provide perspective on classroom interactions and environment
- Coach’s supportive presence (the sense that the coach understood their situation and was in their corner)
- Coach’s expertise and knowledge in the field
- Assistance with ERS
- Inside line to LAUP (information and logistical assistance)
- When coach acted as advocate/mediator with own program director
- When coach provided additional resources
In general, providers’ descriptions of what more they wanted from LAUP mirrored what they already received. Providers wanted more:

- Frequent visits (monthly or twice monthly, especially for new teachers)
- Time for feedback for classroom teachers
- Communication with all staff (teachers, supervisors, directors)
- Responsiveness, timeliness, and reliability
- Help with parent engagement (for example, talking to parents monthly)
- Support for working with children with special needs
- Information, research, and additional resources (for example, classroom materials, information for parents)
- Support for CLASS and ERS review preparation
In this section of the report we outline the formative study research questions. The specific research questions aim to address the key elements outlined in the logic model, taking into account LAUP priorities and the pilot study findings. LAUP priorities are drawn from ongoing discussions with key staff in LAUP’s Provider Operations (which includes Quality Support Coaching) and Research and Evaluation divisions and input from LAUP leadership. Note that to craft the research questions, we considered feedback from both coaches and providers on the pilot study findings on whether the findings resonate with them and their suggestions as to why certain themes may have emerged from the qualitative data. Questions were reviewed and approved by both First 5 LA and LAUP. Questions are organized according to the study goals outlined in Section 1.

Document and explain the process of Quality Support Coaching, particularly with respect to coaching around the dimensions of the CLASS. Research questions related to this goal address the actual process of coaching—how coaches and providers together move through the elements of the logic model—and the influence of the context on their work. Research questions are grouped around five central topics identified as important during the pilot study.

- **Establishing and maintaining relationships** (context and activities): How do coaches and providers go about establishing their relationships? What emphasis on relationships is noted with directors versus classroom staff (teachers and assistants)? How do the start-of-year activities (for example, developing the quality improvement plan, identifying the provider’s vision of quality, developing communication strategies) differ for new and existing relationships? How many months do coaches commit to relationship building prior to beginning work on goals? How do coaches maintain their relationships with providers on an ongoing basis?

- **Defining quality** (activities and outcomes): Do coaches and/or providers enter their relationship with existing definitions of quality? Do coaches and providers systematically work to develop a shared understanding of quality? If so, how? How congruent are quality definitions with the philosophical approaches of programs? Does the shared understanding of quality reflect providers’ vision for their own program or classroom, or does it reflect an aspect of the context within which they are working? How do coaches and providers interpret the dimensions of the CLASS, and how does the CLASS influence the process of understanding quality? Are there ways in which the CLASS seems to conflict with programs’ philosophical, curricular, or cultural approaches?

- **Identification of, evolution of, and work toward goals** (activities and outputs): How do providers and coaches go about selecting/identifying goals at the start of the year? What factors influence the selection of goals? How do goals evolve over the course of the year, and what is the impetus for a change in goals? What kinds of support do providers want in selecting and setting goals? What preferences do providers and coaches have for the approach to co-creating goals (directive versus collaborative), and do those preferences differ according to subject-matter? How does the CLASS influence...
goal-setting? In light of the fact that both the ERS and CLASS will be part of the 5-Star rating system, what is the interplay of the ERS and CLASS in setting and working toward goals? How does the timing of the ERS and CLASS reviews influence work toward goals?

- **The coaches’ toolkit** (inputs, activities, outputs): Among the tools available to coaches—observation, discussion, modeling, video feedback, activity logs, trainings, peer support, communities of learners, self-assessment checklists, additional resources—which are coaches most likely to use, especially when working on aspects of quality related to the CLASS? What do providers see as being of greatest value for helping them improve their practice, especially as related to the CLASS dimensions? How do coaches select and use the different tools with different programs? What factors (including time available to coaches to work directly with programs and teachers) make it easier or more difficult for coaches to use these various tools?

- **Navigating programs’ administrative structure** (context, activities): With whom are coaches interacting in programs, and how is that determined? What work do coaches do with the various program staff? What are the advantages of working with different program staff? What are the primary barriers to working with and communicating additional information to classroom teachers (individually and teaching teams)? What do classroom teachers and coaches report about their frequency and duration of interaction?

**Identify successes, challenges, and lessons learned.** Our investigation of successes and challenges will cut across the topics we aim to address with regard to the process of coaching. Because the use of the CLASS is new this year, we will pay particular attention to how coaches and providers adjust and respond to the focal constructs and dimensions in the CLASS.

- What do providers report are the most useful aspects (activities) of coaching, in particular around the domains of the CLASS? How might the usefulness of coaching around the CLASS be improved?

- What are the biggest challenges to coaching around the domains of the CLASS? What tools or supports do coaches most need to improve coaching around the CLASS?

- What are the biggest barriers to a focus in coaching on classroom teaching quality (versus a focus on health and safety, provision of materials, administrative or other tasks)? How have coaches and providers successfully moved past those barriers?

- Do providers (or coaches) perceive a change in classroom practice as a result of coaching, particularly around the CLASS?

---

* Beginning in the 2011-2012 program year, the 5-Star rating will account for both CLASS and ERS scores. Not every program is reviewed each year, depending on their current 5-Star Rating.

* In this context, observation refers to what the coaches observe about classroom practice during their monthly visits to programs, not the use of a formal observation tool such as the CLASS or ERS. However, the scores from formal observations completed for the purpose of the 5-Star rating are available to coaches and can be used as a resource for their work together. Coaches can also choose to implement a practice observation using the CLASS or ERS. The observations that inform the 5-Star rating are completed by a third party.
• How can findings from the research literature on characteristics of effective coaching help us understand perceived successes and challenges of Quality Support Coaching in LAUP programs?

The third goal of the formative study is to clearly define the elements of the Quality Support Coaching logic model. As we seek to answer the research questions outlined above, we will be able to refine the content of the logic model.
SECTION 4: FORMATIVE STUDY ACTIVITIES

In this section we summarize the proposed activities of the formative study, their goals and purpose(s), and the content and topics addressed by each. We propose that the formative study include interviews with providers, coach questionnaires, and coaching session debriefing calls. The content of each protocol will be designed in consultation with LAUP and First 5 LA to answer the agreed-upon research questions. Note that coaching sessions will not be observed; thus, the only reports of what actually occurs during coaching sessions will come from coaches and teachers, a limitation of the current study. We will summarize findings from this set of activities in two reports, and we describe the contents of these reports at the conclusion of this section. We turn first to a description of the study’s data collection activities.

A. Sample Selection and Recruitment for the Quality Support Coaching Study

As in UPCOS-4, UPCOS-5 will include an examination of child progress in a representative sample of LAUP programs for the purpose of informing the performance-based contract between First 5 LA and LAUP. This representative sample will serve as the core sample for the coaching study as well. We will randomly sample 56 programs for the purpose of developing a final sample of 40 programs (we are assuming 70 percent of programs will be eligible and agree to participate). For this sample, we will follow the same procedures used in UPCOS-4: at the program level, we will stratify by type (center-based versus FCC), and the allocation of centers and FCCs will be proportional to their representation in LAUP.

Each of the selected programs will receive a letter from LAUP introducing UPCOS-5 and Mathematica. Shortly after the LAUP letter is received, programs will also be mailed a letter from Mathematica that explains the elements of UPCOS-5. This letter will also inform programs that an UPCOS Study Coordinator will be contacting them by phone to discuss the study and seek their agreement to participate. From each of the 40 programs that agree to participate, we will randomly sample one classroom. All children in sampled classrooms whose parents give consent will participate in the study of child progress. Mathematica field enrollment specialists will work with teachers to collect consent forms from parents. All lead teachers in the sampled classrooms will be asked to participate in the coaching study by completing telephone interviews in fall 2011 and spring 2012.

