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Purpose of Study

- Learn more about quality support coaching in LAUP
- Key research questions
  - What is the theory of action for the LAUP coaching program?
  - How is coaching enacted in LAUP?
  - How do various stakeholders perceive the coaching process?
  - How is the LAUP coaching model similar to and/or different from coaching models identified as effective in the literature?

Methods

Agenda

- Purpose of study/research questions
- Study methods
- The LAUP coaching model
- Study findings
- Discussion
Multiple Perspectives on Coaching

Key Informants

Documentation Records

Center-Based Providers

FCC Providers

Coaching

Center-Based Coaches

FCC Coaches

Case Studies Coaching in Action

Review of Research

Initial Visit to Los Angeles

- Key informant interviews
  - Visit to LAUP
  - 15 interviews
    - LAUP professional development staff
    - Program and research/evaluation staff
    - Coaching supervisors
  - Meeting with coaches at monthly meeting
  - Focus of initial information-gathering
    - Overall coaching model and implementation
    - Perceived strengths and challenges

- Conducted 16 focus groups
  - LAUP coaches (3) – 15 participants
    - Conducted during initial LAUP visit
  - LAUP providers (10) – 74 participants
    - Recruited by geographic area
    - Included providers from FCCs and centers, range of auspices
    - Program directors (3) – 12 participants
      - Conducted by phone
  - All focus groups recorded and notes taken

Focus Groups

- Five case studies
  - We worked with LAUP to recruit providers
    - 2 FCCs, 3 center-based providers
  - In-depth conversations, March-June
  - Weekly classroom visits
  - Observations of monthly coaching visits
  - Reviews of associated coaching notes
  - Conducted by J&A

Case Studies
Document Review

Activity logs:
- Frequency and nature of visits
- Goals, activities, and progress recorded

LEO data:
- Duration of coaching visits
- Number/type of program encounters
  - Coaching visits, emails, phone calls, etc
- Recipients of coaching information
  - Director, lead teachers, assistant teachers, etc

Data Analysis

- All focus groups recorded and text coded by two or more Mathematica staff
- Theme tables developed to record emerging themes, evidence sources, and intensity
- Confirming/disconfirming evidence sought across interviews, case studies, document review (activity logs + LEO data); integration of data from multiple sources
- “Member checks”—presented and discussed findings with LAUP staff, coaches, selection of focus group participants, case study participants—before finalizing

The LAUP Quality Support Coaching Model

The Theory: Process Consultation (PC)  (Schein 1999)

- Key assumption: One can only help a human system help itself
- Goals of PC (framed in coaching):
  - Build Relationship: Establish an effective helping relationship where teacher/provider and coach together reflect on current practice and identify areas for improvement and appropriate solutions
  - Empower: Pass on the skills of how to identify the problem and find an appropriate solution to the teacher/provider
- Key components:
  - Active inquiry: Listen, learn by asking questions
  - Appreciative inquiry: Focus on strengths, what is working
Process Consultation: The LAUP Model

- Key assumption: Teachers/providers possess the capacity to support quality programs
- Coach-provider relationship is central and is supported by:
  - Monthly on-site visits by coaches
  - Use active inquiry (learn by asking questions, listening) to understand teachers/providers’ strengths and needs
  - Use observation to understand teachers/providers’ strengths and needs
  - Availability to teachers/providers as needed (calls, e-mails, additional visits)

Process Consultation: The LAUP Model, cont.

- Teachers/providers and coaches to co-create goals and solutions
  - Active inquiry, observation will give coach an understanding of provider needs
  - Coach will use knowledge to help teacher/provider identify goals and develop Quality Improvement Plan
  - Coach will use appreciative inquiry—focus on strengths—to help teacher/provider develop solution
    - Empowerment: Ideally, teacher/provider will own the solution especially if rooted in strengths
- Ongoing work
  - Coach and teacher/provider will continue to strengthen relationship over time
  - Focus on goals/solutions will continue over the year

A coach perspective:

- “Here’s how we influence, by looking for opportunities, answers to questions that already exist anyway, but are looking to be highlighted. They already have the idea. We’re always asking questions. It’s the only way to take the temperature of the provider, through inquiry. It is authentic, organic, not manipulative, but it is influential.”

