The Quality Start Los Angeles Developmental Evaluation

Technical Appendix

CELIA J. GOMEZ, ANAMARIE A. WHITAKER, JILL S. CANNON,
SUSANNAH FAXON-MILLS, MALLIKA BHANDARKAR

RAND
CORPORATION

The RAND Corporation is a research organization that develops solutions to public policy challenges to help make communities throughout the world safer and more secure, healthier and more prosperous. RAND is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and committed to the public interest.

RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

Support RAND
Make a tax-deductible charitable contribution at
www.rand.org/giving/contribute

www.rand.org

Preface

Quality Start Los Angeles (QSLA) is a county-level quality rating and improvement system that supports center-based and family child care providers serving children from birth to age five. The RAND Corporation conducted a developmental evaluation focused on selected QSLA components. This technical appendix describes the data sources and methods and presents data tables from the developmental evaluation.

This study was undertaken by RAND Education and Labor, a division of the RAND Corporation that conducts research on early childhood through postsecondary education programs, workforce development, and programs and policies affecting workers, entrepreneurship, and financial literacy and decisionmaking. This study was sponsored by First 5 Los Angeles.

More information about RAND can be found at www.rand.org. Questions about this report should be directed to Celia Gomez at cgomez@rand.org, and questions about RAND Education and Labor should be directed to educationandlabor@rand.org.

Contents

Tables

1. Introduction

This technical appendix describes the data sources and methods and presents data tables from the developmental evaluation of Quality Start Los Angeles (QSLA). The appendix is organized in three sections: (1) data sources and methods; (2) developmental evaluation research questions; and (3) data tables.

2. Data Sources and Methods

In this chapter, we discuss the data sources, data-collection procedures, samples, and analytic techniques used in the evaluation. The text presented here draws heavily from the "Data, Sample, and Methods" section of the main report and includes additional detail.

Data Sources and Data-Collection Waves

To address the study research questions described in the main report, the RAND team engaged in primary data collection and analysis of the following seven data sources:

1. early learning provider survey
2. QSLA administrative data
3. interviews with key QSLA stakeholders and leaders
4. focus groups with early learning provider focus groups
5. focus groups with technical assistants (TAs)
6. focus groups and interviews with coaches
7. observations of coaching sessions.

Data collection and analysis for the evaluation took place over two waves; wave 1 was conducted from February to June 2019, and wave 2 was conducted from February to March 2020. We addressed all research questions in both waves. However, the information collected in wave 2 was intended to delve deeper into the evaluation topics and research questions that QSLA stakeholders felt were not fully addressed in wave 1. As we describe below, we engaged in some data-collection activities during one wave only and other activities in both waves. The two data collection waves roughly line up with two different QSLA program years, which run from July 1 to June 30. Data collection during wave 1 largely focused on providers' experiences during the 2018–2019 program year (July 2018 to June 2019), and the wave 2 data collection focused on the 2019–2020 program year (July 2019 to June 2020).

Early Learning Provider Survey

During April and May 2019, in wave 1, we fielded an online provider survey to QSLA sites. The purpose of the survey was to gather information about providers' perspectives on their tier ratings, assessment technical assistance, and coaching. A total of 816 QSLA program sites (636 centers and 180 family child care [FCC] providers) were included in the survey invitations sent to program staff; these sites represented all enrolled QSLA programs as of April 2019. Early care and education (ECE) program staff in four different categories were eligible to take the survey: (1) center directors or other administrators (such as principals or supervisors who oversee multiple centers), (2) center lead teachers, (3) center assistant teachers, and (4) FCC owners. At

the time of the evaluation, QSLA system leaders lacked a comprehensive, up-to-date list of all staff employed at the programs. Similarly, individual contact information for all staff (e.g., email addresses) was not available; we had access to contact information only for center directors or administrators and FCC owners. Using existing records provided by QSLA partners, we estimated that 3,297 staff across the four named categories were employed at the 816 sites; this figure was used to estimate approximate response rates.

Survey invitations with site-specific survey links were sent directly to FCC owners and to center directors and administrators. The center directors and administrators were instructed to forward the invitation to the lead and assistant teachers at their sites. In addition, QSLA coaches aided in survey recruitment by distributing flyers with site-specific survey links when they visited sites for coaching sessions. One staff member per FCC (i.e., the FCC owner) was eligible to take the survey, whereas the number of staff members per center who were eligible for the survey was determined by the estimated number of directors and/or administrators and lead and assistant teachers at each center (based on QSLA records). Respondents were categorized as having only one possible role. Respondents had the option to take the survey in either Spanish or English.