In order to provide a more in-depth picture of Quality Support Coaching, we will conduct case studies in 8 to 10 programs (one coach-provider pair per program). The case studies will provide additional detail about coach-provider interactions through debriefing interviews with coaches and providers following each coaching visit, in addition to a review of activity logs. We will purposively select these 8 to 10 programs and consider factors including program type (center versus FCC) and program auspice. We will select two programs for each of five coaches; by selecting two programs

---

9 A final sample of 40 programs was selected for the purpose of providing precise estimates for the study of child progress to be conducted as part of UPCOS-5. A representative sample of 40 programs (with one classroom selected from each, with all children in each classroom recruited) allows us to estimate the percentage of children making a particular gain or achieving a particular score with confidence intervals of approximately 10 percentage points (5 points on either side of the estimated percentage) when accounting for the clustering of children in classrooms. The descriptive study of quality support coaching will take place in the same sample of programs.
per coach, rather than one, we will be able to explore questions related to the importance of program context for the approach used by an individual coach in different programs. Because many coaches will be assigned to new programs this year, we will also try to vary new versus familiar programs for some of the coaches. Once these programs are selected, they will receive a letter from Mathematica that explains the case study activities. In order to capture the full range of activities used by coaches and the influence of different contexts on coaching it will be valuable to maximize variability in characteristics such as coach (that is, choose only two programs per coach), program type (center versus FCC), and auspice (for example, school district and private programs potentially have different coordination challenges).

Ensuring confidentiality of all study participants is an important step in the data collection process. Before sample recruitment begins, we will prepare drafts of all recruitment materials, including advance letters to programs describing the study, Frequently Asked Questions for both providers and parents, and consent forms. Note that materials for parents relate to the study of child progress; neither children nor parents will be recruited for the study of Quality Support Coaching. Once these materials are approved by First 5 LA and LAUP, we will submit them as a package to the Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) institutional review board (IRB). The package will include (1) a detailed description of the procedures, (2) an explanation of why the research is being conducted, (3) the safeguards put in place to ensure that potential participants are informed about what study participation would mean and their right to refuse to participate in the study, and (4) the mechanisms employed to ensure that individuals are not harmed by study participation. Mathematica will follow P/PV’s standard procedures for IRB approval. We will prepare and submit another IRB package to include the provider interviews, coach questionnaire, and coaching session debriefing protocols once those have been drafted.

B. Teacher Interviews

The main purpose of the teacher interviews is to gather systematic information from a representative sample on key elements of the coaching process. The interviews include a combination of closed- and open-ended questions. Topics include: the teacher’s relationship with LAUP and her current coach; goal-setting (including preceding work to identify the providers’ vision for her own program or classroom); strategies and activities used during coaching interactions; and the content of those interactions. Given the interest in the CLASS, the interview includes items that focus on the nature and content of coaching interactions specifically as related to the teaching interactions examined in the CLASS. To address the successes and challenges of coaching, teachers will be asked to share their perceptions of what aspects of coaching have been most useful to them, any perceived changes in classroom practice as a result of coaching, and what hinders the usefulness of coaching to their work. Interviews will also capture background information about the teacher and his/her classroom or FCC setting (for example, years of teaching experience, years working with LAUP, number of coaches s/he has worked with, number of children served, and languages used in the classroom/FCC). The draft fall 2011 and spring 2012 teacher interviews are included in Appendix A.

The fall 2011 and spring 2012 interviews have a slightly different focus, although questions do overlap. The fall 2011 interview focuses more strongly on gathering baseline information about providers and their classrooms and the early-stage processes that take place between teachers and coaches (for example, establishing or re-establishing relationships, developing a vision for goals, early goal-setting). The spring 2012 interview focuses more strongly on the pursuit of goals over the year, the evolution of the relationship, and the role of the CLASS in coaching, among other things.
We will conduct the interviews with teachers in the sample of 40 programs (classrooms) in fall 2011 and spring 2012. Because the desired recipients of coaching are classroom teachers, lead teachers will be recruited for interviews in both centers and FCC programs. Thus, the perspective of other teachers in the classroom (such as assistants) and of directors in center-based programs will not collected in this interview. (In FCC programs the lead teacher is likely to also be the director of the program and may therefore offer a broader perspective.) Telephone interviews will be conducted one-on-one by staff from Mathematica’s survey operations center (SOC) and will be approximately 30 minutes in length at each time point. SOC staff will take notes during the interview and we will take audio recordings as a back-up.

C. Coach Questionnaires

In the winter, we will request that all Quality Support coaches complete a short, self-administered questionnaire during one of their weekly coaching meetings. Potential topics include early childhood and coaching experience, approaches to establishing relationships with providers, goal-setting (including preceding work to identify the providers’ vision for her own program or classroom), and approaches to working with programs and providers to improve quality (including the use of observation, discussion, modeling, activity logs, trainings, and additional resources). To address the successes and challenges of coaching, coaches will be asked to share their perceptions of what strategies are most successful in working with providers and anything that hinders their capacity to focus on quality improvement. Questionnaires will include an emphasis on coaching interactions as they relate to the CLASS. Where appropriate we will capture similar information as is gathered in the provider interviews. We will also gather information from coaches on their experience navigating the administrative structures at the programs with whom they work. The coach questionnaire will be developed in consultation with First 5 LA and LAUP.

D. Coaching Session Debriefing Calls

Following coaching sessions, we will conduct debriefing calls with coaches and providers in the 8 to 10 case-study programs following monthly coaching visits. These discussions will be central to understanding how coaching is enacted and perceived across the LAUP network. We will be able to address, among other things, the key messages the coaches aim to communicate (with a special focus on CLASS dimensions), the strategies they use for communicating with providers, and their approach to working with providers to set goals and devise strategies for meeting goals. We will be able to compare these data from coaches with provider perceptions regarding key messages and their assessment of the process. In addition, the debriefing calls will allow us to explore in a more in-depth way a number of the topics to be addressed by the fall 2011 and spring 2012 provider interviews and the winter 2012 coach questionnaire. The debriefing interviews will include a core set of questions about that month’s visit, additional questions to be asked during a subset of the debriefing calls, and special topics to be addressed once during the year.

We will conduct calls six to eight times during the program year (approximately once per month) and will aim to have separate discussions with both the coach and provider within two days of the coaching visit. Discussions will be 30 to 60 minutes in length and will occur at a time that is convenient for participants. As the pilot study indicated (Atkins-Burnett et al. 2011), coaches sometimes meet with lead teachers, directors, assistant/other teachers alone or in combination depending on the program or the content of the visit. Because the teacher is the intended recipient of coaching, we will aim to speak with the lead teacher following every coach visit. When a visit occurs with the center director or FCC owner, we will aim to speak with both the director or owner and the lead teacher in separate conversations; this will allow us to explore how and what
information is filtered from a director to the teachers. Note that in FCC programs it is likely that the lead teacher will also be the program owner. We will not conduct debriefing calls with assistant/other teachers. In months where a coaching visit does not occur, we will still speak with the coach and teacher to address what other communication may be occurring and work toward goals. The draft debriefing protocols for coaches, teachers, and directors/owners are included in Appendix B.¹⁰

As part of the debriefing effort, we will also analyze associated activity logs. The activity logs will provide an indicator of both how goals evolve over the year and how coaches communicate with teachers and other individuals at programs. In addition, the logs can be analyzed for whether written communication embodies the approach (process consultation, focusing on strengths) identified in the LAUP coaching model. Note that activity logs will not be available to researchers conducting debriefing calls so as to maintain the independence of the data sources.

E. Analysis and Reporting

1. Approach to Analysis

As a mixed-methods study, the study of Quality Support Coaching will have both quantitative and qualitative data available to address the research questions outlined in Section 3 of this report. Qualitative sources include the teacher, director, and coach debriefing calls; open-ended questions in the fall and spring teacher interviews and the winter coach questionnaire; and the activity logs. Quantitative sources include closed-ended questions and scales in the fall and spring teacher interviews and the coach questionnaire, as well as some data from the activity logs. Table C.1 in Appendix C outlines which of the study’s research questions will be informed by each of the data sources. The seven sources noted across the top of the table—teacher, director, and coach debriefing calls (three sources); fall and spring teacher interviews (two sources); coach questionnaire (one source); activity logs (one source)—will be considered different sources of data for the purpose of the analysis.