Overarching Findings
Definitions of quality are individualized to providers.

What is quality?

- Coaches and providers have varied perspectives on what “quality” means
  - Happy children
  - Encouraged to explore and express
  - Teachers asking open-ended questions
  - Parents engaged
  - Emphasis on process rather than product
  - Safe environment
  - Use of research-based curriculum
  - Proper assessment tool
  - Teacher credentials
  - Etc.

- Most providers perceive coaches share their vision of quality

Some coaches focus on teaching interactions (including parent engagement); others spend considerable time on environment, particularly health and safety (especially table washing and hand washing).

Some coaches balance focus on overall quality and ECERS

- Some coaches keep broader focus on instructional interactions and quality, even with ECERS pressures

- Most providers value emphasis on instructional interaction
  - Some providers specifically mentioned this when asked about positive things about coaching

- Several providers noted improvements in their approaches toward their children and early learning
Apparent tension between ECERS coaching and coaching for quality support broadly
- Often ECERS seems to drive substance (handwashing!) and pacing
  - May crowd out emphasis on broader quality support
  - Some providers suggest intensity, with coach direction, during ECERS prep, followed by “mellow” coaching after

As a trained professional… the coach is examining how you speak to the child and whether you are asking open-ended questions. Are you allowing the child to really think and expand their vocabulary? She’s showed me that that’s quality preschool—helping kids think outside the box and reach the next level. Her vision is coming along with my vision—they’re going hand in hand."

Our coach … is at each of the sites every month. She does talk about ECERS, but she talks about interactions and offers positive suggestions.

It seems we are always working to get better, we never relax, always pushing on handwashing.

Tell me if I’m wrong! She’s there to help us get a high score, right?

Many providers appear to work hard to help providers with ECERS prep and feedback
- Many providers cite coach’s useful assistance
- A few said coach focused too much on ECERS (and handwashing)
- Some wanted more or different support
  - More visits, walk-throughs, modeling, specific guidance
  - Coach prep that is more consistent with ECERS reviewers focus

"Last week, she told us she was training us to get that 7. She was observing us, listening to our conversations, and in the report she had our strengths and what we could’ve added … When she comes to visit, she’s clear and honest. It was one of the best sessions we’ve had."

I do know they are trying to help. That’s why we did well with our scores. She tells me I am good and I don’t have to worry.”

..., I haven’t seen my coach since September. I don’t know if I’m the one that has to make the time to call her. We’re getting coaches so that they can work with us, but they’re not in all areas that we need. Before ECERS came out, I didn’t see her.”

Robots, they want to see robots—especially with the handwashing.”
Coaches and providers suggest both opportunity and anxiety in CLASS

- Several coaches and providers see opportunity to focus more on instructional interactions, with CLASS providing the tool.
- Providers seem concerned about how and if they will be adequately prepared:
  - Very aware that CLASS will affect star rating and payment
  - Overview training helpful but they want more (modeling, role playing, video)

What coaches and providers said:

- Coach:
  - “One of my providers has a teacher, she’s been very hands-off, not connected with the kids. Now that we’ve been talking about CLASS, I see her talking with them at eye level...I can’t believe all the language she’s involved with with the children... Now she’s on the floor, on the carpet, talking with them.”

- Director:
  - “...if we are doing what we should be doing, [the CLASS] should capture our strengths and bring in guided acquisition, focusing on higher level thinking and interactions to make sure we are really working on one-on-one conversations and building on [the children’s] knowledge base. I think it is really going to help us...”

- Teacher:
  - “In a way, I’m kind of nervous about that CLASS stuff, I think we did fairly well on that, but it’s just one more thing for them to assess.”