The survey contained 50 questions, including multiple-choice and open-ended questions. In total, the survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete; however, respondents were routed to certain questions depending on their staff role. Not all respondents received all questions. In general, all respondents were eligible to answer questions related to tier perceptions. Questions regarding assessment technical assistance support were limited to center directors and FCC providers. Questions regarding program coaching were limited to center teachers and FCC providers. The sample sizes reported in the survey data tables (see Chapter 4) reflect the differences in samples across questions in addition to any other skip patterns, such as not answering further questions if a respondent indicated that they had zero months of coaching received.

We describe the survey sample in Table 2.1. We received 2,228 survey submissions but excluded 65 of these respondents from analysis because we had discrepant information on their program type. Specifically, these respondents indicated on the survey that they were an FCC, but our source data from the QSLA partners indicated that they worked at a center. We could not reconcile these inconsistencies confidently and we lacked information about their staff role if they indeed worked in a center, so we excluded them in order to avoid misreporting information. After removing the 65 cases, the remaining 2,163 respondents represented 598 sites, or 73 percent of QSLA sites, including 58 percent of FCCs and 78 percent of centers. The provider response rate was 66 percent based on the estimated total of 3,297 providers. In the final sample of 2,163 respondents, center lead and assistant teachers made up the majority of the respondents (77 percent), with FCC owners and center directors or administrators comprising the rest of the sample.

Table 2.1. Early Learning Provider Survey Sample

Early Learning Provider Type	Number of Sites or Staff Respondents	Percentage of Total Survey Respondents	Percentage of QSLA population
Site level			
FCCs	105	21%	58%
Centers	493	79%	78%
Total	598	100%	73%
Staff level			
FCC owners	105	5%	N/A
Center directors and administrators	394	18%	N/A
Center lead teachers	892	41%	N/A
Center assistant teachers	772	36%	N/A
Total	2,163	100%	66%

NOTES: N/A = not applicable. The percentage of the QSLA population estimates are based on an estimate of 816 sites (180 FCCs and 636 centers) and 3,297 providers (across all roles).

Multiple-choice survey questions were analyzed for overall proportions of eligible respondents indicating answers, as well as by program type (i.e., FCC or center). Eligible respondents included those who were administered a particular question based on the skip patterns within the survey questions. The level of missing data from eligible respondents was very small for each question (i.e., less than 1 percent). Open-ended responses for several survey questions were coded into broad themes for additional analysis of perceptions.

iPinwheel Administrative Data

We used administrative data from iPinwheel, QSLA's centralized administrative database, to conduct analyses on two topics: (1) assessment technical assistance and (2) coaching. The database is managed by the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), but all implementation partners have access to the database as necessary. TAs and coaches access the database directly to enter information about the technical assistance and coaching supports provided to QSLA sites. For these analyses, we used data that were extracted from iPinwheel in March 2020; this included programmatic data entered from March 2019 through February 2020.

Assessment Technical Assistance Analyses

We conducted analyses of QSLA sites' assessment technical assistance experiences, including how much support they received and the topics discussed during the support. The sampling frame included sites that were in the assessment process from March 2019 through February 2020. We selected these dates because they reflect the time frame when QSLA

stakeholders believed that the assessment technical assistance supports were being implemented as intended.

The data set is at the assessment technical assistance contact level; there is one data point for each time a TA made contact with a site. The data included deidentified site IDs to track assessment technical support contacts at each site. All information was recorded by the TAs. The following variables were used in the analyses:

- **date:** the date of the contact
- **contact mode:** a categorical variable indicating whether the contact was in-person, over the phone, or via email
- **contact duration:** an incremental variable measuring the length of the contact in minutes
- **topics:** a set of categorical variables indicating the topics addressed; TAs can select up to five topics per contact (see Table 3 in the full report for the list of topics)
- **notes:** qualitative notes regarding the TAs' thoughts on the session; notes also included whether the session or contact was cancelled or if the contact was related to scheduling (and thus not substantive).

The data set also contains the following site-level variables:

- **provider type:** a binary variable identifying sites as either center-based providers or FCCs
- **center type**: a categorical variable identifying the following six kinds of center-based providers: Head Start, public school district, for-profit organization, nonprofit organization, college or university, and other. We collapsed this variable into three mutually exclusive categories: (1) Head Start, (2) public school district, and (3) other community setting. The first two categories correspond exactly to the raw data, and the last category subsumes the remaining options from the raw data
- **assessment date**: the date of the site visit associated with each sites' most recent quality assessment
- **tier rating date**: the date each site was sent their tier rating report.