Coding and Analysis of qualitative data. As part of the UPCOS-4 pilot study, we developed a coding scheme for the qualitative data. To develop that coding scheme, we used the open coding approach of grounded theory.¹¹ Open coding involves the process of examining, comparing, and categorizing data, rather than using pre-established codes. Codes are then applied to other data and expanded or refined in an iterative fashion. As a first step toward coding in UPCOS-5, we will refine the coding scheme based on the UPCOS-4 work. We will both sharpen the existing codes where necessary and add new codes relevant to the research questions of UPCOS-5. That coding scheme will be applied to data collected during the coaching debriefing interviews and activity logs in an ongoing way across the year. It will also be applied to open-ended questions asked in the teacher interviews in fall 2011 and spring 2012. We expect to continue refining the existing codes

¹⁰ All coaches will be debriefed using the coach protocol. Center-based teachers and FCC teachers who are either only in the classroom or who are also the owner of the FCC will be debriefed using the teacher protocol. Center directors and FCC owners who are not classroom teachers or who are not the teacher selected for the UPCOS sample will be debriefed using the director protocol.

¹¹ Grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967) is a methodology that systematically generates theory from data, enabling researchers to identify and articulate underlying concepts through an iterative process. Researchers initially use an inductive approach to generate categories for coding from the data they gather. These codes are usually developed by means of a relatively open and unframed data collection process.
throughout the research process. Because the research questions for the UPCOS-5 coaching study address additional areas and specifically target concepts not examined systematically in UPCOS-4, we also expect to develop some additional new codes as data collection and analysis proceed. To ensure consistency in the application of codes, the first two of the six to eight debriefing sessions for each case study (coach, teacher and/or director) will be coded by two researchers, and a senior researcher will periodically conduct a review of how codes are being applied.

We expect to gather a large amount of data through the debriefing calls, teacher interviews, and activity logs. Thus, we will use a qualitative analysis software package, Atlas.ti (Scientific Software Development 1997), to organize and synthesize the data. The coding scheme and all qualitative data will be loaded into Atlas.ti. Project team members will then code all of the interview data and activity logs.

Once data have been coded, the research team will conduct searches using Atlas.ti to “sort and sift” data related to our specific research questions and subquestions. Data can be retrieved for all participants, from individual participants, or for different types of participants. Examples of characteristics that may be used to organize searches in Atlas.ti include: program type, program size, the number of goals (high or low), and the types of goals (for example, environment- versus interaction-focused). We can also examine data based on particular codes across time (fall or spring for the teacher interviews, approximate month for the debriefing conversations) to examine the evolution of coaches’ and providers’ work together across the year. This analytic approach will allow us to consider emerging themes and findings as they are reflected in different data sources, consider confirming and disconfirming evidence, and ultimately ensure that any conclusions we draw are supported by sufficient evidence from multiple respondents and/or sources.

**Coding and analysis of quantitative data.** The fall and spring teacher interviews and the coach questionnaire will include closed-ended items to be summarized across the 40 participating teachers and approximately 20 participating coaches, respectively, using statistical analysis software. We will summarize quantitative data from the provider interviews by presenting means, frequencies, and standard errors as appropriate. We will also examine groups of items in the teacher interview that we would expect to form scales. For these sets of items, we will examine internal consistency reliability with Cronbach’s alpha and item-to-total correlations as indicators of functioning. Typically, internal consistency reliability of .70 is considered to indicate an adequate scale. Very low item-to-total correlations indicate that additional dimensions are influencing the measurement and will signal a need to look at whether the differences in the item responses are systematically different in ways that matter to our analysis (that is, if they differ according to characteristics of interest). For example, programs with newer coaches may rate a particular item less positively than other programs, but rate other items in that scale in ways that are similar to the other programs. Like the qualitative data analysis, we will examine responses by key program and teacher characteristics, including whether the coach is new to the program or has an ongoing relationship from previous years.

**Drawing together qualitative and quantitative data.** Analysis will focus on triangulating what we learn from each qualitative and/or quantitative source to answer key research questions and identify overarching themes. As required by triangulation, we will aim to verify all key themes with at least three different respondents and/or sources of data. We will also identify and summarize disconfirming evidence. However, as Table C.1 shows, not all research questions will be addressed in all of our data sources. Certain questions are likely only to be addressed by two to four of the seven data sources (for example, the question of what providers see as greatest value to them in
improving practice will only be addressed by four of the seven sources: teacher debriefing calls, director debriefing calls, fall teacher interviews, and spring teacher interviews).

2. Fall Baseline Report

   The fall baseline report will summarize information collected across multiple data sources and begin triangulating what we learn from each source to meet the overall goals of the study. We will begin to explore reports of how relationships are built between coaches and providers, how coaches and providers go about setting goals and planning for the year ahead, and begin mapping approaches to coaching around instructional interactions and how providers perceive and experience that coaching. The report will be framed around the research questions agreed upon by LAUP and First 5 LA. We will submit a draft report in February 2012 and revise it based on feedback in March 2012.

3. Spring (Preliminary) Final Report

   As previously stated, the fall baseline report will summarize information collected across multiple data sources and begin triangulating what we learn from each source to meet the overall goals of the study. In the spring report, we will undertake the same task but also explore how coaching and providers’ experience of it evolves over the course of the year, with a special focus on the dimensions of the CLASS, especially Instructional Support. As with the baseline report, the spring report will be framed around the final set of research questions. We will submit a draft and final preliminary report in June 2012.
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TEACHER INTERVIEW
DRAFT

September 20, 2011
INTRODUCTION

My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Mathematica Policy Research in Princeton, New Jersey. We are calling teachers who lead classrooms participating in the most recent Universal Preschool Child Outcome Study and need to hear about your experiences. The director/owner of your program has agreed that you can participate. This survey will help to improve the coaching program for teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?

Before we begin, I want to define a few terms we will use. When we use the term ‘owner,’ we are referring to the owner of a family child care program. When we refer to a ‘director,’ we are talking about the director of a center-based program.

FALL ONLY
A1. How long have you been working at [NAME OF PROGRAM ON CONTACT SHEET]?

INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONSE IS LESS THAN ONE YEAR, SELECT ONE OF FIRST THREE OPTIONS BELOW, OTHERWISE ENTER NUMBER OF YEARS.

CODE ONE ONLY

LESS THAN 3 MONTHS ................................................................. 1
MORE THAN 3 MONTHS BUT LESS THAN 6 MONTHS ................. 2
6 MONTHS TO 11 MONTHS ....................................................... 3

|__|__| YEARS

FALL ONLY
A2. How long have you been working with your current quality support coach?

INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONSE IS LESS THAN ONE YEAR, SELECT ONE OF FIRST THREE OPTIONS BELOW, OTHERWISE ENTER NUMBER OF YEARS.

CODE ONE ONLY

LESS THAN 3 MONTHS ................................................................. 1
MORE THAN 3 MONTHS BUT LESS THAN 6 MONTHS ................. 2
6 MONTHS TO 11 MONTHS ....................................................... 3

|__|__| YEARS

FALL ONLY
A3. How many other LAUP quality support coaches have you had at this program?

ONLY ONE ............................................................................... 1 GO TO A7

|__| COACHES
A4. When you changed coaches how was the transition? Did your new coach seem to have...

INTERVIEWER: READ EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND MARK YES/NO FOR EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Information about your current goals?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Information about the goals you completed?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Information about your experiences as a teacher?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Any other information? (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A5. Do you think (she/he) had all the information (she/he) needed to work with you?

YES ............................................... ................................................... ....... 1
NO ................................................ ................................................... ....... 0

A6. Is there any type of information your coach did not have that you wish (she/he) had to prepare for working with you?

INTERVIEWER: RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE IN SPACE BELOW

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

A7. Since September, how many in-person visits have you had with your coach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A8. For my next questions, please think of a typical visit. In a typical visit, how much time does your current coach spend at your program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FALL ONLY

FALL AND SPRING
FALL AND SPRING
A9. In a typical visit, who does the LAUP coach meet with? Please tell me yes or no for each person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. You</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Your assistant teacher(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The (director/owner)/owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Anyone else (SPECIFY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALL AND SPRING
IF BOTH A9a AND A9d=YES ASK A10, ELSE GO TO A11.
A10. In a typical visit does (she/he) talk with you and the (director/owner) separately, together or both separately and together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEPARATELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SEPARATELY AND TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALL AND SPRING
A11. In a typical visit, how much of that time does your coach usually spend ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO TIME</th>
<th>LESS THAN 30 MINUTES</th>
<th>BETWEEN 30 AND 60 MINUTES</th>
<th>BETWEEN 60 AND 90 MINUTES</th>
<th>MORE THAN 90 MINUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. observing your classroom?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. talking with you?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. talking with the assistant teacher(s)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. talking with your (director/owner)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALL AND SPRING
A12. Do you sometimes have other contacts with your coach between visits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO TO B1
A13. Since September, how many times have you and your coach been in contact between visits?

\[\underline{\quad} \quad \text{TIMES}\]

A14. What methods of communication do you and your coach most often use when you are in contact between visits?