Providers discuss coaching around curricula and parent engagement

- Providers noted both coaches’ expertise with curricula and help connecting them to training, resources, and models
- Many providers say they value their coach’s work with them to educate parents and expand engagement:
  - Educating parents about learning strategies (home and school) and kindergarten transition
  - Developing ways to improve relations
  - Connecting them with specialists and other resources
  - Involvement in and understanding of community and culture

What providers said:

- “My coach is helping me convey to parents that their child is still learning, it might appear to be at a slower pace, but it’s not really a slower pace, it’s just learning a different way. So, for homework, instead of giving them a packet...I give the parents an assignment to do with their child. For example, let them cook with you in the kitchen and ask the child to show you something shaped like a cylinder. Or, at the grocery, ask them to find a certain letter...”

- “The coach we were working with realized we were doing a lot with parents and asked how she could help, and she brought in different people so someone else could do the presentations who had the breadth and depth and also the cultural understanding of the parents.”
Trusting relationships are an important part of LAUP coaching.

Relationship quality and trust are central

- Providers indicate the relationship with the coach is...
  - Important element for improving quality
  - Important to coaching process
  - What makes coaching different from supervision/monitoring

- Coaches indicate...
  - Quality of the relationship is a necessary precondition for effective coaching
  - Developing the relationship is complex: some differences in styles and personalities
    - "a dance"

Coaches indicate relationship building takes time

- Does depend on the providers and context
  - "With some people it takes time, some people you click right away."

- Building a good relationship can require pacing
  - "...I know well enough I can’t take everything on right away, but instead plant a seed. Maybe we’ll come back to it later, as a goal later."

- External factors can affect the pace
  - "Sometimes the relationship opportunity gets accelerated if there’s an ECERS review coming up, or the results are coming back, there’s lots of discussion after."

Coaches identify multiple avenues to establishing relationships, trust

- Draw on preparation for and discussion after ECERS as a way to establish helpfulness
- Deliver on what they say they will do
- Coach backgrounds (as teachers, supervisors, and directors; their empathy, expertise and knowledge) noted by both coaches and providers as valuable and helping providers feel understood
- Sharing interest in personal lives (go to events, ask after family, etc.)
Focus on process consultation (use of active and appreciative inquiry) is evident and valued by many coaches and providers but many also prefer or utilize more directive approaches.

Coaches talk in terms of helping providers solve their own problems

Some providers indicate appreciation for coaches’ work to make them feel confident and empowered

However, providers also cite active/direct help from coaches as valued
  - Direct help seems dominant

Coaches report using active inquiry for building relationships

Coaches, providers, and case studies indicate confrontive inquiry is most common
  - Many providers say coaches make helpful suggestions, guide them to new/different perspective

The use of the model varies across coaches and across providers

Evidence of appreciative inquiry and PC in some comments and case studies

“Providing care in our home, we get used to how things are and don’t notice what we need to change. When a coach comes, they can tell you, “I think you could change something this way; it will look better.” They don’t impose their perspective, but now you can see it from a different perspective.”

“What she observes something, she won’t say that it’s wrong, but she’ll give suggestions. For example, she saw that [an English language learner] child had difficulty communicating with us, so she raised the topic and offered resources and ideas on how to deal with it. She brought a lady to teach us how to communicate with children like that, and she brought handouts that taught communication techniques.”

What providers said about process:
What providers said about process, cont.:

- “We call her our cheerleader sometimes—she will say she can’t wait to share [something about our program] with other coaches. It’s a very affirming process.”
- “She’s always giving us feedback. And making us feel like we’re doing good. Sometimes you need that reinforcement.”
- “She recorded us... and we looked at the movie and she gave me some questions and she asked me to answer my questions while I am looking at myself doing my work. She says you are doing really good in lots of areas... what do you think? You can see yourself doing your work. It is a cool way to learn. I do like it.”