We included 437 sites, with approximately 2,700 records of assessment technical assistance in the data set. We conducted analyses separately for pre-assessment technical assistance, which is support that occurred in preparation for the assessment, and post-assessment technical assistance, which is support that occurred after the assessment. For the majority of sites, we identified the pre-assessment technical assistance as the contacts that took place at any point prior to or on the site visit date. However, because of the timing of the data download for the study, there were some sites that had received pre-assessment technical assistance but whose site visit dates had not yet been logged in the data set. QSLA stakeholders identified these sites ($n =$ 164); although their site visit dates had not been observed in the data set, all assessment technical assistance records for these sites were counted as pre-assessment support. All 437 sites were included in the pre-assessment technical assistance analysis.

According to the QSLA model, post-assessment technical assistance can occur anytime following the assessment date through one month following the receipt of the tier rating report.

To ensure that we were accounting for the full post-assessment support window, we excluded sites whose tier rating dates had not yet been recorded or sites for whom a full month following their tier rating date had not elapsed ($n = 215$). In addition, our analyses did not include 89 sites with a tier rating date and no record of any post-assessment technical assistance. As a result, we included 133 sites in the post-assessment technical assistance analysis.

For both the pre- and post-assessment technical assistance analyses, we produced descriptive statistics on support dosage (i.e., total duration of all contacts per site), number of assessment technical assistance contacts per site, and the topics addressed across contacts for the full sample and disaggregated by provider and center type. Dosage analyses were conducted at the site level; all other analyses were conducted at the contact level. We excluded contacts that appeared from the notes fields to focus on cancellations or scheduling. We also excluded contacts that were missing data on duration (< 1 percent of TA contacts). Email contacts were excluded from the dosage analyses but were included in the total number of contacts and topic analysis.

Coaching Analyses

We conducted analyses of QSLA sites' coaching experiences, including how much support the sites received, how many and which staff members attended the sessions, what topics were discussed, and what methods were used during the contacts. The sampling frame included sites that received coaching from July 2019 through February 2020; we selected this time frame because it represented all possible months of coaching during the 2019–2020 program year for which data were available.

Like the assessment technical assistance data set, this data set is at the coaching contact level; there is one data point for each time a coach made contact with a site. The data included deidentified site IDs to track coaching support contacts at each site. All information is recorded by the coaches. The following variables were used in the analyses:

- **date:** the date of the contact
- **contact mode:** a categorical variable indicating whether the contact was in-person, over the phone, or via email
- **contact duration:** an incremental variable measuring the length of the contact in minutes
- **topics:** a set of categorical variables indicating the topics addressed; coaches can select up to five topics per contact (see Table 4.13 for the list of topics)
- **methods:** a set of binary variables indicating the methods addressed; coaches can select as many methods as were used (see Figure 6 in the main report for the list of methods)
- **attendees:** a set of variables listing unique staff identification numbers for the providers who attended each in-person session
- **notes:** qualitative notes regarding the coaches' thoughts on the session; notes also included whether the session or contact was cancelled or if the contact was related to scheduling (and thus not substantive).

The data set contained the same site-level variables as listed in the TA section, along with the number of classrooms per site. We also made use of a staff-level data set that contained a unique identification number for each staff member at the enrolled QSLA programs and a categorical variable identifying their titles. The data set contained more than 50 staff titles. We created the following mutually exclusive title categories, combining across titles in the data set that we deemed to indicate similar roles:

- **center directors or administrators** includes staff titles that indicated site- or agency-level director or administrative roles, such as *director/center manager–single site, center manager, campus manager,* and *education coordinator*[1]
- **lead teachers** includes staff titles that indicated lead or head teacher roles, such as *head teacher, teacher,* or *lead teacher*
- **assistant teachers** includes staff titles that indicated supportive teaching roles and roles for interns or students, such as *assistant, assistant teacher/aide, floater,* or *student teacher/intern*
- **FCC owner** includes the staff titles *owner/operator of a licensed family child care* [provider]*, childcare provider/owner,* and *owner or owner/director* (when these titles were logged for a visit at an FCC)
- **other** includes staff titles that indicated other ECE staff roles that did not fit into any of the categories above and were less likely to receive coaching, such as *substitute teacher, specialists: special education/intervention/trainer,* and *program worker (janitorial, cook, etc.)*.