CODE FIRST AND SECOND MENTIONED AS 1 AND 2. DO NOT PROBE.

\[\underline{\quad} \quad \text{EMAIL}\]
\[\underline{\quad} \quad \text{PHONE}\]
\[\underline{\quad} \quad \text{MAIL}\]
\[\underline{\quad} \quad \text{IN-PERSON}\]
\[\underline{\quad} \quad \text{OTHER (SPECIFY)}\]

____________________________________________________________
B. RELATIONSHIP WITH COACH

ALL SECTIONS FALL AND SPRING

B1. Would you consider your relationship with your coach...

CODE ONE ONLY

Excellent, ........................................................................................... 5
Very good, .......................................................................................... 4
Good, ................................................................................................. 3
Fair, ....................................................................................................... 2
Poor, or .............................................................................................. 1

Do you feel you do not interact with your coach enough to have a relationship? ........................................................................ NA

B2. For each of the following statements about the relationship a teacher may have with a coach, please tell me how true it is for you and your coach. (READ STATEMENT) Is this never true, rarely true, sometimes true, or usually true?

MARK ONE PER ROW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER TRUE</th>
<th>RARELY TRUE</th>
<th>SOMETIMES TRUE</th>
<th>USUALLY TRUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I feel free to discuss challenges I face in my classroom with my coach.........................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My coach is someone I trust .........................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I know my coach truly wants to help me.........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My coach shows me respect in our interactions.........................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My relationship with my coach motivates me to continue to improve my classroom practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My relationship with my coach is strictly professional without personal discussions .....</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B3. Now I am going to read you three statements that teachers have said about what they value most in their coaches. Please tell me which of the following you would select as the most important and the next most important?

CODE FIRST AND SECOND MENTIONED AS 1 AND 2. DO NOT PROBE.

_____ a. the way your coach interacts with you,
_____ b. his/her knowledge about teaching, or
_____ c. the resources he or she provides?
C. ASSESSING QUALITY

C1. There can be many different visions of what defines a quality preschool. What components of quality do you consider most important?

   INTERVIEWER: RECORD VERBATIM THEN SELECT THE CATEGORY THAT BEST FITS THE VERBATIM RESPONSE

   [LEAVE OPEN AND CODE FROM LIST OF SEVEN QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AREAS FROM 8/25 LAUP MTG]

C2. Coaches can work with teachers on different aspects of preschool quality. What are the components of quality that your coach considers most important?

   INTERVIEWER: RECORD VERBATIM THEN SELECT THE CATEGORY THAT BEST FITS THE VERBATIM RESPONSE

   [LEAVE OPEN AND CODE FROM LIST OF SEVEN QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AREAS FROM 8/25 LAUP MTG]

C3. LAUP is now including the CLASS in the 5-Star Quality Assessment and Improvement System. The CLASS assesses different aspects of the preschool classroom focused on effective teaching interactions. What training did you receive about the CLASS?

   RECORD VERBATIM

   DID NOT RECEIVE ANY TRAINING .................................................... 0  GO TO C5

C4. Would you say that the training you received was...

   CODE ONE ONLY

   Too much, ................................................................. 1
   Enough, or ................................................................. 2
   Not enough? ............................................................... 3
When thinking about effective teaching interactions, you could think about three dimensions: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. Thinking of your classroom, if you could work with your coach on only one dimension now, which would you choose?

PROBE IF ASKED ABOUT THE DIMENSIONS: – (1) emotional support, which includes having a positive or negative classroom climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives, (2) classroom organization that includes behavior management, productivity, and instructional learning formats, and (3) instructional support, the final area includes concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling.

CODE ONE ONLY

EMOTIONAL SUPPORT ................................................................. 1
CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION .................................................. 2
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT ...................................................... 3
My next questions are about goals you have set with your LAUP coach.

**FALL ONLY**

**D1.** When did you and your coach begin to discuss formal goals this year?  

**CODE ONE ONLY**

- IN THE SUMMER........................................................................ 1  
- IN SEPTEMBER.......................................................................... 2  
- IN OCTOBER............................................................................. 3  
- WE HAVE NOT DISCUSSED GOALS YET .................................. 0

**D2-D3b FALL AND SPRING**

**D2.** What are the current goals you have set with your LAUP quality support coach?  

**D3.** Were any of your current goals selected to improve classroom quality specifically in relation to the dimensions of effective teaching interactions that we just discussed?

PROBE IF ASKED ABOUT THE DIMENSIONS: – (1) emotional support, which includes having a positive or negative classroom climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives, (2) classroom organization that includes behavior management, productivity, and instructional learning formats, and (3) instructional support, the final area includes concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling.

**D3a.** IF D3=YES, ASK: I’m going to read you the goals you just mentioned. Please tell me for each one if it includes activities that are targeted towards increasing your CLASS scores. CODE YES OR NO FOR EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D2. CURRENT GOAL</th>
<th>D3. ANY GOALS RELATED TO EFFECTIVE TEACHING INTERACTIONS?</th>
<th>D3a. IF D3 = YES, ASK D3a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Table" /></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. FIRST GOAL.........................................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SECOND GOAL......................................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. THIRD GOAL........................................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. FOURTH GOAL......................................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. FIFTH GOAL........................................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D3b. Please tell me more about the work you are doing with your coach that will help you with more effective teaching interactions and the CLASS.

RECORD VERBATIM


SPRING ONLY

D4. What goals have you and your coach determined that you met this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Goal 4</th>
<th>Goal 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NONE ........................................................................................................... 0

FALL AND SPRING

D5. There are different ways that goals can be set and different ways of working towards achieving these goals. For each of the following statements about goal setting, please tell me how true this is of the way your goals are set and your work with your coach.

READ STATEMENT BELOW AND THEN ASK AFTER EACH STATEMENT: Is this never true, rarely true, sometimes true, or usually true?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEVER TRUE</th>
<th>RARELY TRUE</th>
<th>SOMETIMES TRUE</th>
<th>USUALLY TRUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My coach considers my views when we work together to identify goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My coach takes enough time to understand me, my circumstances, and the goals I want to achieve.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My coach identifies the good things I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My coach understands my existing knowledge and experience and helps me build on that in my goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My goals are manageable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D6. SPRING ONLY

**D6.** In thinking of the goals you and your coach have discussed so far this year, please tell us how you and your coach set your goals. For each of the following statements, please tell me if this kind of goal setting has happened rarely, sometimes, or often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK ONE PER ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RARELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. My coach tended to rely on (his/her) expertise and suggests goals and action steps ........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My coach told me what I should select as my goals and how I should pursue them ........................................................................................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My goals came from other sources, like my (director/owner), the owner, or program ........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I came up with the goals and told my coach ................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My coach and I talked together about my hopes for my classroom and other things and came up with goals that way ........................................................................................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other factors influenced my selection (SPECIFY) .................. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPRING ONLY**

**D7.** There are many reasons why goals can change. I am going to read you a list of reasons. For each one please tell me if this is a reason why your goals changed, either since last year or since earlier this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK ONE PER ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. You completed them ............................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Your circumstances changed ........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. You realized you wanted to change priorities to improve your program .......................... 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Your coach encouraged you to change them ........................................ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Is there some other reason? (SPECIFY) ................................ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E1. Coaches have different approaches or ways of supporting teachers. I am going to read you a list of tools and approaches that coaches can use in working with teachers and ask you if your coach used this tool and then ask you which tools were the most helpful to you.

When your coach worked with you to learn new practices or to strengthen your interactions with children, did they (READ ITEM)? CODE YES OR NO FOR EACH.