What providers said:

- “...with my coach, I am very, very happy with her because I set my own goals to work on, and say “I need help with this.” So she comes [back] and says these are my goals for the next month... She tells me when she is going to come back and gives me a paper that repeats that, she writes the date when she’s coming back so I [know when to] expect her...”
- “The first time she came... she walked through one door and out the other. And I said “that was the coach.” Then she came back again a couple months later and sat in the room just observing and then typing and typing and typing and then we dismissed the children and then she was gone. I guessed that was what coaches do ... I am the lead teacher, and... I need feedback to make sure things are OK, and she hadn’t left anything... my experience [was] not negative. But I went to a training that said they are supposed to meet with you, go over things with you to help you feel more comfortable. She is a really nice lady. I just thought that was it.”

Providers suggest many but not all coaches co-create with some consistency

- Some indicate they and their coach consistently co-create and work on goals
  - Goal-setting begins at start of year, continues systematically to end
  - Coaches make goals manageable and attainable
- Pace of co-creation can vary over the year and over multiple years
  - Factors may include: ECERS timing, relationship, experience, time for coach and provider to meet
- Some sites and providers reflect
  - “Ad hoc” approach addressing issues piecemeal

What providers said:

- “At my site, we are consistently revisiting and re-doing our goals and creating goals on top of goals. We are always progressing through feedback. We go over goals and create new goals and have something to always work on. If we have nothing to work on, we don’t expect anything more, we won’t have anything to show progress. And it is not just based on the current session, but also what we discussed on previous session. I go over the activity log she gives me with all my teachers so we are all on the same page.”
- “She makes the goals attainable, she makes them easy, they are things we can work on. You know, they are not out of reach. They are things that just need a little bit of improvement so then the next time she is there, in a month or two, we have been able to meet our goals.”
- “I personally would be happy to know [what the] goals [are] and what is going on.”
Many providers describe collaboration:
- Between teacher and coach
- Among site team and coach
- Reflecting elements of PC and appreciative inquiry

Sometimes work around goals is more directive:
- On ECERS prep, safety, other issues (providers may seek coach direction/expertise)
- By coach orientation and/or relationship quality (some coaches seen as rigid or arbitrary)

"She makes great suggestions, and she does so as a partner. She doesn’t come around and say, “Oh, you need to do this and this and this.” She says, “What do you think about this? How do you think we can do this?” She treats us like we treat our kids! It makes us more willing to go along with her and think in other ways.”

"[It's] collaboration between teachers and coach, putting the coach’s ideas with the teachers ideas to come up with something better.”

“She tries to put her beliefs into our curriculum [but], our curriculum is very different…”

“Each coach is different … Some are more stubborn on it being “their way,” so we really need to work together.”

Providers often indicate they value coaches’ expertise and knowledge
- Particularly true for preparation for the ECERS review
  - ECERS incentives (part of Star Rating) seem to work against PC and appreciative inquiry approach
- Some providers indicated desire for more directive communication

“ECERS is very stressful for me. We only have 2-3 staff members and 3 were new staff. I contacted our coach for help. We sat down and she tried her best but I realized her training method was not going to work. She wanted the new staff, who had never worked a day in their life, to come in and ask her questions and it was not going to happen. It was too much … I needed support from her. It was hard, I’m still stressed out… She tried, but her method was not conducive with new staff. I kid you not.”
Providers highly value modeling

- Related to ECERS, but providers also suggest it would be valuable for CLASS and improving instructional interactions
  - Director: “I think modeling is important because it lets the teacher say the coach is not only talking the talk but also walking to walk.”
  - Teacher: “I am a visual learner. Model with me. Did you see what you did? Did you see your gestures? Did you see your face? Oh, I got it. Because it has been modeled for me and I think it would help for a lot of us if they would model, role play some of the stuff we are going to encounter, especially with the CLASS because I haven’t had the CLASS.”

Consistent, timely communication (verbal and written) is important.