We included 812 sites with more 14,000 records (or logs) of coaching in the data set. We produced descriptive statistics on support dosage (i.e., duration of coaching contacts), the number of coaching contacts, the number of staff who attended the sessions, the type of staff who attended the sessions, and the topics and methods selected. The dosage analyses were conducted at the site level. Because of data quality issues, we could not identify total dosage for a given individual classroom in a site. To derive the average minutes of coaching per site per classroom, we summed the duration of coaching contacts per site and divided by the total number of classrooms at each site. All other analyses were conducted at the coaching contact level. We excluded contacts that appeared to focus on cancellations or scheduling based on entered comments in the notes field. We also excluded contacts that were missing data on duration (< 1 percent of coaching contacts). Email contacts were excluded from the dosage analyses but were included in the total number of contacts and topic analysis. The analyses on the number and type of staff who participated in coaching sessions included only in-person contacts. The analyses focused on describing who attended the coaching sessions were limited by data quality. Approximately 50 percent of the staff listed in the staff-level data set were missing a value on the staff title variable; therefore, their titles were unknown. As a result, it was not

---

[1] The italicized titles in this list represent the exact titles from the raw iPinwheel data set.

possible to identify the title of the coaching attendees in 20 percent of logs across 106 sites; these logs were excluded from the analysis of the types of staff who participated in coaching.

Focus Groups and Interviews

In both wave 1 and wave 2, we conducted interviews and focus groups with a variety of different populations, including QSLA stakeholders, early learning providers, TAs, and coaches.

QSLA Stakeholders

To learn about QSLA in general, and specifically about the components of the QSLA model that were the focus of the evaluation, we interviewed key QSLA stakeholders in wave 1 who could offer broad perspectives on the system. From February to March 2019, we extended invitations for interviews to 17 stakeholders. The sample was selected collaboratively between RAND researchers and the QSLA leaders managing the evaluation to represent individuals with high-level perspectives on the design of the QSLA model. The sample included members of the QSLA Architects group, supervisors who managed coaches and/or TAs, research managers, and agency directors. In total, we interviewed 16 QSLA stakeholders representing five of the seven agencies that govern QSLA (First 5 Los Angeles, LACOE, Child 360, Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles [CCALA], and Child Care Planning Committee [CCPC]). The 17th individual was unable to complete an interview. Over the course of approximately 60-minute phone or in-person interviews, we asked questions about the goals of QSLA in general, along with specific questions about assessment technical assistance, coaching, and tier ratings.

Early Learning Providers

During both wave 1 and wave 2, we conducted focus groups with early learning providers to gain more-detailed information about their QSLA experiences. We describe the wave 1 and wave 2 provider focus group samples in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2. Early Learning Provider Focus Group Sample

	All Focus Groups	By Provider Type			
		Mixed Staff (wave 1)	FCC Owners (wave 2)	Center Directors (wave 2)	Center Teachers (wave 2)
Number of focus groups	15	2	3	5	5
In-person	10	2	1	4	3
By phone	5	0	2	1	2
Total number of participants	47	8	8	17	14

During wave 1, we recruited participants from the survey respondents who indicated that they would like to be contacted about future focus groups. We sent a focus group invitation to 90 respondents. We held two focus groups total, with four participants each. Each group contained a mix of roles. Two FCC providers and two center directors participated in the first focus group, and the second focus group comprised two center directors, one center lead teacher, and one FCC provider. The wave 1 focus groups took place in person, were conducted in English, and lasted approximately 90 minutes. We asked providers in-depth questions about their QSLA experience, including their satisfaction with assessment technical assistance, their thoughts on the assessment process and their tier ratings, and their perspective on the coaching support they received.

The wave 1 focus groups offered rich information, but were limited in sample size. In wave 2 (February to March 2020), we conducted 13 additional focus groups with early learning providers to broaden our understanding of the provider experience. We aimed to invite all QSLA providers enrolled in the 2019–2020 program. To do so, we advertised the focus groups via a variety of QSLA communication channels (e.g., newsletter and email lists); interested providers were directed to a link for an interest survey that allowed them to express their desire to participate in a focus group and provide their contact information. Using the information collected on the interest survey, we sent focus group invitations to a total of 348 providers to participate in the wave 2 focus groups.

Unlike the mixed staff role groups in wave 1, in wave 2, we scheduled groups for three different kinds of providers: FCC owners (three groups), center directors or administrators (five groups), and center lead and assistant teachers (five groups). A total of 39 providers attended the focus groups (with two to seven participants per group). We intended for all focus groups to take place in person, but the stay-at-home orders beginning in March 2020 associated with the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic forced us to change how some of the groups were held. In total, six groups took place in person and seven took place over the phone; all lasted approximately 90 minutes. All but two focus groups were conducted entirely in English; one FCC provider focus group was conducted in both English and Spanish, and another FCC focus group was conducted only in Spanish. We asked providers similar questions to those posed

in wave 1, although we probed on different topics. For example, in wave 2, we asked about how different types of staff participate in coaching.