IF 2 OR MORE CODED YES, ASK Which was the most helpful to you? (RECORD 1 IN COLUMN A)

THEN ASK: And which was the least helpful? (RECORD 2 IN COLUMN A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK YES OR NO IN EACH ROW</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A MOST HELPFUL RECORD 1 IN ONE ROW</th>
<th>B LEAST HELPFUL RECORD 2 IN ONE ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Observe classroom interactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Discuss things with you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Model good behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provide video of other teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide video feedback of your classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Provide activity logs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provide trainings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Provide peer support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Discuss communities of learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Ask questions to get you to think about what to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Provide written directions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Give oral directions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Tell you specifically what parts I am doing well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Give you a self-assessment checklist that breaks down the teaching skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Share some other resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Anything else? (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF 2 OR MORE CODED IN E2 ASK

**E2a.** Why do you think that (ITEM CODED 1 IN COLUMN A) was the most helpful?
RECORD VERBATIM

**E2b.** Why do you think that (ITEM CODED 2 IN COLUMN B) was the least helpful?
RECORD VERBATIM

**E3.** Now please think of all the other areas (for example, changes to the learning environment or working with families) you have worked on with your coach this year. When your coach worked with you in other areas did they (READ ITEM)?

When your coach worked with you in other areas did they (READ ITEM)? CODE YES OR NO FOR EACH.

IF 2 OR MORE CODED YES, ASK Which was the most helpful to you? (RECORD 1 IN COLUMN A)

THEN ASK: And which was the least helpful? (RECORD 2 IN COLUMN A)

**MARK YES OR NO IN EACH ROW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Observe classroom interactions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Discuss things with you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Model good behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Provide video of other teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Provide video feedback of your classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Provide activity logs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provide trainings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Provide peer support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Discuss communities of learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Ask questions to get you to think about what to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Provide written directions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Give oral directions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Tell you specifically what parts I am doing well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Give you a self-assessment checklist that breaks down the teaching skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Share some other resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Anything else? (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF 2 OR MORE CODED IN E3 ASK

E3a. Why do you think that (ITEM CODED 1 IN COLUMN A) was the most helpful?
RECORD VERBATIM

E3b. Why do you think that (ITEM CODED 2 IN COLUMN B) was the least helpful?
RECORD VERBATIM
### F. COMMUNICATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS (FALL AND SPRING)

**F1.** Coaches work with classrooms in all kinds of different ways. For each of the following statements about communicating with your coach, please tell me if you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>My coach observes my classroom regularly...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>My coach meets mostly with classroom teachers ................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>My coach keeps the (director/owner) or other supervisors (if applicable) in the loop ..........</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>My coach meets at the same time with classroom teachers and (director/owner)s or other supervisors ........................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>My coach works primarily with the (director/owner) or other supervisors ...............</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>My coach relies on the (director/owner) or supervisor to communicate with classroom teachers ........................................................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F2.** Does your coach provide information and feedback mainly to your (director/owner) or to you?

- CODE ONE ONLY
  - TEACHER ...................................................................................................................... 1 GO TO F4
  - (DIRECTOR/OWNER) ............................................................................................................. 2
  - BOTH EQUALLY ......................................................................................................................... 3

**F3.** How is the information your coach gives to your (director/owner) communicated to you?

- RECORD VERBATIM


**F4.** How successful is the communication of information and feedback between you and your coach? Is it...

- CODE ONE ONLY
  - Very successful, .................................................................................................................. 1
  - Somewhat successful, .............................................................................................................. 2
  - Somewhat unsuccessful, or ..................................................................................................... 3
  - Very unsuccessful? .................................................................................................................. 4
What, if any, are the main barriers your coach faces to working directly with you?

PROBE: Anything else?

RECORD UP TO THREE BARRIERS BELOW. THEN ASK F5a FOR EACH

FOR EACH BARRIER CODED ASK: Is (ITEM CODED IN F5), a significant barrier that gets in the way of accomplishing your goals, a barrier that you can work around, or just a minor barrier?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F5. BARRIER</th>
<th>F5a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. FIRST BARRIER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SECOND BARRIER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. THIRD BARRIER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have a few final questions about the introduction of the CLASS assessment and focus on effective teaching interactions and how it may influence your classroom practice and coaching.

G1. What do you think are the most useful aspects of coaching, in particular around improving your score around instructional support?

- DETERMINE ACTIVITIES TO INCLUDE IN A LIST BASED ON FALL AND WINTER CASE STUDIES WITH LAST OPTION AS OTHER, SPECIFY [RESPONSES: YES, NO]

G2. How do you think coaching around instructional support in the CLASS might be improved?

- DETERMINE ACTIVITIES TO INCLUDE IN A LIST WITH LAST OPTION AS OTHER, SPECIFY [RESPONSES: YES, NO]

G3. Have you noticed changes in your classroom practice as a result of coaching this year around the CLASS and effective teaching interactions?

YES .................................................................................................................. 1
NO .................................................................................................................... 0 GO TO END

G3a. In what way?
RECORD VERBATIM

...............................................................
...............................................................

ENDING: Thank you very much for your time.
APPENDIX B

COACHING SESSION DEBRIEFING PROTOCOLS
COACH DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

CALLING INSTRUCTIONS: Juarez and Associates (J&A) and coach will discuss likely schedule of visits at the start of the year. The week before expected visit, J&A will contact coach to confirm visit, set time for debrief call, and verify if there is a change in the teacher. If change in teacher, J&A will use “first visit” questions for coach and teacher.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR GATHERING ACTIVITY LOGS: Request to receive shortly after coaching meeting but independent of debrief calls (i.e. use them as independent third data source rather than in preparation for call, and don’t read them first).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONS: Unless otherwise noted, each question should be asked during each debriefing call.

NOTE: The protocol refers to the “teacher” with whom the coach is working. In FCC programs, the teacher might also be called the provider.

INTRODUCTION (FOR USE IN FIRST INTERVIEW WITH COACH)

My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles, California. We are calling coaches who work with teachers in classrooms participating in the most recent Universal Preschool Child Outcome Study and need to hear about your experiences. Your coaching supervisor has discussed your participation with you and we presented an introduction to this part of the study at a coaches’ meeting. This survey will help to improve the coaching program for coaches and teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?

INTRODUCTION (FOR USE IN ALL FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS WITH COACH)

My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles, California. We spoke with you in MONTH and appreciate the time you are giving us. I would like to remind you that this survey will help to improve the coaching program for coaches and teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?

Before we begin, I want to define a few terms we will use. When we use the term ‘owner,’ we are referring to the owner of a family child program. When we refer to a ‘director,’ we are talking about the director of a center-based program.
A. INFORMATION TO RECORD BEFORE CALL BEGINS:

PROGRAM NAME:

COACH:

TEACHER:

DATE OF VISIT:

TIME OF VISIT:

B. COACHING RELATIONSHIP

B1. FIRST VISIT ONLY
   Is this a new teacher for you? If not, how long have you worked together?

B2. ASK DURING F/W/S\textsuperscript{12} VISIT
   How would you characterize your relationship with this teacher?

B3. ASK DURING F/W/S\textsuperscript{13} VISIT
   How would you characterize your relationship with the director/owner?

B4. FIRST VISIT ONLY
   What start-up activities or discussions did you have with this teacher?
   PROBE: Talking with teacher about her vision for her classroom, developing communication plans, developing the quality improvement plan? Are these activities typical for starting the year with a new [ongoing] teacher?

B5. FOR NEW TEACHER ON FIRST VISIT ONLY
   What particular things did you do to help build your new relationship with this teacher?

B6. What do you think is most important for establishing a strong relationship with your teacher when you first start to work together?

B7. FOR ONGOING TEACHER ON FIRST VISIT ONLY Were there particular things you did with an eye to strengthening your ongoing relationship with this teacher?

B8. What do you think is most important for building and maintaining a strong relationship with a teacher you’ve worked with before?

\textsuperscript{12} F=fall, W=winter, S=spring questions should be asked at least once in fall, at least once in winter and at least once in spring
B9. ASK IN FALL ON 2ND OR 3RD VISIT WITH TEACHER How long would you say you have worked on relationship building with this teacher before turning to developing goals?

B9A. Would you say this is typical or not?

B10. ASK DURING F/W/S\textsuperscript{14} VISIT: What did you do during this last visit to try to maintain or strengthen your relationship with this teacher?