Coaches often communicate successfully in very different programs

- Providers in different types of program said their communication with their coach was strong
- Effective methods cited:
  - Consistent visits, planned in advance
  - Timely email or telephone response and general information sharing
  - Prompt feedback and distribution of activity logs
  - Meeting with all teachers, supervisor, director
  - Relaying information between provider and LAUP
  - Attentive visits undistracted by phone or text
- A few providers noted methods such as:
  - Periodic meetings with coach off-site
  - Coach-facilitated video trainings

Providers see consistent and regular visits and communication as key

- Many providers value when coaches:
  - Plan ahead (some set visit schedule for the year)
  - Alert them in advance if changes necessary
- Different approaches used to schedule visits and apply routines to visit
- Providers whose coach visits monthly generally value this frequency, indicating:
  - Regular visits help them pursue goals, quality improvement
  - Consistent visits and work on goals linked with positive comments about relationship
Some providers indicate coaches do not visit them consistently or frequently:
- Don’t know if coach will come or not
- Feel schedule set at coach’s convenience
- Don’t know when coach is sick or on leave
- Are frustrated by inconsistency

Provider perception in some cases may be shaped by program structure and who coach works with

A few providers like shorter and less frequent visits

Some providers see coach as inconsistent

What providers said:

- “We have a schedule at the start of the school year, the coach leaves it with us. So we know or expect what will happen. She calls us with a reminder, or emails, ‘I’ll go to your site on this date.’ She emails everybody, emails with the teachers.”
- “I see her every month, and if I need I talk to her, we communicate on the phone or via email.”
- “...last year she came every month... and I would make changes and then make goals and slowly I was improving a lot. But this year, I have hardly seen her, maybe I’ve seen her three or four times at the most... I would like to see her more often now... With the new CLASS that they are going to observe, I would like her to coach me a little bit more because she was really helpful and now I want to improve in CLASS.”

Attentive, responsive coaches perceived as helpful to provider progress

What providers said:

- “She’s wonderful, our coach is wonderful, she is really observant, she’s very positive, has a lot of positive suggestions and gives positive feedback.”
- “If we send an email or make a call, we instantly have an answer.... Even after hours, she will respond every time!”
- “I know they are busy, I really do... but I feel like in the classroom they should give us their individual attention even if they are observing.... But they tend to text a lot, send each other messages a lot.... There are times when we have questions and they don’t have answers so they will text their coworkers, but there are times when they are constantly on their blackberry... If you came for those 3.5 hours you need to give those 3.5 hours to us, especially if you are only with me for once a month or whenever you come back.”
Program structure and scheduling pose challenges to implementing coaching and communicating.

- Gatekeepers: In some sites, coaches limited to communicating with director and/or lead teacher or supervisory staff
- Organizational complexity can make it difficult for coaches to establish strong relationships with teachers
  - Developing effective lines of communication
  - Sharing information with the appropriate people
  - Many teachers indicate they would prefer the coach has discussions with the full teaching team
- Provider turnover, coach changes

What coaches and providers said:

- Coach: “Sometimes I work directly with the teacher, but mostly I filter through the director.”
- Teachers:
  - “I heard that sometimes my Coach does meet with the Site Supervisor, but not with us. There is no communication.”
  - “Sometimes, for example in my case, I got to work early but my assistant came in later so the coach talked to me about details or resources, then I had to talk to my assistant. It’s better if she talks to us as a group. I would like it if she discussed it with our group.”

Who coaches spend time with varies

- Many work primarily with classroom teachers, coordinate with supervisors/directors
  - Some say they consider who needs the greatest help
  - Providers value direct coaching with teachers (leads and assistants)
- Program structures and schedules can make it challenging for coaches to work directly with all LAUP teachers
  - But teachers and some directors say they want more
  - And sometimes goals include agency goals, not only those co-created with teachers
What providers said:

- Teacher: “She spends some time with the director but then she’s in the classroom and we set goals...”
- Director: “When the coaches go to the sites, they sit with the teachers, talk about their goals, and follow up with them after observation. It’s really helped them. ... I agree with the way they do it, direct coaching with the teachers.”
- Teacher: “I’ve only seen her in my classroom once... I don’t know if I am supposed to call her to come to my classroom... She wanted to have time for just she and I to talk. It’s hard. I don’t see her much.”
- Lead teacher: “I’d like it to be not just me but all the teachers, so we don’t have to translate it to each other. I’m not sure how it would work. Her work performance is fine, I would just like separate time for the teacher group without the kids.”