Technical Assistants

In both wave 1 and wave 2, we held focus groups with all of the QSLA TAs, as noted in the main report. During wave 1, there were six TAs (four employed by Child360 and two by CCALA); by wave 2, Child360 had hired one additional TA, for a total of seven. In each wave, we held one 60-minute focus group with the TAs at each coaching partner, for a total of four focus groups across the evaluation; three were held in-person and one over the phone. In both waves, we asked the TAs to describe the support they offered to early learning providers, focusing on the strengths, weaknesses, and utility of assessment technical assistance. Conducting focus groups across both waves allowed us to learn more about the assessment technical assistance support services, which were new as of the 2018–2019 program year and that matured over the course of the evaluation.

Coaches

In both wave 1 and wave 2, we held focus groups or interviews with a sample of QSLA coaches. Like for the TAs, we conducted data collection separately for the two coaching partner agencies and followed a recruitment plan with which they were most comfortable. In both the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 program years, there were about 100 coaches employed across the two organizations. For Child360, the RAND research team managed the recruitment process. In both waves, Child360 supplied a list of all coaches (approximately 60 coaches in each wave). We extended a focus group invitation to 25 randomly selected coaches. In wave 2, we excluded the coaches who had been selected to participate in wave 1. In both waves, eight unique coaches (16 total) accepted the invitations and attended the in-person, 60-minute focus groups. CCALA conducted the recruitment for its coaches, both selecting the participants and inviting them to attend the scheduled groups. In wave 1, seven coaches attended an in-person focus group. In wave 2, an in-person focus group was not possible because of COVID-19; instead, we conducted individual phone interviews with eight coaches. In total, we spoke to 28 coaches, or approximately 30 percent of all QSLA coaches. Across all focus groups and interviews in both waves, we asked the coaches to describe the support they offer to early learning providers, focusing on the strengths and weaknesses of the QSLA coaching model. Collecting data from coaches in both waves allowed us to sample a larger share of the coach population over time and address multiple topics in detail. There was some variation in the topics covered across waves, in part because of the evolving interests of the QSLA stakeholders. For example, the focus group questions in wave 1 (as compared with wave 2) focused more on coaching dosage, while in wave 2, we put greater focus on understanding which staff participated in coaching.

Qualitative Analysis

All interviews and focus groups were conducted by RAND staff and were audio recorded, transcribed, and translated into English (for those focus groups that were conducted either entirely or partially in Spanish). Five team members coded and analyzed the transcripts. The coding scheme reflected the project's core research questions and evaluation topics on the assessment process, assessment technical assistance, tier ratings, and coaching. To ensure consistency and reliability in the coding process, we conducted a coding calibration exercise at the start of the process in which the team coded the same transcript independently and compared coding application. Throughout the coding process, the coders regularly communicated about issues related to code definitions and coding decisions. Analysis involved thematically grouping the coded data. RAND team members read across the data coded to similar topics for emerging themes related to the implementation of the QSLA model. Once the key themes were developed, we documented their prevalence and variation in the sample. We counted the number of focus groups in which at least one participant endorsed the key themes. In addition, we explored whether the themes were endorsed only by certain participant groups, such as FCCs or center teachers.

Coaching Session Observations

To better understand the nature of the coaching supports in the QSLA model, we conducted observations of 12 coaching sessions during wave 1 data collection. The RAND research team developed a structured observation protocol designed to capture the content of the coaching session. The tool included items to capture the presence and absence of coaching topics addressed, methods used, and the nature of the provider-coach relationship. In addition, observers took running qualitative notes throughout the session. To our knowledge, there were no validated observation tools for coaching in ECE or K–12 education settings. Therefore, we developed the tool drawing on existing protocols designed to capture coaching-like interventions in settings with young children, such as home visiting interventions designed to support parenting skills.[2] We piloted the observation tool in two coaching sessions prior to data collection; the pilot suggested that the tool allowed us to collect the desired information about the nature of the coaching sessions.

The RAND research team worked with the QSLA coaching partners to develop a recruitment process. The coaching partners provided a list of more than 100 possible sessions. We sampled 12 sessions, aiming for diversity across the coaching partners and providers. The 12 sessions included 12 unique coach-provider dyads selected in collaboration with the QSLA coaching partners to represent provider diversity. We observed two sessions with FCCs and ten sessions at

---

[2] See Sara Schodt, James Parr, Maria Caridad Araujo, and Marta Rubio-Codina, *Measuring the Quality of Home-Visiting Services: A Review of the Literature*, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, October 2015.

centers. Five of the sessions included both a classroom portion and an out-of-the-classroom debrief conversation between the coach and provider; seven sessions included a debrief conversation only. Eight sessions were conducted entirely in English, one session was conducted entirely in Spanish, and the remaining three sessions featured both languages. Three members of the RAND research team conducted all observations, which lasted an average of 75 minutes. The small number of observations was not intended to represent the QSLA provider population; rather, the observations provided a more in-depth look at coaching on the ground than the other data sources could offer. To analyze the data, we aggregated information across the 12 observations to tabulate the different topics and methods observed. In addition, we read across the qualitative notes to provide illustrative examples of how coaches applied different methods or addressed topics in action.

3. Developmental Evaluation Research Questions

As we describe in the full report, the developmental evaluation had an initial 22 research questions that were developed collaboratively between RAND researchers and QSLA leaders. Throughout the developmental evaluation, it became apparent that some research questions could not be answered given the available data or that some questions could be combined. Additionally, and as expected, the QSLA model changed throughout the course of the evaluation, and some of the research questions—specifically, those focused on QSLA components that are no longer offered to providers (e.g., specialized coaching services beyond program coaching)— were not relevant. Thus, we have consolidated the study research questions into a list of ten organized under two broad headings: (1) the assessment process and tier ratings and (2) coaching (see Table 1 in the main report).

For reference, we list the complete set of 22 developmental evaluation research questions below:

1. What type and amount of assessment technical assistance was provided to ECE programs participating in QSLA? How closely did the support follow the program design?
2. How did programs experience assessment technical assistance? To what extent are technical assistance providers perceived to be available and knowledgeable by programs?
3. What were the perceptions of the technical assistance providers about the support they provided to programs?
4. To what extent is assessment technical assistance related to the number and type of technical reviews requested by programs?
5. To what extent are agencies (or providers) requesting and receiving agency-level technical assistance? How, if at all, is agency-level technical assistance communicated to the individual site level?
6. What are programs' perceptions of the assessment process?
7. What are programs' perceptions about their tier ratings?
8. To what extent do programs understand their tier ratings and the rationale for their ratings?
9. What concerns do programs have about the accuracy or fairness of their tier ratings?
10. How did programs experience coaching? To what extent are coaches perceived to be available and knowledgeable by programs?
11. How closely does the implemented program coaching align with the program design?
12. What typifies program coaching? What happens during a typical visit? What are typical interactions?
13. What does program coaching look like throughout the course of the year? What are its various phases?
14. How and to what extent do program and specialty coaches coordinate to support programs?
15. How closely do the implemented program coaching and specialty coaching dosages match the prescribed dosages?

16. Do program and specialty coaches and programs perceive the implemented dosage to be sufficient?
17. What factors affect the ability to implement the prescribed dosage?
18. How do programs make decisions about the type of specialty coaching they would like to receive?
19. How is the QSLA coaching model working in conjunction with existing coaches?
20. In what ways are site directors, other administrators, and assistant teachers involved in program coaching?
21. What is the landscape of other programs providing coaching services to early learning providers in Los Angeles County? What does this coaching consist of? Who receives these coaching services?
22. How do program characteristics and types affect the early learning programs' experiences of QSLA? Specifically, how does coaching differ, if at all, across center type (e.g., school districts compared with community programs)? Are certain aspects of QSLA perceived as more or less beneficial for FCCs? How does coaching differ for FCCs compared with center staff?

4. Data Tables

In this chapter, we present the data tables referenced in the full report; these tables contain results from the early learning provider survey and administrative data analysis.

Table 4.1. Average Pre-Assessment Technical Assistance Dosage, by Provider Type

	Dosage in Minutes			Average Number of Contacts				
	In-Person	Phone	Total	In-Person	Phone	Email	Total	N
All QSLA sites	249	18	267	2.45	0.94	2.11	5.5	437
Center-based care	237	20	256	2.29	1.01	2.43	5.74	335
Head Start	79	10	88	0.8	0.64	3	4.44	25
Public school district	237	16	252	2.12	0.92	3.2	6.24	150
Other community-based center	261	25	287	2.69	1.16	1.79	5.64	160
FCC	291	13	304	2.97	0.71	1.04	4.72	102

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.

Table 4.2. Average Post-Assessment Technical Assistance Dosage, by Provider Type

	Dosage in Minutes			Average Number of Contacts				
	In-Person	Phone	Total	In-Person	Phone	Email	Total	N
All QSLA sites	16	14	30	0.25	0.7	1.37	2.32	133
Center-based care	9	16	25	0.13	0.77	1.63	2.54	104
Head Start				Data suppressed; n < 5				
Public school district	2	10	11	0.02	0.5	1.67	2.19	42
Other community-based center	15	20	35	0.22	0.95	1.73	2.9	60
FCC	38	8	46	0.66	0.45	0.41	1.52	29

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.

Table 4.3. Providers' Perceptions of the Amount of Technical Assistance Support

Perception	All Respondents (%)
Generally enough to address my questions and/or needs	83
Sometimes, but I needed more or a different form of contact for some topics	12
Rarely enough to address my questions and/or needs	5

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTE: The sample size is 244. Survey question: In your opinion, was the type and amount of contact with your Technical Assistant (TA) enough to address your questions and/or needs?

Table 4.4. Challenges Providers Experienced with Technical Assistance Support

	All Respondents (%)
No challenges	71
At least one challenge	29
Limited time to meet with the TA (in person and/or by phone)[a]	48
Not enough information, materials, and/or resources provided **after** tier rating[a]	32
Not enough review of my program's tier rating report[a]	30
Not enough information, materials, and/or resources to help prepare for the rating process[a]	24
Not enough contact with the TA (e.g., TA unavailable or unresponsive)[a]	21
The TA could not answer my questions most of the time[a]	14
My TA and I were not compatible (e.g., our workstyles and/or personalities were not a match)[a]	7
Other[a]	17

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTE: The sample size is 244: 173 = no challenges and 71 = at least one challenge. Group sample sizes are center = 139, FCC = 105. Survey question: Did you experience any challenges with the Technical Assistance support you received?
[a] Percentages reported for each specific challenge are based on the denominator of 71 respondents (29 percent) who indicated at least one challenge from the list, so percentages indicate which of the listed challenges were reported more often given that at least one challenge was experienced.

Table 4.5. Providers' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of Technical Assistance Topics

	Very Helpful (%)	Somewhat Helpful (%)	Not Helpful (%)	Did Not Discuss This Topic (%)	N
Documentation requirements for assessment/rating	73	22	2	3	244
QSLA assessment and data-collection process	73	22	2	2	243
The ECE registry documents	72	22	2	4	242
Review of all elements of the California quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) Rating Matrix	71	22	3	5	244
Overview of the welcome kit	69	20	3	8	244
Collection of staff qualifications and professional development hours	69	24	2	5	244
Accessing provider trainings	66	22	2	11	244
Coaching expectations	65	22	2	11	243
Scheduling of assessments with Child360 or the University of California, Los Angeles	63	25	3	9	243
Quality improvement grant and/or quality achievement award	59	21	3	17	244
Common data elements survey	50	26	2	23	242
Accessing parent education events and R&Rs	46	27	4	23	243

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTE: Totals across a given row may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. Survey question: How helpful were the following topic discussions with your Technical Assistant (TA)? R&R = Resources and Referral Agencies.

Table 4.6. Providers' Perceptions That Tier Ratings Accurately Reflect Program Quality

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Unsure (%)	N
All respondents	59	27	13	1,277
Tier 1	57	17	26	23
Tier 2	36	48	16	88
Tier 3	36	46	18	446
Tier 4	74	15	11	573
Tier 5	89	5	6	147
N	759	346	172	

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTE: Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. Excludes respondents who said that they do not know their rating level. Survey question: In your opinion, does your site's current Tier Rating accurately reflect the quality of the program?

Table 4.7. Average Monthly Coaching Dosage Per Classroom Per Site

	Dosage in Minutes			Average Number of Contacts				
	In-Person	Phone	Total	In-Person	Phone	Email	Total	N
All QSLA sites	81.3	0.5	81.8	0.8	0	0	0.8	812
Center-based care	77.1	0.4	77.5	0.7	0	0	0.7	638
Head Start	73	0.1	73.3	0.7	0	0	0.7	59
Public school district	81.4	0.4	81.8	0.7	0	0	0.8	298
Other community-based center	73.6	0.3	73.9	0.7	0	0	0.7	281
FCC	96.1	1.3	97.4	0.9	0	0	1	174

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.

Table 4.8. Average Coaching Dosage Per Classroom Per Site, by Month (July 2019–February 2020)

	Dosage in Minutes								
	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	N
All QSLA sites	63	87	99	95	85	67	79	79	812
Center-based care	45	75	94	94	87	69	79	78	638
Head Start	31	64	71	96	89	79	91	66	59
Public school district	33	83	108	97	93	73	84	84	298
Other community-based center	60	68	85	90	81	63	70	75	281
FCC	132	132	115	98	80	62	80	81	174

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.

Table 4.9. Providers' Opinions About the Amount of Program Coaching Required

	All Respondents (%)
About right	80
Too little	14
Too much	6

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTE: The sample is 1,401. Survey question: In your opinion, how would you describe the amount of Program Coaching required for your program's participation in QSLA?

Table 4.10. Percentage of In-Person Coaching Sessions with the Number of ECE Staff Attending

	Number of Attendees					
	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5+ (%)	N
All QSLA sites	67	22	9	2	1	812
Center-based care	65	23	10	2	1	638
Head Start	49	40	9	1	2	59
Public school district	64	20	12	3	1	298
Other community-based center	69	22	8	2	1	281
FCC	85	14	2	0	0	174

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.
NOTE: Includes in-person coaching sessions only.

Table 4.11. Percentage of In-Person Coaching Sessions with Types of ECE Staff Attending

	Type of Staff					
	Directors (%)	Lead Teachers (%)	Assistant Teachers (%)	FCC Owner (%)	Other (%)	N
All QSLA sites	8	75	16	10	3	706
Center-based care	9	84	17	0	3	556
Head Start	9	83	20	0	1	57
Public school district	7	88	14	0	3	284
Other community-based center	12	79	20	0	3	215
FCC	2	7	6	89	4	150

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.
NOTE: Includes in-person coaching sessions only; excludes contacts for which all staff have unknown titles.

Table 4.12. Percentage of Coaching Contacts Addressing Coaching Topics

	Coaching Topics											
	CLASS (%)	ERS (%)	QSLA Program Details (%)	Child Obs. (%)	Other (%)	Family Eng. (%)	Teacher Qual. (%)	Dev. Health (%)	Ratings and Assess. (%)	Director Qual. (%)	Strength. Fam. (%)	N
All QSLA sites	74	44	8	4	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	812
Center-based care	77	44	7	3	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	638
Head Start	83	42	10	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	59
Public school district	79	50	5	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	298
Other community-based center	74	39	7	3	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	281
FCC	47	42	21	12	3	3	6	6	2	2	0	174

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of iPinwheel administrative data.
NOTES: Child Obs. = child observations and assessments. CLASS = Classroom Assessment Scoring System. Dev. Health = developmental and health screenings. Director Qual. = director qualifications. ERS = Environment Rating Scale. Family Eng. = family engagement. Ratings and Assess. = ratings and assessments. Strength. Fam. = Strengthening Families Program. Teacher Qual. = teacher qualifications.

Table 4.13. Providers' Perceptions of the Helpfulness of Program Coaching Topics

Coaching Topic	Very helpful (%)	Somewhat helpful (%)	Not helpful (%)	Did not discuss this topic (%)	N
Classroom observations (e.g., CLASS/ECERS-R/FCCERS-R/ITERS-R)	70	22	2	6	1,398
Instructional techniques or curriculum implementation	67	26	1	6	1,401
Use of data from classroom observations (CLASS/ECERS-R/FCCERS-R/ITERS-R), and/or child screenings or observations	65	23	2	11	1,400
Support for children's social and emotional development (e.g., CSEFEL Pyramid)	59	25	1	15	1,399
Implementation of child observations (e.g., DRDP 2015 or DRDP Tech)	55	24	2	19	1,401
Cultural diversity	53	26	2	20	1,399
Behavioral and mental health supports for children or staff	52	25	3	21	1,400
Support for children who are dual language learners	51	25	2	22	1,399
Developmental screenings (e.g., ASQ, ASQ:SE)	48	22	2	28	1,397
Inclusion of children with special needs	46	23	2	29	1,397
Meeting the needs of infants and toddlers	43	18	1	39	1,398

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTES: Totals across a given row may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. ASQ = Ages and Stages Questionnaire. ASQ:SE = Ages and Stages Questionnaire: Social and Emotional. CLASS = Classroom Assessment Scoring System. CSEFEL = Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning. DRDP = Desired Results Developmental Profile. ECERS-R = Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, Revised. FCCERS-R = Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale, Revised. ITERS-R = Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale. Survey question: Since July 2018, how helpful were the following topic discussions with your QSLA Program Coach?

Table 4.14. Providers' Reports of the Frequency of Program Coaching Strategies Used During In-Person Coaching Sessions

Strategy	Always (%)	Often (%)	Sometimes (%)	Never (%)	N
Provided feedback or debriefing (e.g., on observed practices)	67	20	11	3	1,398
Engaged in reflective conversation	61	24	12	3	1,397
Observed a classroom	58	23	15	4	1,397
Provided resources for staff (directors, FCCs, teachers) to reference	50	27	18	5	1,399
Modeled classroom practices	40	25	23	12	1,397
Shadowed a teacher in the classroom	37	23	24	16	1,397
Provided a training to staff	35	23	27	15	1,395
Led a community of practice	23	17	24	36	1,388
Co-led a lesson with a teacher	22	14	23	42	1,390

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of the early learning provider survey.
NOTE: Totals across a given row may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. Survey question: Since July 2018, about how often did the QSLA Program Coach use the following strategies during the in-person coaching sessions you attended?