B11. ASK IN FALL ON 2ND OR 3RD VISIT WITH TEACHER AND AGAIN ONCE IN SPRING: What would you say is this teacher’s vision for the type of quality program they would like to have?

B11A. What aspects of preschool quality seem most important to them?

B12. What would you say your vision is for this teacher in terms of aspects of preschool quality?

B13. SPRING

Can you give me an example of a success a teacher has had as a result of your work together?

B14. SPRING

Can you give me an example of a time where you and your teacher worked through a challenge together?

C. INFORMATION ABOUT THIS COACHING VISIT

INSTRUCTIONS: Every Month/Visit: When J&A emails coach to confirm visit and set up call, find out who the meeting is likely to be with to help tailor questions in advance.

[USE MATRIX TO FILL OUT INFO FOR EACH VISIT/CONTACT DURING EACH CALL]

C1. With whom did you meet this visit?

C1A. (If other than lead teacher) Why did you meet with these staff?

C2. If you did not actually meet in person, what type of contact did you have?

C3. How much time was spent with each person, with each activity (director; classroom observation; teacher; assistant teacher)?

C4. Do you feel like you had sufficient time with the classroom teacher(s) on this visit?

C5. IF MET WITH DIRECTOR/OWNER ASK

Do you meet with the director every time you visit? How long is typical?

\textsuperscript{14} F=fall, W=winter, S=spring questions should be asked at least once in fall, at least once in winter and at least once in spring
C6. FOR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT VISITS/MEETINGS THAT INCLUDED DIRECTOR [BUT WERE NOT WITH DIRECTOR ONLY]

What did you discuss during this meeting?

C6A. What role did the director play in the discussion? (i.e. led, observed, was active participant but in collaborative fashion, other)

C6B. What appears to be the nature of the director’s and teacher’s relationship?

C7. FOR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT VISITS/MEETINGS THAT OCCURRED ONLY WITH DIRECTORS

What did you discuss during this meeting?

C7A. As far as you know, how will this information get to the teachers?

C7B. As far as you know, what is this director/owner’s usual practice for relaying information to teachers?

C7C. Why did you meet with the director/owner only?

C7D. What appears to be the nature of the director’s and teacher’s relationship?

C8. FOR DISCUSSIONS ABOUT VISITS/MEETINGS WITH TEACHERS

How long did you spend in the classroom?

C8A. What did you do there?

C8B. What was the focus of your activities this visit?

C8C. How did you accomplish that?

C8D. What do you think works well with this teacher?

C8D1. Why?

C8E. Are there things you tend to avoid with this teacher?

C8E1. Why?

C9. What did you discuss this visit? [if needed, can use revised drop-down goals menu for prompts for J&A]

C10. Can you give me an example/examples of questions you asked this teacher?

C10A. What were you hoping to achieve with these questions?

C10B. Did the teacher respond in the way you expected or hoped?

C10C. Can you give me some examples of the questions that you asked?
C11. Did the teacher ask you any questions?
   C11A. Can you tell me about those?

C12. Is any of this information shared with the director?
   C12A. If so, how?
   C12B. Which information would be communicated?

C13. ASK THIS QUESTION IF RESPONSE TO C10 TO C12 FOCUS ON GOALS

   How did the [topic of the goal] come up?
   C13A. Is the teacher setting goals around emotional support, classroom organization, and/or instructional support?
   C13B. If so, what are they?
   C13C. How interested does the teacher seem in pursuing goals around these domains?
   C13D. Do you have a sense of why this is their interest level?
   PROBE: It is consistent with their curriculum? Philosophy? Any other reasons?

C14. ASK THESE QUESTIONS IF RESPONSES TO C10 TO C12 DO NOT MENTION GOALS

   Did the teacher and you set any new goals?
   C14A. How/why were these goals selected?
   C14B. Did you discuss progress on existing goals?

C15. This past visit, what did you do to support their progress on goals?
   PROBE: What activities? Any resources? Specialist?

C16. What do you think was most effective?
   C16A. Why?

C17. ASK IF MULTIPLE GOALS DISCUSSED:

   What did you do to support each goal? [Review each goal area mentioned and ask probes above.]
   C17A. Why did you use this approach?

C18. Was there anything else you discussed with the teacher on this visit?
   PROBE: For each topic raised, ask who initiated the conversation about it, and how it was initiated; if the coach and teacher discussed areas related to CLASS dimensions, probe further about whether they discussed these areas explicitly in relation to CLASS.
C19: ASK ONCE IN FALL AND SPRING, BUT IF TEACHER IS NEW, ASK IN SPRING ONLY

Overall, how would you describe the style of coaching you tend to use with this teacher?

PROBE: tend to be more collaborative/"light touch", tend to be a bit more directive, etc.)

C19A. Why do you tend to use this style with this teacher?

C20. Were there any particular challenges to your work during the last visit?

C20A. How did you address these challenges?

C21. Was this a typical visit?

C21A. Did anything unusual happen?

C21B. If so, what?

C21C. Did it affect the visit in a substantial way?

C22. What do you see as success on this visit?

PROBE: did you see progress on any of the goals this visit? On building or strengthening your relationship? On any other areas?

C22A. Did you talk with the teacher about this?

C22B. Can you give examples of what you said?

C23. Did you have any contact with this teacher between your last visit and this one?

C24. With whom in the program?

PROBE: What kind of contact? What was the purpose?

C25. Do you have any plans for follow-up before your next visit?

C26. When is the next visit scheduled?
D. POSSIBLE SPECIAL TOPICS

We will select one or two special topics to discuss each month. For example,

- In the month before the CLASS/ERS\textsuperscript{15} observations we will ask about preparation for the CLASS/ERS and in the month afterwards we will debrief about the observation and feedback.
- When we know that LAUP, the coach, or specialists are doing a training we will add questions related to that training.
- In the mid-Fall and late-Spring, probe more around the teacher’s and coach’s definitions and conceptions of preschool quality? How the goals and related activities converge (or don’t) around these conceptions of quality? The relationship to CLASS dimensions?
- For a Winter Special topic, additional questions on the effective teaching interactions/CLASS to be developed
- Other topics that arise as debriefing calls are made and then analyzed, and as coach supervisors and others move forward with coaching across the year.

\textsuperscript{15} The CLASS and ERS are used as part of LAUP's ongoing star quality rating system. The references for both follow.


TEACHER DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

CALLING INSTRUCTIONS: Calls should occur within a couple days of monthly visit. Juarez and Associates (J&A) and coach will discuss likely schedule of visits at the start of the year. The week before expected visit, J&A will contact coach to confirm visit, set time for debrief call, and verify if there is a change in the teacher. J&A will then contact teacher to set up call. If change in teacher, J&A will use “first visit” questions for coach and teacher.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR GATHERING ACTIVITY LOGS: Request to receive shortly after coaching meeting but independent of debrief calls (i.e. use them as independent third data source rather than in preparation for call, and don’t read them first).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONS: Unless otherwise noted, each question should be asked during each debriefing call

NOTE: Use of “Director” here also can pertain to FCC owners.

INTRODUCTION (FOR USE IN FIRST INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER)
My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles, California. We are calling teachers who work with coaches in classrooms participating in the most recent Universal Preschool Child Outcome Study and need to hear about your experiences. The director/owner of your program has agreed that you can participate. This survey will help to improve the coaching program for coaches and teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?

INTRODUCTION (FOR USE IN ALL FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHER)
My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles, California. We spoke with you in MONTH and appreciate the time you are giving us. I would like to remind you that this survey will help to improve the coaching program for coaches and teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?

Before we begin, I want to define a few terms we will use. When we use the term ‘owner,’ we are referring to the owner of a family child care program. When we refer to a ‘director,’ we are talking about the director of a center-based program.
A. INFORMATION TO RECORD BEFORE CALL BEGINS:

PROGRAM NAME:

COACH:

TEACHER:

DATE OF VISIT:

TIME OF VISIT:

B. COACHING RELATIONSHIP

B1. FIRST VISIT ONLY

Is this a new coach for you? If not, how long have you worked together?

B2. ASK DURING F/W/S\(^{16}\) VISIT

How would you characterize your relationship with your coach?

B3. PERIODICALLY QUERY

Are there things that your coach did or said this month to help you feel comfortable and positive about working with him/her?

B3A. If so, what were they?

B4. FIRST VISIT ONLY

What start-up activities or discussions did you and your coach have?

PROBES: talking about your vision for your classroom this year, developing communication plans, developing the quality improvement plan?

B4A. In your experience with coaching, are these activities typical for starting the year with a new [ongoing] coach?

B5. FIRST VISIT FOR NEW-COACH TEACHER ONLY

What do you think is most important for establishing a strong relationship between a teacher and coach when you first start to work together?

B6. FIRST VISIT FOR ONGOING COACH-TEACHER

\(^{16}\) F=fall, W=winter, S=spring questions should be asked at least once in fall, at least once in winter and at least once in spring
What do you think is most important for building and maintaining a strong relationship with a coach you’ve worked with before?

B7. FALL (2ND OR 3RD VISIT) AND SPRING, AND ASK IN SAME VISIT WHEN YOU ASK COACH THIS SAME QUESTION What would you say is your vision for the type of classroom you would like to have this year?

B7A. What aspects of preschool quality would you say are most important to you?

B7B. Have you and your coach discussed your ideas about this?

B7C. If so, can you tell me those conversations?

B7D. As far as you know, is your vision of quality similar to or different from the vision of your program?

B7E. How so?

B8. SPRING

Can you give me an example of a success you've had as a result of your work with your coach?

B9. SPRING

Can you give me an example of a time where you and your coach worked through a challenge together?

C. INFORMATION ABOUT THIS COACHING VISIT

C1. Did your coach observe your classroom this month?

C2. Did you have time to talk with him/her before, after, or during the visit?

C3. If so, how long did you meet with your coach?

C4. Did your coach talk with your assistant teachers?

C5. The director/owner? (Does the coach meet with the director/owner every visit?)

C6. Any other program staff?

C7. Tell me about what the coach did on the visit.

C7A. If it was not primarily with you, as far as you know what did the coach do on the visit?

C7B. With whom?

C7C. For how long?

PROBES: Modeled, did assessment, other?
C8. If the coach did not visit in person this month, what type of contact did he/she have with you (or your program, as far as you know)?

[USE MATRIX TO FILL OUT FOR EACH VISIT/CONTACT RE WHO, HOW LONG, WHAT DONE]

C9. Do you feel like you had sufficient time with the coach on this visit/this month?

C10: FOR DISCUSSIONS WITH PROGRAMS WHERE COACH’S DISCUSSION IS ONLY WITH DIRECTOR/OWNER

How does the information they discussed get to you?

C11. What did you and your coach talk about this visit?

PROBE: For each topic raised, who/how initiated each topic; if they bring up areas related to emotional support, classroom organization, and/or instructional support--CLASS dimensions--probe further about whether they discussed them with the coach explicitly in relation to CLASS.

C12. Was it just you and the coach, or did others take part in this conversation?

PROBE: who? What role did they play (led the conversation, observed, participated in a collaborative way?) For how much of the conversation?

C13. What are your current goals?

C13A. How or why were these goals selected?

C13B. Are you setting goals around the areas of emotional support, classroom organization, and/or instructional support?

C13C. If so, what are the goals?

C13D. Are there particular goals in these areas you are especially interested in pursuing?

C13E. If so, which ones?

C13F. Why?

C13G. How are you working on these goals?

C14. This visit, what did your coach do to support your progress on goals?

PROBE: Which goal? What activities? Any resources? Specialist? [Start broad and then probe.]

PROBE IF TEACHER DISCUSSES MULTIPLE GOALS: What did he/she do to support each goal?

C15. What do you find most helpful in supporting your progress?

C16. Did you discuss progress on existing goals?
C17. Did you set any new goals during this visit?
   
   PROBE IF OTHER GOALS: How or why did you select this goal?

C18. Did you discuss anything else with the coach on this visit?

C19. Did you ask the coach any particular questions this visit?
   
   C19A. Can you give me some examples of questions that you asked the coach on this visit?

C20. Did the coach ask you any particular questions?
   
   C20A. Can you tell me about those?

C21. Were there any challenges to your meeting with the coach during this visit?
   
   C21A. How did you (or do you plan to) address these challenges?

C22. Was this a typical visit?
   
   C22A. Did anything unusual happen?
   
   C22B. If so, what?
   
   C22C. Did it affect the visit in a substantial way?

C23. What do you see as success on this visit?
   
   PROBE: did you see progress on any of the goals this visit? On building or strengthening your relationship with the coach? On any other areas?
   
   C23A. Did you talk with the coach about this?
   
   C23B. Can you give me some examples of what you said?

C24. Did you have any contact with this coach between your last visit and this one?
   
   PROBE: What kind of contact? What was the purpose?

C25. As far as you know, did anyone else in your program?

C26. Do you have any plans for follow-up before your coach’s next visit?
   
   C26A. When is the next visit scheduled?
D. POSSIBLE SPECIAL TOPICS

We will select one or two special topics to discuss each month. For example,

- In the month before the CLASS/ERS17 observations we will ask about preparation for the CLASS/ERS and in the month afterwards we will debrief about the observation and feedback.
- When we know that LAUP, the coach, or specialists are doing a training we will add questions related to that training
- In the mid-Fall and late-Spring, we may probe more around the teachers’s and coach’s definitions and conceptions of preschool quality? The convergence of the goals and related activities around these conceptions? The relationship to CLASS dimensions?
- For a Winter Special topic, additional questions on the CLASS implementation to be developed
- Directors on their understanding of effective teaching interactions/the CLASS

---

17 The CLASS and ERS are used as part of LAUP’s ongoing star quality rating system. The references for both follow.


DIRECTOR/OWNER DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

CALLING INSTRUCTIONS: If director/owner is primary contact with coach, call the director/owner monthly. If director/owner stays in the loop but is not primary contact, do these calls a few times over the year in fall, winter, and spring.

NOTE: In center-based programs, the respondent is known as the director. In FCC programs the respondent is known as the owner.

INTRODUCTION (FOR USE IN FIRST INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR/OWNER)

My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles, California. We are calling directors who work with coaches in classrooms participating in the most recent Universal Preschool Child Outcome Study and need to hear about your experiences. This survey will help to improve the coaching program for coaches and teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?

INTRODUCTION (FOR USE IN ALL FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS WITH DIRECTOR/OWNER)

My name is (NAME) and I’m calling from Juarez and Associates in Los Angeles, California. We spoke with you in MONTH and appreciate the time you are giving us. I would like to remind you that this survey will help to improve the coaching program for coaches and teachers in the future. All of the information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your responses to interview questions will not be associated with you personally in any way. Direct quotes from your interview responses may be used in order to illustrate a point, or illuminate findings, but any names or places that could be attributable to you personally will be omitted. The interview takes about 30 minutes depending on your responses. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to answer any question. Is this a good time for you to continue?
A. INFORMATION TO RECORD BEFORE CALL BEGINS:

PROGRAM NAME:

COACH:

TEACHER:

DIRECTOR:

DATE OF VISIT:

TIME OF VISIT:

B. COACHING RELATIONSHIP

B1. FIRST VISIT AND SPRING

How would you characterize your relationship with your program’s coach?

B2. FIRST VISIT AND SPRING

How would you characterize your relationship with this teacher?

B3. FIRST VISIT ONLY

What start-up activities or discussions did the coach have with you [and your program staff]? PROBES: talking about your vision for your classroom this year, developing communication plans, developing the quality improvement plan

B4. FIRST VISIT ONLY

In your experience with coaching, are these activities typical for starting the year?

B5. PERIODICALLY QUERY FOR DIRECTOR-ONLY PROGRAMS

Are there things that the coach did or said this month to help you feel comfortable and positive about working with him/her?

B5A. If so, what were they?

B6. PERIODICALLY QUERY FOR ALL DIRECTORS

Are there things that the coach did or said this month to help you feel comfortable and positive about how they work with your program?

B7: SPRING

Can you give me an example of a success you have had as a result of your work with your coach?

B8: SPRING
Can you give me an example of a time where you and your coach worked through a challenge together?

C. INFORMATION ABOUT THIS COACHING VISIT

[USE MATRIX TO RECORD FOR EACH VISIT/CONTACT RE WHO, HOW LONG, WHAT DONE]

C1. Did the coach observe the classroom this month?

C2. Did she/he talk with the lead teacher before, after or during the visit?

C3. Did the coach talk with your assistant teachers? Other staff?

C4. Tell me about what the coach did on the visit. If it was not primarily with you, as far as you know what did the coach do on the visit? With whom? For how long?

    PROBES: Modeled, did assessment, other?

C5. What did you and the coach talk about during this visit?

C6. Was it just you and the coach, or did others take part in this conversation?

    PROBES: Who? What role did they play (led the conversation, observed, participated in a collaborative way?) For how much of the conversation?

C7. PERIODICALLY QUERY

    Do you meet with the coach every time s/he visits?

    C7A. How long is typical?

C8. FOR VISITS/MEETINGS THAT OCCURRED ONLY WITH DIRECTORS

    Did you share the information you and the coach discussed with teacherss in your program?

    C8A. Which teachers (lead? assistants?)?

    C8B. How did you communicate it?

C9. As far as you know, what type of contact did the coach have with teacherss in your program?

C10. FOR VISITS/MEETINGS THAT INCLUDED DIRECTOR [BUT WERE NOT WITH DIRECTOR ONLY]

    Do you feel like you had sufficient time with the coach on this visit/this month?

    C10A. Do you feel teacherss in your program had sufficient time with the coach?

C11. How does the information the coach discusses with teacherss in your program get to you?

C12. FOR ALL DIRECTORS IN FALL (2ND OR 3RD VISIT) AND SPRING
What would you say is your vision for the type of program you would like to have?

C12A. What aspects of preschool quality would you say are most important to you?

C12B. As far as you know, is this similar to or different from the vision of the coach who works with your program?

C12C. How so?

C12D. How do you share your vision with the teachers in your program?

C13. FOR DISCUSSION ABOUT MEETING WITH COACH, ASK IN FALL AND SPRING

What are your program’s current goals? How or why were these goals selected?

C13A. Is your program setting goals around the areas of emotional support, classroom organization, and/or instructional support?

C13B. If so, what are the goals?

C13C. Are there particular goals in these areas you are especially interested in pursuing?

C13C1. If so, which ones?

C13C2. Why?

C14. How is your program working on these goals?

C15. This visit, what did your coach do to support your progress on goals?

PROBE: What activities? Any resources? Specialist?

PROBE IF MULTIPLE GOALS DISCUSSED: What did s/he do to support each goal?

C15A. What do you find most helpful in supporting your progress?

C15B. Did you and the coach discuss progress on existing goals?

C15C. Did your program set any new goals during this visit? How or why did you select this goal?

C16. What else did you discuss with the coach on this visit?

PROBE: Who/how initiated each topic; if they discuss areas related to CLASS dimensions probe further about whether they discussed in relation to CLASS

C17. Did you ask the coach any questions? Can you give me some examples of questions that you asked the coach on this visit?

C18. Did the coach ask you any questions?
C18A. **FOR MEETINGS WITH DIRECTOR AND OTHERS:** Did the coach ask teachers any questions?

C18B. Can you tell me about those?

C19. Were there any challenges in your meeting with the coach during today’s visit?

C19A. How did you (or do you plan to) address these challenges?

C20. Was this a typical visit?

C20A. Did anything unusual happen?

C20B. If so, what?

C20C. Did it affect the visit in a substantial way?

C21. What do you see as success on this visit?

**PROBE:** did you see progress on any of the goals this visit? Strengthening of your relationship with the Coach? On any other areas? Did you talk with the coach about this? Give examples of what you said.

C22. Did you or staff in your program have any contact with this coach between your last visit and this one?

**PROBE:** What kind of contact? With whom? What was the purpose?

C23. Do you have any plans for follow-up before his/her next visit? When is the next visit scheduled?

**D. POSSIBLE SPECIAL TOPICS**

We will select one or two special topics to discuss each month. For example:

- In the month before the CLASS/ERS\(^{18}\) observations we will ask about preparation for the CLASS/ERS and in the month afterwards we will debrief about the observation and feedback.
- When we know that LAUP, the coach, or specialists are doing a training we will add questions related to that training.
- In the mid-Fall and late-Spring, probe more around the teacher’s and coach’s definitions and conceptions of preschool quality? The convergence of the goals and related activities around these conceptions? The relationship to CLASS dimensions?

---


- For a Winter Special topic, additional questions on the CLASS implementation to be developed
- Providers and/or directors on their understanding of effective teaching interactions/CLASS.
APPENDIX C

UPCOS-5 COACHING STUDY RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES TABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Topics &amp; Sub-questions</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Coach SAQ</th>
<th>Activity Logs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Establishing and maintaining relationships (context and activities)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How do coaches and providers go about establishing their relationships?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What emphasis on relationships is noted with directors versus classroom staff (teachers and assistants)?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do the start-of-year activities (for example, developing the quality improvement plan, identifying the provider’s vision of quality, developing communication strategies) differ for new and existing relationships?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many months do coaches commit to relationship building prior to beginning work on goals?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do coaches maintain their relationships with providers on an ongoing basis?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Defining quality (activities and outcomes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do coaches and/or providers enter their relationship with existing definitions of quality?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do coaches and providers systematically work to develop a shared understanding of quality? If so, how?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How congruent are quality definitions with the philosophical approaches of programs?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the shared understanding of quality reflect providers’ vision for their own program or classroom, or does it reflect an aspect of the context within which they are working?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do coaches and providers interpret the dimensions of the CLASS, and how does the CLASS influence the process of understanding quality?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are there ways in which the CLASS seems to conflict with programs’ philosophical, curricular, or cultural approaches?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Identification of, evolution of, and work toward goals (activities and outputs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Activity Logs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do providers and coaches go about selecting/identifying goals at the start of the year?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors influence the selection of goals?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do goals evolve over the course of the year, and what is the impetus for a change in goals?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of support do providers want in selecting and setting goals?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What preferences do providers and coaches have for the approach to co-creating goals (directive versus collaborative), and do those preferences differ according to subject-matter?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the CLASS influence goal-setting?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In light of the fact that both the ERS and CLASS will be part of the 5-Star Rating system, what is the interplay of the ERS and CLASS in setting and working toward goals?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the timing of the ERS and CLASS reviews influence work toward goals?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. The coaches’ toolkit (inputs, activities, outputs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Activity Logs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among the tools available to coaches—observation, discussion, modeling, video feedback, activity logs, trainings, peer support, communities of learners, self-assessment checklists, additional resources—which are coaches most likely to use, especially when working on aspects of quality related to the CLASS?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do providers see as being of greatest value for helping them improve their practice, especially as related to the CLASS dimensions?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do coaches select and use the different tools with different programs?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors (including time available to coaches to work directly with programs and teachers) make it easier or more difficult for coaches to use these various tools?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Navigating programs’ administrative structure (context, activities):

1. With whom are coaches interacting in programs, and how is that determined? | x | x | x | x | x | x
2. What work do coaches do with the various program staff? | x | x | x | x | x
3. What are the advantages of working with different program staff? | x | x | x | x
4. What are the primary barriers to working with and communicating additional information to classroom teachers (individually and teaching teams)? | x | x | x | x | x
5. What do classroom teachers and coaches report about their frequency and duration of interaction? | x | x | x | x | x | x

### F. Identify successes, challenges, and lessons learned.

1. What do providers report are the most useful aspects (activities) of coaching, in particular around the domains of the CLASS? | x | x | x | x
2. How might the usefulness of coaching around the CLASS be improved? | x | x | x | x | x
3. What are the biggest challenges to coaching around the domains of the CLASS? | x | x | x | x
4. What tools or supports do coaches most need to improve coaching around the CLASS? | x | x | x | x | x
5. What are the biggest barriers to a focus on quality in coaching (versus a focus on administrative or other tasks)? | x | x | x | x
6. How have coaches and providers successfully moved past those barriers? | x | x | x | x
7. Do providers (or coaches) perceive a change in classroom practice as a result of coaching, particularly around the CLASS? | x | x | x
8. How can findings from the research literature on characteristics of effective coaching help us understand perceived successes and challenges of Quality Support Coaching in LAUP programs? | Literature