What providers and coaches said:

- “My coach makes sure to come as scheduled and has met several times with all of us teachers, not just the lead teachers—she brings everyone on board.”
- “At the start of the year, we plan what is expected for the year. She meets with teachers and she gives me back a report. We have very good communication with her, open. Once a year we meet, just me and her, to plan for the future, for the next year.”
- “The best time to get feedback is right away. Like with the activity log: I will remember today, not tomorrow. I am not going to remember what happened today tomorrow.”
- “It’s tricky with big agencies. It’s hard to keep everyone in loop, especially with turnover. I’m emailing activity logs to everyone. This is provider specific.”

Program structures, coaching reporting systems can challenge communication

- Different program structures can pose different communication challenges; staff schedules and turnover contribute to this
  - Larger centers with more complex communication channels can limit coaches’ ability to work with teachers
  - FCCs, in particular, may face difficulties finding “kid-free” time
- Activity logs may be less effective than they could be
  - Not always shared among teachers and other key staff in timely fashion (lack of working printers can make immediate distribution difficult)
  - Log format emphasizes accountability elements (e.g., attendance) more than goals and progress—the medium may be the message
  - Different levels of specificity in the log
- LEO is cumbersome to use, lacks flexibility

Juggling accountability demands for both coaches and providers

- For coaches:
  - Consistent monthly visits and feedback
  - Timely recording in logs and LEO
  - Integrating evolving LAUP requirements into coaching
  - Coaching within complex program contexts (providers’ accountability requirements)
- For providers:
  - Impact/incentives of ECERS, CLASS, and star ratings
  - Multiple masters to serve within programs
    • Directors/supervisors/other coaches
    • Varied funders and requirements (including LAUP)
Providers value many aspects of coaching and generally want more of it.

Providers value many aspects of coaching

- Providers especially value:
  - Consistency and reliability from coach
  - Coach’s ability to provide perspective on classroom interactions and environment
  - Coach’s supportive presence - sense that the coach understands their situation and is in their corner (“our cheerleader”)  
  - Coach’s expertise and knowledge in the field
  - Assistance with ECERS
  - Inside line to LAUP (information and logistical assistance)

- Providers also appreciate when coach:
  - Acts as advocate/mediator with own program director
  - Provides additional resources

Providers and coaches reflect a range of perceptions about the coaches’ role

- Supportive friend and ally
- Link to LAUP
- Advocate
- Source of ECERS training
- Relatively distant person who provides intermittent but valuable advice and information
- Potential monitor or judge
- Some providers suggest they do not understand the coaches’ role

Providers like coaching, and many would like more …..

- Frequent visits (monthly or twice monthly, especially for new teachers)
- Time for feedback for classroom teachers
- Communication with all staff
- Responsiveness, timeliness, and reliability
- Help with parent engagement (e.g., talking to parents monthly)
- Support for working with children with special needs
- Information/research/resources
- Support for CLASS/ECERS preparation
LAUP Coaching in the Context of the Literature

Overview

- Purpose: Identify aspects of coaching important for positive outcomes for children and providers
  - Consider how LAUP model coincides
- Approach: Systematic review focusing on coaching in early childhood settings
  - Research review
  - Expert input

Coaching Approaches Vary

- Provided one-on-one or in small groups
- Face-to-face or technologically-mediated
- One time or in a series of sessions
- Supports new practice/curricula or current practice/curricula
- Expert model → peer-to-peer
- Etc.

Coaching Approaches Include Multiple Components

- Coaching often done in conjunction with pre-service or in-service activities
- Experimental studies often randomized by factors other than coaching receipt (e.g., curriculum)
Coaching is typically...

- Ongoing
- Individualized
- Builds on strengths
- Reciprocal between teachers and coaches
- Non-evaluative

- AIR 2001
- It is also goal-focused (NAEYC 2011).

Coaching Elements in LAUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic from literature*</th>
<th>Enactment in LAUP model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Coaches and providers meet multiple times during the year; variation in frequency of interactions, however</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>Coaches work with providers to set their own goals; flexibility in how coaches support providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds on strengths</td>
<td>The degree to which coaches aim to build on provider strengths is unclear, given variability in approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal between teachers and coaches</td>
<td>Model is intended to be reciprocal; however, the study cannot address whether this is the case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-evaluative</td>
<td>Coaches do not directly evaluate providers; however, LAUP’s Quality Rating System has implications for the focus of coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-focused</td>
<td>Coaches report goals for all providers in LEO; the number of goals, degree to which goals are carried out, and ways goals evolve vary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: AIR 2001; NAEYC 2011

Five Practice Characteristics of Coaching Models

- Joint planning
- Observation
  - Coach observes – Opportunity for later reflection
  - Coach is observed – Modeling
- Action/practice – based on discussion and/or practice with coach
- Reflection – analysis of existing strategies
- Feedback
  - Affirmative
  - Recommendations

Hanft et al. 2004

Key Factors Associated with Coaching

- Time devoted to and available for coaching
- Variability in how coaching is implemented
- The coach-provider relationship
- Provider engagement
- Specificity and focus of coaching
- Provider mental health
Time Devoted to and Available for Coaching

**Coaching literature**
- Time is a critical challenge for coaches.
- Coaching duration and intensity are important for uptake in instructional practices and for influencing child outcomes.

**In LAUP**
- Coaches report that finding enough time for all of their teaching groups is difficult.
- Providers desire more coaching time. They note consistency of coaching visits as important for the success of their work with the coach.

Variability in How Coaching is Implemented

**Coaching literature**
- There is inconsistency in how coaches spend their time and in expectations of their duties.

**In LAUP**
- There are standard expectations for all coaches (e.g., monthly on-site visits; completion of activity logs; use process consultation and appreciative inquiry).
- However, by definition, process consultation allows flexibility in approach.

The Coach-Provider Relationship

**Coaching literature**
- Relationship building and respect for providers as important
- Ability to define the coaching role also helpful to supporting the relationship

**In LAUP**
- The coach-provider relationship is viewed as the foundation for all work together
- Coaches and providers typically spoke positively of their relationships with one another, and indicated that they saw this as a precondition for their work together

Active Engagement and Involvement of Providers

**Coaching literature**
- Active engagement and involvement of providers as important
  - "The more actively involved the learners were in judging the consequences of their learning experiences (evaluate, reflection, and mastery), the stronger the relationship between the adult learning method characteristics and the study outcome." (Trivette, Dunst, Hamby, and O’Herin, 2009, p. 6)

**In LAUP**
- Active engagement is characteristic of process consultation and is valued by many
- Some also prefer or utilize more directive approaches
Specificity and Focus of Coaching

**Coaching literature**

- Efforts that are specific and targeted may be most effective
- Pianta points out that from his work it seems crucial to have coaching that is “aligned and targeted to a standardized lens, language, and metric for classroom practice.”

**In LAUP**

- LAUP does not dictate a specific coaching focus
- Coaches work with providers to identify their own vision and set their own goals
- Coaches have flexibility in supporting providers

Summary of Pilot Study Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic from literature</th>
<th>Enactment in LAUP model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time devoted to and available for coaching</td>
<td>Limited evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability in how coaching is implemented</td>
<td>Limited evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach-provider relationship</td>
<td>Prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider engagement</td>
<td>Prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity and focus of coaching</td>
<td>Limited evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion