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Florida’s Office of Early Learning (OEL) understands the importance of developing and supporting high-quality early learning programs in order to help children have the foundation for lifelong social and emotional skills, literacy, curiosity, and approaches to learning (Pemberton, Thorman, Rippley & Langley, 2013). Driven by this understanding, OEL, along with the state’s 30 early learning coalitions, provider associations, and other partners have committed to collaborate on a project to improve the quality of early childhood programs and developing the skills and knowledge of early childhood professionals.

The Florida Legislature created the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project (ELPFPP) through the 2014-15 General Appropriations Act and directed OEL to organize a workgroup of early learning stakeholders who provided input to OEL regarding project goals, needs, and specifications. Based on their recommendations, the ELPFPP was designed to: (1) place an emphasis on school readiness providers in areas with high-needs populations; and (2) collect sufficient data to determine if professional development experiences provided from this project had a positive impact on teacher interactions with children and/or child outcomes. The project was approved to continue into the 2015-16 fiscal year offering the opportunity for approximately 400 providers and their teachers to receive additional funding for improving school readiness program outcomes (Florida Office of Early Learning, 2015).

In order to understand the impact of this statewide professional learning initiative, OEL commissioned the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning (UF Lastinger Center) and Yale University to conduct a comprehensive evaluation study of the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project in 2015 to engage the voices of stakeholders in the ELPFPP and complete an analysis of this project’s strengths, gaps, and needs for improvement.

In order to understand the impact of this statewide professional learning initiative, OEL commissioned the University of Florida Lastinger Center for Learning (UF Lastinger Center) and Yale University to conduct a comprehensive evaluation study of the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project in 2015 to engage the voices of stakeholders in the ELPFPP and complete an analysis of this project’s strengths, gaps, and needs for improvement.

**THIS FINAL EVALUATION REPORT INCLUDES**

- An overview of the 2015-2016 Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project
- A detailed overview of the methods and design of the ELPFPP evaluation study
- Quantitative and qualitative evaluation results of the ELPFPP for 2015-2016
- Key strengths and challenges of ELPFPP interventions by level (Tier 1 and Tier 2)
- Detailed descriptions of stakeholders’ experiences emphasizing both successes and practical and contextual issues faced with ELPFPP implementation.
- Analysis, implications and recommendations to strengthen this statewide professional development initiative for the 2016-2017 Year 3 implementation and future years.
THE UF LASTINGER AND YALE EVALUATION STUDY TEAM

UF Lastinger Center and Yale University assembled a team of talented professionals with diverse backgrounds and experiences in research, evaluation, and early childhood education to conduct this study. This research team was co-led by Walter Leite, Ph.D., a UF Research and Evaluation Methodology Associate Professor; Walter Gilliam, Ph.D., an Associate Professor and Director of the Edward Zigler Center of Child Development and Social Policy at Yale University; and Mary Kay Rodgers, Ph.D., a UF Lastinger Research, Evaluation and Development Coordinator. Other consulting team members included Abby Thorman, Ph.D., Early Learning Florida Director and early childhood consultant; Lara Glaser, MA, Lastinger Early Childhood Operations Manager; Chin R. Reyes, Ph.D., an Associate Research Scientist at Yale University’s Child Study Center; and Jingyi He, UF doctoral student and Lastinger researcher. The complexity of this evaluation required team members with early childhood systems and policy development expertise, university faculty with quantitative and qualitative research expertise, specialists in early childhood teacher professional development, and professionals with experience working in early learning coalitions, centers, and early childhood programs within the state of Florida.

This study team met weekly by virtual meeting and regularly in person in analysis meetings to share study progress, successes, challenges, and problem solving to maximize study potential and credibility. Quantitative measures and results were continuously analyzed by researchers at both UF and Yale, and these results were then compared with qualitative measures and results throughout the study’s duration. Because Early Learning Florida courses are coordinated by the University of Florida, all course quantitative measures were completed by Yale researchers to ensure objectivity in research and findings. In addition, all qualitative findings were reviewed by each member of the research team individually and then collectively discussed until consensus of analysis was reached in order to provide reliability of analysis procedures. Due to this rigorous methodological approach of cross-triangulation of data between research institutions, transparency and validity of research outcomes were achieved.

The Lastinger Center and Yale research team are grateful to all early childhood teachers, directors, and early learning coalition leaders and staff who participated in this study for offering important resources, knowledge and perspective to ensure these recommendations benefit Florida’s early childhood educational community.

CITATION REFERENCE FOR THIS REPORT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM AND EVALUATION PLAN

The Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project- Year 1 (2014-2015)
The Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project began in the state of Florida in 2014, designed by a stakeholder workgroup consisting of early childhood policy makers, early learning coalition leadership, private provider organizational leadership, and private funding partners in order to achieve the following: (1) create a funding differential to provide incentives for high-needs populations; (2) create a professional development system to significantly improve teacher quality; (3) incorporate a research-based observational system to significantly improve teacher interactions with children; and (4) create alignment with the Early Learning Florida blended professional learning system (operating in Florida since 2014) to provide consistency in technical assistance and coaching in order to significantly improve teacher quality. In year one of this project’s implementation, 200 providers were selected as the “pilot” group from specific criteria and required to improve school readiness outcomes through tiered interventions, and 200 providers were selected as the “control” group and did not receive these interventions, but were provided incentives for participation in the control group. An external evaluation of this pilot year (2014-2015) was commissioned but not completed by the Florida Center for Reading Research (Florida Office of Early Learning, 2015).

GRAPHIC OF TIER 1 INTERVENTION FOR PILOT GROUP (2014-2015):

All teachers were required to participate in CLASS® training, titled Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI), for classroom implementation.

All teachers were required to have observations completed by trained observers in the fall and the spring (CLASS® observations).

A subset of teachers were required to participate in courses offered by Early Learning Florida.

The Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project- Year 2 (2015-2016)
The Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project was approved to continue into the 2015-2016 fiscal year by the Florida Legislature and OEL. This approval gave approximately 400 providers and their teachers the opportunity to receive additional funding for improving school readiness program outcomes (OEL, 2015). The professional development design was refined for Year 2 and providers were assigned to one of two tiers to receive specific professional development strategies.

GRAPHIC OF TIER 1 AND TIER 2 INTERVENTIONS (2015-2016)

Tier 1:
- A two-hour Introduction to Classroom Assessment and Scoring System® (CLASS®) online module.
- 20 hours of Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI) training.

Tier 2:
- Be trained in and implement a research-based, comprehensive child assessment tool
- 20 hours of Early Learning Florida coursework (2 classes).
- Four technical assistance and instructional coaching sessions.
Logic Model and Evaluation Plan of the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project (2015-2016)

The UF Lastinger Center and Yale University were commissioned to conduct an evaluation of the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project in 2015 for the 2015-2016 implementation year. In order to accurately evaluate the goals and desired outcomes of the ELPFPP for this implementation year, the research team created an evaluation logic model based upon OEL’s stated objectives. This model details the inputs (sources of both financial and human capital) of these tiered initiatives, the professional development activities of each tier, and assumed desired short-term and intermediate outcomes based on these objectives. From these desired outcomes, the research team created a research plan to align with the data collection instruments and measurements to determine if these proposed outcomes were achieved. As part of this evaluation, data from a myriad of sources, using both quantitative and qualitative measures, were collected to answer multiple formative and summative questions to assess the impact of this project. Specifically, these investigations focused on whether early learning provider participation in the ELPFPP had a positive impact on: (1) teacher knowledge gain; (2) improvement in teacher-child interactions; (3) teacher implementation of effective teaching practices; (4) improvement in classroom climate; and (5) teacher use of curriculum-based child assessments. Details about methodological design and decision making of this study can be found in the description of study methods in the following section.

Figure 1: Logic Model of the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project 2015-2016
Though the intermediate and long-term impact of the ELPFPP initiative will not be determined for several more years of implementation, we present relevant findings from the 2015-2016 implementation year below.

Findings Summary

Impact on teacher knowledge gain: Knowledge gains for Tier 1 participants were measured with pre and post knowledge assessments covering the contents of the Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI) training. The mean gain from MMCI training from pre-test to post-test was 11.6% of the total score, which corresponded to 0.5 standard deviations. Knowledge gains for Tier 2 participants were measured with pre and post assessments of the contents of the Early Learning Florida (ELFL) Infant Toddler Social Emotional Development (ITSED) and Preschool Observation (PKO) courses. The mean gain from pre-test to post-test as a percentage of the total score was 42.1% for the ITSED course and 22.8% for the PKO courses. The analysis for the ITSED course indicated that the gains in knowledge tended to increase as the teacher spent more time in the ELFL learning management system; however, this trend was not statistically significant. For the PKO course, teachers taking the online-only model of the course had significantly higher gains than teachers taking the online + community of practice model of the course. Qualitative interviews also provided in-depth descriptions of specific knowledge gained by Tier 2 participants.

Impact on teacher-child interactions: The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS®) was used to measure the quality of teacher-child interactions. A classroom-level longitudinal analysis was performed using all CLASS® scores collected from 2014 to 2016, across the first year and second year of the ELPFPP. Growth in CLASS® scores was evaluated based on three stages of training of the teacher, from no training, to MMCI training (Tier 1), to MMCI + ELFL training (Tier 2). The results detail an increase in CLASS® scores across the three stages of training, with the largest increase occurring from no training to MMCI training in the first year, followed by a smaller increase from MMCI training to MMCI + ELFL in the second year of training. For pre-kindergarten classrooms, the largest changes occurred in the instructional support domain. For toddler classrooms, the largest changes occurred in the engaged support for learning domains.

Impact on teacher implementation of practices and collaboration in the classroom: In qualitative interviews, teachers reported using new knowledge and strategies from ELPFPP in their practice. In the corresponding survey of ELFL participants, when asked about the time involved in this implementation, over 87% of teachers reported no or little difficulty finding time to implement practices in the classroom. Over 72% of teachers surveyed considered that implementing the new practices learned in ELFL courses would not disturb the routine of their classroom. Among survey participants, 87% of teachers collaborated with other colleagues when implementing these strategies.

Impact of organizational support on teacher learning and implementation of practices: The results of the ELFL completion survey indicate that teachers received adequate support from the director (85%) and other teachers (81%) for the implementation of practices learned in ELFL courses. The analysis of survey data combined with knowledge assessment data indicated no relationship between support provided by the director and other teachers and teacher gains in knowledge from ELFL courses.

Characteristics of providers that influenced improvement in teacher outcomes: Teachers in Gold Seal programs (see description in discussion section) had significantly higher gains in knowledge with the ITSED course, and some gain in the PKO course. Statistics such as the number of children attending the provider, and the percentage of children in poverty attending the provider had no relationship with teacher gains in knowledge from ELFL courses or CLASS® scores. Gold Seal programs also achieved higher CLASS® scores on the Emotional Support (ES) and Instructional support (IS) domains for pre-kindergarten classrooms, but not for the other domains of Pre-K or Toddler CLASS® scores.

Stakeholder successes and challenges with ELPFPP Tier 2 interventions: Results from both teacher and coalition staff interviews as well as end-of-course survey results showed all teachers believed they had a positive learning experience with Tier 2 interventions, despite several challenges and ranges of difficulty in learning. Teachers reported positive improvements in knowledge gain, confidence in the classroom, increased professionalism in educational
contexts, implementation of effective practices, and collaboration with peers, directors, and course instructors. Teachers also reported challenges such as lack of technology access or expertise, lack of time for implementation and understanding, and lack of organizational support regarding the implementation of child-based assessments. Coalition leadership focus groups reported supporting the positive intentions of the ELPFPP, but voiced challenges such as coalitions’ lack of staffing capacity, lack of input regarding provider selection and support, and lack of oversight regarding ELPFPP guidelines and funding as obstacles for both provider and coalition success. Coalition focus groups also described limitations to the impact of ELPFPP based on the project's lack of alignment with coalition quality initiatives, and lack of alignment, consistency, and support in the implementation of project interventions.

Overall Impact of ELPFPP in 2015-2016: Based on this evaluation, there are several implications for this professional development initiative to improve the quality and consistency of early childhood education in the state of Florida. With just this year-long investment from the Florida Legislature and the Office of Early Learning, the ELPFPP cultivated significant dividends in quality improvement by elevating the teaching and learning of Florida's early childhood workforce that participated in this program. By combining specific professional development elements in tiered progression, short-term outcomes of increasing teacher knowledge, improving teacher-child interactions, and introducing new and effective strategies in the classroom were achieved. With more time, significant investment, and proper scalability of these opportunities, the ELPFPP has the potential to create a positive paradigm shift in the learning of our youngest children in the state of Florida. But in order to provide specific targeted support to those providers that most need this professional development, ELPFPP stakeholders and researchers believe that these interventions must be supported with both top-down organization and proper management from Florida's early learning leaders and legislators, and bottom-up buy-in, capacity-building, support and collaboration from Florida's early learning teachers and educational professionals. Without this marriage of systems, collaboration, capacity and capital, efforts may continue to create some change, but only in pockets where these necessary components are already in place. To achieve the bigger picture of improving Florida's early learning systems, a continued commitment to these investments and focused support from all system levels and stakeholders is critical so this program can truly create a measurable impact.
STUDY METHODOLOGY

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THIS STUDY

The theoretical perspective that informed the research design for this study is based on research of quality early childhood educational settings, empirical research on job-embedded professional development effectiveness, synthesis reports on current early childhood professional development and outcomes, and research on core theories of action to produce teacher change in practice and improve child outcomes. Together, this research highlights key assumptions that underlie our research in this evaluation. Those assumptions include: (a) quality teaching plays an immense role in children’s early learning development; (b) professional development that contains both content and pedagogical knowledge may best support early learning teachers to apply knowledge into practice; and (c) the causal link between teachers’ gain of knowledge and change in beliefs and practices to provide improved instruction requires the study of both proximal and distal outcomes over a span of time that allows teachers to implement these changes.

Professional Development in Early Childhood Settings

Educational research has identified the continuing development and learning of teachers as key to improving the quality of schools in the United States (Desimone, 2009; Putnam & Borko, 2000), and, as a result, creating effective professional development for educators has become integral in transforming all levels of education (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson & Orphanos, 2009; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman & Yoon, 2001). Professional development is especially important for those teaching the youngest and often most marginalized students in early learning environments. Research links quality teacher education to students’ positive early experiences and later success in schooling (Barnett, 2003; Neuman & Cunningham, 2009; Sheridan, Edwards, Marvin & Knoche, 2009). Due to varied levels of education, training and experience of early childhood teachers, there is a growing call in early childhood literature to determine what quality experiences for educators are needed to ensure students are receiving the highest quality learning experience possible (Neuman, Roskos, Vukelich & Clements, 2003). While “quality” can be conceptualized as many things, current interpretations emphasize the importance of “teacher or caregiver-child interactions that are emotionally supportive, responsive to children’s individual and developmental needs, and rich in their provision of support for children’s exploration and understanding of new concepts” (Smith, Robbins, Schneider, Kreader & Ong, 2012, p. 4). Thus, professional development for early childhood educators should facilitate the acquisition of specific learning and social-emotional competencies in young children, and also promote important family-specific attitudes to support children’s learning and development (Sheridan, Edwards, Marvin, & Knoche, 2009).

A synthesis of studies examined the connections between program characteristics and environmental quality in early childhood settings, and found that teachers with more education and specialization in early childhood development had higher quality programs and engaged children in best practices (Fukkink & Lont, 2007). Kontos & Wilcox-Herzog (1997) showed that teachers showed positive gains from professional development in the domains of roles (socializing, encouraging play, managing misbehavior); sensitivity (being responsive, not harsh or detached); and teacher talk (frequency and quality of verbal support and stimulation). Other studies (Girolametto, Weitzman, & Greenburg, 2003; Rhodes & Hennessy, 2000) showed a dramatic increase in children’s language production as well as intensification of children’s play after teacher training. There is also evidence from research that indicates the importance of connecting content and context in professional development, and suggests that professional development should occur in the learning context of teacher practices (Neuman & Cunningham, 2009). However, there is a growing consensus that existing early childhood professional development efforts at the national, state, and local levels are fragmented at best (Buyesse, Winton & Rous, 2009; Winton & McCollum, 2008), and professional learning within teacher practice in early childhood classrooms is almost non-existent (Fukkink & Lont, 2007).
Quality Professional Development Research and Design
Numerous studies have documented a causal link between improved teacher practice and improved child outcomes based on a core theory of action (Desimone, 2009; Hamilton et al., 2003; Mayer, 1998; Supovitz, 2001; Wenglinsky, 2002):
1. Teachers experience effective professional development.
2. Professional development increases teachers’ knowledge and skills and/or changes attitudes and beliefs.
3. Teachers use their new knowledge, skills, attitudes and beliefs to improve the content of their instruction or their approach, or both.
4. The instructional changes foster increases in student learning.

Based on this conceptual framework for studying teachers’ professional development (Desimone, 2009), specific design features are critical to quality professional development intervention research. First, the issue of what treatment being studied in professional development interventions rests on two theories, the theory of instruction and the theory of teacher change. Theory of instruction is the link between the specific kinds of teacher knowledge and instruction (a specific set of instructional practices) emphasized in the professional development, and the expected changes in child outcomes. Theory of teacher change examines the features of the professional development that will promote change in teacher knowledge and/or practice including its theory about the assumed mechanisms through which features of the professional development are expected to support teacher learning (duration, span, elements of activities, and intermediate teacher outcomes). This model also operates using classroom context as an important mediator and moderator (Desimone, 2009).

Secondly, professional development research needs to address what should be measured, and how and when those outcomes should be measured (Supovitz, 2001). The “what” examines specific alignment between approaches of instruction. The “how” examines specific methodologies, such as observations, surveys, interviews and direct assessments to determine the alignment between the content of what is taught in the classroom and the changes in both teacher and student performance; and the “when” must allow for sufficient time between the professional development intervention and the measurement of the professional development impact. Therefore, during implementation years (when teachers are receiving interventions), studies should focus on increases in teacher knowledge and changes in teacher attitude, beliefs, and practices (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Wayne et al., 2008).

Context of Study
Based on these theoretical underpinnings of quality professional development research and design, this evaluation study used both quantitative and qualitative data sources to examine theories of teacher instruction and change in both structures and mechanisms within the ELPFPP. Specifically, this study focused on determining the impact of early learning provider participation in the ELPFPP on teacher knowledge gain, implementation of effective teaching practices, improvement in teacher-child interactions, improvement in classroom climate, and use of curriculum-based assessments. Researchers also investigated what these effects were, and how and why they occurred with data from participant experiences. Year 2 of the ELPFPP was comprised of two tiered interventions administered at the provider level (i.e., early childhood centers) and consisted of engaging providers in both online and blended professional development and instructional support. For the purpose of this evaluation year (2015-2016), providers that received the more complex version of ELPFPP are referred to as the Tier 2 program, while providers that received the introductory Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI) training are referred to as the Tier 1 program. These specific interventions will be described further in the following section.

Both groups of providers received MMCI training as part of this professional development intervention (during different time frames), thus maintaining the MMCI training as a constant variable in this ELPFPP evaluation. In order to examine the objectives previously stated, this evaluation concentrated on observations and assessments of Tier 2 providers. Within Tier 2 providers, three models of intervention based on support provided to ELPFPP teachers through Early Learning Florida course options were compared (see table 1) based on the following research questions:
1. What impact does the ELPFPP have on teacher knowledge for the Tier 2 program?
2. What impact does the ELPFPP have on teacher-child interactions for the Tier 2 program as compared to Tier 1 program?
3. What impact does the ELPFPP have on classroom climate for the Tier 2 program as compared to Tier 1 program?
4. Do the effects of participating in the Tier 2 program depend on the characteristics of the providers and the population it serves?
5. Do the effects of participating in the Tier 2 program depend on the level of participation of the provider’s teachers in Early Learning Florida?
6. Do the effects of participating in the Tier 2 program depend on the initial CLASS® scores of the provider’s teachers?
7. Do the effects of participating in the Tier 2 program depend on the organizational support the teachers receive?

TIER 2 INTERVENTIONS

- **MMCI + Early Learning Florida online coursework with Community of Practice (CoP) option**
  - 4 TA visits per participant, per Classroom (instructional support: TA must be provided by a person reliable on the CLASS® tool)

- **MMCI + Early Learning Florida online coursework with TA option with a Lastinger certified Coach**
  - 2 additional TA visits within this model, for a total of 6 TA visits

- **MMCI + Early Learning Florida online only option**
  - 4 TA visits per participant, per Classroom (instructional support: TA must be provided by a person reliable on the CLASS®)

The purpose of qualitative research for this evaluation was to analyze and determine (a) Tier 2 early childhood teachers’ experiences and perceptions of ELPFPP program, and impact on their instructional practice, gains in content knowledge, and classroom interactions with children; and (b) ELPFPP stakeholders (coaches, facilitators, and coalition leaders) perceptions of the impact of the ELPFPP on teacher effectiveness and program quality. For this purpose, three phases of interviews were conducted: (1) Tier 2 teacher pre-intervention interviews determining educational background, motivations, and preliminary experiences of participating in the ELPFPP; (2) Tier 2 teacher post-intervention interviews determining specific experiences from elements of the ELPFPP, overall interpretations of those experiences, and identification of barriers and opportunities for improvement to the ELPFPP initiative, and (3) early learning coalition leadership focus group interviews determining both impact and effectiveness of the ELPFPP on teacher classroom practice, center and provider quality, and coalition quality.

Sample

Providers were recruited for participation in Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs by the Office of Early Learning. Tier 2 participants consisted of providers that participated in the ELPFPP the previous pilot year (i.e., 2014-2015) as well as new providers that already completed the 20-hour MMCI training. Tier 1 participants consisted of providers that participated in the control group the previous year as well as new participants without the MMCI training. Criteria for provider participation are listed on Appendix A. Providers were considered dropouts of the Tier 2 program if none of its teachers working with school readiness were active participants of Early Learning Florida.
Interventions

**Tier 1**

**Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI)** is an interactive, face-to-face training for teachers to help prepare them to recognize, understand, and implement stronger CLASS® interactions in their classroom or care settings. The teacher attends ten 2-hour workshops with a Teachstone-trained instructor where teachers learn to identify and describe effective interactions in classrooms, discuss strategies on how to interact intentionally to increase their children's learning, and are provided with CLASS® handouts and exemplar video resources (Teachstone, 2016).

**Tier 2**

**Blended Professional Development and Instructional Support**

**Early Learning Florida** is a dynamic online/blended professional learning system custom-designed to build the skills and knowledge of early learning teachers who serve infants, toddlers, and preschoolers in centers, schools, and family child care homes. Early Learning Florida courses can be accessed online 24 hours a day, and offer teachers guidance and feedback from a highly qualified course instructor. Online discussion forums provide opportunities to collaborate with peers, and additional support is also delivered through face-to-face meetings with a trained Communities of Practice facilitator or a Certified Early Learning Coach. There are three levels in which a teacher can experience Early Learning Florida courses – online only, online with a local Community of Practice (CoP), or online with coaching sessions. For online only, teachers take the course with an online course instructor who provides guidance and feedback to each participant. For teachers taking the online with a local CoP option, course participants meet face-to-face as a cohort with a trained facilitator multiple times during the course to reflect on their practice and support implementation of the content. Practitioners taking the online with coaching sessions similarly engage in the online course with an instructor but receive one-on-one individualized sessions with a Certified Early Learning Coach in their classroom or family child care home. Courses are provided free of charge to the teacher and upon mastery, the teacher can earn up to 2.0 CEUs/20 in-service hours.

**Child Assessments**

For Tier 2 programs in the ELFPFPP, providers were given three possible choices of child assessments to implement during the 2015-2016 year. Researchers provide descriptions of each of these assessment tools, but data from providers focused solely on experiences with Teaching Strategies GOLD® implementation.

**ATI-Galileo** provides early childhood educators and other stakeholders a complete and fully integrated assessment, curriculum, and reporting system that links assessment, planning, individualization and program progress. Galileo utilizes the Instructional Intervention Cycle and provides users with reliable and valid data on which to base learning opportunities and program management decisions. Developmental domains addressed in the assessment include creative arts, approaches to learning, early math, language and literacy, nature and science, physical health practices, fine and gross motor development, and social and emotional development. The cycle begins with goal setting and planning and is followed by implementation, then evaluation (data gathering and analysis); the results of evaluation inform decisions guiding the next goal setting and planning stages (www.ati-online.com).

**Child Observation Record (COR) - HighScope.** The COR assessment is based on six child development categories that represent broad domains of child development. For the Preschool COR, these categories are initiative; social relations; creative representation; movement and music; language and literacy; and mathematics and science. The Infant-Toddler COR has a parallel set of six categories: sense of self; social relations; creative representation; movement; communication and language; and exploration and early logic. Within each category, children are assessed on three to eight COR items that describe developmentally important behaviors. (The Preschool COR has 32 items, the Infant-Toddler COR has 28). Each item has five levels that indicate a typical developmental sequence for that behavior, enabling COR users to assign precise ratings to their observations of children. To carry out the assessment, teachers or caregivers spend a few minutes each day writing brief notes (called “anecdotes”) that describe significant episodes of young children's behavior. They record their notes on printed forms or in computer files, and then classify and rate them according to the COR categories, items, and levels (HighScope Educational Research Foundation, 2015).
Teaching Strategies GOLD® (TSG) is an observation-based teacher rating evaluation instrument designed to assess the ongoing development and learning of children from birth through kindergarten. The purpose of the instrument is to assist teachers in planning appropriate experiences, individualizing instruction, and monitoring and communicating child progress to families and other stakeholders. The measure is intended to be inclusive of ELLs (English language learners) and children with disabilities as well as typically developing children and those who demonstrate competencies beyond developmental expectations. TSG has 38 broad research-based objectives which are operationalized into 53 rating scale items organized into the following developmental and learning areas: social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, mathematics, English language acquisition, science and technology, social studies, and the arts (Kim, Lambert, & Burts, 2013; Snow & Van Hemel, 2008).

Technical Assistance and Instructional Coaching
Within the Tier 2 ELPFPP program, there were two models of face-to-face professional development delivered through technical assistance and/or instructional coaching. For Tier 2 providers that engaged in the ELPFPP Early Learning Florida course options that did not provide coaching (online only, online + CoP), these providers received four technical assistance visits from coaches working with their local early learning coalition. The goals and objectives of these coaching sessions varied, as did the instructional support provided by the coach. These coaches were not required to be Lastinger certified coaches, but some coalitions chose to use Lastinger certified coaches for this process. Tier 2 ELPFPP providers that engaged in the Early Learning Florida course which included the TA/Coach option received the required four coaching visits per ELPFPP guidelines, but also completed an additional two coaching visits required by the Early Learning Florida course guidelines. These coaching visits were provided by a Lastinger Certified instructional coach, and coaching sessions were focused specifically on course content, instructional support, and specific teacher-centered learning strategies to improve child outcomes based on the Lastinger Early Childhood Instructional Coaching Model (see Appendix G).

Data Sources and Instruments
Based on the theoretical model of teacher learning and development used in this study (Desimone, 2009), researchers made assumptions regarding teacher learning and child outcomes that are represented in the evaluation logic model. To better understand these relationships of learning, it was necessary to use previously tested instruments, as well as construct instruments to examine specific learning relationships, which are detailed below.

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS®)
The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS®) was used to measure the quality of teacher-child interactions. The CLASS® focuses on the quality of classroom interactional processes. This differs from other measurement tools that focus on the content of the physical environment, available materials, or a specific curriculum. For CLASS®, the physical environment (including materials) and curriculum matter in the context of how teachers put them to use in their interactions with children. Three versions of the CLASS® were used: Pre-kindergarten, Toddler and Infant. The Pre-K CLASS® measures three domains: Emotional Support (ES), Classroom Organization (CO), and Instructional Support (IS). The Toddler CLASS® measures two domains: Emotional and Behavioral Support (EBS) and Engaged Support for Learning (ESL). The Infant CLASS® measures one domain: Responsive Caregiving (RC).

The Preschool Climate of Healthy Interactions for Learning and Development Scale (CHILD)
The Preschool Climate of Healthy Interactions for Learning & Development Scale (CHILD; Gilliam & Reyes, 2016) is a refined version of the Preschool Mental Health Climate Scale (PMHCS; Gilliam, 2008), which has been validated and used extensively in evaluations of early childhood mental health consultation services in several states. The CHILD was developed to improve the item structure and scoring system of the PMHCS. The CHILD is a comprehensive observational assessment of the mental health (social-emotional) climate of a preschool classroom. It assesses pedagogy (smooth, efficient, and unregulated handling of transitions; child-centered and individualized support; use of clear, consistent, developmentally appropriate and positive disciplinary strategies; promotion of social and emotional learning skills; dignified and equitable treatment of children), the affective climate (staff attunement; staff and child affect; positive nonverbal interactions between and among staff and children), and child behaviors (manifestations of children’s psychosocial adjustment and self-regulation). The CHILD consists of 28 discrete behavioral indicators that are scored on a five-point scale ranging from -2 to +2.
The CHILD assessment (Gilliam, 2008) was used in a sample of 200 classrooms in addition to the CLASS®, with raters collecting data necessary for the completion of both measures simultaneously. The CHILD is an objective observational measure of the social-emotional climate of preschool and child care classrooms, providing a greater depth of information in this area than the Emotional Supports domain of the CLASS® alone. It is designed specifically to measure the effects of coaching preschool and child care providers on improving teacher-child interactions and the overall classroom climate.

**Instructor Knowledge Assessments**

The knowledge assessments were developed by the research team to evaluate the teacher’s knowledge with respect to the standards of early childhood education knowledge based on Early Learning Florida course criteria and objectives. The knowledge assessments were administered to Tier 2 teachers who enrolled in two courses: The knowledge assessment for Infant/Toddler Social Emotional Development (ITSED) and Preschool Observation (PKO). The ITSED assessment contained 22 multiple choice questions, which were worth a total of 2200 points. The PKO assessment contained 20 multiple choice questions, worth a total of 2000 points. Pre- and post-tests were used to measure knowledge gained from participating in Early Learning Florida courses. The pre-test was given to teachers before the course began in order to determine their entry knowledge level of course content. After the completion of the course, teachers were given a post-test to answer the same set of questions. Comparing practitioners' post-test scores to their pre-test scores enabled researchers to determine whether the course was successful in increasing practitioners’ knowledge of the course content. Knowledge assessment data were collected by learning management software platform LoudCloud.

**Survey of Tier 2 Instructors in Participating Providers**

Instructors in Tier 2 provider sites were invited to respond to two online surveys, one administered at the beginning of engagement with Early Learning Florida courses and another at completion of Early Learning Florida courses. The first survey collected data about teacher demographics, working conditions and instructional assignments. The second survey collected data about participants’ reactions to taking Early Learning Florida courses, organizational support provided for Early Learning Florida, interactions with Early Learning Florida coaches and CoP facilitators, and participants’ opportunities for use of knowledge obtained in Early Learning Florida coursework. The online surveys were created by the research team using Desimone’s (2009) model for evaluating professional development.

**Logs of Instructor Participation in Learning Management System**

The learning management system (LMS) used to implement Early Learning Florida courses provided logs of the time each teacher spent in each course website. These logs were used to examine the amount of time teachers’ participated in Early Learning Florida courses.

**Qualitative Interviews**

For the purpose of gathering data to voice participants’ perspectives of engaging in the ELPFPP, three phases of interviews were conducted: (1) Tier 2 teacher pre-intervention interviews determining educational background, motivations, and preliminary experiences of participating in the ELPFPP; (2) Tier 2 teacher post-intervention interviews determining specific experiences from elements of the ELPFPP, overall interpretations of those experiences, and identification of barriers and opportunities for improvement to the ELPFPP initiative, and (3) early learning coalition leadership focus group interviews determining both impact and effectiveness of the ELPFPP initiative on teacher classroom practice, center and provider quality, and coalition quality.

**Data Collection**

**Quantitative Data Collection**

Implementing this research design required a pre-program assessment, using CLASS®, for all sites that did not have a program assessment already available, which included all new sites, and those that requested a new program assessment in the fall prior to the teachers’ participation in MMCI or Early Learning Florida courses or training on the child assessment measure. For sites that had a program assessment and did not request a new one, their previous assessment was used. Some sites may have had an assessment for some classrooms, but not others, in which case pre-
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intervention data, using CLASS®, was collected for the classrooms not already available. All sites in both Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs had a post-intervention program assessment using CLASS® of all participating classrooms in the spring of 2016.

Qualitative Data Collection
In October, 2015, ELPFPP Tier 2 teachers who were enrolled in the Fall (October) soft launch of Early Learning Florida courses were identified and selected with criterion sampling (Glesne, 2006) which required the participants to: (1) have completed Tier 1 ELPFPP professional development (MMCI/CLASS® training); (2) be enrolled and achieve mastery (80% or above) in an October Early Learning Florida course; (3) participate in other ELPFPP professional development activities required for Tier 2 (Teaching Strategies Gold®, TA/Coaching), and (4) have future enrollment in January Early Learning Florida courses. Participant recruitment emails were sent to each teacher identified and enrolled in six regions: Big Bend, Northwest Florida, Pinellas, Hillsborough, St. Lucie, and Miami-Dade/Monroe coalitions. 56 background interviews were scheduled, and participants then received a confirmation email with both the study consent form and the interview protocol before the interview took place. Of the 56 interviews scheduled, 43 interviews were completed by February, 2016. Upon completion of the Tier 2 intervention, those 43 participants that completed background interviews were contacted for second interviews, and 22 responded to continue participation in this study. Of these 22 participants, 15 interviews were completed from May-July, 2016. Participants were interviewed by the study co-investigator by phone. Each interview took between 45-60 minutes, and a semi-structured interview protocol was used. Interviews were audio recorded and field notes were taken by the interviewer. Due to Palm Beach Early Learning Coalition not enrolling in the October launch, they were omitted from first round interviews, but were included in second round interviews for practitioner input. Palm Beach ELC was also included in coalition focus group interviews.

In the spring of 2016, 12 early learning coalitions were contacted by email for recruitment of ELPFPP leadership focus group participation: Northwest Florida, Big Bend, Duval, Alachua, Brevard, Polk, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Palm Beach, St. Lucie, Miami-Dade/Monroe, and South Florida. Participants were recruited based upon: (a) participation in both the soft launch and spring launch of Early Learning Florida in Year Two of the ELPFPP; (b) location of teachers that participated in both first and second rounds of evaluation interviews for data triangulation in those coalitions; (c) availability and willingness to participate in focus groups regarding ELPFPP implementation; and (d) regional perspectives of both Tier 1 and Tier 2 ELPFPP implementation. These participants included early learning coalition directors and assistant directors, professional development and quality improvement coordinators, TA/Coaches, CoP Facilitators, and finance and contract personnel. Nine early learning coalition leadership focus group interviews were scheduled and completed. All early learning coalition focus groups interviews were conducted either face-to-face or by Zoom online meeting system, with interviews taking between 45-90 minutes for completion. A semi-structured interview protocol was used, and interviews were audio recorded with field notes also taken by the interviewer.
Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

The research design of the second year of ELPFPP is quasi-experimental because new participants were added non-randomly to both groups and these new participants cannot be considered to have similar characteristics. Therefore, there is a potential for selection bias. However, analyses removed selection bias due to observed provider characteristics using fixed effects regression models (Allison, 2009) for analysis of CLASS® scores and multilevel models (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) for analysis of CHILD scores and knowledge assessments.

Researchers analyzed data from the knowledge assessments with a multilevel model with two assessments per teacher (pre and post), nested within teacher. Researchers ran separate multilevel models for the knowledge assessment scores for the ITSED course and the PKO course. The knowledge assessment data was treated as two-wave longitudinal data, and estimated the effect of time (that is, change from pre-test to post-test), controlling for cluster effects of teachers. More specifically, researchers used a two-level model with time, fixed effects of type of ELFL model (online only or online + CoP), and quartiles of time spent by the teacher in the ELFL system as predictors, and random intercepts of teacher:

\[ Y_{ti} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T_i + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \gamma_n P_{ni} + 0_i + \epsilon_{ti} \]

Where \( Y_{ti} \) indicates the score on the knowledge assessment of the ITSED or PKO course for participant \( i \) at time \( t \). \( \beta_0 \) is the intercept. \( T_i \) is a binary indicator of assessment wave, where \( T = 0 \) indicates pre-test and \( T = 1 \) indicates post-test. \( \beta_1 \) is the gain in knowledge between pre-test and post-test. The random participant effect is \( u_{0i} \), and the time-specific residual is \( \epsilon_{ti} \). Researchers ran two versions of this model: 1) To answer research question 4, the predictors \( P_{ni} \) are four provider characteristics (count of attending children, percent of children in poverty, Gold Seal status, and mean score on CLASS® domain most related to the ELFL course). 2) To answer research question 5, the predictors were the type of ELFL program (online only and online + CoP), the quartiles of time spent in the ELFL for the course (ITSED or PKO) and the quartiles of time spent win the ELFL system with other courses. The effects of the predictors are the \( \gamma_n \) coefficients in this equation.

Data were analyzed from all CLASS® observations collected in Year 1 and Year 2 of ELPFPP, and therefore had longitudinal data on the classrooms. This longitudinal data allowed us to estimate within-classroom change over time, from the teacher having no training, to finishing MMCI training, and then to completing both MMCI and ELFL training. Therefore, every teacher could potentially reach three different training states: 1) Those with no training were either in the control group of Year 1, in the treatment group at the beginning of Year 1, or in Tier 1 at the beginning of Year 2; 2) Those with MMCI training were either in the treatment group at the end of Year 1, or were in Tier 2 at the beginning of Year 2; 3) Those with MMCI and ELFL training were at Tier 2 at the end of Year 2. Fixed-effects regression models were used because it allowed estimation of within-classroom change due to the teacher moving from no training to MMCI training, and then from MMCI training to MMCI + ELFL training. The advantage of within-classroom effects is that it does not contain any bias due to provider or early learning coalition characteristics.

\[ Y_{ti} = \beta_i + \beta_1 T_i + \beta_2 W_i + \epsilon_{it} \]

Where \( Y_{ti} \) indicates the score on each domain of CLASS® for participant \( i \) at time \( t \). \( \beta_i \) is the intercept for each participant. \( T_i \) is a binary indicator of assessment wave, where \( T_i = 0 \) indicates no training and \( T_i = 1 \) indicates finishing MMCI training. \( \beta_1 \) is the gain in CLASS® between no training and finishing MMCI training. \( W_i \) is a binary indicator of assessment wave, where \( W_i = 0 \) indicates not completing both MMCI and ELFL training and \( W_i = 1 \) indicates finishing both MMCI and ELFL training. \( \beta_2 \) is the gain in CLASS® between finishing MMCI training and finishing both MMCI and ELFL training. The time-specific residual is \( \epsilon_{it} \).

The analysis of the effects of ELPFPP on classroom climate is preliminary because of the limited sample size obtained and difficulties encountered in training observers and collecting data. The means and standard deviations of Tier 1 and Tier 2 teachers on the post-test administration CHILD scale were estimated. The means were compared for statistical significance using independent samples t tests with an alpha level of 0.05.
Qualitative Analysis
Qualitative analysis occurred in three phases using an inductive interpretive analysis approach (Hatch, 2007; Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, 2013). After the first round of background interviews were complete, transcripts from interviews were separated and analyzed individually for common themes and descriptions, and then separated and analyzed by coalition (i.e. Big Bend, NW Florida) and then by region (North: Big Bend, NW Florida, Duval; Central: Alachua, Hillsborough, Pinellas; South: Palm Beach, St. Lucie, Miami-Dade/Monroe) to determine coalition and regional patterns related to study objectives. Excerpts from interviews were then analyzed and catalogued with condensed codes according to: (a) motivations for participating in the ELPFPP, (b) initial experiences and descriptions of professional development elements of the Tier 2 ELPFPP Intervention, and (c) initial understandings of the impact of ELPFPP elements on teacher gains in knowledge and perceived contributions to provider and coalition quality. Phase Two of analysis occurred after the second round of teacher interviews and early learning coalition focus group interviews were completed. This comprehensive analysis of each participant’s entire data set as well as researcher memos ensued repeating these procedures and condensing data into emerging codes and phrases related to this study’s objectives. From this data reduction, a third phase of analysis occurred in which case “stories” were written for stakeholder participants (teachers and coalitions) to summarize findings from these experiences. These vignettes were member-checked by participants to promote trustworthiness and rigor in research.

Concurrent Triangulation Analysis (Mixed-Methods)
In an effort to fully explore the relationships and phenomenon under study in this evaluation, a triangulation method of research was used by combining quantitative and qualitative methods in order to compensate for the weaknesses and blind spots of both research methods (Cresswell, 2003; Flick, 2009). These methods remained autonomous and occurred side by side, with their meeting point being the study objectives of this investigation. Within this study, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative methods focused on single cases (teachers), as well groups (early learning coalitions). Cases required that the same participants that completed course surveys, knowledge assessments, CLASS® and CHILD observations were also interview participants. However, due to the size of the sample of ELPFPP Tier 2 programs, only a smaller sample of teachers meeting these criteria were used as cases. These answers were compared to each other, and combined for analysis at the final stage of this research process. Group data from early learning coalitions were used to triangulate case data and compare results. Once case and group qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed, all data were reduced and analyzed further to explore outcomes in which quantitative and qualitative results converged and confirmed conclusions, were complementary to each other to lead to a fuller picture, and also diverged and provided contradictory evidence. From this triangulation analysis, typologies were developed and linked to the broader study objectives (Flick, 2009).
RESULTS

QUANTITATIVE INSTRUMENTS

Based on this evaluation study’s objectives, quantitative measures focused on if early learning provider participation in the ELPFPP had a positive effect on teacher knowledge gain, implementation of effective teaching practices, improvement of teacher-child interactions, and improvement of classroom climate. Results from these measures are presented in the order of the research questions, and describe sample, analysis procedures and results for each measure used.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHAT IMPACT DOES THE ELPFPP HAVE ON TEACHER KNOWLEDGE FOR THE TIER 2 PROVIDERS?

Tier 2 providers were required to complete 20 hours (2 courses) of Early Learning Florida coursework. A total of 52 infant toddler teachers and 79 preschool teachers participated in Tier 2 and completed two Early Learning Florida courses specific to the age group with whom they worked. Pre-post data was collected at the beginning and end of the course. The Infant Toddler Social Emotional Development (ITSED) course had 22 questions on the pre-test and post-test. The Preschool Observation (PKO) course had 20 questions on the pre-test and post-test.

Multilevel models were used to estimate the change in assessment scores between pre-test and post-test for the ITSED class and the PKO class. Two multilevel models were run, one with ITSED scores as the outcome, and one with PKO scores as the outcome (both post-test and pre-test). The predictors were mean gain in knowledge scores between pre-test and post-test, the type of Early Learning Florida model (online only or online + community of practice), the time that the student spent in the Early Learning Florida system with each class, and the time spent in the Early Learning Florida for all other classes in which the teacher was enrolled. The results show a statistically significant mean gain of 42.1% in the ITSED class and statistically significant mean gain of 22.8% in the PKO class between pre-test and post-test.
Figure 2. Mean and range of pre & post knowledge assessment scores for ITSED class

Figure 3. Mean and range of pre & post knowledge assessment scores for PKO class

Additional details and tables of coefficients for these models are presented in the results for Research Question 5.
Results from analysis for MMCI knowledge assessment (pre & post) for teachers in Tier 1 providers

Although Research Question 1 was only about knowledge gains of Tier 2 providers, data was available about knowledge gains of Tier 1 providers, and the analysis of these data is reported here. The Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI) course was a 20-hour training that took place over the course of several sessions scheduled between September, 2015 and May, 2016. The dates of these trainings varied by coalitions. The pre and post knowledge assessments each contained nine multiple choice questions and were completed by teachers in Tier 1 to measure knowledge gain. The pre-test was given to teachers before taking the MMCI training and the same post-test was given to teachers after the training. Comparing teachers’ post-test scores to their pre-test scores enabled examination of whether the MMCI training was successful in increasing teachers’ knowledge of practices taught in the MMCI training. Test scores on the MMCI knowledge assessment (pre & post) were collected by each participating Early Learning Coalition in Tier 1: 666 pre-tests and 597 post-tests were received. MMCI data from Orange County was excluded in this analysis due to pre-tests being administered after teachers had started the MMCI training.

The average pre-test score was 5.74 (SD=1.73), ranging from 0 to 9. For those teachers who took the post-test, the average score was 6.79 (SD=1.71), ranging from 1 to 9. A dependent samples T-test was performed to analyze the scores of MMCI. Results indicate that there was statistically significant increase from pre-test to post-test. Practitioners gained significantly on MMCI by 1.05 (t=9.50, p=0.00). The average gain from MMCI training is 11.7% of the total score. The standardized mean gain is 0.5 standard deviations.

Figure 4. Mean and range of pre & post MMCI
Figure 5. Histogram of gains in MMCI knowledge scores from pre-test to post-test
RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHAT IMPACT DOES THE ELPFPP HAVE ON TEACHER-CHILD INTERACTIONS FOR THE TIER 2 PROGRAM AS COMPARED TO THE TIER 1 PROGRAM?

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS®) was used to measure the quality of teacher-child interactions. Descriptive analysis was performed with CLASS® pre-test scores and post-test scores at provider level. For CLASS® pre-test, scores from 307 active providers were analyzed, in which 231 were Tier 1 providers and 76 were Tier 2 providers. Out of the 307 providers, approximately 91% of have scores from the Pre-K CLASS®, nearly 89% of them were assessed using the Toddler CLASS® and only 8% were assessed using the Infant CLASS®. For CLASS® post-test, scores from 275 active providers were analyzed, in which 204 of them were Tier 1 providers and 71 of them were Tier 2 providers. Out of the 275 providers, approximately 89% have Pre-K CLASS® scores, nearly 83% were assessed using the Toddler CLASS® and only 4% were assessed using the Infant CLASS®.

The two figures below provide an overall view of the performance of the Tier 2 sites at post-test. Then, the results for each CLASS domain are presented, together with graphs comparing pre-test with post-test performance for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers.

Figure 6. Range of Pre-K CLASS® Domains
Statistical analysis was also performed with CLASS® observations at the classroom level for all CLASS® domains. Classroom observations from both Year 1 and Year 2 of the ELPFPP were used in this analysis. Observations were coded into three groups according to the training of the teachers: no training, MMCI, MMCI + Early Learning Florida. The study was conceptualized as a longitudinal design where providers' classrooms were observed several times over multiple years. The baseline for all classrooms is the observation prior to any training. The sample was restricted to those classrooms that had a known teacher and the same teacher across all observations. Overall, there were 955 observations associated with no training, 569 associated with MMCI, and 135 associated with MMCI + Early Learning Florida.

For preschool classrooms, there were 520 observations with no training, 323 for providers who completed MMCI, and 75 associated with MMCI + Early Learning Florida. For toddler classrooms, there were 434 observations with no training, 235 associated with MMCI, and 56 associated with MMCI + Early Learning Florida. For infant classrooms, there was one observation on a program with no training, 11 assessments with providers who completed MMCI, and four conducted on classrooms with MMCI + Early Learning Florida.

A fixed-effects model (Allison, 2009) was performed to estimate within-classroom effects of MMCI (after 1 year of participation in ELPFPP) and MMCI + Early Learning Florida (after two years of participation in ELPFPP) as compared to having neither (baseline).
Pre-K CLASS® Emotional Support

When comparing Pre-K CLASS® pre-test scores on Emotional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 5.46 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 6.00, yielding a difference of +0.54.

When comparing Pre-K CLASS® post-test scores on Emotional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 5.95 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 6.11, yielding a difference of +0.16.

CLASS PRE-K CLASSROOM EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (PRE)

![Distribution of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Emotional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers (PRE)](image)

CLASS PRE-K CLASSROOM EMOTIONAL SUPPORT (POST)

![Distribution of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Emotional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers (POST)](image)

Figure 8 a and b. Distribution of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Emotional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers
Figure 9. Range of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Emotional Support for pre-test and post-test

Figure 10. Distribution of pre and post scores on Pre-K CLASS® Emotional Support for Tier 1 providers
Results from analysis of classroom-level change across the first year of participation (from baseline to MMCI) across all coalitions indicate that for preschool classrooms, teachers had statistically significant change on Emotional Support. The standardized effect is 0.60 (SE=0.05, p=0.00).

Across the second year of participation (from MMCI to MMCI + Early Learning Florida) across all coalitions, the change on Emotional Support was positive but not statistically significant. The standardized effect is 0.16 (SE=0.09, p=0.15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS® Domain</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>MMCI</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>MMCI + Early Learning Florida</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Classroom-level gain on Emotional Support across preschool classes all coalitions

Pre-K CLASS® Classroom Organization

When comparing Pre-K CLASS® pre-test scores on Classroom Organization for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 4.76 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 5.36, yielding a difference of +0.60. When comparing Pre-K CLASS® post-test scores on Classroom Organization for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 5.30 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 5.49, yielding a difference of +0.19.
Figure 12a and b. Distribution of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Classroom Organization for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers
Figure 13. Range of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Classroom Organization for pre-test and post-test

Figure 14. Distribution of pre and post scores on Pre-K CLASS® Classroom Organization for Tier 1 providers
Figure 15. Distribution of pre and post scores on Pre-K CLASS® Classroom Organization for Tier 2 providers

Results from analysis of classroom-level change across the first year of participation (from baseline to MMCI) across all coalitions indicate that for preschool classrooms, teachers had statistically significant change on Classroom Organization. The standardized effect is 0.53(SE=0.06, p=0.00).

Across the second year of participation (from MMCI to MMCI + Early Learning Florida) across all coalitions, the change on Classroom Organization in preschool was positive but not statistically significant. The standardized effect is 0.15(SE=0.11, p=0.16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS® Domain</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Organization</td>
<td>MMCI</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Organization</td>
<td>MMCI + Early Learning Florida</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Classroom-level gain on Classroom Organization preschool classes across all coalitions

Pre-K CLASS® Instructional Support

When comparing Pre-K CLASS® pre-test scores on Instructional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 2.33 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 3.00, yielding a difference of +0.67.

When comparing Pre-K CLASS® post-test scores on Instructional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 3.12 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 3.68, yielding a difference of +0.56.
CLASS PRE-K INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT (PRE)

Figure 16a and b. Distribution of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Instructional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers

CLASS PRE-K INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT (POST)

Figure 16a and b. Distribution of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Instructional Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers
Figure 17. Range of Pre-K CLASS® scores on Instructional Support for pre-test and post-test

Figure 18. Distribution of pre and post scores on Pre-K CLASS® Instructional Support for Tier 1 providers
Results from analysis of classroom-level change across the first year of participation (from baseline to MMCI) across all coalitions indicate that for preschool classrooms, teachers had statistically significant change on Instructional Support. The standardized effect is 0.73(SE=0.06, p=0.00).

Across the second year of participation (from MMCI to MMCI + Early Learning Florida) across all coalitions, there was positive and statistically significant change for the domain of instructional support in preschool classes. The standardized effect is 0.79(SE=0.11, p=0.00).

### Table 3. Classroom-level gain on Instructional Support in preschool classes across all coalitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS® Domain</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>MMCI</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>MMCI + Early Learning Florida</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toddler CLASS® Emotional and Behavioral Support

When comparing Toddler CLASS® pre-test scores on Emotional and Behavioral Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 5.21 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 5.57, yielding a difference of +0.36.

When comparing Toddler CLASS® post-test scores on Emotional and Behavioral Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 5.70 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 5.62, yielding a difference of -0.08.
Figure 20. Distribution of Toddler CLASS® scores on Emotional and Behavioral Support for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers
Figure 21. Range of Toddler CLASS® scores on Emotional and Behavioral Support for pre-test and post-test

Figure 22. Range of Toddler CLASS® scores on Emotional and Behavioral Support for pre-test and post-test
Figure 23. Distribution of pre and post scores on Toddler CLASS® Emotional and Behavioral Support for Tier 2 providers

Results from analysis of classroom-level change across the first year of participation (from baseline to MMCI) across all coalitions indicate that for toddler classrooms, teachers had statistically significant change on Emotional and Behavioral Support. The standardized effect is 0.53(SE=0.06, p=0.00).

Across the second year of participation (from MMCI to MMCI + Early Learning Florida) across all coalitions, the change on Emotional and Behavioral Support in toddler classes was positive but not statistically significant. The standardized effect is 0.07(SE=0.10, p=0.58).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS® Domain</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and Behavioral Support</td>
<td>MMCI</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and Behavioral Support</td>
<td>MMCI + Early Learning Florida</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Classroom-level gain on Emotional and Behavioral Support in toddler classes across all coalitions
Toddler CLASS® Engaged Support for Learning
When comparing Toddler CLASS® pre-test scores on Engaged Support for Learning for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 2.73 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 3.43, yielding a difference of +0.70.

When comparing Toddler CLASS® post-test scores on Engaged Support for Learning for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 3.51 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 3.62, yielding a difference of +0.11.

CLASS TODDLER ENGAGED SUPPORT FOR LEARNING (PRE)
CLASS TODDLER ENGAGED SUPPORT FOR LEARNING (POST)

Figure 24a and b. Distribution of Toddler CLASS® scores on Engaged Support for Learning for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers

Figure 25. Range of Toddler CLASS® scores on Engaged Support for Learning for pre-test and post-test
Figure 26. Distribution of pre and post scores on Toddler CLASS® Engaged Support for Learning for Tier 1 providers

Figure 27. Distribution of pre and post scores on Toddler CLASS® Engaged Support for Learning for Tier 2 providers
Results from analysis of classroom-level change across the first year of participation (from baseline to MMCI) across all coalitions indicate that for toddler classrooms, teachers had statistically significant change on Engaged Support for Learning. The standardized effect is 0.77(SE=0.08, p=0.00).

Across the second year of participation (from MMCI to MMCI + Early Learning Florida) across all coalitions, the change on Engaged Support for Learning in toddler classes was also positive and statistically significant. The standardized effect is 0.27(SE=0.14, p=0.02).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS® Domain</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Support for Learning</td>
<td>MMCI</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Support for Learning</td>
<td>MMCI + Early Learning Florida</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Classroom-level gain on Engaged Support for Learning in toddler classes across all coalitions*

**Infant CLASS® Responsive Caregiving**

When comparing Infant CLASS® pre-test scores on Responsive Caregiving for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 4.20 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 5.15, yielding a difference of +0.95.

When comparing Infant CLASS® post-test scores on Responsive Caregiving for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers, the average score for Tier 1 providers was 4.31 and the average score for Tier 2 providers was 5.25, yielding a difference of +0.94.

**INFANT CLASS RESPONSIVE CAREGIVING (PRE)**

![Graph showing percentage of providers by score](image-url)
INFANT CLASS RESPONSIVE CAREGIVING (POST)

Figure 28 a and b. Distribution of Infant CLASS® scores on Responsive Caregiving for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers

Figure 29. Range of Infant CLASS® scores on Responsive Caregiving for pre-test and post-test
Figure 30. Distribution of pre and post scores on Infant CLASS® Responsive Caregiving for Tier 1 providers

Figure 31. Distribution of pre and post scores on Infant CLASS® Responsive Caregiving for Tier 2 providers
Results from analysis of classroom-level change across the first year of participation (from baseline to MMCI) across all coalitions indicate that there was no significant change for infant classrooms.

Comparing the 15 Infant CLASS® observations that were obtained for teachers with MMCI training with the four observations for teachers with MMCI + ELFL training, the change in responsive caregiving in infant classes was negative and not statistically significant, with the standardized effect of $-0.23 (SE=0.20, p=0.40)$. However, due to the fact this was an unplanned subset of teachers in this study, these results are not expected to generalize due to the very small sample size, and should not represent all subsets of Infant teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS® Domain</th>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Caregiving</td>
<td>MMCI + Early Learning Florida</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6. Classroom-level gain on Engaged Support for Learning in toddler classes across all coalitions*

**Comparison of CLASS® Scores by Early Learning Coalitions (ELC)**

CLASS® pre-test and post-test data were analyzed by types of Early Learning Coalitions. The participating ELCs were categorized into two groups: ELCs with QRIS and ELCs with no QRIS. Table YYY shows the number of classrooms at pre-test and at post-test for each type of coalition. The results indicate that the classroom retention from pre-test to post-test was much better in coalitions with no QRIS.

The means of CLASS® pre-test and post-test scores on each domain of CLASS® by types of ELC were also obtained and it was showed in Table YYY. The results indicate the ELCs with QRIS had higher pre-test on average for all the CLASS® domains except for Instructional Support and Responsive Caregiving. For post-test, the ELCs with QRIS had higher scores on average for all the CLASS® domains except for Emotional and Behavioral Support, Engaged Support for Learning and Instructional Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ELC</th>
<th>Number of Classroom (Pre)</th>
<th>Number of Classroom (Post)</th>
<th>Percentage of Classroom Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QRIS</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-QRIS</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7. Number of classrooms at pre versus post by types of ELC*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of CLASS</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>QRIS</th>
<th>Non-QRIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Organization</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and Behavioral Support</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Support for Learning</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Caregiving</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8. Means of CLASS® pre-test and post-test scores on each domain by types of ELC*
**RESEARCH QUESTION 3: WHAT IMPACT DOES THE ELPFP PPP HAVE ON CLASSROOM CLIMATE FOR THE TIER 2 PROGRAM AS COMPARED TO THE TIER 1 PROGRAM?**

The Preschool Climate of Healthy Interactions for Learning and Development Scale (CHILD) is an objective observational measure of the social-emotional climate of preschool classrooms, providing a greater depth of information in this area than the Emotional Support domain of the Pre-K CLASS® alone. A comparison of means across Tier 1 and Tier 2 was performed for the total score of CHILD and each domain score with CHILD observations for classrooms with consistent teachers at pre-test and post-test to examine the impact of the ELPFPPP on classroom climate for the Tier 2 program as compared to the Tier 1 program.

Overall, there were 77 observations associated with Tier 1 providers, 27 observations associated with Tier 2 providers. Means and standard deviations of CHILD total score and domain scores by tier were shown in Table 9. Results indicate that Tier 2 participants scored higher than Tier 1 participants on both the total score and each domain (except Staff-Child Interactions), but these differences were not statistically significant.

These results are preliminary because there were problems with data collection, which resulted in unequal group sizes for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers. The original design was to collect 100 observations for Tier 1 and 100 observations for Tier 2. However, the observers did not reliably record teacher names, and therefore there were classrooms where we could not ascertain that the teacher was the same for the duration of the study. The scores for these classrooms were not used in the analysis. Furthermore, there is evidence that the training received by the observers was insufficient to provide adequate reliability of raters. A longer training section would solve these problems, as well as an extended data collection protocol that enforces the recording of teacher names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mean Tier 1</th>
<th>SD Tier 1</th>
<th>Mean Tier 2</th>
<th>SD Tier 2</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean Difference</th>
<th>t statistic</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions &amp; Rules</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Affect</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and Emotional Learning</strong></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td><strong>0.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Awareness</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Cooperation</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-Child Interactions</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized &amp; Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Behaviors</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9. Means and standard deviations of CHILD total score and domain scores*
RESEARCH QUESTION 4: DO THE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATING IN THE TIER 2 PROGRAM DEPEND ON THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROVIDERS AND THE POPULATION IT SERVES?

Researchers investigated whether the effects of participation on knowledge assessments and CLASS® scores depended on provider size (i.e., count of children attending), the percentage of children in poverty attending the center, and if the provider had Gold Seal Accreditation status when participating in the ELPFPP.

For knowledge scores, the analyses consisted on three-level multilevel models of teachers (level 1), clustered within providers (level 2), clustered within early learning coalitions (level 3). Separate multilevel models were fit for the ITSED course scores and PKO course scores. The outcome was the gain scores from pre-test to post-test, and the predictors were the pre-test score and provider characteristics. These models were fit using the lme4 package of the R statistical software.

For knowledge assessments, the data for the ITSED assessment data had 34 teachers, 8 providers and 6 coalitions. The data for the PKO assessment had 54 teachers, 15 providers, and 6 coalitions. The results indicate that teachers in providers with Gold Seal status had higher gains in the ITSED course, but not in the PKO course. None of the other Tier 2 provider characteristics had an effect on knowledge assessment scores of participant teachers.

For CLASS® scores, the analysis was restricted to 128 teachers who were in Tier 2 providers in the spring of 2016. The CLASS® observations were repeated measures at three waves (no training, MMCI training, and MMCI + Early Learning Florida training) occurring between 2014 and 2016. The dataset had 376 observations, with 98 in the no training condition, 281 having completed MMCI and 135 having completed MMCI and two Early Learning Florida course. Each teacher had been observed between one and six times. The analysis consisted of cluster-robust regression models at the observation level, controlling for clustering of observations within classrooms, provider, and coalition. The models were fit using the survey package of the R statistical software. For pre-K classrooms, the outcomes of the analysis were ES, CO, and IS domain scores. For toddler classrooms, the outcomes were EBS and ESL domain scores. Infant RC CLASS® scores could not be analyzed because the sample size was too low for the model to converge. The only provider characteristic that had an effect on CLASS® scores of Tier 2 participants was Gold Seal status: providers with Gold Seal status had higher scores on the ES and IS class domains. Further data and analysis is needed to determine the impact of different accreditation models rather than aggregate results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>4373.89</td>
<td>614.04</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test ITSED class</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>-13.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider mean EBS</td>
<td>-117.53</td>
<td>138.97</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider mean ESL</td>
<td>-630.07</td>
<td>171.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of attending children</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children in poverty</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Seal</td>
<td>1529.62</td>
<td>258.91</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Effect of provider characteristics on ITSED knowledge scores
Table 11. Effect of provider characteristics on PKO knowledge scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1730.36</td>
<td>548.45</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test PKO class</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>45.03</td>
<td>-14.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider mean ES</td>
<td>-40.72</td>
<td>193.08</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider mean CO</td>
<td>146.86</td>
<td>141.39</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider mean IS</td>
<td>-147.80</td>
<td>78.37</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of attending children</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children in poverty</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Seal</td>
<td>123.73</td>
<td>116.37</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Effect of provider characteristics on PKO knowledge scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Characteristic and interactions with Early Learning Florida</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count of Children Attending</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Florida by Count of Children Attending</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Seal Status</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Florida by Gold Seal Status</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in poverty</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Florida by percent in poverty</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>EBS</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Effect of provider characteristics on CLASS® scores
RESEARCH QUESTION 5: DO THE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATING IN THE TIER 2 PROGRAM DEPEND ON THE LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION OF THE PROVIDER’S TEACHERS IN EARLY LEARNING FLORIDA?

To answer this research question, Tier 2 participants were separated by type of Early Learning Florida course and model. Researchers also collected the time teachers spent logged in into the Early Learning Florida system, which was used as a measurement of level of participation. There were 74 teachers taking the ITSED course. However, only 7 of the teachers taking the ITSED course completed the online + community of practice model, while the remaining 67 completed the online only model. There were 86 teachers taking the PKO course, with 37 taking the online + community of practice version and 49 taking the online only version.

The distribution of time teachers spent logged into the Early Learning Florida system for these two courses were shown in Figure 31 and Figure 32. Practitioners spent 9.58 (SD=5.35) hours in the Early Learning Florida system on average for the ITSED course. For the PKO course, teachers spent 9.12 (SD=4.26) hours in the Early Learning Florida system on average. The time logged into the system is a reliable measure of level of participation of teachers in Early Learning Florida courses, and was used to answer Research Question 5.

Figure 32. Distribution of time spent logged in into the Early Learning Florida system for ITSED course
Figure 33. Distribution of time spent logged in into the Early Learning Florida system for PKO course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Learning Florida Course</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSED</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Means and standard deviations of hours spent logged into the Early Learning Florida system for ITSED and PKO courses

The effects of level of participation in Early Learning Florida courses on teacher knowledge were estimated with two multilevel models where the outcomes were the scores on knowledge assessments for the ITSED and PKO courses and the predictors were an indicator of time (pre-test or post-test), an indicator of the type of Early Learning Florida model (Online only or Online + Community of Practice), dummy indicators of quartiles of time spent on the Early Learning Florida system with the ITSED or PKO courses, and dummy indicators of quartiles of time spent in the Early Learning Florida system in other courses that the teacher was enrolled on. Two-way interactions between time and the other predictors were also analyzed to capture whether change from pre-test and post-test depended on type of Early Learning Florida model, time spent in the course and time spent in other courses.
The multilevel model indicated significant gains from pre-test to post-test for knowledge with both ITSED and PKO courses. The table of means indicates that the 7 participants that received the online only version of the ITSED course had higher gains than the 67 participants receiving the online + community of practice version. However, the multilevel model indicated that after controlling for time spent in the Early Learning Florida system, there was not difference between the types of Early Learning Florida model on knowledge with the ITSED course. The descriptive statistics of knowledge gains for the ITSED course by quartiles of time spent in the Early Learning Florida system indicates a trend for higher gains as the time in Early Learning Florida increases, but this trend was not statistically significant in the multilevel model. For the PKO course, the table of descriptive statistics shows that the gains for the 49 participants of the online only version of the PKO course were higher than the gain of the 37 participants of the online + community of practice version. This difference was found to be statistically significant in the multilevel model, as indicated by a significant interaction between gain and model type. More specifically, participants in the online only were found to have gains that were 155.45 (SE = 73.98, p = 0.04) points higher than participants of the online + community of practice version. There were not significant effect of time spent logged into the Early Learning Florida system for the PKO course on knowledge gains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Learning Florida model</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Mean Pre-test</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>Mean Gain as % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online + Community of Practice</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Average gains from pre-test to post-test for ITSED Class by Early Learning Florida model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Learning Florida model</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Mean Pre-test</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>Mean Gain as % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online + Community of Practice</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online only</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Average gains from pre-test to post-test for PKO Class by Early Learning Florida model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Learning Florida Model</th>
<th>Quartiles of Hours in Early Learning Florida system</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Mean Pre-test</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>Mean Gain as % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td>0 - 5.56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.56 - 9.64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.64 - 12.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.8 - 27.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online + Community of Practice</td>
<td>5.56 - 9.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.64 - 12.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Average gains from pre-test to post-test for ITSED Class by hours in the Early Learning Florida system and Early Learning Florida model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Learning Florida Model</th>
<th>Hours in Early Learning Florida system</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Mean Pre-test</th>
<th>Mean Post-test</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>Mean Gain as % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td>0.683 - 6.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.17 - 8.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.88 - 11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5 - 23.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online + Community of Practice</td>
<td>0.683 - 6.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.17 - 8.88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.88 - 11.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5 - 23.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Average gains from pre-test to post-test for PKO Class by hours in the Early Learning Florida system and Early Learning Florida model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>944.75</td>
<td>209.88</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain from pre to post test</td>
<td>928.17</td>
<td>241.76</td>
<td>56.94</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Type ITSED Online only</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>130.59</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with ITSED - Quartile (5.56,9.64]</td>
<td>218.43</td>
<td>143.09</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with ITSED - Quartile (9.64,12.8]</td>
<td>110.50</td>
<td>130.86</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with ITSED - Quartile (12.8,27.4]</td>
<td>152.06</td>
<td>137.44</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with other courses - Quartile (1.12,7.39]</td>
<td>-156.09</td>
<td>222.55</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with other courses - Quartile (7.39,11.6]</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>218.99</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with other courses - Quartile (11.6,25.2]</td>
<td>-226.23</td>
<td>223.37</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Model Type ITSED Online only</td>
<td>316.15</td>
<td>187.06</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with ITSED - Quartile (5.56,9.64]</td>
<td>-180.41</td>
<td>256.73</td>
<td>55.68</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with ITSED - Quartile (9.64,12.8]</td>
<td>-75.30</td>
<td>250.95</td>
<td>58.77</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gain by Time with ITSED - Quartile (12.8,27.4) & -155.55 & 252.70 & 56.87 & -0.62 & 0.54
Gain by Time with other courses - Quartile (1.12,7.39) & -183.82 & 182.39 & 45.10 & -1.01 & 0.32
Gain by Time with other courses - Quartile (7.39,11.6) & -177.24 & 148.17 & 42.44 & -1.20 & 0.24

Table 18. Results of multilevel model for ITSED Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1197.34</td>
<td>82.05</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain from pre to post test</td>
<td>455.86</td>
<td>104.81</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Type PKO Online only</td>
<td>-41.59</td>
<td>64.97</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with PKO - Quartile (6.17,8.88)</td>
<td>157.57</td>
<td>92.49</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with PKO - Quartile (8.88,11.5)</td>
<td>166.56</td>
<td>91.16</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with PKO - Quartile (11.5,23.1)</td>
<td>128.55</td>
<td>94.44</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with other courses - Quartile (7.78,10.5)</td>
<td>-62.42</td>
<td>88.78</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with other courses - Quartile (10.5,13.4)</td>
<td>-103.54</td>
<td>92.92</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with other courses - Quartile (13.4,57.7)</td>
<td>-76.73</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Model Type PKO Online only</td>
<td>155.45</td>
<td>73.98</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with PKO - Quartile (6.17,8.88)</td>
<td>-56.50</td>
<td>111.21</td>
<td>73.14</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with PKO - Quartile (8.88,11.5)</td>
<td>-154.58</td>
<td>110.46</td>
<td>73.70</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with PKO - Quartile (11.5,23.1)</td>
<td>-75.61</td>
<td>114.20</td>
<td>73.55</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with other courses - Quartile (7.78,10.5)</td>
<td>-42.91</td>
<td>99.80</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with other courses - Quartile (10.5,13.4)</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>107.23</td>
<td>70.01</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain by Time with other courses - Quartile (13.4,57.7)</td>
<td>-127.59</td>
<td>105.87</td>
<td>69.80</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Results of multilevel model for PKO Class

Note. Coefficients in bold are statistically significant.
RESEARCH QUESTION 6: DO THE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATING IN THE TIER 2 PROGRAM DEPEND ON THE INITIAL CLASS® SCORES OF THE PROVIDERS’ TEACHERS?

The dataset of CLASS® pre-test for Tier 2 teachers with the dataset of knowledge assessments were merged. There were 148 Tier 2 teachers who had been collected on CLASS® pre-test and had completed either the PKO or the ITSED courses. From the 148 Tier 2 teachers, 72 of them had taken the pre-tests of knowledge assessment for ITSED and 60 of them had taken the post-tests for ITSED. There were 76 teachers who completed the pre-test of knowledge assessment for PKO and 69 teachers who completed the post-test for PKO. Statistical analyses of the knowledge scores as a function of the initial CLASS® scores of the Tier 2 teachers were performed. Multilevel modeling approach was employed to analyze the knowledge assessment scores for ITSED class considering time and the CLASS® pre-test scores on two domains of Toddler CLASS® (Engaged Support for Learning & Emotional and Behavioral Support) as the predictors. The same approach was employed to analyze the knowledge assessment scores for PKO class considering time and the CLASS® pre-test scores on three domains of CLASS® Pre-K (Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support) as the predictors.

Table 20 and 21 contain results from statistical analysis for each course. Results indicated statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test on both the ITSED and PKO assessments. Practitioners gain 1510.68 (SE=476.90, p=0.00) which is about 69% of the total score from pre-test to post-test on ITSED assessment. Practitioners gain 414.41 (SE=34.77, p=0.00) which is about 21% of the total score from pre-test to post-test on PKO assessment. There were no statistically significant relationships between domains of Toddler CLASS® and the knowledge assessment scores for ITSED class. There were also no statistically significant relationships between domains of Toddler CLASS® and teachers gains on knowledge assessment for ITSED class. Similarly, for PKO class, results also indicated there were no statistically significant relationships between the three domains of Pre-K CLASS® and the knowledge assessment scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>-572.51</td>
<td>743.93</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1510.68</td>
<td>476.90</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Support for Learning</td>
<td>36.64</td>
<td>110.65</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and Behavioral Support</td>
<td>123.45</td>
<td>174.37</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Support for Learning*Time</td>
<td>-15.59</td>
<td>71.54</td>
<td>46.93</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and Behavioral Support*Time</td>
<td>-131.12</td>
<td>111.04</td>
<td>44.85</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Results of statistical analysis for ITSED course assessment
Table 21. Results of statistical analysis for PKO course assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>683.26</td>
<td>219.06</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>414.41</td>
<td>34.77</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>-17.77</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>60.88</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Organization</td>
<td>63.46</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>-31.29</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>66.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH QUESTION 7: DO THE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATING IN THE TIER 2 PROGRAM DEPEND ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT THAT TEACHERS’ RECEIVED?**

Data on organizational support was obtained from a survey of Tier 2 teachers who completed the Early Learning Florida training. The objective of the survey was to collect data about: (1) participant’s reactions to Early Learning Florida; (2) determine levels of organizational support for Early Learning Florida courses; (3) determine interactions with Early Learning Florida course instructors, coaches, and community of practice facilitators; and (4) determine participants’ opportunities for use of knowledge obtained in Early Learning Florida courses. The survey was sent to teachers who completed and mastered (achieving 80% or higher) two Early Learning Florida course, and was sent after the course through online survey software Qualtrics. There were 244 responses (69 % of the targeted teachers) in total out of 353 teachers received. Among those teachers, nearly 51% of them participated in the online only model. Approximately 18% of them participated the Online course + TA Coaching model. About 38% of them participated in the Online course + Community of Practice model. The summary of the results are presented below, but graphs for all the survey questions are presented in the Appendix F.

With regard to course experiences, it was found that about half of the teachers reported difficulty finding time to complete coursework assignments, such as watch videos, and also had difficulty with internet connection. Nearly 63% of teachers had difficulty finding time to complete the assigned readings. Only 18% of teachers had difficulty with the language and vocabulary used in courses. When asked about incorporating new strategies into their existing teaching schedule, approximately 72% of the teachers thought new practices they learned in Early Learning Florida would not disturb the routine of their classroom.

Among the teachers who completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, all of them reported being able to implement strategies. With regard to collaborating with other teachers, nearly 87% of teachers reported collaborating with other colleagues in their centers or family child care homes when implementing the strategies. In terms of the usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to including increasing teachers’ knowledge of content & teaching practice, learning new approaches to child assessment, and learning strategies to teach ALL children, the majority (97%) of teachers thought Early Learning Florida courses were useful. Almost all of the teachers reported making changes in their teaching practices as a result of the Early Learning Florida learning. Among the teachers who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, approximately 82% were interested in taking another Early Learning Florida course. Nearly 96% of teachers would encourage other colleagues to take an Early Learning Florida course.
Perception of Online course + TA coaching model
Among the teachers who were participating the Online course + TA Coaching model, about 22% met with the UF Certified TA Coach less than three times, while 65% of teachers reported meeting with coaches between three and five times. Only 14% of teachers met with coaches more than five times. Regarding the number of classroom observations made by the UF Certified TA Coach, nearly 35% of teachers in the Online course + TA Coaching model reported that their classrooms were observed less than three times. Approximately 62% of teachers were observed between three times and five times, and only 3% of teachers were observed more than five times. Regarding the quality of coaching experiences, the majority (98%) of teachers thought their interactions with the UF Certified TA Coach were helpful in improving their practices.

Perception of Online course + Community of Practice model
Among the teachers who participated the Online course + Community of Practice model, nearly 86% of teachers attended more than three COP sessions, and approximately 94% of teachers thought their interactions within their Communities of Practice were helpful. The majority of teachers shared successes and challenges in their Communities of Practice, and nearly 95% of teachers sought ideas from colleagues participating in the same course in their CoP. Almost 96% of teachers reported they learned a great deal from others in their blended learning community.

Lack of Director support
Among the teachers who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, only 9% reported a lack of director support in their coursework, while 85% of teachers did not encounter any barriers regarding director support of learning.

Figure 34. Lack of Director support
Lack of Support from the Course Instructor
Among the teachers who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, only 3% of teachers reported lacking support from their course instructor, while almost 81% of teachers reported not encountering any difficulty at all in terms of lack of support from the instructor.

Lack of Support from Other Teachers
Among the teachers who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, only 1% of teachers were lacking support from other teachers, while almost 82% of teachers did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of support from other teachers.
Lack of Necessary Materials
Among the teachers who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, approximately 20% of teachers reported lacking necessary materials in some way, while almost 78% of teachers did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of necessary materials.

![Figure 37. Lack of necessary materials](image)

Relationship Between Organizational Support and Knowledge Gains
For research purposes, the dataset of survey responses was merged with the dataset of knowledge assessments. From the respondents of the survey, 120 Tier 2 teachers had completed either the PKO or the ITSED courses. Statistical analyses of the knowledge scores as a function of organizational support the teachers’ received were performed. The organizational support includes the support from director, support from the Early Learning Florida course instructor, support from other teachers, and availability of necessary materials and resources. The average knowledge assessment scores and gain scores for each course are reported by level of reported lack of director support, lack of support from the course instructor, lack of support from other teachers and lack of necessary materials (Table 23 - Table 25). Multilevel modeling was performed to analyze the knowledge assessment scores considering time and organizational support as predictors.

Table 22 and Table 23 contain results from statistical analysis for each course. Results indicated statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test on both the ITSED and PKO assessments. Practitioners gained 657.24 (SE=57.38, p=0.00) which is about 30% of the total score from pre-test to post-test on ITSED assessment. Practitioners gained 397.37 (SE=35.02, p=0.00) which is about 20% of the total score from pre-test to post-test on PKO assessment. There was no statistically significant difference on knowledge scores between teachers who responded “Somewhat or a lot” to the questions and those who responded “A little or not at all” about whether they lacked any organizational support from directors, course instructors, other teachers, or support from materials and resources.
### Table 22. Average knowledge assessment scores by levels of reported lack of Director support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of Director support</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Pre-test ITSED</th>
<th>Post-test ITSED</th>
<th>Gain ITSED</th>
<th>Pre-test PKO</th>
<th>Post-test PKO</th>
<th>Gain PKO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little or not at all</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat or a lot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23. Average knowledge assessment scores by levels of reported lack of support from the course instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of support from the instructor</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Pre-test ITSED</th>
<th>Post-test ITSED</th>
<th>Gain ITSED</th>
<th>Pre-test PKO</th>
<th>Post-test PKO</th>
<th>Gain PKO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little or not at all</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat or a lot</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 24. Average knowledge assessment scores by levels of reported lack of support from other teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of support from other teachers</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Pre-test ITSED</th>
<th>Post-test ITSED</th>
<th>Gain ITSED</th>
<th>Pre-test PKO</th>
<th>Post-test PKO</th>
<th>Gain PKO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little or not at all</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat or a lot</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 25. Average gains in knowledge assessment by reported lack of necessary materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of necessary materials</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Pre-test ITSED</th>
<th>Post-test ITSED</th>
<th>Gain ITSED</th>
<th>Pre-test PKO</th>
<th>Post-test PKO</th>
<th>Gain PKO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little or not at all</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat or a lot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 26. Results of statistical analysis for ITSED course assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1046.90</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>657.24</td>
<td>57.38</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>193.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>80.26</td>
<td>100.05</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-368.34</td>
<td>209.96</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-41.78</td>
<td>138.59</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. Results of statistical analysis for ITSED course assessment
Table 27. Results of statistical analysis for PKO course assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>1266.80</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>46.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>397.37</td>
<td>35.02</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-235.70</td>
<td>270.49</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-115.48</td>
<td>160.10</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-15.48</td>
<td>114.22</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>184.52</td>
<td>160.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 27. Results of statistical analysis for PKO course assessment**

**Relationship between Organizational Support and CLASS® Scores**

The dataset of survey responses with the dataset of CLASS® (pre-test & post-test) were also merged. From the respondents of the survey, 62 Tier 2 teachers had both CLASS® pre-test and post-test scores on domains of Emotional Support, Classroom Organization and Instructional Support. There were 43 Tier 2 teachers that had both CLASS® pre-test and CLASS® post-test scores on domains of Emotional and Behavioral Support and Engaged Support for Learning. Statistical analyses of the CLASS® scores as a function of organizational support the teachers’ received were performed. Multilevel modeling approach was employed to analyze the CLASS® scores considering time and organizational support as predictors.

Table 28, Table 29 and Table 30 contain results from statistical analysis for each domain of CLASS® Pre-K. For Emotional Support, results indicated teachers who responded “Somewhat or a lot” to the questions about whether they lacked support from the course instructor gained significantly more by 1.37 (SE=0.56, p=0.02) as compared to those who responded “A little or not at all”. Practitioners who responded “Somewhat or a lot” to the questions about whether they lacked support from other teachers gain significantly less by 1.86 (SE=0.59, p=0.00) as compared to those who responded “A little or not at all”. There was no statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test on Emotional Support.

For Classroom Organization, results indicated there was no statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test. For Instructional Support, results indicated statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test. The effect was 0.83 (SE=0.15, p=0.00).

Table 31 and Table 32 contain results from statistical analysis for domains of Toddler CLASS®. For Emotional and Behavioral Support, results indicated there was no statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test. And there was also no statistically significant difference on gains between teachers who responded “Somewhat or a lot” to the questions about whether they lacked organizational support and those who responded “A little or not at all”. For Engaged Support for Learning, results indicated statistically significant gains from pre-test to post-test. The effect was 0.39 (SE=0.20, p=0.05). Practitioners who responded “Somewhat or a lot” to the question about whether they lacked support from the course instructor gained significantly less by 3.46 (SE=1.00, p=0.00) as compared to those who responded “A little or not at all”. Practitioners who responded “Somewhat or a lot” to the question about whether they lacked support from the other teachers gain significantly more by 3.82 (SE=1.64, p=0.03) as compared to those who responded “A little or not at all”.

### Table 28. Results of statistical analysis for CLASS® domain of Emotional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>87.85</td>
<td>75.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>73.41</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>104.38</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>114.01</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>104.38</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>64.87</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>64.87</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 29. Results of statistical analysis for CLASS® domain of Classroom Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>82.86</td>
<td>48.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>96.58</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>112.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>96.58</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>62.95</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>73.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>62.95</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 30. Results of statistical analysis for CLASS® domain of Instructional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>76.48</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>64.93</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>88.84</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>109.39</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>88.84</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 31. Results of statistical analysis for CLASS® domain of Emotional and Behavioral Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>40.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>40.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>71.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>55.16</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 32. Results of statistical analysis for CLASS® domain of Engaged Support for Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>51.99</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>39.88</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>48.86</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>68.08</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials (Somewhat or a lot)</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>52.12</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>41.14</td>
<td>-3.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials (Somewhat or a lot)*Time</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>39.45</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

In order to triangulate quantitative data results and present the voice of stakeholders who engaged in the ELPFPP, three phases of interviews were conducted: (1) Tier 2 teacher pre-intervention interviews determining educational background, motivations, and preliminary experiences of participating in the ELPFPP; (2) Tier 2 teacher post-intervention interviews determining specific experiences from the ELPFPP, overall interpretations, and identification of barriers and opportunities for improving the initiative; and (3) early learning coalition leadership focus group interviews determining both impact and effectiveness of the ELPFPP on classroom practice, provider quality, and coalition quality. The results of these interviews are presented as follows according to objectives of this qualitative research: (1) themes that resonated in teacher interviews regarding their overall ELPFPP experience; (2) a detailed breakdown of both tiers of professional development to describe understanding of teacher learning, changes in practice, impact on quality for providers and coalitions, and challenges and barriers to project implementation; and (3) challenges of ELPFPP participation (teachers) and implementation (coalition staff). Evidence in the form of direct quotes from stakeholders are given to further support themes and offer in-depth description of processes and structures involved in this project. All evidence are provided with codes that categorize participants by regions that are detailed in Figure 38, but de-identify individual participants in order to preserve confidentiality during the data collection process. The goal was to interview teachers and early learning coalition staff in the same regions in order to further triangulate data regarding ELPFPP experiences. While no Tier 1 providers were direct participants in these interviews, post-intervention recollections regarding Tier 1 professional development were discussed with Tier 2 participants and coalition staff, and thus will be presented.
Experiences of Tier 2 from the Teacher’s Voice

During Tier 2 teachers’ first round of interviews, questions regarding motivations to participate in the ELPFPP were asked, and teachers cited specific goals such as gaining new knowledge and learning strategies to improve teaching and student learning. Other motivations included financial incentives such as receiving stipends and taking free Early Learning Florida courses, obtaining new teaching curriculum and materials through coursework, and collaborating with other teachers and providers regarding course content and strategies (ELPFPP Preliminary Report, 2016). For the second post-intervention teacher interviews, participants were reminded of these earlier statements, and asked if specific goals were achieved with the completion of this professional development project. All teachers responded that goals for learning, gaining new knowledge and materials, and collaboration were not only achieved, they were surpassed. Collective themes of teachers’ experiences learned from second interviews included elevating the level of teacher knowledge, professional practice, and confidence in the classroom, and seeing evidence from changes in teacher’s instructional practice directly in children’s learning and language.

Elevating the Level of Teachers’ Knowledge, Professional Practice, and Confidence in the Classroom

When teachers were asked to describe their ELPFPP experience in one word during second interviews, words like proud, professional, better, difficult, impossible, learning and knowledge were given, but the most common answer was beneficial. All teachers felt that engaging in Tier 2 of the ELPFPP provided them a sense of accomplishment
because this was a difficult learning experience for many. Despite those difficulties, teachers felt more knowledgeable and considered themselves better teachers as a result. Practitioners spoke of their professional growth, and recited strategies they had learned and implemented from Early Learning Florida coursework and child assessment training. Regardless of challenges such as time to complete assignments or technological difficulties, teachers believed this effort was a positive learning experience and it made them more confident as teachers. For example, a teacher from a northern coalition stated:

_I feel like I accomplished my goals, and it provided me with such tremendous benefits. I was able to grow professionally and improve the quality of care and education to my young children. There were days when I didn’t think I could finish, and when I thought I wasn’t cut out for online learning and everything just piled up, but then I would realize that what I was learning was influencing the way I taught my children, and it was so much better! It was inspirational (JHD36E, Interview 2)._

When asked what specific parts of their teaching had changed or been impacted by their ELPFPP experience, the majority of teachers cited knowledge gain as their biggest outcome from this learning. Novice teachers felt that they were often overwhelmed with new information, and veteran teachers said they were “refreshed” with new knowledge and practices, but teachers managed to retain that information to inform their teaching. A first-year teacher in a southern coalition stated,

_The thing that stood out to me the most was how I learned to be able to observe a child, and then implement all these ideas to them. I never knew how important observation was, I was just going about my day and hitting all the learning I was supposed to hit, you know, checking the boxes. But I watched them so much more, and I never knew that before…and after I watched them, I realized they all needed specific things, and really different things to help them grow, and I never knew any of that stuff before. I felt really good about myself as a teacher after figuring that out (EON412, Interview 2)._

When first interviewed, many teachers spoke of the need to make early childhood education more professional. Teachers felt undervalued in their role in children’s learning due to lack of compensation, education, and credentialing. These reasons were a common motivation to increase learning and knowledge to feel “more like teachers, and less like babysitters” (T6GLDX, Interview 1). After completing the ELPFPP, teachers felt more professional, and were encouraged to continue their education. Many participants cited their involvement in collaborative work in Early Learning Florida courses as part of professionalizing their mindset. During course online discussions and Communities of Practice meetings (not all participants were in CoP course options), teachers realized the power and value of discussion and reflection, and felt a sense of empowerment from working together and sharing ideas. A participant from a northern coalition gave an example:

_In the CoP we were able to communicate and use language that all of us knew from the courses, and I felt like a real teacher! I actually used words like ‘engage’ and ‘scaffold’! We talked about what we were doing our self, and heard what everyone else was doing, and our facilitator made us realize those connections and helped us solve problems. She compared us to a group of business leaders, and called us a “think tank”...and we were! We were creating new ideas and solving problems. I left there feeling so proud of what I was doing, and that other people wanted to use my ideas in their classrooms...I never thought I could do this, to learn like this, and now I don’t want to stop (VQ13N4, Interview 2)._

Many directors who had several teachers involved with ELPFPP (and were course participants as well) felt that in their center, the ability of teachers to help children was on a higher level, and as a result, teachers were acting more professionally when working with children and each other. A center director from a southern coalition stated:

_With other things that have been implemented, we weren’t going through it together. We were going through the motions and getting it done because we had to. As a center, we are on higher level because of ELPFPP. My teachers used to sit in the break room on their phones, and not work together. They used to
always come to me for ideas and help, especially with behaviors that were bad in the classroom. Now, all of sudden, we are taking classes together, and we are talking to each other, and we are sharing ideas and supporting each other. And I’m seeing it in the classroom. Doors are open and communication is happening. Kids are learning and responding. Language barriers that used to be so hard for my teachers are now easier to manage. During lunch now, teachers are planning together! That has never happened (YZM80J, second interview).

While many providers expressed the difficulty of being in the Tier 2 program, teachers and directors believed that this program provided the “avenue for elevating the learning landscape” (PTXQVL, Interview 2) in early childhood learning centers in Florida, and wished to continue in the program.

Evidence from Change in Teacher’s Practice in Children’s Learning and Language

Though direct child outcomes were not part of the measures for this evaluation study for 2015-2016, several teachers and directors gave specific anecdotal examples of the causal link between gains in teacher knowledge that resulted in change of teacher practice, which then created changes in student learning from elements in the ELPFPP. Specifically, teachers stated noticeable improvements in children’s behavior, language and concept development, teacher-child interactions and child-child interactions from their use of strategies and knowledge gained from Tier 2 professional development. Details case studies from participants (with pseudonyms) are below, who felt their changed practice positively influenced children’s learning.
Susan: Changing the learning environment with family-oriented strategies

Susan is the director/owner of a family child care home in northern Florida, and has been teaching for over 18 years. Susan chose to enroll in the ELPFPP because she wanted specific knowledge to help her stay current with multi-age classroom teaching to help the eight children she serves in her home, ranging in age from six months to six years of age. Susan believes being a Tier 2 provider has directly impacted every aspect of her teaching and learning environment. Specifically, she stated that she learned things about both her learning environment as well as strategies to help her children talk more openly. “We totally redid our room arrangement because the transition time was taking so long, and we just weren’t getting a lot of learning done. There was just no room. I moved our center area to a different section, and added several new pieces of curriculum, and as a result, my older kids had so much more time to learn and move to play and dance, just from a simple shift in the room. I saw an immediate change in my older kids.” Susan also discussed a cultural strategy suggested in her course in which parents brought in pictures of the family and they were posted throughout the room. “It made the kids totally talk more! Then actually one little fella, who was always quiet, was now talking about his sister, because he saw his sister’s picture, and now I can’t shut him up! And then from those pictures we created stories about our families and our culture like they told us to, and the kids talked like crazy! And their language is so much more descriptive, and they use really good vocabulary. So now all they do is ask to do more family activities because it just brightens their days. All from a picture on the wall” (VQI3N4, Interview 2).

Tiffany: Child-guided learning through observations

Tiffany is a director and teacher in a mid-size learning center in northern Florida who has been teaching eight years, and recently started teaching the Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) program. Tiffany was being overwhelmed by trying to administer the Teaching Strategies GOLD child assessment, and as a result of taking the Preschool Observation course, learned specific strategies that informed her instructional practice. Tiffany changed her style of teaching, going from teacher-centered to child-centered, and noticed her VPK children became more engaged and conversed at a higher level. “This new spin on observation taught me so much about my teaching. I used to speed through things like a steam roller, and the kids were lost. This showed me to pump the brakes a little, and I walked away with so many fresh ideas. My observations used to be with paper and pen, and I missed so much, and often lost a lot of what the children were doing. But now I use my I-phone, so I make notes or use voice memos, and then when the kids are napping, I really process that information. I fill in the documentation, and I can edit. I can SEE so much more of what they are doing. And I realized my interactions with them were so rushed after really looking at the observation. It gave me insight to just let them grow in their own way, and be the guide. Each child grows differently, so it’s not my agenda, it’s theirs. It’s allowed me to change my style, to slow down and let them lead, and make sure the children are grasping what I’m giving them. And they are, so much more, and I can see it in the way they speak and how they want to take charge, and how they react to me and each other” (P8LUMZ, Interview 2).

Mary: Extending conversation through questioning strategies

Mary is a third-year preschool teacher in a small learning center in southern Florida that serves a diverse cultural and socio-economic population. Mary often struggled with helping children extend their conversations, and had several English language learners (ELL) in her classroom. When taking the Preschool Observation course, Mary learned strategies to help her students think more deeply about their conversations. “When they are in different center areas, I’m observing them and writing anecdotal notes, and then I have conversations with them, and really try to dig in and ask questions that I know will have them think and respond. They try to get an understanding of what they’re doing. Like if one of them is in housekeeping, I ask them specific questions so they can explain, and then I make them extend those thoughts into stories or new ideas. When you are asking open-ended questions with kids of that age, it’s beyond their imagination, and they just open up! And before you know it you are in a detailed conversation with them.” Mary also saw direct correlation between her use of questioning strategies, and changes in the children’s interactions. “They ask each other questions! They are so much more productive now, especially when it comes to literacy. I used to always read aloud, but now, I have the kids read, and then they become familiar with the book. And then I ask open-ended questions, and they come up with these great ideas! And then they ask questions, and then re-enact the story, and you should see them go, they love it” (XC972J, Interview 2).
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS OF THE ELPFPP

Tier 1 Professional Development

For the 2015-2016 year of ELPFPP implementation, Tier 1 professional development for providers consisted of a two-hour online introduction to Making the Most of Child Interactions (MMCI) training, and then 10 two-hour face-to-face training sessions based on the MMCI framework created by Teachstone (Teachstone.com) and facilitated by early learning coalition MMCI trainers. Though no Tier 1 participants were directly interviewed, early learning coalition focus group participants as well as Tier 2 teachers discussed previous MMCI training, and described both the successes and challenges of this training.

Most participants described MMCI to be beneficial for teachers to create improved classroom interactions, and spoke of the foundational learning that was included in this series of trainings to promote quality teacher-child interactions. A central coalition staff member stated, “We believe really strongly in the benefits of the full MMCI training. We have seen the impact for people who choose to commit to the 20 hours. You’re seeing a lot of improvement. You’re seeing that they’re trying to incorporate these methods and these concepts” (NN3S82, interview). A southern coalition program coordinator stated, “MMCI is great, a really positive training that the teachers loved. You could see them excited when they would leave the classroom, even after they had been working a 12-hour day, they were energized” (EI420, interview).

Teachers also believed in the positive results after going through MMCI training. A northern coalition family home provider expressed how MMCI provided the refresher for her regarding ideas about interacting with children, and then her Early Learning Florida coursework reinforced and built on that knowledge:

> I was a “sit down” and “be quiet” teacher before. And since then, I’m more flexible and I give the kids more choices. I now don’t expect them to sit all the time. A light came on from that. I reshaped the way I set up my day from this. I was more engaged in doing numbers, games, more games, more talking, and more communication. And then after the MMCI I took the Preschool Language Development class, and I realized there is just so much more I could be doing (HJ542T, interview 1).

Another veteran teacher in a southern coalition stated that while this was just review for her, this training did help the novice teachers in her center:

> Over the years I’ve taken a lot of classes which dealt with the same information. So there wasn’t really a lot of new information for me. But I work with a lot of ladies who are new to this profession and I know it helped them out greatly. Everyone, the next day at work, they’re like, “Wow, this is amazing. I’m really gonna try this in my class.” And just like they say, making the most of your classroom interactions and stuff. It’s just especially when you’re new to it… I’ve been doing it for 12 years, it’s also a great reminder (VSDPZZ, interview 1).

A central coalition director discussed the benefits of MMCI training for family home providers: “Our family childcare home providers loved taking part in MMCI. They are a completely different beast than center childcare, that’s because they own their own business, and they directly see outcomes of the work they do” (NN3S82, interview).

While the benefits of MMCI training were apparent, both teachers and coalition staff discussed the challenges regarding the Tier 1 training in terms of content, implementation and support. For example, a center director in a southern coalition discussed content issues:

> A lot of the things we went over in MMCI, it was a refresher for this year. I’m glad we went through it because the courses match the [MMCI] training. But it was unrealistic to me. Some of the videos weren’t realistic, showing the exemplar, not the reality. This doesn’t exist in my world. Those videos were downright not useful. But the breakdown of CLASS*, how to group and separate kids, work with them based on their ability…that was helpful (2799SO, interview 1).
Many coalition staff participants reflected on the implementation of Tier 1 training and the lack of coalition capacity to provide these trainings to Tier 1 providers. A southern coalition MMCI trainer stated the challenges of facilitating MMCI trainings in both English and Spanish:

*We struggled with MMCI…the teachers didn’t realize the time commitment, the Saturdays and all the evenings, and the coalition was understaffed. And the fact that it’s not in Spanish, that was a huge obstacle for us, that was a hard time for our community because the majority of our providers in Tier 1 were Spanish speakers. I feel like a lot of them [providers] didn’t get anything out of it, and ended up leaving the class or program because they would say, ‘Oh, this is in English, I’m not going to understand anything’…and we’re told as trainers if they are not actively participating, they are not allowed to continue. I tried to make it work… but it was tough, they had co-workers trying to translate for them, so then I tried to translate, and then the content took twice as long (EI4210, interview).*

Other early learning coalition staff members mirrored these statements, and cited logistical issues and incentives for teachers as the biggest challenges to Tier 1 training. For example, a northern coalition assistant program director stated her coalition covered seven counties and two times zones, and did not have the staff capacity to provide MMCI training, having to request additional MMCI trainers from OEL:

*Making MMCI possible was the hardest part for us. We lost trainers at the beginning of this year, and had such a geographic challenge, not to mention getting teachers there. Teachers don’t like being there at night or on the weekends…and if a teacher comes late, they’ve missed the session and you are not supposed to let them continue. So many teachers in Tier 1 were not aware of the time commitment. Without the stipends we offered and our ability to “borrow” trainers, we would have never made this work (AFE3Y0, interview).*

Both teachers and coalition staff discussed the fact that many teachers received no incentive to be part of the Tier 1 program and participate in MMCI training. Based on Tier 1 guidelines, all ELPFPP financial reimbursements went to provider owners or directors, and thus, many teachers did not receive stipends or CEUs for this 20-hour training commitment. As a central coalition program director stated, “When you don’t offer teacher incentives when they have to take their nights and weekends and really work on this stuff, you are not creating capacity, you are creating resentment” (T981Q2, interview). A southern coalition director described the disparities of how Tier 1 providers implemented this training:

*Some sites chose to reward their staff almost on a bi-weekly basis so they got a little incentive every time they came to class to keep them motivated. And others chose to just say, ‘Well, let’s wait and see what your outcome is, and if you’re up then I’ll give you a bonus.’ There’s a lot of differences in how they were spending their money and what they were spending their money on. And teachers talk, and they got really frustrated, because they knew that there was money being exchanged based on their hard work, and they deserved a piece of that, but it’s up to the director or owner how the money is spent… it caused major drama (L3RZ8L, interview).*

When asked about this implementation issue, teachers responded in a positive, but similar way, and suggested the need for change in Tier 1 implementation guidelines. A central coalition veteran teacher said:

*If they expect us to go through all this training, which I know is valuable, I get that, but take our nights and weekends away from our own children, then they must make the incentives fair. They must make sure this money goes to the teachers, not the directors. Not all directors have their teachers, or the children’s, best interests at heart. If you want to create big change in the way teachers work in the classroom, you have to get us on board first (NALZ02, interview 2).*
Other suggestions for changes to the ELPFPP Tier 1 program included providing more explicit face-to-face support for teachers. The Tier 1 program did not require coalitions to provide technical assistance or coaching to support teachers completing the MMCI training, and many coalition staff participants felt this was needed.

> MMCI is really in depth, with the Pre-K CLASS® tool. And there is not that partnership there as there was in Tier 2 with technical assistance, so I think a lot of things got lost in translation. You don't know what it looks like as far as implementation without getting in those classrooms and coaching those teachers” (L3RZ8L, interview).

Other challenges with Tier 1 program implementation stated by stakeholders included scheduling make-up sessions for trainings and keeping better records of teacher progress to ensure teachers are not being replaced mid-training in order to keep classrooms active for ELPFPP requirements and reimbursements.

Tier 2 Professional Development
The qualitative focus of this evaluation study centered on Tier 2 providers and their professional development experiences. Tier 2 providers engaged in three elements of professional development during the 2015-2016 implementation of the ELPFPP as well as two observation assessments (CLASS®, CHILD). Teachers were required to take 20 hours (2 courses) of Early Learning Florida online coursework. To determine which courses were offered to teachers, early learning coalitions were provided options of course level (preschool or infant and toddler), course content (language development, socio-emotional skills, etc.) and delivery options (online only, online + Communities of Practice, and online + TA/Coaching) based on coalition capacity, OEL ELPFPP guidelines, and teacher requirements. Towards the completion of 2015-2016, a few coalitions were offered courses in Spanish, but results from those courses were not part of this study. A complete list of Early Learning Florida course offerings and options for ELPFPP participants in this study are located in Appendix H.

The second professional development element focused on one-to-one teacher support by providing four technical assistance/coaching visits for teachers to enhance learning from Early Learning Florida coursework and provide guidance from CLASS® assessments. Coaching was provided by a teacher’s local early learning coalition staff or subcontractors. Early learning coalitions were not required to use UF certified coaches in ELPFPP coaching visits, but were required to use UF certified coaches if teachers enrolled in the Early Learning Florida online+ TA/Coaching option. These select teachers received the four required ELPFPP visits, as well as two additional visits as required by Early Learning Florida course objectives with a UF certified early learning coach.

Finally, Tier 2 providers were required to adopt and implement a research-based child assessment tool (see intervention descriptions) and engage in any training necessary to implement these assessments with school-readiness children. For the majority of providers, Teaching Strategies GOLD® was used which required 12 hours of online training in four consecutive modules, and then a reliability assessment before the tool could be used. Providers were required to purchase the assessment tools and training directly from the manufacturer (though some coalitions purchased these tools directly), and coalition staff were not required to provide support for this element of the ELPFPP. Results for each Tier 2 element will be presented with both teacher and coalition feedback and discuss strengths, challenges, and barriers of these interventions as well as participant suggestions for future implementation of the ELPFPP.

Technical Assistance and Instructional Coaching
All participants were asked about their perceptions of the four TA/Coaching visits that were provided to Tier 2 teachers during ELPFPPP implementation (see Table 33). While the majority of feedback highlighted positive qualities of technical assistance and coaching as well as described specific strategies used in coaching, a regional discrepancy became evident regarding the quality of coaching within coalition study participants. While several participants in both the central and southern region described coaching to have positive impact on their practice, there was disparity in how coaching was implemented, who provided coaching, and what specific goals
and focus were required for TA/Coaching in these regions due to factors such as coalition size and capacity issues. A
continuum of coaching experiences was conferred, ranging from exceptional support and collaborative learning, to
having a coach that was evaluative and provided little feedback or support, to not receiving coaching at all through
the ELPFPP. A central coalition teacher explained her dissatisfaction with the coaching provided:

*We were supposed to have two sessions for each course… I didn’t receive any coaching. Other teachers explained it as to more TA than coaching. Not much of modeling… she would go in and take notes, she would share notes with teacher, you know, what I saw, what needs to be improved, very little feedback. The second time around, the coalition told them to do more hands-on coaching. If we asked her for help, it was supposed to be provided during TA coach visits.* (NALZ02, Interview 1).

Central and southern coalition staff participants shed light on these disparities and provided insight as to the
dilemmas they faced with coaching implementation for the ELPFPP. For example, in Palm Beach Early Coalition,
providers were part of several types of professional development initiatives including the ELPFPP, and often the TA/
Coaching was a combination strategy used for several initiatives. A coach in this coalition explained:

*My providers were getting so confused… they would say ‘Wait, why are you here today?’ when I came for a coaching observation, and all the different components just mixed together. It became overwhelming for them. I really enjoyed doing the TA/Coaching, but for teachers or providers who already have a coach through some other program, then, I had to communicate with that person to see what they were working on so I didn’t duplicate that for ELPFPP. There were some times when we would be in there the same week. These teachers didn’t know which end was up, and were getting told different things about different programs by different coaches. There was no alignment* (L3RZ8L, interview).

Other coalition staff participants believed that the quality of coaching depended specifically on the amount of visits
required, and felt certain that four coaching visits was not enough to provide support and collaborative learning for
teachers in order to increase knowledge gain and promote improvement in instructional practice. A central coalition
quality director stated:

*This program [ELPFPP] is very loose, and our coalition standards are significantly higher and our oversight is significantly higher, and we have dedicated a significant portion of our quality dollars to enhanced observation and technical assistance around what the ELPFPP doesn’t provide. So they [providers] will get a minimum of 20 visits per teacher this year. We believe if OEL is giving them a higher rate of reimbursement… we need to see quality output from those dollars to assure child outcomes are happening. We are not like small coalitions. We have significant systems already in place so this becomes duplicates of said work. Only providing four coaching visits doesn’t work. You just get to know somebody in four coaching visits, you can’t do anything related to quality. You have to build that rapport* (NN3S82, interview).

While this variety of coaching experiences and disparity in outcomes could have several causes, it was noted
that some coalitions did not engage UF certified coaches to provide technical assistance/coaching sessions, and
participants in these areas reported challenges with this element of the ELPFPP.

In the northern region, TA/Coaching was considered a positive, valuable experience by teachers and directors that
received this professional development. Coaching strategies ranged from providing resources and suggestions of
practice to modeling feedback strategies such as video observation to provide teachers the ability to analyze and
reflect upon their practice. A northern coalition teacher discussed how her coach provided new ideas that helped her
understand how to observe and assess her children in a positive way:

*My coach was wonderful. She coached me on checklists and observations of the children. I was leery with documentation… that was new to me. In the beginning, I would do checklists, what they do and don’t know. That was my documentation. Now going through these teaching strategies with her, it gave me the option of taking videos, which I never thought of before* (LN4S73, Interview 1).
Northern region teachers commented on the trusting coaching relationship they enjoyed with their coaches, and also described specific strategies that both empowered them as teachers, and provided learning for the children in their program. This result was supported by northern coalition staff members when reflecting on their coaching techniques and experiences. For example, a coach explained her coaching process to provide support:

*What I did was for the first two benchmarks, I took their CLASS® assessment scores, and we would look at them and discuss the lower scores, but not in an evaluative way, I did it almost like an inquiry. I used my protocols, and I used probing questions, and they guided the learning. We would choose items to work on together, but they would make the decisions as to which things were most important. We would take a piece of it and work on it, and then I’d come back and we’d unpack and reflect on that, and then work on another piece (BSHQZT, interview).*

Due to many stakeholders’ opinions of the non-specific guidelines regarding coaching goals and techniques, as well as the fact that many coalitions already had strong coaching initiatives in place before the ELPFPP, technical assistance and instructional coaching within the ELPFPP Tier 2 program was the most inconsistent component. However, coaching was proven to provide substantial impact regarding teacher reflection, change in beliefs and practice, and collaboration when implemented successfully. Table 33 below details specific coaching experiences in each region of ELPFPP participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Coalition</th>
<th>Coach attributes</th>
<th>Coaching skills</th>
<th>Coaching challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH: Big Bend, Duval, NW Florida (UF Certified Coaches used)</td>
<td>Provided non-judgmental feedback</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Created trusting coaching relationship</td>
<td>Setting goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offered “wonderful” ideas</td>
<td>Provided resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provided value through open, honest conversation</td>
<td>Introduced data collection techniques (video observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduced checklists for observations that helped teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraged teacher, provided confidence despite lower scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTRAL:
Pinellas, Hillsborough, Alachua
(both UF certified and sub-contractors used)

Coaching relationship was genuine
Established rapport and trust
Became part of classroom community

Used active listening
Extended teacher ideas and thinking with positive feedback
Coach and teacher co-learning model
Provided resources
Provided instant strategies tailored to teacher practice

Many teachers did not receive ELPFPP coaching
More TA-based, not coaching
Deficit-based coaching

SOUTH:
Palm Beach, St. Lucie, Miami-Dade/Monroe

Coach provided non-judgmental feedback
Coach was “good” teacher

Used positive feedback to push teacher out of comfort zone
Provided useful strategies Modeling
Provided one-on-one support and individualized interaction

Many teachers did not receive ELPFPP coaching
Checklists were used to provide feedback, no data displays
Coach “scored” teacher with little support

| Table 33. Qualitative Participants Coaching Experience |

Early Learning Florida Courses
Due to each coalition and region engaging in different Early Learning Florida course options and content (online only, online + CoP, online + TA/Coaching; Preschool and Infant/Toddler; Spanish), there were variations of course experiences reported in interviews (see Table 33). However, in second interviews, teachers overwhelmingly stated that participation in Early Learning Florida coursework was the most impactful element on their knowledge gain and changes in instructional practices. In initial interviews, many teachers described apprehension due to lack of technology experience with online learning, as well as time constraints with center obligations and initiatives. For example, a participant from Big Bend stated:

*The beginning was a struggle. We were on a safari, and just got lost… My computer would not cooperate and this type of learning was very new to me, really difficult at first. The coalition helped us with a laptop, and showed us how to use it. Now I LOVE IT. I am so excited to use the equipment. It took a little while to get up to speed. That first two or three weeks, I wanted to give up, but now I feel like a professional through all this because I know how to do all these great things (SBIBR6, Interview 1).*

Culminating course experiences were described as transformational, inspirational, and beneficial, but all teachers agreed this year-long experience was difficult due to the demands of other elements required in the ELPFPP and day-to-day teaching demands. A northern coalition family home provider stated her difficulties in continuing with her courses in the spring:
I was taking the Preschool Feedback course and trying to keep up with TSG, and having to stay up so late to get my coursework finished, and there were so many days when I wanted to quit. It was really hard to try and balance everything. But then I read this article in my class, and it was an eye-opener, it had to do with explaining how young children respond to praise, and it was my moment of Yes! I need this! I learned about praise junkies, and I realized I was doing that. My praise wasn’t meaningful. That really made me want to continue, because I was learning so much. After reading that article, I put that into effect immediately with my kids (JHD36E, interview 2).

In coalition staff interviews, most participants praised the Early Learning Florida coursework, and believed both content and delivery methods were valuable to create teacher learning and change. A central coalition assistant program director stated,

*I absolutely love the coursework. When it first started, I wasn’t able to envision how this would work, how it all would come together. But after seeing teachers get through two courses, and hearing them talk about what they learned, it was really valuable*” (T981Q2, interview).

A northern coalition coach also echoed this sentiment, stating that:

*Early Learning Florida courses blow anything we’ve seen before this out of the water...they are engaging, interactive and really provide valuable content that these teachers desperately need*” (TQC7BJ, interview).

While teachers and coalition staff commented on the useful strategies presented within course content, a significant finding was reported regarding course difficulty in coalition interviews. Coalitions that had larger geographic areas and number of providers in ELPFPP reported teachers having difficulty with course content and design. A coalition staff member with worked directly with Early Learning Florida coursework implementation spoke of reactions from her Tier providers:

*From what I’ve heard, I wouldn’t say anybody from Tier 2 would sign up for courses again on their own. By and large, our population of early care and educational professionals are not honed, self-regulated learners. They’ve not had the opportunity to hone those skills. In a lot of ways, this learning system’s been built out that we’re dealing with a highly proficient professional cadre, and that’s not the case...Early Learning Florida is complex coursework. It is associates level or advanced credential work, and they have missed their target market completely. Your teachers are not at an AS level, they are high school diploma, maybe? One course actually asks teachers to do a social work review, and many of our early care and education professionals are at the same socio-economic status as the children they are serving. It’s at-risk serving at-risk. They’ve chosen early learning because they love children. You are expecting Tier 1 teachers to perform well in, my estimation, Tier 3 level courses, and then waving money at them. They don’t’ have that academic prowess to do this (NN3S82, interview).

This viewpoint was also echoed by southern coalition staff who described struggles of teachers with both content, language, and technology proficiency. Before Spanish courses were offered to ELPFPP Tier 2 providers (in late Spring, 2016), many Spanish-speaking teachers were overwhelmed with the difficulties of taking courses in English. One southern coalition program coordinator commented on this:

*My poor Spanish teachers really struggled. I had one teacher who had her daughter translate the entire course for her, and she still managed to finish but didn’t obtain mastery. Some of our providers are not computer savvy, and they struggled so much with the technical side that they got lost, and were dropped from the course (EI4210, interview).

While the overall experience of coursework appeared positive and teachers believed they gained knowledge from this experience, several challenges were mentioned by both teachers and coalition staff. The most prevailing challenge
was the lack of technology available to teachers, and the lack of teacher and director technical proficiency when participating in online learning. Many teachers reported they had no access to computers at their centers, and several had no home devices to complete coursework. Coalition staff also reported a tremendous need for funding to provide technology to lower socio-economic centers so they could complete courses successfully. One central coalition staff participant described how a center which she described as “really motivated” had to work with this challenge:

There were several centers that only had one computer, and I felt really badly for these eight or ten teachers that had to share that to do assignments and couldn’t work at home because they didn’t have the right internet capability or didn’t have a device. This one director literally made a computer schedule for her teachers during their kids’ nap times, and she went without a computer during most days so they could get this stuff done. She would have to go to Starbucks to get work done at night sometimes (ORXL80, interview).

The Learning Power of a Community of Practice

A critical common theme of teacher learning identified from participants in initial interviews was the need for collaboration and interaction with other teachers. This attribute of quality professional development, which is researched and shown to provide change and growth in teacher practice in early learning literature (Desimone, 2006; Wenger, 2004) was present throughout these interviews. Of the course options offered to teachers, the online + Communities of practice option was most desired by both teachers and coalitions, but often presented dilemmas regarding staffing for ELC implementation of this course model. Participants specifically mentioned wanting the ability to meet, learn with, and learn from other teachers within their own centers, and with other providers through discussion boards and blended course options within Early Learning Florida courses. When asked why this type of collaboration had not occurred before, a participant from a northern coalition suggested:

We’ve never thought of ourselves as teachers that can give knowledge and experiences to other people, I mean other teachers, before this. We’ve never had a way to do that. And it’s so simple: you are online, going into discussion, you comment, but to put a face with the name, it was great. I got to know different people within coalitions. You realize you are not the only one having that particular issue. People are more apt to have a verbal conversation with you online. I loved getting together. It was fun, and very informative (P8LUMZ, Interview 1).

When discussing this collaborative “gap” that is present within early learning teachers’ professional development, many teachers suggested that due to geographic and financial limitations, most teachers did not have the ability to connect with other teachers previously. By providing a virtual meeting space through Early Learning Florida courses as well as Communities of Practice meetings, these teachers were excited to learn and felt motivated to post discussion prompts as well as go to meetings to work with and learn from other teachers’ experiences and challenges. A participant from a southern coalition explained:

I never got to do this before because we are so far away from other centers. The coalition tries to get us together, but it’s really difficult and there’s just not a lot of time at night. I really liked the CoP meetings, even though I was so tired. They were so informative, kept us up to date, where we needed to be. I really appreciated the feedback from my peers. If there were some challenges that came up, we worked on it as a group. They accepted my ideas, and changed some things. It was such a different and creative way to learn (85XFEF, Interview 1).

Participants from all regions stated benefits in learning with other teachers through online courses and virtual discussions, and spoke specifically of the power of problem-solving challenges as a group. A southern coalition director stated,

Some of the other schools gave us different insights and ideas. It’s been frustrating teaching with non-English speakers, and this really helped us with that. It was great and made us feel more knowledgeable, and we tried some of the strategies they suggested (XSA72E, Interview 1).
Northern coalition staff members voiced the power of learning provided with the CoP course option, and discussed the transformation not only of teachers’ learning, but of the coalition’s ability to provide professional development at a deeper, stronger level. A northern coalition quality director described the change in her beliefs about teachers learning:

> When we did the Communities of Practice model...we used the protocol and the agendas we were trained to use, and it required us to provide feedback on what they were learning...it took us out of assuming what we’re giving them they aren’t really learning, to ‘Okay, I know that this is working, or I can hear where it’s not working, and I can help fix that. It’s the relationship building and the networking. I assume I know all the struggles that teachers face on a daily basis in a classroom. I think this helped identify common trends that are happening that I wasn’t aware of. A lot of our providers are in competition with each other for business, and this built a bridge to help providers build relationships. It knocked down that silo, that wall, so the learning becomes a community of work with partners (BSHQZT, interview).

Another central coalition CoP facilitator echoed this shift in becoming aware of the struggles that teachers face:

> The biggest difference for me in CoP was before, when our team did mentoring, we would go in and would tell our providers ‘This is what you need to change to make it better.’ That was so disrespectful to how much they deal with and how much they care for their children. But you get in that cycle of accountability and compliance. I learned so much facilitating the CoP, how to create better conversations, and help providers see how they need to help themselves with prompting and guiding questions, and let them take the reins with a little bit of guidance (BSHQZT, interview).

Though many participants appreciated their CoP learning, some experienced frustration, as with the TA/Coaching element, with CoP session organization and implementation. In coalitions that faced geographic challenges, teachers often had to travel long distances to attend required CoP meetings at their own expense during the course term. Within the central region, participants expanded on what they felt to be non-informative sessions that did not provide active learning and engagement. A central coalition participant discussed this notion:

> If I’m going to talk about the meetings they weren’t helpful at all…I was expecting to go there and actually go over the material, but the meetings were basically a lot of introductions and just talking about ourselves. And it was a couple, I guess you could call them team building exercises, which is great, because it creates good camaraderie with your co-teachers and stuff. But I was just expecting them to go over the material that we were doing online, and if we had any questions about it and they didn’t do that... when you’ve been working since 7am, you need active learning, and the practicality just wasn’t there. I drove an hour, had to get a babysitter, and it was not useful (6MFWDD, Interview 1).

Other specific challenges mentioned by teachers and coalition staff were the amount of time that coursework required, the variation in instructional quality in all course options, and challenges with stipend disbursement after course completion. It was noted during these interviews that several regions combined CoP efforts in order to alleviate travel challenges for their participants, as well as combined course CoPs to alleviate coalition staffing issues. For example, a norther coalition director stated that in their CoP meetings, they had both Pre-K and Infant/Toddler teachers meet together, and adjusted the meeting agendas accordingly to provide collaborative learning that was not content-based, but strategy-based. More detailed descriptions of Early Learning Florida Tier 2 teacher course experiences are listed in Table 34 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Coalition</th>
<th>Course Content and Strategies</th>
<th>Course Design and Platform</th>
<th>Collaboration and Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH: Big Bend, Duval, NW Florida</td>
<td>Courses were “relevant and up to date”</td>
<td>Tech issues made navigating course difficult (uploading documents) for non-tech users</td>
<td>CoP provided camaraderie and “seamless” support with facilitator &amp; instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All course options offered)</td>
<td>Courses provide theory to practice connection</td>
<td>Online learning provided self-paced learning in quiet, convenient space</td>
<td>CoP alleviated isolation for teachers in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples in courses were realistic</td>
<td>Course provided opportunity to pre-plan with handouts, create time management with assignments</td>
<td>Teachers worked together to master the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veteran teachers felt content was repetitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helped bridge centers in coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open discussions in course posts “opened the mind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided “common language” with teachers in center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL: Pinellas, Hillsborough, Alachua</td>
<td>Teachers gained knowledge in parent interactions</td>
<td>Tech issues with website and course uploads created dissatisfaction Timeline of course was rushed</td>
<td>Teachers appreciated online feedback and discussions from instructor and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All course options offered)</td>
<td>Course provided great “starting points” for growth in practice</td>
<td>Course was much more intensive than 10 hours per week, and required “extensive” preparation Instructor feedback was inconsistent</td>
<td>Online discussions created valuable learning community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses were right “blend” of content knowledge and useful strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>CoP sessions were “useless” and in need of more organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CoP discussions needed more connection to coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH: Palm Beach, St. Lucie, Miami-Dade/ Monroe</td>
<td>Content was complimentary with current knowledge base</td>
<td>Self-pacing of courses was helpful</td>
<td>Discussion posts added collaborative piece to learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Online only, Online + CoP offered)</td>
<td>CLASS® alignment with courses was valuable and helpful</td>
<td>Tech issues with saving docs for assignments Timely feedback needed from instructors for quality learning</td>
<td>Teachers traded ideas and used collaborative problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content challenged assumptions, previous strategies of veteran teachers</td>
<td>Convenience of online platform helped teachers with scheduling</td>
<td>Taking course together provided common language among teachers in center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses provided asset-based approach to view student challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Perceptions of Early Learning Florida courses from Tier 2 teacher participants
Research-Based Child Assessments
While three possible child-assessment tools were given to Tier 2 providers in ELPFPP guidelines, the majority of providers chose to use Teaching Strategies GOLD®, which was also a requirement of VPK providers in the state of Florida for the 2015-2016 year. When investigating the implementation of the child-based assessment element of the ELPFPP for Tier 2 providers, a major finding was the difference in implementation in providers and coalitions that had previously used Teaching Strategies GOLD® (TSG) due to coalition quality improvement plans, versus providers that were not familiar or had used this assessment tool. Based on ELPFPP guidelines for 2015-2016, Tier 2 providers were required to purchase the assessment tool, complete a two-hour online introduction training, 12 hours of online training modules, and then a reliability assessment with no oversight or supervision from their local coalitions. When speaking with Tier 2 teachers, experiences with TSG was mixed, varying from teachers who praised the tool and implementation process, to those who struggled so much that they dropped from the Tier 2 program all together. A southern coalition teacher explained her experience:

> When I first started out, it was a lot, and we didn’t receive any support or guidance. We were all over the place. So our director actually had to pay out of her own pocket to get a TSG specialist from Broward county to come and help us. The online classes were not great compared to Early Learning Florida...and it was so time consuming. I believe that the assessment is not really accurate, but it’s fair because of the content we are assessing. It’s not black or white, it’s color-coded (WOFN24, interview 2).

All teachers agreed the biggest challenges with TSG implementation were the time needed to become reliable in the assessment, and then the time to implement the assessment tool itself. A northern coalition teacher expelled the virtues of the TSG assessment once she understood how to use it properly:

> I really like it, I really like the concept, I like it because it’s an amazing tool, way better than ASQ, but to me, honestly, it was most valuable when there was a student that we knew had a learning issue. With TSG, you are actually able to pinpoint specific things. I so appreciated having that data when talking to parents (P8LUMZ, interview 2).

Other teachers spoke of the difficulty of the reliability assessment, and the need to take the training and test several times before passing. Many teachers were frustrated with the lack of coalition support to get this process mastered in the timeline required:

> The coalition didn’t help us at all, they just told you when to have it done. When you have a training like this that is so difficult and all online, it’s really hard to understand without help, and we were all in the same boat (QY9NEZ, interview 2).

When coalition staff were asked about Teaching Strategies GOLD® implementation, there was a division of responses regarding effectiveness and implementation procedures. For those coalitions that had used TSG previously, many had supports already in place through coaching and coalition professional development trainings to allow teachers to truly understand the assessment tool and procedures, and provide scaffolded support. For example, a northern coalition executive director described the benefits and challenges of TSG implementation:

> I think if TSG is implemented correctly, it produces some of the best data for making decisions about how to address specific issues than any other system I’ve seen, but I think there has to be decision how to approach it: you can do it quickly or you can do it right. I have been able to watch teachers literally crumble because they haven’t received the proper training and support to be able to implement this. There needs to be more explanation, more orientation, and definite training on inter-rater reliability. If an ELC hasn’t already implemented this, they are going to be completely lost (BSHQZT, interview).
A southern coalition program coordinator discussed her coalition’s struggles with TSG implementation due to lack of training and knowledge of coalition staff:

> We’re probably a little more behind than other ELCs because we hadn’t launched [Teaching Strategies] GOLD®, and that came down as a mandate. I don’t think many of our providers knew about it, which is why our contract managers and specialists had such a hard time. The modules were very intensive, and the time frame to implement was totally unrealistic. There was very little guidance...and it was a lack of training for us as well. And we are the main point of contact when they have questions. I would contact OEL with questions, but that’s just passing the buck, and providers got so frustrated. I think more training on the tool is desperately needed from OEL (EI4210 interview).

Several coalition staff had suggestions for TSG implementation based upon their previous experiences with the child assessment tool and training:

> We had 13 sites and we paid for TSG, and we do the training, we coach them, we follow up, we work with them on meeting the checkpoints and entering the information. The first year is so totally confusing, whether they go through online or face-to-face training, so we had to supplement that with how to do observations correctly. And very practical basic trainings on how to write things, and what’s the difference between an objective and subjective observation (NN3S82, interview).

A central coalition coach also suggested that coalition support was paramount in creating reliability in using the assessment tool:

> We are trying to get ahead of the game, and requiring all our Tier 1 providers to join our TSG trainings so they can be ready. We try and get them coached into it, so it’s something they already do and it becomes part of their practice. The first year of TSG has to be considered a learning year. And you have to identify one person at each center that’s really good at it to be a point person, to develop that capacity. We also try to take advantage of time in summer programs, when they have less kids usually, to use that downtime and really practice. It has to be a well-aligned effort, or the assessments won’t be reliable, period (T981Q2, interview).

Both teachers and coalition staff reported that Teaching Strategies GOLD, when implemented with a proper timeline and with proper support for teachers learning and implementation, should be used as a statewide assessment for child outcomes and to inform instructional practice. However, the challenges of implementation regarding time to use the tool, inter-rater reliability and performing quality observations created doubts in using this tool with the ELPFPP initiative. A northern coalition director stated the importance of getting the child-assessment piece of this initiative to be performed effectively in order to truly gauge child outcomes:

> When it comes to legislators, they ask the questions, and say ‘Show me what works, show me why I should invest.’ It is the data out of TSG that will be able to speak the loudest to the value of all these other investments. CLASS® is great, Early Learning Florida provides those strategies and knowledge, but they want to see where a child started, through all these different facets of teacher learning and improvement, and at the end of the day, see where that child is now, and that they are learning more and becoming proficient. Isn’t that the point of all this? How are we improving education for these children? If we can show that gain in a tool that we are confident in administering, then those gains will be accurate. We can’t lose sight of that value, or the necessary time it takes to make that happen. That’s the collateral value of something like this (BSHQZT, interview).

Challenges and Improvements of ELPFPP Tier 2 Participation

While all teachers who were Tier 2 participants had different experiences with the ELPFPP due to educational background, context, amount of instructional support, and ability to successfully navigate all elements of these professional development platforms, teachers stated the following challenges as most critical for review and future
improvement of the ELPFPP, which are summarized here:

1. Teachers must be allowed adequate time to complete these components, and be given release time in classrooms to engage in online coursework, coaching and training. All teachers who participated in Tier 2 concurred that the amount of work required was intensive and much more support was needed for successful participation.

2. Technological access and capacity must be at a much higher level for the majority of teachers to be successful in Tier 2. Many centers had limited internet access and/or computers for teachers to participate, and while coalitions tried to support this effort with help regarding computer technology, this issue deterred many teachers from continuing in Tier 2 and thus dropped from the program.

3. Teachers believed that Early Learning Florida coursework should be differentiated based on previous educational experience, technology expertise, and the ability to implement strategies in the classroom. Teachers believed that they should be allowed to choose coursework (not the provider owners, directors, or coalitions) and have the ability to pursue continued educational opportunities based on self-directed goals.

4. Teacher incentives for Tier 2 participation must be delivered at the teacher level, not the provider level. All teachers believed that if they are required to participate, despite the fact that this program created positive learning and benefits in their practice, they must have financial benefits in order to offset lack of technology and personal time and travel to attend trainings and complete coursework.

5. Teachers believed more support was required for child-assessment implementation, and wanted more one-on-one professional support through coaching and technical assistance.

Challenges and Improvements of ELPFPP Tier 2 Implementation

As with teachers, the implementation of the Tier 2 program varied widely throughout coalitions due to staffing capacity issues, funding, knowledge of Tier 2 interventions, support from OEL, and the alignment of previous and continuing quality improvement programs within each coalition. All coalition focus group participants believed this program had positive intentions and possibilities for improvement, and each discussed specific beneficial results they witnessed with providers during the 2015-2016 implementation year. While many coalitions experienced contextually-based issues of implementation, all coalition staff discussed the following challenges as most critical for review and improvement to the ELPFPP Tier 2 program: (1) the requirements for participation and process of provider selection; (2) the jump in difficulty from Tier 1 to Tier 2; (3) the reimbursement process and lack of oversight for providers; and (4) the need for alignment of OEL’s vision and theory of action for the ELPFPP and coalition quality improvement to provide capacity and quality support for program implementation. These challenges will be summarized with coalition staff participant evidence below.

The Provider Selection Process for Tier 2 Participation

All coalition staff that were interviewed concurred that the Tier 2 selection process had several glitches that needed remedy, and required more input from coalition staff that were more familiar with their local providers. While the blind selection process was used by OEL initially for research purposes to achieve control and subject groups for evaluation, all coalition staff felt this process hindered the success of many providers who were not ready for Tier 2 participation with regards to administration, organization and implementation factors, or denied access to providers that would most benefit from Tier 2 participation. A northern coalition executive director elaborated on this dilemma:

*We have been doing coaching since 2000, and we know our learning community intimately. I believe we also feel like there are directors who are very knowledgeable about their teachers and their teachers’ skill level, and then there are directors that just said, “I want this money. Teachers, go do this training,” and they had to. I just think we’d make the better, stronger selection if we were controlling who gets what and rewarding those who play nice in the sandbox as opposed to just letting these people on the outskirts of our quality work get involved in the performance funding pilot. One of the things we felt really strongly about was we had to terminate four of the ELPFPP providers, and two of them were open less than a year. ELPFPP really should not be working with childcare centers who have not really proven themselves to be solid business people and learning leaders. I don’t believe you should be able to take state dollars unless you have a proven business model that works, so anyone who gets DCF violations, in our coalition was out, and thus, we had a huge drop in providers from start to finish (TQC7BJ, interview).*
A central coalition quality improvement coordinator stated the same grievance, and provided insight into why so many providers did not complete the Tier 2 program:

I really wish we had more input. We could only validate the applications, but there was no preference in how the selection was made. Out of our six, I had recruited some people to make sure they put in applications, and we had selected them very intentionally based on the fact that they served a high percentage of school-readiness children, and also had directors with the capacity to really work with their staff to take this big commitment forward. But several of them were not chosen, and instead, we had one provider in there, and I just have no idea how we’re going to do it with them. They don’t have the organizational skills to pull it off (T981Q2, interview).

The Jump in Difficulty From Tier 1 to Tier 2 Participation
All coalition participants believed that the differences in Tier 1 and Tier 2 levels of participation and difficulty were vast, and suggested a more leveled system of professional development in Tier 2 to decrease hardships for teacher participants. As a central coalition program director described,

So many of our Tier 1 providers just don’t have the organizational skills to manage the level and requirements of Tier 2, and Tier 2 hits with a bang. They just don’t have the capacity for it. Tier one is relatively easy with MMCI, and the training is great, but all of a sudden in Tier 2 you are taking courses that are difficult, you are working with TSG that is really difficult, and you are receiving coaching, maybe or maybe not, to help you do this. The benchmark timing is really unrealistic. I appreciate the level of support added to Tier 2 to get these things done, but it’s not nearly enough, and as a result, the hardship falls on the coalitions to help these providers through this. It’s a gigantic jump, and the workload and requirements need to be more leveled to help these centers be successful (T981Q2, interview).

Coalition staff participants told several stories of Tier 1 providers starting Tier 2 participation, but due to several circumstances such as lack of knowledge of program requirements, lack of capacity, lack of technology or lack of incentives, these providers chose to not continue or were dropped due to not achieving necessary benchmarks. A northern coalition coach said:

We wouldn’t have nearly the attrition rates for providers if these benchmarks were more realistic, and there was more support for these providers. Don’t get me wrong, I appreciate that so much money is going into this, because money brings people to the table that really need this change and these improvements. But we need to realize these centers with large school readiness populations don’t have the ability to get to this place by themselves (AFE3Y0, interview).

The Reimbursement Process for Tier 2: Lack of Oversight for Providers
As stated previously, all coalition staff participants felt that reimbursement and incentives for Tier 2 ELPFPP participation should be dispersed on the teacher level to adequately compensate and motivation teachers to continue their educational growth within the ELPFPP. Many coalition participants believed that the financial enticement of reimbursements and stipends from ELPFPP were not fully considered when designing this intervention, and thus, many providers “came for the money, and left in shambles” (NN3S82, interview). A central coalition staff member stated:

They don’t truly understand what’s expected of them, and they don’t understand the mission behind this program, and they’re hearing that you could get big bucks, and that’s what’s enticing them. I think there is too much money, and not enough accountability with how those reimbursements are being spent (NN3S82, interview).
A northern coalition executive director echoed this statement:

*Because there is so much money going out to so few providers, it’s not really sustainable because we can’t continue down this road. We’re going to need millions and millions of dollars. I want to see a benchmark of CLASS® to be able to receive funding to be really significant, there is going to have to be a major move in child outcomes, something that is really going to get a director saying, “I need to be a learning leader because I want this funding to improve my center and help my teachers.” I am really hoping the accountability of this money becomes more intentional because if we spend all this money and we aren’t getting significant increases in CLASS® scores, then we won’t see outcomes in children. We really need to move the needle, and the most critical piece of this is how these providers spend that money. We know for the most part teachers aren’t seeing any of it, no raise or bonus, and they have done all this work and deserve to be rewarded (TQC7BJ, interview).*

Many coalition staff told stories of providers that used dollars received for ELPFPP for “non-educational” purposes, and agreed that there need to be stipulations put on ELPFPP reimbursements that this funding be re-invested back into the center for educational purposes, such as new curriculum, technology needs or upgrades, and teacher raises and bonuses. However, there were other success stories communicated of centers that wisely re-invested funding into quality improvement for teacher learning. For example, a southern coalition program coordinator spoke of a center in a low socio-economic area that used funding from ELPFPP to buy new I-pads for all teachers for observation purposes and course requirements. Another southern coalition coach stated,

*Centers, and directors particularly, need to provide evidence of investment in their children from this program, it’s as simple as that. When all the money goes to facility enhancement or something in a way that allows for them to get bigger and not better, I think the coalition needs the role of helping make a plan for how that money is spent, and the first priority needs to be teachers (ORX08L, interview).*

While all coalition staff participants agreed that more oversight was needed for ELPFPP funding in order to create a funding source that elevates center quality and learning, they also agreed that coalitions don’t have the capacity to provide that oversight, and suggested that OEL provide more dedicated staff for this purpose.

The Need for Alignment of OEL’s ELPFPP Vision and Theory of Action and Coalitions’ Quality Improvement Plans

An interesting division emerged when coalition staff participants were asked about the goals and purposes of the ELPFPP, and how these goals aligned with coalition quality improvement initiatives. Many participants felt that the ELPFPP vision provided by OEL was “blurry”, and often was muddled with contracts that were hard to decipher, constant changes to benchmarks and implementation, and timelines that were difficult to implement. Though most coalition staff believed in the ability for the ELPFPP to create “a major change, a paradigm shift in professionalism” (EI4210, interview) for centers that serve the most marginalized children, coalitions wanted more open communication and input into the program with OEL, and alignment with their current quality improvement programs. In fact, some coalitions that had quality rating improvement systems in place (QRIS), believed that ELPFPP was an initiative that was in addition to those quality investments, not aligned with them, and often detracted from quality initiatives in place previously. A central coalition quality improvement director explained this:

*This project is taking some of our participants away from the Quality Counts work because OEL gives them a bigger paycheck than we do. So they’re choosing not to be a part of our quality counts grading system, and just participate in ELPFPP because your requirements are easier than ours. The providers that OEL has chosen serve our largest number of school readiness children. So it’s imperative that they have a high level of quality because they’re serving, sometimes 95 to 100 percent, of their children are school-readiness. Some of them have been programs that have been with us in Quality Counts for multiple renewals, and have let their stars expire and not renew, and new providers who were going to start were like, ‘Oh wow, from what I hear, I can get so much more money, with less to do (NN3S82, interview).*
Another southern coalition quality improvement coordinator stated their struggles with the ELPFPP implementation in conjunction with their coalition’s professional development system:

> It’s not really pay for performance, it’s pay to participate, let’s be honest. This program is supposed to be about quality, but yet providers were allowed to switch teachers mid-term, and teacher turnover was a huge concern. How are we promoting quality with six different teachers in one classroom, just so they stay active? This contract wasn’t provider friendly, and so many of them didn’t understand the requirements and timing. Here is a project that we’re helping OEL with, but we don’t have the one-on-one ability to help them. Contract managers aren’t there 24/7 to assist them. We are just not staffed to make this work plus everything else we do with Quality Counts in our coalition, and the providers are suffering. If we could just sit down and organize this in a way that fits, it would be transformational because all the elements are so powerful (El4210, interview).

While discrepancies existed contextually for each coalition about ELPFPP implementation, an overall theme of improvement and change was given, and many coalition staff urged the need for this program to continue with the proper professional development models in place in order to give teachers success on every level. With the proper focus on increasing coalition capacity and financial support for teachers, coalition staff participants were cautiously optimistic about this initiative. A northern coalition director summed up his vision of the ELPFPP:

> I think all coalitions need to understand that they can’t half way do all this stuff. They either have to commit the resources they need to do it right, or completely don’t do it. You either have to be all in or all out, and I don’t even know if we have the information yet to understand what that looks like. This is a moving organism, the ELPFPP, and it will take staff dedicated solely to this project to do it right. Most of the resistance I hear from other coalitions have to do with the time involved, and perhaps communication needs to be better and more upfront in terms of what the specific goals are. Are we creating quality? Are we providing support? This isn’t just a little project we’re running that will be gone in two years. There is a long term plan, and in order for us to make the case as a state about the value of these things, of our children and our teachers, we all need to be willing to commit whatever it takes to get it done (BSHQZT, interview).
DISCUSSION

This evaluation study examined professional development interventions of Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project (ELPFPP) during the 2015-2016 implementation year, with specific focus on determining if provider participation in the ELPFPP had impact on gains in teacher knowledge, the implementation of effective teaching practices in the classroom, improvement in teacher-child interactions, improvement in classroom climate, and the use of research-based child assessments to inform instruction. The original focus of this investigation was to examine specific elements of the Tier 2 professional development intervention regarding teacher competencies and significant changes or improvements. However, data from quantitative and qualitative methods and analysis (Cresswell, 2003; Desimone, 2009; Flick, 2002) produced results regarding both tiers of ELPFPP professional development. The research team also determined how these professional development interventions were experienced by all stakeholders of the ELPFPP, and examined benefits, challenges and barriers of the 2015-2016 implementation.

The results of this study provided strong evidence that participation in the ELPFPP positively impacted the following teacher competencies:

- Teacher knowledge gain
- Improvement in teacher-child interactions
- Implementation of effective teaching practices

These findings were consistent through the entire sample, and supported by both quantitative and qualitative measures. By engaging in the ELPFPP in both Tiers, teachers gained knowledge, and applied this new knowledge to improve teacher-child interactions. Analysis also indicated that teachers gained knowledge of effective instructional strategies and practices, and then incorporated those practices in their classroom. Discussions of these and other significant findings will be presented according to the concurrent triangulation analysis, in which results that were supported by both methods of data analysis are explained, challenges or discrepancies in data sets are presented and hypothesized, and data that outlies previous explanations are discussed.

TRIANGULATION TYPOLOGIES OF ANALYSIS

When triangulating quantitative and qualitative results, three specific results were supported by both data sets: teachers’ gain in knowledge, improvement in teacher-child interactions, and teacher implementation of effective practices in the classroom.

Teachers’ Gain in Knowledge

There was significant knowledge gain from participating in Early Learning Florida coursework, shown by pre and post knowledge assessments in both the ITSED and PKO courses. The results show a statistically significant mean gain of 928 points (42.1% of the total) in the ITSED class and statistically significant mean gain of 455 points (22.8% of total) in the PKO class between pre-test and post-test. These results were supported by evidence from participants in qualitative interviews, with all teachers claiming they gained new knowledge of child development, social and emotional concepts, vocabulary and literacy concepts, and effective instructional practices. From this gain in knowledge, many teachers stated feeling more confident, professional, and powerful in their classrooms. These gains in knowledge were also influenced by spending time in the Early Learning Florida course system, with results showing that more teacher knowledge gains were acquired when teachers spent more time in the course site. An explanation of this was provided in qualitative interviews, with teachers stating that the amount of time spent in the course directly impacted how they learned specific content and strategies. According to teachers in the two courses that were measured, course modules that required more teacher interaction and discussion (and thus more time spent in the course system) provided more active learning, deeper understanding of content, and more collaborative
discussion. Teachers provided anecdotal evidence in which they spent hours analyzing vocabulary and concepts, formulating strategies, and consulting both their course instructors and other teachers participating in course discussion forums to properly understand course content.

**Improvement in Teacher-Child Interactions**

Both quantitative and qualitative results detail an increasing trend in CLASS® scores, with the largest increase occurring from no training to receiving Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI) training in the first year of intervention (Tier 1), followed by a smaller increase from Tier 1 to Tier 2 (MMCI + ELFL + Technical Assistance (TA)/Coaching + Child Assessment) in the second year of training. Tier 1 participant CLASS® scores improved on Emotional Support and Instructional Support indicators for Pre-K classrooms, and on Emotional and Behavioral indicators and Engaged Support for Learning indicators for Toddler classrooms. For Pre-K CLASS® domains, Emotional Support indicators include positive climate, teacher sensitivity, and regard for student perspectives. Instructional support indicators include concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling. For Toddler CLASS® domains, emotional indicators are concurrent with Pre-K, and behavioral indicators include behavioral guidance.

A possible explanation of these gains is teachers' exposure to prompts focused on instructional support was associated with growth in all three domains of classroom behavior, perhaps indicating a broad spectrum effect in which teachers learned applicable knowledge and skills in all domains from these learning activities. This may alternatively have been a function of teachers accumulating more exposure to instructional support prompts, on average, across the year of professional development. If instructionally supportive behavior is more difficult to change, it may be true that when teachers' behavior in this area of practice does improve, the learning that makes it possible to change instruction (e.g., seeing and understanding feedback loops, stimulating language and conversation) transfers into other areas of practice rather easily. This finding supports other research (Pianta et al., 2014) that mirror this impact on teacher instruction.

These results were explained in qualitative interviews with teachers describing specific learning from their MMCI training (post-intervention). Many preschool teachers commented that because of teaching Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten (VPK) programs, they were often focused on more academic content (concept development) to ensure school readiness. However, MMCI training emphasized the social and emotional growth of their students, and thus, knowledge of this was evidenced in improved interactions. Many toddler teachers reflected on not feeling like “teachers” but babysitters when they began this training, and thus, any knowledge gain reported in Tier 1 toddler teachers was evidenced by their professed lack of literacy content, classroom behavior strategies, and ability to engage their children in questioning and response. Coalition staff interviews also reinforced this finding, stating that they saw direct results from classroom implementation of strategies with toddler teachers that participated in the Tier 1 program. This gain was also evidenced with family home providers in both preschool and toddler domains in both teacher and coalition interviews.

Across the second year of participation (from MMCI to MMCI+ELFL) in all coalitions, Tier 2 CLASS® scores showed significant change and growth in Instructional Support for Pre-K classrooms, and gains in Engaged Support for Learning for Toddler classrooms. While there was also growth in Emotional Support for Pre-K classrooms, and improvement in Emotional and Behavioral support for toddler classrooms, it was not as significant. These findings directly correlate to the amount of growth shown from Tier 1, emphasizing that for preschool teachers, more content in Tier 2 interventions were targeted towards effective instructional strategies and support, while toddler teachers gained knowledge regarding emotional and behavioral support and engagement strategies from Tier 2 interventions, as described in qualitative interviews. Teachers described learning and implementing strategies that reinforced this measured outcome to help preschoolers with school readiness skills, such as brainstorming, integrating previous knowledge, using open-ended questioning, and providing connection to real-world learning and application. Teachers also discussed the emphasis on providing children with self-directed learning strategies. Explanations for this leveling of teacher-interaction growth can be due to several factors. While one Tier 2
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intervention, Early Learning Florida courses, provided content aligned with CLASS® frameworks and domains, these courses were aimed at increasing teacher knowledge and thus impacting the implementation of effective practices, and short-term outcomes of these objectives are evident in teachers’ anecdotal evidence and collaborative work. Direct outcomes in teaching observations, however, may not appear in CLASS® domains until intermediate years of intervention according to this study’s theory of teacher change and instruction. Other factors impacting this finding include the lack of alignment of other Tier 2 professional development elements with CLASS®, such as the implementation of child assessments (TSG) and TA/Coaching, as well as inconsistent implementation of these interventions, as evidenced in all stakeholder qualitative interviews. Thus, CLASS® scores may not reflect the teacher gain of knowledge or implementation of strategies gained from these interventions because intervention goals were not aligned. Another explanation for the slight decrease in growth from Tier 1 to Tier 2 can be explained by the ceiling effect on CLASS® scores, which will be discussed more in the limitations section.

Implementation of Improved Teaching Practices in the Classroom

While no measured relationship existed between gains of knowledge and improving CLASS® scores on both ITSED and PKO courses for toddler and preschool teachers to provide a conclusive link between knowledge gain and implementation of practice, both qualitative and survey data provide evidence that teachers successfully implemented effective strategies learned from the ELPFPP into their daily practice. Reasoning behind these results can be explained by the timing of CLASS® observations with the theory of teacher change and instruction used by this evaluation study. The post CLASS® timeframe directly followed the conclusion of the interventions, in some instances, by less than a week. This timeframe is far too close in the span of teacher learning to see gains in the first year with short-term outcomes, yet can serve as a potential baseline for a third year of ELPFPP implementation. However, there were multiple accounts from teachers and coalition staff of teachers’ implementing practices and strategies learned from Early Learning Florida coursework in their daily practice, and also evidence provided about how these practices impacted children’s learning and language. End-of-course survey results also reported that the majority of teachers surveyed implemented practices from coursework. This finding could also be validated with direct child outcomes data (Teaching Strategies GOLD®) that will be introduced in future implementation years of this program.

Challenges in Triangulation Data Analysis

During triangulation analysis, there were some results that were contradictory, and required further analysis for more interpretive results and discussion. These results included: the amount of organizational support needed for participants to be successful in Early Learning Florida courses; the amount of time needed to produce knowledge gains in Early Learning Florida courses; and the impact of course options (online only, online + CoP, online + TA/Coaching) on teacher knowledge gain and improvement of instructional practices.

The Relationships Between Organizational Support, Knowledge Gain and Teacher-Child Interactions

When looking at course surveys and knowledge assessment pre and post scores, there was no explicit relationship detected between whether teachers received support (or lack of) from directors, course instructors, other teachers, or use of materials and their gain in knowledge. Therefore, this result implies that organizational support and access or use of materials did not impact teacher’s knowledge gain. However, there was countervailing evidence given in qualitative interviews to suggest otherwise. Many teachers discussed the need for support from both their directors in terms of time to work in courses and time to implement strategies, and fellow teachers for collaborative learning, as critical for their success. Coalition staff interviews also provided evidence that many teachers did not receive the proper materials for both Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs, and this detracted from their learning. This result might be explained by the fact that the definition of organizational support varied in Tier 2 settings. There were many cases where directors and teachers were new to Early Learning Florida, and the online learning format and experience. Thus, director support was often focused on course registration, implementation, and completion, and the learning curve of requirements of all Tier 2 interventions. The amount of support needed and provided varied greatly throughout Tier 2 providers. For those teachers that were interviewed, they defined organizational support primarily as center release time from classroom instruction to implement practices and complete coursework. Other definitions of support from
Tier 2 teachers included learning support through collaborative discussion, and materials and access to technology. However, directors that were interviewed viewed support as showing solidarity in learning, and being in the same course with their teachers, and working on assignments together. A disconnect of “support” definitions thus would have been evident in survey results.

When examining relationships between organizational support and improvement in teacher-child interactions through CLASS® observations, Pre-K teachers improved Instructional Support indicators from pre to post on CLASS® scores, but there was no difference in scores between teachers who felt supported or lacked support from organizational factors. Therefore, from this analysis, organizational support did not impact teachers’ practices on Instructional Support CLASS® indicators. A more reasonable explanation for this, as stated in the previous results, is that organizational support takes time for processing new learning and implementation of the new learning into a system of care, and there needs to be consistency in program implementation for this to impact teacher learning. As qualitative evidence showed, teachers reported new and increased conversations taking place between organizational administrators and the teachers in the classrooms, yet this outcome was unmeasured by quantitative assessments.

**Course Model Effect on Knowledge Gain and Time Within Course System**
When looking at the relationship between instructional course models for Early Learning Florida and teacher knowledge gain, there were also challenges in data reporting. A multilevel model indicated that after controlling for time spent in the ELFL system, there was not a difference among the types of ELFL models (online only model, online + Communities of Practice model, online + TA/Coaching model) on knowledge gains with the ITSED course. Quantitative measures also reported that knowledge gains were higher for those students in the online-only course option for ITSED and PKO courses, though sample sizes on these measures are considered too small to be significant. These measures directly contradict both qualitative interview data and teacher survey data. From course surveys, 96% of respondents reported that attending Communities of Practice helped them understand course content and strategies and provided collaborative learning and problem-solving with other course participants. Qualitative interviews also detailed the powerful professional learning that teachers experienced, and these collaborative learning sessions were highlighted as the most beneficial aspect of the courses offered. Considering this range of evidence, one explanation for the inconsistency might be the fact that while knowledge gain was not necessarily impacted by attending a Community of Practice session, teacher competencies such as critical thinking, questioning, facilitating problem-solving, working collaboratively with other teachers, and connecting course content with implementation of practice were impacted. Another explanation for this divergent outcome is the fact that many sample sizes (n=7) were too small to detect significant impact from Communities of Practice knowledge gain. Finally, as mentioned in previous analysis, the skills and dispositions gained from participating in an Early Learning Florida Communities of Practice course option are not quantitatively measurable by either CLASS® observations or knowledge assessments within the small time frame allowed for this evaluation, and thus, future implementation years will show a larger gain in this respect.

It should also be noted that time spent within the course system, meaning the time a teacher spent logged in to the course LMS, does not correlate to time spent learning outside the system when implementing practices, completing assignments, and reading course material. More than half of all survey respondents stated they did not have enough time to complete assignments, read materials, watch videos or implement practices. Thus, while course option and time within the course system did not impact knowledge gains, time outside the system was not measured in relationship with both knowledge gains and implementation of effective practices, and thus should be integrated in future data collection.

**Improvement of Classroom Climate**
While results indicate that Tier 2 participants scored higher than Tier 1 participants on both the total score and each domain for improving classroom climate on the CHILD assessment, there was little qualitative evidence to support this result. This quantitative result was expected due to Tier 2 teachers having more exposure to strategies to improve
classroom transitions and teacher-child interactions, and engaging in more collaborative work through Early Learning Florida courses that could improve staff cooperation. The analysis of CHILD scores used a restricted sample to only those classrooms that had the same teacher from pre-test to post-test, and also used the teacher pre-test CLASS® scores as covariates, rather than using provider-level averages.

Outliers of Triangulation Data Analysis

Provider Characteristics: Quality Rating Improvement Systems (QRIS) and Gold Seal Data
While examination of the relationships between the impact of Tier 2 interventions (gains in knowledge, improvement in teacher-child interactions, implementations of effective teaching practices, and child-based assessments) and coalitions/providers with a QRIS system and those without this system in place was not a central objective of this evaluation study, results from both quantitative and qualitative data suggests this relationship exists.

QRIS: Quality Rating and Improvement System
In an effort to bolster children's school readiness skills and close the achievement gap between lower- and higher-income children, local coalition board members aim to improve the quality of child care settings. One popular policy strategy for improving child care quality is through the use of quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS). In some states, QRIS have been designed to serve as a state's overall early childhood education (ECE) accountability system and are largely hinged on a multidimensional assessment of child care program quality (Schaack, Tarrant, Boller, & Tout, 2012). In Florida, many local coalitions have implemented a QRIS. Although the specific criteria for rating child care centers vary, some QRIS indicators include structural quality indicators such as classroom ratios, staff education and specialized training, and their years of experience (Malone, Kirby, Caronongan, Tout, & Boller, 2011). Structural quality features are easily monitored and can be regulated by state child care licensing or other policy levers, but are believed to be only distally related to children's outcomes (NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (ECCRN), 2002). In contrast, process quality variables are more directly related to children's outcomes and measure children's actual experiences within the early care and education settings (NICHD ECCRN, 2002). However, process quality indicators are more costly to measure because they require direct observations, and cannot be controlled by policy as easily. Due to costs, QRIS are primarily composed of structural quality indicators, but almost all include an assessment of the classroom environment that captures aspects of process quality in a global way (Malone et al., 2011).

Gold Seal Quality Care Program
In 1996, the Florida Legislature established the Gold Seal Quality Care program to acknowledge child care facilities and family day care homes that are accredited by nationally recognized agencies and whose standards reflect quality in the level of care and supervision provided to children. In addition, the Legislature established provisions for Gold Seal providers participating in the subsidized child care program, (a.k.a. School Readiness and Early Learning), to receive a higher reimbursement per child, than providers not receiving a Gold Seal designation. In 1999, the Legislature revised the program to provide tax incentives through the Department of Revenue or county tax appraiser for participating in the Gold Seal Quality Care Program. Since then, the Florida Legislature has revised the maximum amount of the reimbursement. Currently, the rate differential cannot exceed 20% above the reimbursement rate established by the local early learning coalition, a.k.a. the local school readiness coalition. In December 2004, Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) legislation was passed and signed into law. This bill requires participating child care facilities and homes to maintain quality care accreditation and higher education standards for staff. The Gold Seal Quality Care Program is an approved accreditation for child care providers to be eligible to participate in VPK (www.myflorida.com).
**Gold Seal Providers**

From quantitative data analysis, it was determined coalitions with a QRIS had higher post-test scores in all CLASS® domains. These results could be explained by the descriptions of QRIS requirements given by many coalition staff participants in focus group interviews. For many coalitions, a QRIS requires infrastructure that supports professional development implementation, and requires systems of quality adherence. Many coalition staff participants spoke of these quality programs and initiatives in interviews, conveying that the ELPFPP Tier 2 requirements were often less rigorous in quality than that of pre-existing QRIS requirements, and thus, providers would have higher scores because of higher quality expectations within the coalitions. In other words, the ELPFPP requirements were easier to maintain, and thus providers produced higher scores because of previous knowledge and experience with quality professional development. Programs within a QRIS are focused on higher standards of quality, and therefore higher CLASS® outcomes should be expected.

**Providers with High Populations of Children in Poverty**

While characteristics of providers discussed above attest to the standards of quality required both by the state of Florida and Early Learning Coalitions, it is important to note the result that the characteristic of providers that serve high populations of children in poverty was not statistically significant. This means that providers who serve high populations of children in poverty did not score lower on CLASS® assessments or knowledge gain. This result speaks to one of the objectives of the ELPFPP, which was to target providers who serve high needs areas and provide equitable education for children in poverty, and thus, the ability of these tiered interventions to meet the needs of these teachers provides hope that early childhood educational settings in these areas can be improved. While higher scores in knowledge gain and teacher-child interactions are more likely to come as these interventions progress and get refined, this finding is significant in the goal of creating equitable education for teachers who serve school readiness children.
LIMITATIONS

The findings of this study should be interpreted with some caution given limitations inherent in both quantitative and qualitative research, as well as in the process of data collection for both proximal and distal outcomes.

**Provider Attrition**
Attrition of providers from pre CLASS® observation to post CLASS® observation, while expected, may have introduced bias in the results, as providers that remained could be systematically different from the providers that did not complete the project year. Year 2 of ELPFPP started with almost 400 providers, fell to 307 when the pre CLASS® observations were conducted, and only 275 providers remained in the ELPFPPP by the post CLASS® observation time frame. Additionally, the large attrition rate reduced the power to detect the effects of ELPFPP.

**Classroom Attrition**
Although some providers remained in ELPFPP the entire project year, within the providers, classroom attrition took place. Among the 275 provers that remained at post CLASS® observation, 150 had fewer classrooms than they had at pre CLASS® observation. Due to both classroom attrition within provider, and provider attrition, there were 1,497 classrooms at the pre CLASS® observation, and only 1,004 classrooms at the post CLASS® observation. Thus, bias may have an effect. For example, if only the best performing, most organized, and better supported classrooms remained for the entire study, this would bias the effects of ELPFPP downward.

**Different Teacher in the Same Classroom**
For some of the participating classrooms, the teacher at the pre CLASS® observation was not the same when the post CLASS® observation was conducted, which reduced the sample size of the classrooms eligible for analysis and consequently reduced power to detect ELPFPP effects.

**Other Challenges with Respect to Number of Participating Providers**
- Some of the Early Learning Coalitions (ELCs) have zero or very few (i.e. 1 or 2) Tier 2 providers, which does not allow examining specific effects for these ELCs.
- The number of providers with infant classrooms in Tier 2 were very small. For the pre CLASS® observation, out of the 307 providers, only 8% of providers had infant classrooms participating in the ELPFPP. For the post CLASS® observation, out of the 275 providers, only 4% had infant classrooms participating in the ELPFPP.

**Lack of Efficiency with the Web-based Early Learning System (WELS) Database**
- Without a unique identifier in the WELS database to align with an identifier in the Office of Early Learning (OEL) database, data merging was a challenge due to matching provider characteristics.
- In the WELS dataset, several fields were blank for the teacher names, which took significant time to link the pre CLASS® observation with the post CLASS® observation.
- Classroom IDs in the WELS database were not reliable at the post CLASS® observation as some room IDs had multiple post CLASS® observations with different assessment dates.

**CLASS® Observer (Rater) Effect on CLASS® Scores**
The intra-class correlations for observers on CLASS® domains range from 0.25 to 0.55, resulting in 25% to 55% of the variances on the CLASS® data. This rater effect substantially reduces power to detect ELPFPP effects on CLASS® scores.

**Difference in Sample Sizes by Tier for PMHCS Data Collection**
The number of PMHCS-R observations for Tier 1 were much higher than the number of observations for Tier 2 due to the number of participating providers in Tier 2. A total of 160 observations were conducted with Tier 1 providers and only 39 observations associated with Tier 2 providers.
No Knowledge Achievement Results for ELFL + TA Model
When the ELFL knowledge assessment data was merged with the data from the ELFL learning management system, no teachers took the online + TA coaching model of the ITSED or PKO course, providing no analysis opportunity regarding differences between the online + TA coaching model with the other two models (online only & online + CoP) on knowledge with ITSED or PKO courses. This was due to ELCs reported lack of capacity to support the introduction of the TA coaching model in this second implementation year.

Lack of Quantitative Data on Implementation of Practices
While the investigation of teacher implementation of effective practices in classrooms was sought out by both qualitative interviews and survey responses, there was no quantitative measurement to validate this implementation occurred, such as observation protocols or assessment tools scoring specific behaviors and strategies gleaned from ELPFPP participation.

Lack of Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment Data
Though TSG data from 2015-2016 was incorporated originally into this evaluation research plan, this data was never received from Teaching Strategies GOLD® despite efforts from both the research team and OEL to obtain these measures. Therefore, there are no direct child-outcome assessments included in this analysis.

CLASS® Ceiling Effects and Limitations
While it is reasonable to expect that higher process quality in providers is related to better child outcomes, and that higher structural quality is related to better process quality, it is also reasonable to expect that there may be a minimum level of quality that needs to be reached before better outcomes are manifested (Le, Schaack, & Setodji, 2015). Thus, it may be that the CLASS® observation tool has limited utility in measuring aspects of teaching that promote more significant cognitive development. As we noted above for professional development interventions, this perhaps suggests the more challenging nature of changing instructional support but may also signal that for some teachers, there may be a ceiling effect in terms of how much change they can achieve in one year. Finally, it should also be noted that a considerable limitation of this study is the use of the CLASS® as both the focus of intervention and an outcome measure, a circumstance that could reflect “teaching to the test” (Pianta et al., 2014). The lack of a separate and perhaps more independent measures of observed teacher practice is a shortcoming of this work.

Qualitative Self-Reporting and the Hawthorne Effect
A key limitation to qualitative data was the power dynamic of the researcher-participant relationship, which may contribute to the Hawthorne Effect, in which participants believe their performances were changed because they were being interviewed and observed regarding those changes. To alleviate this effect, all interviews were conducted by research team members that did not have previous relationships with participants, and challenging data regarding lack of positive improvement was included in analysis. We did not overstep boundaries regarding participants’ time and dedication to this research. All interviews and correspondence were scheduled at participants’ convenience, and we established trust and rapport as much as possible by providing resources and words of encouragement and appreciation during interviews and meetings.

A second limitation stems from the self-reporting of information from all participants. There was no externally reliable data to show whether teachers were doing what they reported in their classrooms with the exception of CLASS® observations, which were not aligned with several interventions measured in this study such as implementation of practices and child-based assessments. This study was concerned with the experiences and challenges faced by ELPFPP stakeholders, and thus depended on personal feedback through interviews and the integration and testing of ideas presented within the literature on early childhood teacher professional development.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ELPFPP IMPLEMENTATION

As evidenced in research on early childhood educational settings (Fukkink & Lont, 2007), the lack of understanding about the critical importance of training for early childhood educators and caregivers has created an undervalued importance of quality professional development. Many authors emphasize the importance of training as a means of improving and maintaining process quality (Clarke-Stewart et al., 2002; Zaslow & Martinez-Beck, 2006), and document the significant gains in the quality of teacher-child interactions that can be realized from these learning opportunities. Further, observational measures of teacher–child interactions, such as the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, et al., 2008), are often a component of states’ QRIS and other accountability frameworks (Hamre et al., 2009; Maxwell & Tout, 2012). Therefore, professional development aligned to these measures is increasingly a central element of workforce development and quality improvement efforts. Understanding the specific nature of these professional development effects could be helpful in designing more potent and efficient approaches to teacher learning.

In the state of Florida, synthesis studies showed inconsistent access to high quality trainings that included active and consistent engagement based upon content to build core competencies and support early learning and developmental standards (Pemberton et al., 2013). This was particularly true in areas with providers that served high needs populations such as children from low-income families. Thus, a call for a comprehensive approach to implement a consistent definition of quality, supported by high quality professional development to help early childhood teachers improve their performance has been consistently given by both policy makers and stakeholders. As a result, the Florida Legislature and the Office of Early Learning created the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project. The Office of Early Learning has also recently revived efforts to create a comprehensive professional development system, designing career pathways, quality assurance, and other mechanisms in partnership with diverse stakeholders to strengthen the implementation of future professional development efforts.

Based on this need to provide such evidence and inform stakeholders of these professional development inquiries, this evaluation study demonstrates that the knowledge and competencies gained by Florida’s early learning teachers who participated in the ELPFPP were beneficial, and these findings answer many questions regarding learning forms (methods, structures, and delivery approaches) and processes (underlying mechanisms for influencing change) based on both proximal and distal outcomes of the ELPFPP. These findings are also consistent with this study’s evaluation framework and theory of change model, which posit that as a result of quality professional development, teachers became more knowledgeable, professional, and able to create positive learning environments for children. Results from this study also reinforce Desimone’s (2009) theory of educational action in that the more specific, consistent, powerful, and stable a policy initiative is in education, the stronger its implementation will be.

A number of lessons can be gleaned from this evaluation study on all levels of this systemic approach to learning and these results support themes in current professional development research, including: (1) the importance of valuing teachers and their time and effort; (2) the need for creating systemic capacity to provide quality professional development; (3) the requirement of adequate time to create effective change through processes of “development in use” (Fullan, 2007); (4) the importance of consistency in instruction and implementation while still respecting contextual differences; (5) the need for alignment of initiative goals and resources at all levels of implementation; and (5) the emphasis on providing follow up, and continuous reflection and evaluation to inform development and create institutionalization of practices.
After careful confirmation with stakeholders across the state through multiple rounds of feedback, member-checking and triangulation of data, researchers have created high-impact recommendations for future ELPFPP implementation through identifying “best practices” for all levels and stakeholders (i.e. Office of Early Learning, early learning coalition partners, system supporters and vendors, early learning providers, and early learning teachers) to improve early childhood professional learning and child outcomes. It is important to note that while parents and families of children are stakeholders in this statewide learning initiative through distal outcomes, these stakeholders were not directly involved in evaluation inquiries, but may be included in potential future investigation.

Also, it should be noted that due to the timeline of the completion of this evaluation and the start of Year 3 of the ELPFPP contract and implementation with coalitions (2016-2017), several of these recommendations are post-programmatic, and may not have the possibility of consideration immediately. To support ongoing improvements, the Office of Early Learning created a transitional crosswalk of Year 2 and Year 3 of ELPFPP implementation that can be found in Appendix I.

Recommendations for Transparency, Feasibility and Contextual Implementation of ELPFPP Interventions

As data analysis revealed, the implementation of the ELPFPP was inconsistent for coalitions that participated in this initiative due to factors such as staff capacity, funding reimbursements, and alignment with current quality improvement plans. Therefore, suggestions are offered regarding both future organization and development of the ELPFPP, specific recommendations for all tiers of intervention, and finally a coalition exemplar case study is provided to give concrete and contextual examples of these recommendations in action.

**Overall Recommendations for Future ELPFPP Implementation and Development**

- Create an ELPFPP advisory board comprised of stakeholders on all systems levels: OEL leadership, coalition leaders and provider organizations, CoP facilitators, TA/Coaches, Early Learning Florida support staff and course instructors, center owners and providers, and early childhood classroom teachers to get continuous feedback and suggestions for future development and implementation of the program.

- Within the next six months, collaborate with the Lastinger and Yale Research Team and ELPFPP Advisory Board and create ELPFPP logic model of inputs and outcomes, a theory of action that is aligned with all intervention objectives, and a realistic timeline for implementation that allows theories of action to result into changed practice and improvement in teacher and child outcomes for the 2017-2018 implementation year. This theoretical process will provide alignment, vision and transparency for all stakeholders.

- Re-design the TA/Coaching requirement to provide specific and consistent support for these interventions, and determine specific coaching goals for each tier of ELPFPP. We recommend requiring at least FOUR coaching sessions for Tier 1, and SIX coaching sessions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 in which two sessions are required for each intervention (CLASS, TSG, and ELFL courses). We also recommend using a research-based coaching model for all ELPFPP coaching interactions such as the Lastinger certified coaching approach to provide scaffolded learning and personal instruction and support for teachers (see case study exemplar).

**Recommendations for Tier 1: Making the Most of Classroom Interactions (MMCI) and Class® Observations OEL:**

- Provide additional train-the-trainer sessions for MMCI to create more coalition capacity statewide and alleviate trainer shortages for larger groups of tiered providers.

- Based on coalition needs, schedule and coordinate regional make-up sessions for trainings in order to provide teachers further options to complete trainings and satisfy program completion.

- Provide stipulations to coalitions/providers for funding disbursements of MMCI training at the teacher level, not the provider level, to ensure teachers are compensated and rewarded for this effort.
• Due to MMCI being geared towards Pre-K instructional practice, provide an infant/toddler focused professional development intervention for teachers of younger children to create targeted knowledge gain of development and practices at the infant and toddler level.

• Incorporate coalition staff input and expertise in selecting Tier 1 providers based upon criteria agreed upon by both OEL and Coalition leadership to ensure provider success and buy-in in Tier 1 program.

Coalitions:
• Create transparency of time and difficulty involved with MMCI training for providers and teachers by providing information of Tier 1 guidelines and requirements PRIOR to the start of implementation and MMCI training.

• Create “internal” rewards for providers to provide recognition and motivation for teachers for MMCI training and implementation such as raffles, contests, etc. to promote teacher buy-in.

• Create collaborative spaces for directors/owners to meet and network through face to face or virtual sessions to provide learning and growth on the leadership level.

• Create capacity and support for teachers with coalition staff that are familiar with MMCI and CLASS training and requirements for providers to connect learning from Tier 1 and Tier 2 content and practices.

Teachstone:
• Provide MMCI trainings in Spanish, and not simply be translated by local coalition staff. Materials and resources also need to be available in Spanish to provide adequate learning and equitable opportunity for those early learning educators that do not feel as comfortable learning in English.

• Offer Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for teachers for completion of the 20-hour MMCI training.

• Create a more user-friendly registration for MMCI training through Teachstone’s website for those providers with little expertise or technology access.

Providers (Directors and Owners):
• Engage in all aspects of Tier 1 implementation, and be aware of guidelines and requirements based on information provided by coalition leadership.

• Be present and involved at MMCI trainings, and provide adequate materials for teachers to be successful and feel supported.

• Create transparency of effort by providing information about Tier 1 requirements to teachers PRIOR to enrolling in Tier 1, and create ownership and buy-in with teachers through collaboration and providing incentives for success.

• Network and collaborate with other Tier 1 directors from regionally designated centers/family care homes, and participate in all coalition-led collaborative learning events such as orientations, meetings, and virtual training sessions.

Teachers:
• Become learning advocates through consistent, professional use of email and designated online platforms, as well as communicate with all levels of Tier 1 program supporters such as Teachstone, Coalition staff, and coaches.

• Create self-directed career pathways of learning by maintaining evidence of participation and collaboration for future learning and development regarding Tier 1, 2 and 3 (artifacts, materials, journals, video evidence) participation to provide inner reflection and evidence of learning.

Recommendations for Tier 2: Early Learning Florida, TA/Coaching, and Teaching Strategies Gold™

OEL:
• Incorporate coalition staff input and expertise in selecting Tier 2 providers based upon criteria agreed upon by both OEL and coalition leadership to ensure provider success in Tier 2 program.

• Re-designate Tier 2 and 3 interventions to allow for capacity-building in coalitions and appropriate learning time (per theory of instructional change) in order to successfully reach intermediate teacher and child outcomes.
Introduce Teaching Strategies GOLD® assessment PD in Tier 2, but allow providers one year of learning before implementation with children. All TSG child-assessment implementation and outcomes should either be started in Tier 1 and implemented in Tier 2 or started in Tier 2 and implemented in the Tier 3 year (see case study exemplar below).

- Stipulate a portion of funding reimbursements for Tier 2 providers be re-invested at the provider level in specific components to provide both technological capacity and access to high needs providers and teachers, and allow teachers to be reimbursed directly to reward them for time and effort in a timely fashion.
- Create Early Learning Florida course pathways (succession of course offerings and outcomes) to align with ELPFPP goals and OEL Professional Development Plan (Year 3).
- While OEL support and access was applauded by all stakeholders for this year, it is recommended that OEL create regional “navigators” or a similar model to provide more access, support and programmatic capacity for coalitions and providers at a regional and local level that incorporates cultural and contextual factors.

Coalitions:
- Create orientations and trainings for all coalition staff on all levels of intervention and benchmarks of ELPFPP to include program contract requirements, intervention requirements (TA/Coaching, TSG, ELFL) and calendar/timeline of implementation and funding disbursement.
- Facilitate provider online and face-to-face orientations to disperse information about Tier 2 (and Tier 3) requirements and create transparency of effort and resources for successful participation in these programs.
- Incorporate all Tier 2 interventions into TA/Coaching goals: CLASS, Early Learning Florida coursework, and TSG implementation.
- Create Gap Analysis for connections from Tier 1 to Tier 2, and Tier 2 to Tier 3 to provide support through coaching and resources to providers and create bridges of learning and practice with each level of intervention.
- Create Coalition Quality Improvement Crosswalk incorporating coalition improvement goals/objectives and ELPFPP goals/objectives, and determine areas of gap, overlap and alignment to help determine staff capacity and professional development needed (see case study exemplar).
- Deconstruct Teaching Strategies GOLD® training into specific modules for Tier 2 providers, and create pathways of support for first year of reliability and implementation (see case study exemplar).
- Create center leader and teacher networks of support for Tier 2 directors and teachers by providing coalition-based or regional online communities of practice through social media platforms or other online options.
- Encourage directors to engage in Tier 2 interventions in collaboration with their teachers, and enroll in Early Learning Florida Directors’ Courses (Year 3) to provide job-embedded learning and support for center leadership.

Early Learning Florida:
- Create leveled courses for beginner, intermediate, and advanced learners to differentiate instruction and provide scaffolded learning and support for teachers.
- Provide an introductory course that gives information on technology platform and requirements for coursework and participation.
- Create courses in Spanish for all levels of instruction.
- Create both online and hard copy course catalogs, course workbooks, and resources for all levels of Early Learning Florida courses to provide further support for beginning-level learners with lack of online course experience and technological expertise.
- Provide consistent professional development for all course instructors, CoP facilitators and TA/Coaches to ensure quality instruction and facilitation capacity in all coalitions.
- Become IACET accredited and offer IACET-approved CEUs for all coursework and training.
• Create credentials based on coursework to be used for OEL Professional Development Plan and future college credit.

• Create a Directors’ Network with job-embedded learning for center directors and family child care providers to create capacity and learning leadership for improvement in learning outcomes.

• Create a smart phone application for ease of use and access for teachers that don’t have adequate technology requirements.

• Create a TA/Coaching online tool to virtually coach and upload coaching observation notes and data, allowing coaches more time to coach.

Providers (Directors and Owners):
• If possible, increase technological capacity for Tier 2 teachers by re-investing funding disbursements into new technology and access.

• If possible, re-invest funding reimbursements to allow Tier 2 teachers release time for course strategy implementation and coaching by funding substitute teachers or creating scheduling solutions.

• Become learning leaders, and enroll in Early Learning Florida course work alongside teachers and collaborate to create a center culture of learning and improvement.

• Create internal center capacity by designating staff who are knowledgeable (mentor teachers) with both Early Learning Florida courses and Teaching Strategies GOLD® implementation to provide on-site support for teachers.

• If possible, during slower summer months, “pilot” Teaching Strategies GOLD® child assessments and observations to hone skills and work through challenges during the first “learning year.”

Teachers:
• Become collaborative learners through harnessing communication and collaboration with other Tier 2 providers and teachers through coalition-led networks as well as collaborative blended coursework options.

• Create “laboratories of learning” in classrooms by implementing specific strategies from course work and trainings, and observing other teachers and centers in action to gain different perspectives and knowledge and discuss similarities and differences.
While all coalitions that were interviewed for this evaluation had structures in place to benefit teachers, the case study of the Early Learning Coalition of Big Bend portrays implementation philosophies, strategies, and systems that created measurable benefits for their ELPFPP Tier 1 and Tier 2 participants. We realize the scalability of some of these strategies may not be possible for larger or smaller coalitions due to staffing capacity, geographic, cultural, and language challenges, but believe these ideas can provide a framework for coalitions to begin discussions of how to shape future ELPFPP Tiered programs and opportunities for professional development. This case study uses both ideas and anecdotal evidence from staff at the ELC Big Bend, and we have obtained their collective permission to provide these examples to start the conversation and further strengthen this initiative.

**Learning Approach for ELPFPP:**
- Coalition staff have adopted the Community of Practice mentality for all professional development offerings, and created a learning community based on trust, support, networking and collaboration. Providers within each tier of ELPFPP receive coaching towards the objectives of those specific interventions, and communities of practice are used to debrief, analyze, and reflect on all learning and create connections with tools and improvement objectives.

**Alignment with Coalition Professional Development Goals and Offerings:**
- "After going through the Early Learning Florida coaching and CoP trainings, all of our coalition PD is now a collaborative model, in which we use protocols and activities that are the same as CoPs and courses, to provide continuity, familiarity, and consistency."

**Critical Need for Coalition Data Collection and Analysis:**
- "The critical piece for us was the data we’ve collected ourselves at the provider and classroom level, as well as the data that was provided by Early Learning Florida in strategic planning meetings. We analyzed our own data, and the data showed that there wasn’t necessarily an increase in the CLASS tool, but there was maintenance of the mid and high range, and a tremendous gain in emotional support. We had quite a few classrooms that were in the low range for the pre-assessment, but the post assessment they blew it up. Everyone had moved mid to high range. And we talked to the teachers, and it made perfect sense. When we do pre-assessments, it’s the beginning of the year, and the focus is on relationships. Then the increase of learning happens after relationships have been built. So the more data we have, the better we can understand the needs of our providers. I would recommend collecting data far beyond what the ELPFPP requires."

**Suggestions for Implementation of Tier 1 MMCI:**
- “Break the sessions up, give teachers time to go back, implement it, try some things in their classroom, and then come back, and network and talk about what they’ve tried, and learn from each other. Don’t do the sessions back to back, there is not time for reflection after implementation.”
- “The dimensions that are embedded in the CLASS tool are the three areas of struggle for teachers (classroom organization, emotional support, instructional support), so we provide connections through coaching so teachers see that you can’t organize a classroom if you don’t have a relationship with the kids. There always has to be a connection to move forward.”

**Suggestions for Implementation of Tier 2 Early Learning Florida:**
- “Be meaningful about the courses selected from Early Learning Florida. Instead of choosing from the buffet, start to create an educational plan or ladder for providers. Make it personal and supportive for each
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one. Use the blended model of courses for teachers that are new to the system or online learning, but this requires a shifting of staff priority. We had to shift priorities in our job responsibilities to get this done.”

- “Online-only courses should be for the most veteran teachers that don’t require additional support. I understand that so many coalitions just don’t have the capacity to do the CoP option, and at first we didn’t either, and I think our most challenged teachers suffered through that. Use creative ways to facilitate CoPs, or play around with scheduling, and it can work.”

- “Create CoPs that are multi-age level or multi-course, to provide differentiated learning for those that need support while still providing collaborative learning and understanding for participants. With all the courses connected by CLASS and standards, there are always connections that can be made through CoP interaction.”

**Suggestions for Implementation of Teaching Strategies GOLD**:  
- Break up TSG implementation into 3 years: Year 1/Tier 1 is collecting quality observations; Year 2/Tier 2 is interpreting data from reports into planning for instruction; and Year 3/Tier 3 is practice and implementation to collect reliable child assessment data.

- Provide the same amount of coaching with TSG that you did with MMCI. It should receive 10 additional hours of face to face coaching and support, whether it’s required or not. It’s really difficult material for many teachers.

- Have providers who are learning about and implementing TSG take the Early Learning Florida PKO course in tandem to reinforce quality observations and assessments.

- Coalition staff who provide support MUST have knowledge and practice with assessment tool and reliability testing, so make sure all staff that are coaching are trained on the TSG tool as well.

**Suggestions for Implementation of TA/Coaching**:  
- Meet with center director beforehand to determine coaching schedules so teachers can have release time (not during nap time) and the ability to work and concentrate on reflection.

- “Provide at least 6 coaching sessions, and definitely more than the 4 coaching sessions required, and incorporate all Tier interventions into coaching cycles, not just CLASS, so coaching doesn’t become evaluative. Start with TSG requirements and online training, then move to CLASS, and then move to course content. It’s a natural sequence for learning.”
Recommendations for Data Collection and Management of ELPFPP Measures and Outcomes

**Office of Early Learning and WELS databases:**
- In OEL’s database, there was an ELPFPP ID for each of the participating providers, while in the WELS database, there were no IDs for these providers. In WELS database, for some of the participating providers, the names they were using at pre-test were not the same when at post-test, which made it harder to merge the pre-test data with the post-test data from WELS. Researchers recommend that the ELPFPP ID for each participating provider be entered in WELS database and the names of providers be consistent across databases. It will be more efficient to merge the data from OEL with the data from WELS if there is a common ID for each provider across these two databases.
- In WELS dataset, there were many cases where teacher names for participating classrooms were blank, which made it harder to link the CLASS pre-test data with the CLASS post-test data. Researchers recommend making the teacher name field in WELS a required field, so that it will not allow users to skip these fields when they are entering the data into WELS. Researchers also recommended that the teacher names entered for each participating classroom to be consistent across data systems (OEL, WELS, LoudCloud & Qualtrics).
- The room IDs in the WELS database were not reliable at post-test. There were cases were some of the room IDs have multiple CLASS post-test observations with different assessment dates. It made it harder to figure out which classroom each CLASS post-test observation belonged to. Researchers recommend assigning one unique room ID to each participating classroom and making sure that observers enter the correct ID into WELS database.

**Qualtrics**
- The teacher names were not collected for CHILD, which made it harder to link the CHILD data with the CLASS pre-test data for the participating classrooms. It reduced the sample size of the classrooms we could analyze and reduced power to detect ELPFPP effects on CHILD. Researchers recommend adding a question about teacher names in Qualtrics and making it a required field, so that it will not allow observers to skip this field when they are entering the CHILD data into Qualtrics.

**Early Learning Florida Learning Management System (LoudCloud)**
- The ELFL online system provided no information on teacher participation other than the time teachers spent on website. Researchers recommend the LoudCloud system to collect richer information, such as time spent on each task, route that each teacher followed within the system, and time of the day that each was completed. This information would allow researchers to identify which patterns of participation in ELFL lead to improvement in knowledge and teacher-child interactions.
Recommendations for Future Evaluation Design

Based on triangulation data and analysis, the evaluation research team has determined improvements for future years of ELPFPP evaluation that might better measure both changes and outcomes of this professional development initiative.

Evaluation Timeline

• As mentioned previously, the timeline designated by the Office of Early Learning for this Year 2 evaluation study prohibits many recommendations from being implemented due to program contracts being sent to all providers before the evaluation was completed (July, 2016). Researchers suggest for future years to create a “reflection period” of one month after evaluation data has been measured to provide evaluation analysis and findings PRIOR to the rollout of contracts (if possible) in order to bolster implementation strategies and strengthen both coalition and provider capacity to create stronger intermediate outcomes.

The Need for Tier 3 Practitioner “Artifact of Practice” and Direct Observation

• Based on the logic model presented in this study, intermediate outcomes include teachers’ incorporating knowledge gain from Early Learning Florida coursework and Teaching Strategies GOLD® assessments to inform instructional planning and thus implement effective strategies in the classroom. Therefore, in future years, we believe an element to observe these changes in teacher instruction should be required of Tier 3 teachers. This element could be a teaching artifact such as a lesson plan incorporating both child assessment data and course knowledge into effective classroom strategies. This could also be a video observation of the teacher in the classroom teaching a specific lesson based on his or her learning from both course work and other professional development interventions. While this specific element is to be defined by both the Research Team and OEL, this would produce tangible evidence of this intermediate outcome, and require teachers to truly put theory into practice.
IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The results presented in this report provide a window into a systemic statewide professional development reform initiative, and suggest areas where current practices and structures could be strengthened. However, this window offers only a small picture of the potential landscape of reform that the ELPFPP could provide in future years. Implications for both early childhood educational practice, and early childhood research are far reaching, and will be discussed briefly.

Early childhood professionals deserve the opportunity to advance their educational careers through engaging in quality professional development. This study has shown that Florida's early learning teachers have the drive and motivation to elevate their teaching ability and improve classroom environments when given the opportunity. While many other states have attempted to incorporate sequenced professional development reform in the past in which teachers participate in certain programs without connection or progression (Zaslow & Martinez-Beck, 2006), few have successfully incorporated a multi-tiered progression of professional learning which combines theory, practice, and assessment in a collaborative learning environment like the ELPFPP. Many programs have tested training or practice as one dimensional learning formats, but the ELPFPP design has pioneered training in practice with contextually based Early Learning Florida courses, the use of research-based child assessments to guide instruction from a child-centered approach, and technical assistance and coaching to provide teachers personal learning connections and guided support. These findings contribute to early childhood educational research by providing evidence that teachers with limited knowledge or experience can improve their instructional practice by engaging in specific progression of tiered interventions of professional development. This study also contributes to a small but growing subset of early childhood professional development research that argues that through specific collaborative mechanisms such as a Community of Practice that provide reflection, guided support of practice and problem-solving, teachers will change their beliefs to improve instructional practice for increased child outcomes.

Implications for future research both within future ELPFPP evaluations and in other early childhood professional development initiatives are extensive. Many topics merit further investigation, including: (1) the relationship of contextual classroom elements such as lower class ratios, teacher experience, child demographics, and organizational support and direct child outcomes; (2) examination of specific elements (leadership support, teacher buy-in, accreditation requirements, coalition support) within “quality” providers (i.e. Gold Seal providers, Providers within QRIS) that contribute to higher gains in teacher knowledge and implementation of practice; (3) the investigation and identification of “promising” practices of technical assistance and early childhood coaching that help create teacher and provider improvement in instructional outcomes; (4) the examination of the relationship between provider “culture” (collaborative vs. compliance-based, reflective vs. evaluative) and teacher learning and implementation of new instructional practices; and (5) the elements of online learning that create the most beneficial outcomes for teachers with regard to child-based outcomes. Future investigations should gather information about both systems and structures of professional learning in different types of settings, including those providers that serve non-school readiness children, as well as family home providers with multi-age groups. Most importantly, as quality reform initiatives and Quality Rating Improvement systems evolve, there is a critical need for ongoing effort to identify models of professional learning that contribute to both quality improvement and meaningful impact on children's learning and school success.

The challenges of providing effective professional development to improve teacher practice and children’s learning is well documented in the literature, and this study has presented the tensions and transformations that early childhood teachers and stakeholders experienced when engaging in this systemic professional development initiative. It is important to acknowledge that this professional development initiative served over 1500 early childhood teachers, which represents only 3% of the total amount of early childhood professionals in the state of Florida. Yet this research
shows the potential of these tiered interventions to push teachers toward a level of professionalism and learning that will not only will help them better meet the diverse needs of their young students, but also provide purpose and motivation to become elevated in their teaching practices and interactions with children.

Educational research is so often about the scores, the variables, and the outcomes which are directly tied to funding and inputs, but often overlooks the voice of teachers and the needs of children. When engaging in this research, researchers were both surprised and encouraged to find that while these teachers spoke of technical and frustrating issues with these varied programs and structures, and coalition staff struggled through capacity and implementation obstacles, views were positive, and in some cases, transformational. Each teacher reported specific growth from this process, but also illuminated the many complexities which impact teaching, learning and coaching, and provided the beginning of a continuing conversation to further enhance this process. It is our hope that as this research is analyzed, interpreted and discussed, it creates a larger conversation based on equity and excellence in implementation, and provides the springboard for further educational opportunity and advancement of Florida's early childhood educators.
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The 2014 Florida Legislature created the Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project in the 2014-15 General Appropriations Act and directed the Office of Early Learning to organize a workgroup of early learning stakeholders who would provide input to OEL on determining the details of the pilot. The project has been approved to continue into the 2015-16 fiscal year.

Approximately 400 providers and their instructors will have an opportunity to receive additional funding for improving school readiness program outcomes. The method for allocating funds to early learning coalitions must include

- A funding differential incentive for high-need populations.
- A professional development system to significantly improve instructor quality.
- A research-based observational system to significantly improve instructor interactions with children.
- Alignment to Early Learning Florida to provide consistency in technical assistance to improve instructor quality.

Providers will be assigned to one of two tiers where specific professional development strategies will occur.

**Tier 1** providers will participate in
- A two-hour Introduction to Classroom Assessment and Scoring System® (CLASS) online module.
- 20 hours of Making the Most of CLASSroom Interactions training.

**Tier 2** providers will participate in
- Implementing a research-based, comprehensive child assessment tool.
- 20 hours of Early Learning Florida training.
- Two technical assistance visits initiated by the local early learning coalition.

**Classroom Assessment Scoring System**

The pilot will use CLASS, an observation-based program assessment instrument that measures teacher-child interactions in three broad domains: emotional support, classroom organization and instructional support. CLASS has been validated in thousands of classrooms and is used to
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support research, monitoring, evaluating and professional development efforts nationwide. Each classroom will receive a CLASS observation to measure program outcomes.

**High-Need Populations**

Census poverty tracts were used to identify areas with high-need populations. Providers in tracts where at least 50 percent of the families are in poverty will be eligible for an additional differential payment.

**Eligibility and Participant Requirements**

Providers agreeing to participate will be assigned to one of two groups—Tier I or Tier II. Both sets of providers will complete a contract with their coalition that outlines expected benchmarks/deliverables. Coalitions will also complete a contract with OEL.

To be eligible to participate in the pilot, **providers** must

- Have a minimum of 30 percent of their birth-5 enrollment made up of children in the School Readiness Program.
- Have no Class I or more than two Class II licensing violations within the last two years.
- Have all of the center’s infant to prekindergarten classrooms agree to participate.
- Agree to have the evaluator conduct assessments.
- Agree to all of the benchmarks and submitting information to OEL.
- Agree to have the director participate in all training.
- Agree to pay for instructors’ access to selected CLASS training (estimated at $75/instructor) or child subscriptions to an online assessment system (estimated around $11 per child in school readiness).

For **instructors** to be eligible to participate, they must

- Agree to participate in all training and/or implementation processes.
- Agree to have trained observers conduct observations in the fall and spring.
- Implement a pre- and post-assessment tool, identified by OEL, to the center’s participating children if assigned to Tier II.

**Award Timeline and Benchmarks**

Beginning in November 2015, providers will receive quarterly payments based on meeting benchmarks/deliverables. Award amounts will be calculated on a per-child payment (for children enrolled in the School Readiness Program), based on a fixed percentage increase of the state’s average school readiness reimbursement rate for 2 year-olds. A bonus will be awarded at the end of the pilot to instructors who improved their teacher-child interactions from fall to spring.

Payments to providers for successfully completing benchmarks/deliverables will be based on
the number of children receiving school readiness services at the center as of August 2015 and calculated as follows:

- A fixed percentage (TBD) increase of the average reimbursement rate
- A fixed percentage (TBD) increase for high-need providers (a provider may be defined as “high-need” based on census poverty tracts and if 50 percent or more of their birth-5 enrollments are participating in the School Readiness Program.
- An end-of-year bonus based on the results of CLASS pre- and post-observations.

How to Apply

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

ELPFPP Practitioner Interview 2 Protocol:

Post-Intervention Interview (60 minutes by Zoom online meeting)

Goals:

1. Determine how ELPFPP teachers experienced the professional development

2. What impact teachers perceived the professional development had on their instructional practice, gains in content knowledge, and student interactions

Interviewer: Thanks so much for meeting with me again. Our purpose for this interview is to focus on your experiences and perceptions as an teacher who participated in the ELPFPP. I will ask you specific questions about each aspect of the ELPFPP program, your instructional practice, and your general impressions of the program as a whole related to instructional quality. We greatly appreciate you being completely open and honest as this will assist us to focus on both strengths and challenges in the program for future implementation.

1. Experience of ELPFPP Teacher Learning and Changes in Practice

- Looking at the whole experience of the ELPFPP program as professional development, think about specific things that helped or hindered the process for you and let’s talk about that.

  o In your first interview, you stated you were looking forward to gaining ____________ from the ELPFPP program. Tell me now that this ELPFPP has concluded, what are your thoughts on this program and did you accomplish these goals?

  o What factors or elements about the ELPFPP most contributed to your learning as a teacher? (Prompt for specific examples)

  o Describe if, and how, you have incorporated this new content knowledge into your instructional practice. (Prompt for specific evidence or examples in classroom practice)

  o How has your participation in this program made a difference in the way you think about teaching or in your development as a teacher? (prompt for change in beliefs, practice, interactions)

  o In your first interview, you spoke of specific challenges you were worried about such as ____________. What, in your view, was the most challenging part of this experience for you as a teacher? What did you struggle with throughout this process?

1. Discussion of Specific ELPFPP PD elements:

- Let’s talk about the three specific pieces of the ELPFPP professional development program, and your thoughts and experiences with each one. For each of these elements, we would like to also look at an artifact or example you brought to help us understand your learning process. For the Early Learning Florida course, we will look at a sample course together (through share screen on Zoom video) so I can remind you about certain aspects of the course.

  A. Early Learning Florida Courses: (prompt with course artifact)

    o Tell me your overall impression of each ELF course.
Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project
Contract #SR970

o What course options (online only, online + CoP, online + TA) did you participate in?

o What aspects of the course did you enjoy? What aspects did you struggle with? (prompt with screen and artifact regarding assignments, discussion posts, and videos)

o What were some strategies or ideas that you took away from your coursework? (prompt for discussion of delivery of strategies within online course)

o What suggestions can you give me about these courses in order to make this experience stronger and better for participants in the future? (use specific examples about technology, course design for evidence)

B. Research-based Child Assessment Tool (TSG or other)

o Tell me your overall impression of the Child Assessment Tool and the professional development you received related to this assessment.

o Describe the reliability training and challenges and success you experienced.

o What aspects of this PD did you enjoy? What aspects did you struggle with?

o What were some strategies or ideas that you took away from this PD experience?

A. TA/Coaching (prompt with artifacts from coaching session)

o How did having two TA/Coaching sessions help or hinder your instructional growth? What did you enjoy? What did you struggle with?

o Can you give me specific examples of strategies from coaching that your coach used to help you change your practice in the classroom?

o When you think about this type of personalized professional development in comparison to the other ELPFPP elements, how does this compare? (prompt for specific examples)

o Can you describe your coaching relationship with your coach to me?

o Who was your coach? (for Lastinger certified vs. non-certified comparison)

C. Changes in Teacher-Student Interactions and Outcomes

The goal of the ELPFPP was to result in improved teacher-child interactions in classrooms that are better aligned with the specific needs of children, with children gaining more skills in school readiness domains including socio-emotional development, language and general readiness skills.

o How has your participation in this program impacted your student’s learning? (prompt for evidence and examples)

o What specific elements of the ELPFPP most contributed to improving your instruction with regard to your student interactions?

o What are some other ways you feel could most help you achieve these goals that were not included in the ELPFPP program?
D. When you think about your previous perceptions about the impact of this ELPFPP program from your first interview, how do you feel this program helped you? What ideas or suggestions can you offer for Tier 2 and Tier 3 participants next year? What would you like to see change for next year?

ELPFPP Provider/Coalition Leadership Focus Group Interview Protocol:
Post-Intervention Interview (45-60 minutes)
Goals:
- Determine how ELC/ELPFPP leadership experienced ELPFPP professional development
- Determine what impact provider and coalition leaders perceived the professional development had on teacher instructional practice, gains in content knowledge, and quality of student interactions

**Interviewer:** Thanks so much for meeting with me as a group. Our purpose for this interview is to focus on your experiences and perceptions as provider or coalition leaders and facilitators who participated in the ELPFPP. I will ask you all general questions about your overall impressions, and then more specific questions about each aspect of the ELPFPP program related to instructional and program quality. We greatly appreciate you being completely open and honest as this will assist us to focus on both strengths and challenges in the program for future implementation.

1. Experience of ELPFPP and Changes in Teacher Practices and Instructional Quality
   - Looking at the whole experience of the ELPFPP as professional development for your program, think about specific things that helped or hindered the process for you and your teachers, and let’s talk about that.
     - In your capacity as (coach, director, coalition leader), what involvement did you have with the ELPFPP implementation, and what were your responsibilities?
     - What was your overall impression of the quality of the ELPFPP professional development?
     - From your viewpoint, what elements of the ELPFPP most contributed to teachers’ change or improvement of their classroom practice? (Prompt for specific examples)
     - From your viewpoint, what elements of the ELPFPP most provided gains in content knowledge? (Prompt for specific examples)
     - In your capacity as (coach, director, coalition leader), what challenges did you face with ELPFPP implementation?
     - How has this combination of PD elements differed from previous PD and learning you have encountered?
     - From your viewpoint, do you feel that participating in the ELPFPP has promoted instructional quality and program improvement? Why or why not?

2. Discussion of Specific ELPFPP PD elements (Tier 1 and Tier 2):
   - Let’s talk about the three specific pieces of the ELPFPP professional development program, and your thoughts and experiences with each one.
A. MMCI – overall impressions and quality of program, challenges

B. Early Learning Florida Courses: (20 hours, 2 courses)
   o Tell me your overall impression of the ELF courses.
   o How did participating in the ELF coursework prepare your teachers to provide more quality instruction and student interactions? (Prompt for specific examples).
   o What suggestions can you tell me in order to make the ELF courses better for participants in the future?

C. Research-based Child Assessment Tool (TSG)
   o Tell me your overall impression of the Child Assessment Tool and the professional development you received related to this assessment.
   o How do you think this child assessment tool helped your teachers or impacted their practice? (probe for examples)

B. TA/Coaching
   o How did TA/Coaching sessions provide teachers with support and learning? What specific parts of TA/coaching helped or hindered teachers with ELPFPP work? (Prompt for specific examples)
   o What specific suggestions can you give us about TA/coaching to help teachers incorporate ELPFPP content knowledge and instructional practice in the future?

3. Changes in Teacher-student Interactions and Outcomes
   • The goal of the ELPFPP was to result in improved teacher-child interactions in classrooms that are better aligned with the specific needs of children, with children gaining more skills in school readiness domains including socio-emotional development, language and general readiness skills.
     o Tell me about what you have noticed with your teachers and their teacher-child interactions as a result of participating in the ELPFPP.
     o From your viewpoint, what specific elements of the ELPFPP most contributed to improving teacher-student interactions?
     o From your viewpoint, did ELPFPP achieve these goals, and if not, what are ways these goals could be achieved with future learning?
     o How do parents of children in your program whose teacher participated in the ELPFPP feel about their child’s instruction? Have you noticed any specific changes in parent-teacher interactions? What feedback have you received from parents specific to ELPFPP elements and activities?

4. What overall suggestions do you have for future ELPFPP implementation?

5. Are there any other reflections or perceptions about this experience that you would like to discuss?
APPENDIX C: SURVEY QUESTIONS

Early Learning Florida Survey

Survey of Incoming Program Participants

How old are the children you most often care for each day?

- Infants 0-12 months
- Infants 1-2 years old (13-24 months)
- Toddler 2-3 years old (25-36 months)
- Preschooler 3-4 years old (36-48 months)
- Preschooler 4-5 years old (49-60 months)
- Multiple age group

Answer If How old are the children you most often care for each day? Multiple age group Is Selected

Please specify the age breakdown of the multiple age group that you most often care for each day:

On a typical day, how many children are present in the classroom/family child care home where you work?

Number of children:

On a typical day, how many other caregivers work with you with the same group of children?

Number of Caregivers:

Please indicate the number of hours that you work on a typical schedule for each day of the week:

Monday:
Tuesday:
Wednesday:
Thursday:
Friday:
What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, please select highest degree received.

- Some high school
- High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (GED)
- Some college credit
- Associate degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree

Answer If What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest... Some college credit Is Selected Or What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest... Associate degree Is Selected Or What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest... Bachelor’s degree Is Selected Or What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest... Master’s degree Is Selected

How many early childhood college credits have you completed?

Number of college credits:

Answer If What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest... Bachelor’s degree Is Selected Or What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, highest... Master’s degree Is Selected

Was your degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development?

- Yes
- No

Do you have any professional credential (certifications) in child care?

- Yes
- No

Answer If Do you have any professional credential? Yes Is Selected

Which professional credentials (certifications) in child care do you have? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential
- Florida Child Care Professional Credential (FCCPC)
- Early Childhood Professional Credential (ECPC)
- Director Credential
- Advanced Director Credential
- Infant, Toddler or Pre-K CLASS Observer Certification
Teaching Strategies GOLD Online Interrater Reliability Certification

Other

Answer If Which professional credential (certifications) in child care do you have? Other Is Selected
Please specify your professional credential (certification) in child care not listed above:

Answer If Which professional credential do you have? CDA Is Selected
Which type of Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential do you have? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

Infant/Toddler
Preschool
Family Child Care
Home Visitor

Other than the DCF 45 hour course, do you have any experience with online courses?

Yes
No

Answer If Do you have experience with online courses? Yes Is Selected
What level of online courses have you taken? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

College-level
Continuing education units (CEUs)
Inservice hours
Other

Answer If What level of online courses have you taken? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY) Other Is Selected
Please specify the type of online courses you have taken:

How long have you worked in the field of early childhood?
Years:
Months:
Which role do you most often fill at the early learning program where you work?

- Director
- Director/Teacher
- Lead Teacher
- Assistant Teacher
- Curriculum specialist
- Family Childcare Provider
- Other

Answer If What best describes your position at the early learning program where you work? Other Is Selected

Please specify your position:

Thank you for completing the Early Learning Florida Survey! If there is anything else you would like to tell us about
Early Learning Florida, the Performance Funding Pilot or this survey, please do so in the space below.

**Early Learning Florida Completion Survey**

Survey of Participants

This survey will ask you questions about your experience with Early Learning Florida courses. Your participation is very important because it will help guide future decisions for Early Learning Florida. Your answers are completely confidential and will only be reported as part of group summaries.

Please write your name. This information will only be used to certify that you completed the survey.

First Name: 
Last Name: 

Please write the name of your center or family child care home:

Child care provider name: 

Please select your Early Learning Coalition:

- ELC of Alachua County
- ELC of Big Bend
- ELC of Brevard
- ELC of Broward County
- ELC of Duval
- ELC of Flagler/Volusia Counties
- ELC of Florida’s Gateway
- ELC of Florida’s Heartland
- ELC of Hillsborough
- ELC of IRMO (Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee)
- ELC of Lake County
- ELC of Manatee County
- ELC of Marion County
- ELC of Miami-Dade/Monroe
- ELC of Nature Coast
In a typical week, how long did it take you to complete the work required to do the course?

- Less than 1 hour
- Between 1 and 2 hours
- Between 2 and 4 hours
- Between 4 and 6 hours
- More than 6 hours

In a typical week, how long were you actually online (watching videos, reading handouts, responding to peers on the internet) in the course?

- Less than 1 hour
- Between 1 and 2 hours
- Between 2 and 4 hours
- Between 4 and 6 hours
- More than 6 hours

In a typical week, how long did it take you to prepare to implement the strategies presented in the Early Learning Florida cycles into your classroom (planning time)?

- Less than 1 hour
- Between 1 and 2 hours
- Between 2 and 4 hours
Between 4 and 6 hours
- More than 6 hours

To what extent did you encounter difficulties to complete the Early Learning Florida courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty /finding time to watch videos</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty /finding time to complete the assigned readings</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty completing the assignments</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with internet connection</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with the language</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other difficulties</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer: If To what extent did you encounter difficulties to complete the Early Learning Florida courses? Other difficulties - A little Is Selected Or To what extent did you encounter difficulties to complete the Early Learning Florida courses? Other difficulties - Somewhat Is Selected Or To what extent did you encounter difficulties to complete the Early Learning Florida courses? Other difficulties - A lot Is Selected

Please indicate other difficulties to complete Early Learning Florida courses not presented in the previous question:

First barrier:
Second barrier:
Third barrier:

To what extent did the videos used in the Early Learning Florida courses help you in your learning?
- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- A lot

Answer: If To what extent did the videos used in the Early Learning Florida courses enhance your learning? Not at all Is Selected Or To what extent did the videos used in the Early Learning Florida courses enhance your learning? A little Is Selected
Please indicate reasons that prevented Early Learning Florida videos from enhancing your learning:

First reason:
Second reason:
Third reason:

In a typical week, did you have enough time to complete the tasks asked of you in the course?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Most of the Time
- Always

Answer If In a typical week, did you have enough time to complete the tasks asked of you in the course? Never Is Selected Or In a typical week, did you have enough time to complete the tasks asked of you in the course? Rarely Is Selected Or In a typical week, did you have enough time to complete the tasks asked of you in the course? Sometimes Is Selected

What was the main reason that prevented you from having enough time to complete course-related tasks?

To what extent did you encounter barriers for implementing Early Learning Florida practices in your classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to implement the practices</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Director support</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the instructor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from other teachers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of necessary materials</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New practice would disturb the routine of the classroom</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other barriers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer If To what extent did you encounter barriers for implementing Early Learning Florida practices in yo... Other barriers - A little Is Selected Or To what extent did you encounter barriers for implementing Early Learning Florida practices in yo... Other barriers - Somewhat Is Selected Or To what extent did you encounter barriers for implementing
Early Learning Florida practices in your center or family child care home not presented in the previous question:

First barrier:

Second barrier:

Third barrier:

Did you collaborate with other colleagues in your center or family child care home when implementing the strategies?

- Yes
- No
- I am the only caregiver in the classroom.
- I was not able to implement the strategies.

How useful were the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not useful at all</th>
<th>Slightly useful</th>
<th>Fairly useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased my knowledge of content</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased my knowledge of teaching practice</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased my knowledge of working with families</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned new approaches to child assessment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned strategies to teach ALL Children</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent have you made changes in your teaching practices as a result of the Early Learning Florida activity?

- Not at all
- A little
Somewhat

A Lot

Answer If To what extent have you made changes in your teaching practices as a result of the Early Learning... Not at all Is Selected Or To what extent have you made changes in your teaching practices as a result of the Early Learning... A little Is Selected

Please indicate reasons that prevented you from making changes in your teaching practices as a result of Early Learning Florida?

First reason:

Second reason:

Third reason:

Have you discussed what you learned with other colleagues in your center or family child care home who did not participate in the course?

Yes

No

I do not work with other caregivers.

Will you be interested in taking another Early Learning Florida course?

Yes

No

Would you encourage other colleagues to take an Early Learning Florida course?

Yes

No
Answer If Would you encourage other colleagues to take an Early Learning Florida course? No Is Selected

Please explain the main reason for not encouraging other colleagues to take an Early Learning Florida course.

Please rate the instructor of your most recent Early Learning Florida course with respect to the characteristics shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor or Low</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent or High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication of ideas and information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of expectations for performance in this class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect and concern for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation of interest in course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm for the subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing timely feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of the instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate?(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

☑ Online course only
☑ Online course + TA Coaching
☑ Online course + Community of Practice

Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? Online course + TA visit Is Selected

How many times did you meet with the UF Certified TA Coach?

☑ Not sure
☑ 0
☑ 1
☑ 2
☑ 3
☑ 4
Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? Online course + TA visit Is Selected

How many classroom observations did the UF Certified TA Coach make?
- Not sure
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- More than 10

Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? Online course + TA visit Is Selected

How helpful were your interactions with the UF Certified TA Coach in improving your practice?
- Not helpful at all
- Slightly helpful
- Fairly helpful
- Very helpful

Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY) Online course + Community of Practice Is Selected

In your most recent course, how many Community of Practice sessions did you attend?
Answer If How many CoP sessions did you attend? 0 is Selected

What prevented you from attending a Community of Practice session?
- Because I could not leave my center.
- Because I was not informed of the session.
- Because I was taking a college course that night.
- Other reasons

Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY) Online course + Community of Practice is Selected

To what extent were the interactions with the Community of Practice helpful to you?
- Not helpful at all
- Slightly helpful
- Fairly helpful
- Very helpful

Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY) Online course + Community of Practice is Selected

In the Community of Practice, to what extent did you share your success and challenges?
Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY) Online course + Community of Practice Is Selected

In the Community of Practice, to what extent did you seek ideas from colleagues participating in the same course?

☐ Not at all
☐ Sometimes
☐ Frequently

Answer If Which type of the Early Learning Florida model did you participate? (MARK ALL THAT APPLY) Online course + Community of Practice Is Selected

In the Community of Practice, to what extent did you learn from others in the learning community?

☐ Not at all
☐ Somewhat
☐ A great deal

Thank you for completing the survey! If there is anything else you would like to tell us about Early Learning Florida or this survey, please do so in the space provided below.
APPENDIX D: KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENTS

Infant/ Toddler Social-Emotional Development Knowledge Assessment: Pre/Post

Multiple Choice

Directions: Read each statement carefully and select the choice that provides the best answer.

1. What is one outcome of attachment relationships in shaping a baby’s brain? 4.A.II.8
   a. Dependence on others
   b. Spoiling the child
   c. Academic success
   d. Personality development

2. Which of the following is an approach in supporting attachment relationships? 4.A.II.8
   a. to consistently pick up the baby each time he/she cries
   b. to allow the baby to have tummy time
   c. to allow the baby to soothe him/herself to sleep
   d. to work with parents to make a quick departure at drop off

3. Which of the following show the proper sequence for the necessary steps for developing an infant/toddler social-emotional curriculum? 4.C.III.8
   a. plan, reflect, implement, observe/document, and start again
   b. plan, reflect, start again, observe/document, and implement
   c. observe/document, plan, reflect, implement, and start again
   d. observe/document, reflect, plan, implement, and start again

4. What’s the best way to help mobile infants and toddlers with separation anxiety during drop-off time? 5.C.II.8
   a. appreciate the child’s anxieties
   b. create a drop-off routine
   c. listen to other caregivers
   d. recognize your own frustrations

5. What is the best strategy, of those listed below, to incorporate respect for cultural diversity?
   a. Celebrate cultural holidays
b. Read books from the child’s culture

c. Incorporate cultural diversity throughout all parts of the day

d. Have multi-cultural materials in the environment

6. Which of the following is the term used for close and secure emotional bonds between young children and a small number of consistent adult caregivers?

   e. Empathizing
   
   f. Goodness of Fit
   
   g. Attachment Relationships
   
   h. Personality Development

7. Which of the following is a strategy for building a powerful partnership with parents?

   a. Empathizing
   
   b. Goodness of Fit
   
   c. Attachment Relationships
   
   d. Personality Development

8. Which of the following is one of the best purposes of asking open-ended questions with early intervention providers and parents of children with disabilities? 5.C.IV.17

   a. Empowering them to take the lead
   
   b. Learning about activities that can best support the child
   
   c. Learning more about the diagnosis of the disabilities
   
   d. Learning the technical terms

9. Which of the following is the term used when an adult adjusts their typical style of interacting and expectations to better match with a child’s temperament? 2.A.III.6

   a. Matching
   
   b. Goodness of Fit
   
   c. Styling
   
   d. Compatibility
10. Which of the following emerges from the combination of temperament and experience? 2.A.III.6
   a. Charisma
   b. Personality
   c. Nature
   d. Disposition

11. Which of the following is the term for a young child’s ability to cope with and manage their reactions to experiences that may make them feel unhappy, afraid, hurt, angry or frustrated? 4.A.I.2
   a. Proficiency
   b. Concession
   c. Character
   d. Self-regulation

12. Which of the following terms describes the power of one relationship to directly influence another relationship? (i.e. partnership between families and the caregivers of children) 2.C.II.6
   a. Parallel process
   b. Associative process
   c. Community process
   d. Connection process

13. Which of the following describes the social-emotional curriculum for infants and toddlers? 4.C.III.9
   a. Thematic book reading
   b. Caring for physical needs
   c. Nurturing interactions based on observation
   d. Ages & Stages

14. Drop off or separation can be challenging due to the intensity of feelings for mobile infants and toddlers and can best be handled by which of the following? 4.A.I.3
   a. Let the parent stay all day
   b. Encourage the parent to leave quickly
   c. Modify the experience based on the needs of the child
   d. Distract the child
15. Which of the following describes the needs of children with developmental delays and disabilities in regards to social and emotional support? 2.C.II.5
   a. They do not need as much nurturing
   b. Offer less physical touch as this may be upsetting to them
   c. Nurturing should mostly be offered by their friends
   d. Offer the same level of nurturing as all children

16. Which of the following is one example of a way to encourage age appropriate emotional expression? 5.C.I.4
   a. Allow the babies to cry and soothe themselves
   b. Keep babies on a schedule for activities that teach emotions
   c. Talk to and with babies often
   d. Allow babies to be safe in a walker or swing but explore toys

17. Which of the following is one example of a strategy to help children to calm down after intense emotions are displayed? 5.C.III.12
   a. Share a picture book
   b. Send them to the safe place until they are ready to rejoin the group
   c. Give them a snack they like
   d. Ignore the behavior

18. Which of the following is one example of a strategy to use with infants and toddlers to ease separation? 4.A.I.4
   a. Use words from their home language to describe their feelings
   b. Make the departure quick and non-emotional
   c. Remind them that there is nothing to worry about
   d. Give time to soothe themselves

19. What is one factor that may influence strategies parents use to support emotional regulation? 2.A.I.2
   a. attitude
   b. beliefs
c. culture
d. intention
e. perception

20. Which of the following is one of the primary temperament types? 2.A.II.5
   a. shy children
   b. cautious children
   c. finicky children
   d. hyperactive children

21. Which of the following is the term used for close and secure emotional bonds between young children and a small number of consistent adult caregivers?
   a. Connection
   b. Secure Relationships
   c. Attachment Relationships
   d. Linkage

22. Which of the following is a good way to use your knowledge of a child’s culture to positively impact their behavior? 2.C.II.3
   a. Document what parents share about their culturally based practices
   b. Ask parents to share their culturally based practices with other parents
   c. Implement, as appropriate in the school environment, what parents share about their culturally based practices regarding their child’s behavior
   d. Engage the parent in conversation with you about their culturally based practices, but determine what is more comfortable for you

23. Which of the following is a strategy that supports personality development in toddlers? 4.C.II.6
   a. Select practices that create goodness of fit
   b. Provide duplicates of children’s favorite toys
   c. Play “stop and go” frequently
   d. Allow children to have plenty of time to explore on their own
Using Observations to Inform Individualized Preschool Instruction Knowledge Assessment: Pre/Post

1. When observing children, which of the following is an essential element to accurately interpret what you observe? 6.D.II.4
   a. Having a quiet place to observe the child
   b. Communication with families
   c. Planning for the observation
   d. Ensuring you have the specific materials needed

2. What is the best reason for screening children? 6.A.I.2
   a. Diagnosing of special needs
   b. Determining if a further evaluation is needed
   c. Identifying how children should be grouped in the classroom
   a. Having documentation to discuss with families

3. What should be included in anecdotal notes? 6.A.II.8
   a. Environment details, activity description, behavior facts, feelings of the child
   b. Time of day, who you will observe, behavior facts, feelings of the child
   c. Environment details, behavior facts, feelings of the child
   d. Time of day, who you will observe, activity description, behavior facts

4. Which of the following describes the belief that children learn and make meaning through their interactions with objects and people? 6.C.II.5
   a. Theory of Conservation
   b. Zone of Proximal Development
   d. Constructivist Theory

5. What is the main purpose of child assessment? 6.A.I.2
   a. Determining areas of strength and areas of improvement
   b. Diagnosis of delays
   c. Determining how children compare to others their age
d. Determining how to group children in the classroom

6. Which of the following offers teachers the most flexibility to adapt learning activities to meet the needs of children with different abilities and needs? 6.C.II.5
   a. Large-group time
   b. Circle time
   c. Small-group time
   d. Time in learning centers

7. Which of the following includes the necessary components when concerned about possible development delays? 6.B.I.2
   a. Documented teacher observations, parent input, developmental screening
   b. Parent input, developmental screening, professional support
   c. Documented teacher observation, developmental screening, professional support
   d. Parent input, developmental screening, professional support

8. Which of the following is an acceptable practice for maintaining confidentiality of documents that contain information about children? 6.C.I.2
   a. Documents do not leave the classroom
   b. Documents do not leave the director’s office
   c. Documents are kept locked
   d. Documents are only shared with the legal guardians

9. Child assessment is a complex and multifaceted task that includes all of the following except: 6.A.II.8
   a. observation
   b. screening
   c. curriculum assessment
   d. diagnosis

10. Which of the following classroom environments is what the authors of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) found that children learn best? 6.C.II.5
    a. Activities are based on teacher’s interests and learning goals.
b. Teachers provide extended large-group opportunities to practice skills like counting, days of the week, and letter identification.

c. Teachers provide help and materials if needed and ask questions to extend children's thought process.

d. Activities are theme-based and follow the standards.

11. Which of the following are designed to determine whether children are developing typically? 6.A.I.2
   a. Observations
   b. Screeners
   c. Documentation
   d. Curriculum Assessments

12. Which of the following strategies is an example of best practice when working with children learning English as second language? 6.D.I.2
   a. Families should read and tell stories to their children in their native language
   b. Families should never read and tell stories to their children in their native language
   c. It should not matter to teachers what activities children do at home to support language development
   d. Families should wait until they are proficient in English to read and tell stories to their children in their native language

13. Which of the following is a purpose of developmental screening? 6.A.I.2
   a. Determine if children have speech/language delays
   b. Identify possible developmental concerns
   c. Identify children with autism
   d. Provide weekly information about children's progress

14. What is a valid use of anecdotal notes?
   a. Record how children are feeling
   b. Keep track of your interpretations
   c. Record children's problem solving and progress
   d. Keep track of information that parents provide
15. Which one of the following observation is written objectively? 6.B.II.3
   a. Ella and her mom were fighting before they came in this morning. Ella threw her backpack on the floor and knocked a puzzle off the table because she was still mad.
   b. When Ella’s mom carried her into the classroom this morning, Ella was crying and hanging on to her mom. When mom left, she threw her backpack on the floor and knocked a puzzle off the table.
   c. Ella misses her mom when she’s at school.
   d. Ella misses her mom when she’s at school and through things because she’s upset.

16. Quality of learning is enhanced when centers are adapted to include ongoing classroom projects and themes that are based on which of the following? 6.C.II.5
   a. Children’s interests
   b. Child assessments
   c. Developmental screenings
   d. Children’s’ abilities

17. Which of the following statements describe best practices for teaching 21st century children? 6.C.II.5
   a. Direct instruction in circle time needs to be longer so children can meet learning objectives.
   b. Teachers should spend more time lecturing to children
   c. Teachers should be facilitators who encourage children to learn through hands-on activities.
   d. Children should be given worksheets to practice working more independently

18. Which term refers to the need for children with disabilities to participate in classrooms with non-disabled children to the greatest extent possible? 6.C.II.5
   a. less restraint environment
   b. non-restraint environment
   c. least restrictive environment
   d. non-restrictive environment

19. Which term refers to classrooms that prepare children to embrace diversity? 6.C.II.5
   a. exclusive classrooms
   b. extended classrooms
   c. intrusive classrooms
d. inclusive classrooms

20. What do objective anecdotal notes include? 6.B.II.3
   
   a. only facts and things that can be observed
   b. the teacher's ideas about how the child learns
   c. Your opinion about the child's behavior
   d. Information you gather from the family
APPENDIX E: RESULTS OF THE SURVEY OF INCOMING EARLY LEARNING FLORIDA PARTICIPANTS

The following tables will show the results for this analysis:
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1) Age of children teachers most often care for each day
Among the teachers enrolled in Early Learning Florida, nearly 25% of them care for predominantly 4-5 years old preschoolers. Around 21% of the teachers care for predominantly 2-3 years old toddlers. The percentage of teachers who care for 1-2 years old infants and the percentage of teachers who care for 3-4 years old preschoolers are both around 16%. Approximately, 13% of the teachers care for 0-12 months old infants. And about 10% of the teachers most often care for a multi-age group.

Figure 1. Age of children teachers most often care for each day
2) **Number of children in the classroom/family child care home**

On a typical day, nearly 20% of the classrooms/family child care have fewer than 6 children. Over 40% of the classrooms/family child care home have between 6 and 12 in their classrooms. Around 23% of them have between 12 and 18 children. Approximately 10% of between 18 and 24 children. Only 7% of them have more than 24 children.

*Figure 2. Number of children in the classroom/family child care home*
3) Number of additional caregivers in teacher's classroom

On a typical day, 47% of the teachers work with one other caregiver with the same group of children. Nearly 30% of the teachers work with two caregivers with the same group of children. About 3% of the teachers work with three other caregivers and less than 1% of the teachers work with four caregivers with the same group of children. Approximately 5% of the teachers who work with five caregivers and nearly 15% of the teachers do not work with any other caregivers.

Figure 3. Number of additional caregivers in teacher's classroom
4) Number of hours teachers working on a typical schedule for a week

Among the teachers enrolled in Early Learning Florida, only 1% of the teachers work fewer than 20 hours every week. About 3% of them work between 20 and 30 hours every week. Nearly 20% of them work between 30 and 40 hours. Approximately 70% of the teachers work between 40 and 50 hours. About 10% of the teachers working more than 50 hours.

Figure 4. Number of hours teachers working on a typical schedule for a week
5) The highest degree or level of school teachers have completed
Among the teachers enrolled in Early Learning Florida, 32% of them are high school graduates with diploma or the equivalent (GED). Only 1% of them did not finish high school. Approximately, 34% of the teachers have some college credits. And about 32% of the teachers have either Associate's degree (20%), Bachelor's degree (9%) or Master's degree (3%).

![Bar chart showing the highest degree or level of school teachers have completed.]

*Figure 5. The highest degree or level of school teachers have completed*
6) Degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development
Among the teachers who have degrees (32% of the teachers), nearly 60% of them have a degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development.

Figure 6. Degree in Early Childhood Education or Child Development
7) **Number of early childhood college credits teachers have completed**

Among the teachers who have some college credits (34% of the teachers) or the teachers who have degrees at least at Associate level (32% of the teachers), 55% of them have completed fewer than 25 early childhood college credits. 20% of them have earned between 25 and 49 early childhood college credits. Approximately, 13% of them have completed 50 to 74 college credits in early childhood. The percentage of teachers who have completed 75 to 99 early childhood college credits and that of teachers who have completed more than 100 college credits on early childhood are both roughly 6%.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of early childhood college credits completed by teachers](image)

*Figure 7. Number of early childhood college credits teachers have completed*
8) **Whether teachers have professional credential (certifications) in child care**

Approximately, 78% of the teachers have professional credential (certifications) in child care, and just over 20% of the teachers do not have any professional credentials (certifications) in child care.

*Figure 8. Whether teachers have professional credential (certifications) in child care*
9) **Types of professional credentials (certifications) in child care**

Among teachers who have professional credential (certifications) in child care (78% of the teachers), nearly 31% of them have Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential. The percentage of teachers who have the Florida Child Care Professional Credential (FCCPC) and that who have the Director Credential are about the same (about 17%). Only 5% of the teachers have Early Childhood Professional Credential (ECPC) and 3% of the teachers have Advanced Director Credential. There are about 15% of the teachers having Teaching Strategies GOLD Online Interrater Reliability Certification. And 10% of the teachers have the Infant, Toddler or Pre-K CLASS Observer Certification.

![Figure 9. Types of professional credentials (certifications) in child care](image)

*Figure 9. Types of professional credentials (certifications) in child care*
10) **Types of Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential**
Among the teachers who have Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential (31% of the teachers), nearly 60 of them have the Preschool CDA Credential. Approximately 40% of them have Infant/Toddler CDA Credential and only 2% of them have Family Child Care CDA Credential.

![Figure 10. Types of Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential](image-url)
11) **Practitioners' experiences with online courses other than the DCF 45 hour course**

Other than the DCF 45 hours course, 88% of the teachers have experience with online courses.

*Figure 11. Practitioners' experiences with online courses other than the DCF 45 hour course*
12) Levels of online courses teachers have taken
Among the teachers who have experience with online courses (88% of the teachers), the most common type is in-service hours (over 40%). Approximately 35% of the teachers have taken the Continuing Education Units. And above 20% of teachers who have taken the College-level online courses. Less than 5% of the teachers have experiences with other levels of online courses.

Figure 12. Level of online courses
13) **Time working in the field of early childhood**

Among the teachers enrolled in Early Learning Florida, 8% of them have worked in the field of early childhood less than one year. Nearly 10% of them have worked in this field between one and five years. About 28% of them have been working in this field between 5 and 10 years. Around 16% of them have been working in this field between 10 and 15 years. Approximately 15% of them have been working in this field between 15 and 20 years. And nearly 25% of them have been working in this field more than 20 years.

*Figure 13. Number of year’s teacher working in the field of early childhood*
14) Dominant teacher role at their provider
Of the teachers enrolled in Early Learning Florida, nearly 60% of them are lead teachers. Around 16% of them are assistant teachers and 8% of them are directors. Approximately, 10% of them are both teachers and directors and only 4% of the participants are family childcare providers.

Figure 14. Dominant teacher role at their provider
APPENDIX F: RESULTS OF THE EARLY LEARNING FLORIDA COMPLETION SURVEY

The following tables will show the results for this analysis:
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1) Time completing the ELF course work in a typical week

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two courses of Early Learning Florida, nearly 5% of them took less than 1 hour to complete the work required to do the course in a typical week. About 41% of the practitioners completed the work required between 1 and 2 hours in a typical week. Almost 33% of them completed the work required between 2 and 4 hours. Approximately 11% of them completed the work required between 4 and 6 hours. Only 10% of them spent more than 6 hours on the ELF course work.
2) Time spending online in the course in a typical week

Regarding the time practitioners spent actually online (watching videos, reading handouts, responding to peers on the internet) in the course in a typical week, nearly 7% of the practitioners spent less than 1 hour. Approximately 46% of the practitioners spent between 1 and 2 hours online. Almost 30% of the practitioners spent between 2 and 4 hours. About 12% of the practitioners spent between 4 and 6 hours. Only 6% of the practitioners spent more than 6 hours online in the course.
3) Time for preparing to implement the strategies into classroom in a typical week

In terms of the time practitioners spent in a typical week to prepare to implement the strategies presented in the Early Learning Florida cycles into their classrooms, nearly 16% of the practitioners spent less than 1 hour in a week. Approximately 43% of them spent between 1 and 2 hours in a week. About 26% of them spent between 2 and 4 hours in a week. Almost 10% of them spent between 4 and 6 hours. Only 5% of them spent more than 6 hours preparing to implement the strategies into classroom in a typical week.
4) Difficulty finding time to watch videos

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 32% of them encountered a little difficulty finding time to watch video. Approximately 19% of them encountered difficulty finding time to watch video somewhat. Only 6% of them have a lot of difficulty finding time to watch video. About 43% of them did not encounter any difficulty finding time to watch videos at all.
5) Difficulty finding time to complete the assigned readings

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 37% of them encountered a little difficulty finding time to complete the assigned readings. Approximately 21% of them encountered difficulty finding time to complete the assigned readings somewhat. Only 6% of them have a lot of difficulty finding time to complete the assigned readings. About 37% of them did not encounter any difficulty finding time to complete the assigned readings at all.
6) Difficulty completing the assignments

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 34% of them encountered a little difficulty completing the assignments. Approximately 16% of them encountered difficulty completing the assignments somewhat. Only 4% of them have a lot of difficulty completing the assignments. About 46% of them did not encounter any difficulty completing the assignments at all.
7) Difficulty with internet connection

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 26% of them encountered a little difficulty with internet connection. Approximately 15% of them encountered difficulty with internet connection. Only 11% of them have a lot of difficulty with internet connection. About 48% of them did not encounter any difficulty with internet connection at all.
8) Difficulty with the language

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 12% of them encountered a little difficulty with the language. Approximately 5% of them encountered difficulty with the language somewhat. Only 1% of them have a lot of difficulty with the language. About 82% of them did not encounter any difficulty with the language at all.
9) Helpfulness of the videos used in ELFL courses in teacher’s learning

When it comes to practitioner’s attitude to the videos used in the Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 5% of the practitioners thought it help them in their learning a little. About 18% of them thought it helped them somewhat. Approximately 76% of them thought it helped them in their learning a lot. And only 1% of them thought the videos used in ELFL courses were not helpful at all in their learning.
10) If practitioners have enough time to complete the tasks asked in the course

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida course, nearly 10% of them rarely have enough time to complete the tasks asked in the course. About 24% of them have enough time completing the tasks sometimes. Approximately 37% of them have enough time completing the tasks most of the time. Around 28% of them always have enough time completing the tasks asked in the course. Only 1% of them never have enough time to complete the tasks asked in the course.
11) **Lack of time to Implement the practices**

When it comes to the barriers for implementing Early Learning Florida practices in classroom, nearly 28% of the practitioners were lacking time to implement the practices a little. Approximately 14% of them were lacking time to implement the practices somewhat. Only 5% of them were lacking time to implement the practices a lot. About 53% of them did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of time to implement the practices in their classroom.
12) Lack of director support

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 9% of them felt lack of director support a little. Approximately 4% of them were lacking support from director somewhat. Only 2% of them were lacking support from director a lot. About 85% of them did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of director support.
13) Lack of support from the instructor

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 8% of them felt lack of support from the instructor a little. Approximately 8% of them were lacking support from the instructor somewhat. Only 3% of them were lacking support from the instructor a lot. Almost 81% of them did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of support from the instructor.
14) Lack of support from other teachers

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 10% of them felt lack of support from other teachers a little. Approximately 7% of them were lacking support from other teachers somewhat. Only 1% of them were lacking support from other teachers a lot. Almost 82% of them did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of support from other teachers.
15) **Lack of necessary materials**

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 15% of them felt lack of necessary materials a little. Approximately 5% of them were lacking necessary materials somewhat. Only 1% of them were lacking necessary materials a lot. Almost 78% of them did not encounter any barriers at all in terms of lack of necessary materials.
16) **New practice would disturb the routine of the classroom**

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 20% of them thought new practice would disturb the routine of the classroom a little. Approximately 5% of them thought new practice would disturb the routine of the classroom somewhat. Only 3% of them thought new practice would disturb the routine of the classroom a lot. Almost 72% of them did not think new practice would disturb the routine of the classroom at all.
17) **Collaboration with other colleagues in the center or family child care home when implementing the strategies**

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, almost all of them were able to implement the strategies. Nearly 87% of them collaborated with other colleagues in their centers or family child care homes when implementing the strategies. Only 4% of them did not collaborate with other colleagues when implementing the strategies. About 8% of them did not collaborate with other colleagues when implementing the strategies, since they were the only caregiver in the classroom. Only about 1% of them were not able to implement the strategies.
18) Usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to increasing teachers' knowledge of content

In terms of the usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to increasing practitioners' knowledge of content, nearly 77% of the practitioners thought they were very useful. Almost 12% of them thought they were fairly useful. Approximately 6% of them thought they were slightly useful. Only 3% of them thought they were not useful at all. About 2% of them were not applicable.
19) **Usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to increasing teachers' knowledge of teaching practice**

In terms of the usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to increasing practitioners' knowledge of teaching practice, nearly 78% of the practitioners thought they were very useful. Almost 11% of them thought they were fairly useful. Approximately 5% of them thought they were slightly useful. Only 3% of them thought they were not useful at all.
20) Usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to learning new approaches to child assessment

In terms of the usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to learning new approaches to child assessment, nearly 75% of the practitioners thought they were very useful. Almost 15% of them thought they were fairly useful. Approximately 6% of them thought they were slightly useful. Only 3% of them thought they were not useful at all.
21) Usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to learning strategies to teach ALL Children

In terms of the usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to learning strategies to teach ALL Children, nearly 76% of the practitioners thought they were very useful. Almost 13% of them thought they were fairly useful. Approximately 5% of them thought they were slightly useful. Only 4% of them thought they were not useful at all.
22) Usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to increasing practitioners’ knowledge of working with families

In terms of the usefulness of the Early Learning Florida courses with respect to increasing practitioners’ knowledge of working with families, nearly 72% of the practitioners thought they were very useful. Almost 15% of them thought they were fairly useful. Approximately 8% of them thought they were slightly useful. Only 3% of them thought they were not useful at all.
23) Changes made in practitioners’ teaching practices as a result of the Early Learning Florida activity

In terms of the extent to which practitioners have made changes in their teaching practices as a result of the Early Learning Florida activity, nearly 52% of the practitioners have made a lot of changes in their teaching practices. Almost 36% of them have made changes in their practices somewhat. Approximately 11% of them have made a little change in their teaching practices. Only 1% of them have not made any change in their teaching practices.
24) Whether practitioners have discussed what they learned with other colleagues who did not participate

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, approximately 92% of them have discussed what they learned with other colleagues in their centers or family child care home who did not participate in the course. Nearly 8% of them have not discussed what they learned with other colleagues who did not participate in the course. About 0.4% of them do not work with other caregivers.
Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, approximately 82% of them will be interested in taking another Early Learning Florida course. While 18% of them will not be interested in taking another Early Learning Florida course.
26) **Encouraging other colleagues to take an ELFL course**

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 96% of them would encourage other colleagues to take an Early Learning Florida course. While 4% of them would not.
27) Providing timely feedback

In terms of instructor’s ability with respect to providing timely feedback, nearly 40% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 24% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 23% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 6% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 7% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
28) Communication of ideas and information

In terms of instructor’s ability with respect to communication of ideas and information, nearly 45% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 23% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 24% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 5% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 3% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
29) Expression of expectations for performance in this class

In terms of instructor’s ability with respect to expression of expectations for performance in the class, nearly 43% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 27% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 27% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 1% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 3% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
30) Availability to assist

In terms of instructor’s availability to assist, nearly 37% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 29% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 25% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 5% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 4% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
31) Respect and concern for students

In terms of instructor’s characteristics with respect to their respect and concern for students, nearly 42% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 25% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 26% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 5% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 1% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
32) Stimulation of interest in course

In terms of instructor’s ability with respect to stimulation of interest in course, nearly 38% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 28% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 27% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 5% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 2% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
33) Facilitation of learning

In terms of instructor’s ability with respect to facilitation of learning, nearly 42% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 24% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 29% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 3% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 3% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
34) Enthusiasm for the subject

In terms of instructor’s enthusiasm for the subject, nearly 41% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 27% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 25% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 5% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 2% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
35) Encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking

In terms of instructor’s ability with respect to encouragement of independent, creative, and critical thinking, nearly 42% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 28% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 25% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 4% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 2% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
36) **Overall rating of the instructor**

In terms of the overall rating of the instructor, nearly 47% of the practitioners thought their instructors were excellent or high. About 22% of the practitioners thought their instructors were above average. Approximately 25% of them thought their instructors were at average. Only 4% of them thought their instructors were below average. Also 3% of the practitioners thought their instructors were poor or low.
37) Types of the ELFL model

Among the practitioners who have completed and mastered two Early Learning Florida courses, nearly 51% of them were participating the online course only model. Approximately 18% of them were participating the Online course + TA Coaching model. About 38% of them were participating the Online course + Community of Practice model.
38) Interactions with the UF Certified TA Coach in improving practitioner’s practice

Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + TA Coaching model, nearly 69% of them thought their interactions with the UF Certified TA Coach were very helpful in improving their practices. Approximately 24% of them thought their interactions with the UF Certified TA Coach were fairly helpful in improving their practices. About 4% of them thought the interactions were slightly helpful in improving their practices. Only 2% of them thought the interactions were not helpful at all in improving their practices.
39) Meeting with the UF Certified TA Coach

Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + TA Coaching model, nearly 22% of them had met with the UF Certified TA Coach less than three times. Approximately 65% of them had met with their coaches between three times and five times. Only 14% of them had met with their coached more than five times.
40) Classroom observations the UF Certified TA Coach made

Regarding the number of classroom observations made by the UF Certified TA Coach, nearly 35% of the practitioners in the Online course + TA Coaching model reported that their classrooms were observed less than three times. Approximately 62% of the classrooms were observed between three times and five times. Only 3% of the classrooms were observed more than five times.
41) Interactions with the Community of Practice

Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + Community of Practice model, nearly 59% of them thought their interactions with the Community of Practice were very helpful. Approximately 25% of them thought their interactions with the Community of Practice were fairly helpful. About 10% of them thought the interactions were slightly helpful. Only 6% of them thought the interactions were not helpful at all.
Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + Community of Practice model, approximately 14% of them had attended less than three Community of Practice (COP) sessions in their most recent courses. Nearly 86% of them had attended more than three COP sessions in their most recent courses.
43) Sharing success and challenges in the CoP

Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + Community of Practice model, nearly 74% of them shared their success and challenges in the Community of Practice frequently. Approximately 23% of them share their success and challenges sometimes. Only 3% of them did not share their success and challenges at all.
44) Seeking ideas from colleagues in the CoP

Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + Community of Practice model, nearly 61% of them sought ideas from colleagues participating in the same course in the CoP frequently. Approximately 33% of them did that sometimes. Only 5% of them did not seek ideas from colleagues in the same course at all.
45) Learning from others in the CoP

Among the practitioners who were participating the Online course + Community of Practice model, nearly 68% of them learned a great deal from others in the learning community. Approximately 28% of them learned somewhat form others. Only 4% of them did not learned at all from others in the learning community.
APPENDIX G: THE LASTINGER EARLY CHILDHOOD INSTRUCTIONAL COACHING MODEL
### APPENDIX H: EARLY LEARNING FLORIDA COURSE OFFERINGS AND OPTIONS FOR ELPFPP PROVIDERS 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELC</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Model Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW Florida</td>
<td>ITLE</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITLE</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITSE</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PKO</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLD</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QOF</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend</td>
<td>ITFE</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITLE</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITSE</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PKO</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLD (2 sections)</td>
<td>January; March</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QOF (2 sections)</td>
<td>March; May</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>ITSED (2 sections)</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP; TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLD (3 sections)</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>2 CoP; 1 TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>Infant Toddler Social Emotional Development</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool Observation</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool Quality of Feedback</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>ITFE</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITLE (3 sections)</td>
<td>October; January</td>
<td>CoP; CoP and TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITSE (2 sections)</td>
<td>October; January</td>
<td>TA; CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PKO</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLD (3 sections)</td>
<td>January; March</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>ITF</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITLE</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITSE (2 sections)</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PKO (2 sections)</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLD</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td><strong>ITLE (2 sections)</strong> October; March Online Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ITSE (2 sections)</strong> October Online; CoP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ITSE (Spanish- statewide)</strong> March Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PKO</strong> October Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PLD (2 sections)</strong> October; March Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td><strong>ITSE</strong> October Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PKO</strong> October Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PLD</strong> January Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-D/Monroe.</td>
<td><strong>ITLE (2 sections)</strong> January Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ITSE</strong> October Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PLD (3 sections)</strong> October; January; March CoP Online; Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>QOF</strong> January Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DLL</strong> Understanding and Promoting the Development and Learning of Young Dual Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITF</strong> Engaging Families of Infants and Toddlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITLE</strong> Designing Infant and Toddler Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITSED</strong> Infant and Toddler Social-Emotional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITSES</strong> Fomentando el Desarrollo Socioemocional Saludable en los Bebés y Niños Pequeños (Infant and Toddler Social-Emotional Development, Spanish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PKO</strong> Using Observation to Inform Individualized Instruction in Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLD</strong> Preschool Language Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QOF</strong> Instructional Support in Preschool: Quality of Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2. ELC Administrative Responsibilities | N/A | 2.5. Review participating provider deliverables submitted in the ELPFP system and notify OEL, for their approval, when the ELC’s deliverable requirements are satisfied for the benchmark period. OEL approval of deliverables will trigger participating provider payment(s) and an invoice from the ELC to OEL for services rendered per the terms of the Agreement during the benchmark period. | 90-91 |
| 3. Project Management Responsibilities | N/A | 3.10. Manage participating provider deliverables receipt and validation, late deliverable notifications, ongoing eligibility determination including licensing violations and provider status updates during the project term. | 91 |
| 4.1 Notification for Non-Compliance with Eligibility Requirements | 4.1.3. The ELC shall notify OEL in writing within two business days of the provider’s notification to the ELC of Class I or Class II violations, or if the ELC becomes aware of such violations. | 4.1.3. The ELC shall notify OEL at <a href="mailto:performancefunding@oel.myflorida.com">performancefunding@oel.myflorida.com</a> in writing within two (2) business days of the provider’s notification to the ELC of Class I or Class II violations, or if the ELC becomes aware of such violations. | 92 |
| 4.2 Notification of Disqualifying Violation | 4.2. Notification of disqualifying violation | 4.2. Notification of disqualifying violation | 93 |
| | In the event that a provider has one Class II violation at the time of contract start and receives a second Class II violation during the contract term, the ELC shall notify the Provider in writing that if the Provider receives a third Class II violation during the contract term, the Provider’s contract will be terminated. | 4.2.1. In the event that a provider has two Class II violation at the time of contract start and receives a third Class II violation during the contract term, the ELC shall notify the Provider in writing that if the Provider receives a fourth Class II violation during the contract term, the Provider’s contract will be terminated. | 93 |
| | 4.2.2. If the ELC operates in a county or counties under the jurisdiction of local licensing boards, the ELC shall determine the violation equivalency (as described in sections C.4.1.5 and C.4.1.6) and, following determination of local violation equivalency, follow the action and notification requirements appropriate for the equivalent DCF statewide licensing violation, as required in section C.4.2.1. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Notification related to delinquent provider deliverables</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.3.4. Any participating provider with deliverables delinquent greater than 15 calendar days after receiving delinquent deliverable notification shall be considered non-participating. Non-participating providers are not eligible for payment by the ELC for the benchmark pay period and any benchmark pay periods thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Notification related to delinquent provider deliverables</td>
<td>4.3.6. The ELC shall notify the OEL Project and Contract Managers five business days prior to terminating any non-participating provider's contract. OEL notification shall include all details related to the cause for termination.</td>
<td>4.3.6. The ELC shall notify OEL in writing at <a href="mailto:performancefunding@oel.myflorida.com">performancefunding@oel.myflorida.com</a> within five (5) business days prior to terminating any non-participating provider's contract. OEL notification shall include all details related to the cause for termination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. Notification of change in participating providers</td>
<td>4.4. Notification of change in participating providers</td>
<td>The ELC shall notify OEL at <a href="mailto:Performancefunding@oel.com">Performancefunding@oel.com</a> of any change in teacher of a classroom on the Classroom List in the ELPFP System within two business days of the ELC's notification from the Tier 1 or Tier 2 provider. 4.4.1. An teacher results in the de-activation of an associated classroom. 4.4.2. A classroom results in the termination of the participating provider's ELPFP contract. 4.4.3. A provider is the result of voluntary withdrawal from the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6. Due Process</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>For all ELPFP provider contracts between the ELC and ELPFP providers, any request for review of ELC determinations by contracted ELPFP providers related to the tasks and deliverables described in Exhibit VII shall be in accordance with the Statewide School Readiness Provider Contract, Section III, subsection 64 – Due Process Procedures, incorporated by reference as set forth in those contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Introduction to the CLASS online training (all participating providers)</td>
<td>The ELC shall provide Tier 1 providers with log-in information to the Teachstone Training website where teacher/directors can view the training modules.</td>
<td>The ELC shall provide all participating providers with log-in information to the Teachstone.com training website where teachers/directors can view the online training. Completion of this training is a Tier 2 and Tier 3 qualifying prerequisite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.2. CLASS observation (all participating providers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.2.1. Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers will participate in CLASS pre- and post-observations provided by the OEL-contracted evaluator or the ELC per the benchmarks in section D - Deliverables. Both Tier groups may opt to use previous CLASS observation scores which will be notated in the ELPFPP System by the participating providers.</th>
<th>5.2.1. All participating providers will participate in CLASS pre- and post-observations provided by the OEL-contracted evaluator or the ELC per the benchmark schedule in section D – Deliverables.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2. Project providers may choose to use post observation results from previous ELPFPP CLASS observation in place of the pre-observation requirement in the current contract. To qualify for substitution, CLASS post-observation must have been conducted between Apr. 1, 2015 and the current contract execution date, have been conducted by an assessor reliable on the tool at the time of administration and the teacher remains the same.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2. The OEL project evaluation contractor will determine if participating providers' CLASS observation results from recent CLASS post-observations are valid and acceptable for use as CLASS pre-observations for this project term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3. The ELC shall confirm in the ELPFP System that all participating providers have scheduled CLASS pre-observations or opted out (if qualified) as required in Tier 1 and Tier 2 provider contracts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3. To qualify for substitution, the previous CLASS post-observation must be in accordance with CLASS observation contract between OEL and third party evaluation team. The ELC shall confirm in the ELPFP System that all participating providers have confirmed completion of CLASS post-observations by the due dates as required and in the manner described in this contract and the participating provider contracts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3. MMCI Training Responsibilities (Tier 1 Providers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3.1. MMCI training is required for each participating teacher/director listed on the Instructor/Director Roster of each Tier 1 provider. Previously completed MMCI training will not meet this deliverable requirement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.6.6. Instructors/Directors may, with approval of MMCI trainer, and if available, attend MMCI make-up session within the same benchmark and become participating again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.7.2. Instructors/Directors may, with approval of MMCI trainer, and if available, attend MMCI make-up session within the allowable timeframes for delinquent deliverables and become participating again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3. MMCI Training Responsibilities (Tier 1 Providers)

<p>| 5.3.1. Each participating teacher/director listed on the Instructor/Director Roster of each Tier 1 provider is required to complete MMCI training during the contract term. Previously completed MMCI training will not meet this deliverable requirement. | 95 |
| --- |
| 5.3.6.6. Instructors/Directors may, with approval of MMCI trainer, and if available, attend MMCI make-up session within the same benchmark and become participating again. | 96 |
| 5.3. MMCI Training Responsibilities (Tier 1 Providers) | 5.3.7. OEL will pay the ELC for required MMCI training provided by ELC staff to participating Tier 1 teachers/directors at the rates established in Attachment 6 – Budget. | 5.3.8. OEL will reimburse the ELC for required MMCI training provided by ELC staff to participating Tier 1 teachers/directors in accordance with Program Guidance 250.01 – OCA Working Definitions and funding level provided on the Notice of Award. | 96 |
| 5.4. MMCI Training and Introduction to the CLASS training responsibilities (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers) | 5.4.1. MMCI training completion The ELC shall confirm that each participating Tier 2 provider uploaded a Teachstone certificate of completion for 20 hours of MMCI training for each participating teacher/director. | 5.4.1. MMCI training completion The ELC shall confirm that each participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider uploaded a Teachstone certificate of completion for 20 hours of MMCI training for each participating teacher/director. Infant teachers are exempt from the MMCI requirement. | 97 |
| 5.5. Technical Assistance (TA) visit (all participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers) | 5.5.5. TA visits shall focus on improving teacher child interactions as measured by CLASS assessment. | 5.5.4. TA shall last a minimum of 90 minutes per classroom per visit and focus on improving teacher child interactions as measured by CLASS assessment. | 97 |
| 5.5. Technical Assistance (TA) visit (all participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers) | 5.5.8. The TA visits should be scheduled four to six weeks apart, to the extent possible within the required time frames. | 5.5.7. Each TA visit shall be scheduled to occur during the benchmark listed in section D – Deliverables. | 97 |
| 5.6. Early Learning Florida training (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers) | 5.6.2. Instructors/directors not registered by the course deadlines will not be able to participate in training. | 5.6.2. Instructors/directors not registered by course registration deadlines will not be able to participate in training and will result in the provider being placed in non-participating status. | 98 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.6. Early Learning Florida training (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</th>
<th>5.6.5. OEL-approved ELFL courses are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.6.5.1. Infant Toddler: Social-Emotional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.5.2. Infant Toddler: Family Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.5.3. Preschool: Language Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.5.4. Preschool: Observation to Inform Individualized Care and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5.6.5. OEL-approved ELFL courses: |
| Tier 2 Courses |
| 1. Preschool Language Development |
| 2. Preschool Learning Environments |
| 3. Instructional Support in Preschool: Quality of Feedback |
| 4. Infant Developmental Stages: The First Year of Life |
| 5. Infant and Toddler Social-Emotional Development |
| 6. Engaging Families of Infants and Toddlers |
| 7. Spanish - Infant and Toddler Social-Emotional Development |
| 8. Spanish - Preschool Language Development |
| 9. Spanish - Engaging Families of Infants and Toddlers |

| Tier 3 Courses |
| 10. Using Observation to Inform Individualized Instruction in Preschool |
| 11. Understanding and Promoting the Development and Learning of Young Dual Language Learners in Preschool (DLL 1) |
| 12. Screening and Assessing Young Dual Language Learners in Preschool (DLL 2) |
| 13. Designing Infant and Toddler Learning Environments |
| 14. Using Observation to Support Developmentally Appropriate Practice with Infants and Toddlers |
| 15. Spanish – Using Observation to Inform Individualized Instruction in Preschool |
| 16. Spanish – Designing Infant and Toddler Learning Environments |
### 5.6. Early Learning Florida training (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)

5.6.6. Each ELFL course has a specific start date and ends eight weeks later.

5.6.7. ELFL course one begins Jan. 5, 2016.

5.6.8. The ELC will receive course one registration codes from ELFL by Nov. 23, 2015. Codes will include instructions for registration and login.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Course Begin Date</th>
<th>Course End Date</th>
<th>ELC Receives Course Codes from ELFL by:</th>
<th>ELC Distributes course codes to providers by:</th>
<th>Providers Register for Courses By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/26/16</td>
<td>12/11/16</td>
<td>9/2/16</td>
<td>9/13/16</td>
<td>9/25/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/16/17</td>
<td>4/2/17</td>
<td>12/19/16</td>
<td>1/3/17</td>
<td>1/15/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.9. The ELC shall assign course one codes for courses based on the classroom care level (infant/toddler or preschool).

5.6.10. The ELC shall distribute these course one codes to participating Tier 2 providers by Dec. 1, 2015.

5.6.11. Providers must register their teachers/directors for course one by Dec. 14, 2015.

5.6.12. To confirm registration, the Provider is required to place a note in the comment box in the Instructor/Director Roster in the ELPFPP System indicating all teachers/directors have been registered for training.

5.6.8. To confirm registration, the Provider is required to upload a screenshot from the ELFL Learning Management System for each participating teacher/director in the ELPFP System indicating all teachers/directors have registered for training.

5.6.9. To confirm course participation, providers must attest that each teacher/director is participating in ELFL by placing a check mark for each teacher/director in the ELPFP system.
| 5.7. Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers) | 5.7.1. Verification of assessment tool online subscription  
The ELC is responsible for confirming that by the due date listed in section D – Deliverables, each participating Tier 2 provider:  
5.7.1.1. Purchased a subscription covering the contract term to one of the research-based, OEL-approved child assessment tools listed in Attachment 8. Confirmation of an existing active subscription that is valid through the contract term satisfies this requirement. | 5.7.1. Verification of assessment tool online subscription  
The ELC is responsible for confirming that by the due date listed in section D – Deliverables, each participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider:  
5.7.1.1. Purchased a subscription covering the contract term to one of the research-based, OEL-approved child assessment tools listed in Exhibit VII, G. Confirmation of an existing active subscription that is valid through the contract term satisfies this requirement. | 99 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.7. Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers) | 5.7.2.1. Completed the professional development modules offered by the publisher of their chosen assessment designed to lead to reliability. Chosen assessment must be one of the three OEL-approved assessments listed in Attachment 8 – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk.  
5.7.2.2. Submitted as evidence of completion a certificate of completion from the web-based system of the online assessment tool for each participating teacher/director. See Attachment 8 – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk. | 5.7.2.1. Completed the professional development modules offered by the publisher designed to lead to reliability on their chosen assessment. Chosen assessment must be one of the three OEL-approved assessments listed in Exhibit VII, G. – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk.  
5.7.2.2. Submitted in the ELPFP System as evidence of completion a certificate of completion from the web-based system of the online assessment tool for each participating teacher/director. See Exhibit VII, G. – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk. | 99 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.7. Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>5.7.3. Child Assessment Tool Professional Development Tier 3 requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ELC is responsible for confirming the following programmatic prerequisite requirements submitted in the ELPFP System by Tier 3 providers during the ELPFP application process:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.3.1. Completed the professional development modules offered by the publisher of their chosen assessment designed to lead to reliability. Chosen assessment must be one of the three OEL-approved assessments listed in Exhibit VII, G. – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.3.2. Submitted in the ELPFP System as evidence of completion a certificate of completion from the web-based system of the online assessment tool for each participating teacher/director. See Exhibit VII, G. – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.3.3. Participating teachers/directors previously completing the publisher’s professional development training that cannot provide proof of previously completed training must complete the training prior to contract execution date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7. Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</td>
<td>5.7.3. Reliability Test Completed on Chosen Assessment Tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ELC is responsible for confirming that by the due date listed in section D – Deliverables, each participating teacher/director at each participating provider completed the online reliability test for their chosen assessment tool and uploaded a report into ELPFP System listing their participating teachers'/directors' reliability results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7. Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</td>
<td>5.7.4. Reliability test completed on chosen child assessment tool (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ELC is responsible for confirming that by the due date listed in section D – Deliverables, each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider completed the online reliability test for their chosen assessment tool. Each participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider is required to upload a reliability test report into the ELPFP System for each participating teacher/director. Instructors/directors with currently valid certificates of reliability are exempt from reliability testing as long as their certificate is in effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.</td>
<td>Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</td>
<td>5.7.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ELC is responsible for confirming that by the due date listed in section D – Deliverables:</td>
<td>5.7.4.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.4.2. Only those participating teachers/directors that completed child assessment training specified in sections 5.6.2 and 5.6.3 administered the assessment to participating SR children.</td>
<td>5.7.4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.4.4. Each participating provider uploaded the Assessment Period Report from the online assessment system appropriate for the chosen assessment tool for each assessment period defined in the benchmarks. (See Attachment 8 – Assessment Tool Reporting Requirements Crosswalk for information on the Assessment Period Report).</td>
<td>100-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.5.</td>
<td>Child assessment (Tier 2 providers)</td>
<td>5.7.5.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.5.2. Only administered child assessments using teachers/directors that completed child assessment training specified in sections 5.7.2 and 5.7.3.</td>
<td>5.7.5.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7.</td>
<td>Child assessment requirements (Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.</td>
<td>Quality expenditures reporting (Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers)</td>
<td>5.8.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Initial setup tasks

**6. Initial benchmark setup tasks**

Within two business days of the contract effective date, each contracted project provider is required to log into the ELPFPP System at [http://earlylearningpfp.fldoe.org/](http://earlylearningpfp.fldoe.org/), and complete the following:

6.1. Validate initial project application information

6.1.1. Providers are required to validate or update the Provider's contact person for benchmark submission. Provider shall notify the ELC of any changes.

6.1.2. Providers are required to validate or update the initial Classroom List in the ELPFPP System. The Classroom List shall include all participating classrooms (Tier 1-18 months through pre-k) (Tier 2-infant through pre-k) with a minimum of one SR child enrolled as of Sept. 15, 2015. Provider shall notify the ELC of any changes.

**6. Initial setup tasks**

By the due dates listed in section D – Deliverables, the ELC shall:

6.1. Confirm that no contracted ELPFP provider has a disqualifying licensing violation.

6.2. Confirm and/or validate project prerequisites for each provider. See section C.2.1 for prerequisite requirements.

6.3. Confirm that each contracted project provider has logged into the ELPFP System at [http://earlylearningpfp.fldoe.org/](http://earlylearningpfp.fldoe.org/), and completed or updated the Initial Classroom List in the ELPFP System. The Classroom List shall include all participating classrooms (Tier 1, 18 months through pre-k) (Tier 2, Tier 3, infant through pre-k) with a minimum of one SR child enrolled as of August 1, 2016. Provider shall notify the ELC of any changes.

### 6. Initial setup tasks

6.2.2. Tier 1 provider Instructor/Director Rosters shall only include the director and teachers in participating 18-month through pre-k classrooms that include a minimum of one SR child enrolled as of Sept. 15, 2015.

6.2.3. Tier 2 provider Instructor/Director Rosters shall only include the director and teachers in participating infant through pre-k classrooms that include a minimum of one SR child enrolled as of Sept. 15, 2015.

6.4.2. **Verifying** that Tier 1 provider Instructor/Director Rosters only include the director and teachers in participating 18-month through pre-k classrooms that include a minimum of one SR child enrolled as of August 1, 2016.

6.4.3. **Verifying** that Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider Instructor/Director Rosters shall only include the director and teachers in participating infant through pre-k classrooms that include a minimum of one SR child enrolled as of August 1, 2016.
### 6. Initial setup tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>6.5. Submit TA staff credential documentation with the first TA invoice validating that TA staff meet the following requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Document Requirement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachstone generated CLASS Proof of Certification on CLASS instrument providing TA on Pre-K, Toddler, or Infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Learning Florida Coaching Certificate OR Teachstone-generated Certificate of Participation in Feedback Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmarks and Deliverables

**SEE SEPARATE SECTION BELOW THIS TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Invoice requirements</th>
<th>3.1. The ELC shall provide the OEL Contract Manager an invoice in accordance with the requirements of the State of Florida Reference Guide for State Expenditures.</th>
<th>1.1. The ELC shall provide the OEL Grant Manager an invoice in accordance with the requirements of the State of Florida Reference Guide for State Expenditures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.2. The ELC shall base the invoice request on actual allowable expenditures used to complete the required tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.4. Each benchmark invoice packet shall include a pdf of the actual invoice, an electronic copy of the invoice workbook, all required supporting documentation detailed in Section D - Deliverables and be submitted electronically to the Coalition Zone SharePoint site. Supporting documentation for provider payments includes the Final - All Providers 5045 Report(s) generated from EFS reflecting the Performance Funding Project OCA(s) for each reporting period during the benchmark period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Early Learning Performance Funding Pilot Project**

**Contract #SR970**
## 1.6. Invoice due dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Description</th>
<th>Submission Due by Date</th>
<th>Payment is for/Applicable OCA**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Within seven days of notification from OEL</td>
<td>Providers Only (97PAV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 1</td>
<td>11/30/2015</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 2</td>
<td>1/31/2016</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 3</td>
<td>4/30/2016</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 4</td>
<td>7/31/2016</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final invoice</td>
<td>Within seven days of notification from OEL</td>
<td>Providers Only (97PCL, 97PFP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1.7. Supplemental invoice for delinquent providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Description</th>
<th>Submission Due by Date</th>
<th>Payment is for/Applicable OCA**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Based on need</td>
<td>Providers Only (97PAV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 1</td>
<td>11/30/2016</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 2</td>
<td>2/15/2017</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 3</td>
<td>4/30/2017</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 4</td>
<td>7/31/2017</td>
<td>Providers (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final invoice for bonuses</td>
<td>Within seven days of notification from OEL</td>
<td>Providers Only (97PCL, 97PFP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.8. Additional information

- **OCA definitions** are provided in Attachment 6 - Budget.
- **ELC tracking** expenditures and invoice OEL in accordance with the OCA definition provided in OEL Program Guidance 250.01 – OCA Working Definitions.

### 2. Evidence of completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Description</th>
<th>Submission Due by Date</th>
<th>Payment is for/Applicable OCA**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Only (97PAV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides (97PCG, 97PPR, 97PHN) and ELC (97PFC, 97PMC, 97PFA, 97PFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final invoice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providers Only (97PCL, 97PFP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3.4.3. OCA definitions are provided in Attachment 6 - Budget.

## 1.8. The ELC shall track expenditures and invoice OEL in accordance with the OCA definition provided in OEL Program Guidance 250.01 – OCA Working Definitions.
| 3. Payment | 5.1 OEL shall make payment according to ss. 215.422 and 287.0585, F.S., which govern time limits for payment of invoices. | 3.1. OEL shall make payment according to ss. 215.422, Rule 69I-40.002(1), F.A.C., which governs time limits for payment of invoices. | 128 |
| 3. Payment | 5.2 OEL Contract Manager will review and submit approved requests for payment. | 3.2. OEL Grant Manager will review in accordance with invoice requirements established in Exhibit VII, E. 1. and submit approved requests for payment. | 128 |
| 3. Payment | N/A | 3.4. Failure to follow invoice requirements may result in the ELC not receiving reimbursement or receiving a delayed reimbursement. | 128 |
| 4. Return of funds. | N/A | Upon OEL's final determination of overpayments or disallowed costs under federal or state law, regulation or rule, the ELC shall return to OEL any overpayments or disallowed costs within 40 calendar days of OEL issuing a written notice to the ELC or other timeframes that comply with OEL Program Guidance 240.01. | 128 |
| 5. Advance | 6.1 An advance to each participating ELC is needed to meet the actual, immediate cash requirements for the Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers participating in ELPFP. The OEL will provide notification to the ELC of the allowable advance. | 5.1. If the ELC needs an advance to meet the actual, immediate cash requirements for its contracted Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 providers participating in ELPFP, upon receiving a request for advance from the ELC, OEL will notify the ELC of the allowable advance not to exceed one quarter of the budgeted amounts for the participation payments, excluding the bonus payment amounts. | 128 |
| 5. Advance | 6.2 OEL will provide a project advance payment to the ELC for Tier 1 and Tier 2 providers not to exceed one quarter of the budgeted amounts for the participation payments, excluding the bonus payment amounts. | 5.2. Upon receipt of an initial invoice which serves as the advance request, OEL will provide a project advance payment to the ELC. | 128 |
| 5. Advance | 6.4 If an advance balance is remaining with the ELC, a cash advance reconciliation form is required with submission of the invoice. | 5.4. Advances shall be reconciled with each invoice by completing the cash advance reconciliation form that is part of the Office of Early Learning Performance Funding Excel Invoice Workbook. | 129 |
| 5. Advance | 6.7 All advances must be fully repaid before an ELC can receive a subsequent payment after the first benchmark payment. | 5.5. All advances must be fully repaid no later than the benchmark four invoice. | 129 |
Financial Consequence Section (Page(s) 129-130)

Old 2015-2016 Language:
1. Financial consequences triggers
The following conditions will trigger financial consequences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance (TA)</td>
<td>$100 per visit not conducted, from TA budget</td>
<td>ELC provided fewer than 4 TA visits per teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMCI Training</td>
<td>$33.75 per training hour not provided, from MMCI budget</td>
<td>ELC provided fewer than 20 hours of MMCI training per teacher/director at each participating Tier 1 provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Liquidated damages (Failure to comply with contract requirements)

The Office of Early Learning may assess liquidated damages as an additional remedy for failure to comply with the following contract requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoice submission for benchmark 1</td>
<td>2% of total invoice amount for the benchmark period, per day, for each business day late applied to the benchmark 1 invoice, from Admin funds</td>
<td>Invoice received late or unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice submission for benchmark 2</td>
<td>2% of total invoice amount for the benchmark period, per day, for each business day late applied to the benchmark 2 invoice, from Admin funds</td>
<td>Invoice received late or unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice submission for benchmark 3</td>
<td>2% of total invoice amount for the benchmark period, per day, for each business day late applied to the benchmark 3 invoice, from Admin funds</td>
<td>Invoice received late or unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice submission for benchmark 4</td>
<td>2% of total invoice amount for the benchmark period, per day, for each business day late applied to the benchmark 4 invoice, from Admin funds</td>
<td>Invoice received late or unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New 2016 – 2017 Language:

1. Financial consequences

1.1. The ELC agrees that if the requirements of this agreement are not timely and satisfactorily performed, the ELC shall be subject to one or more of the financial consequences listed herein. These financial consequences shall not be considered penalties.

1.2. The ELC shall ensure 100% of the deliverables identified in Exhibit II are performed pursuant to agreement requirements, and as described in Exhibit II, Section E. Deliverables. Failure to correctly, completely, or adequately perform these major deliverables as described in Exhibit VII, Section D. Deliverables will trigger a financial consequence and the following actions will occur:

1.2.1. The OEL Grant Manager will notify the ELC that it has failed to correctly, completely, or adequately perform these major deliverables and identify the deficiency or deficiencies. Upon receipt of this notification, the ELC has
14 calendar days to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to the OEL Grant Manager that addresses the identified deficiency and states how the deficiency will be remedied within a time period approved by the OEL Grant Manager.

1.2.2. In the event that the ELC fails to submit the CAP timely, beginning the 15th day after notification by the OEL Grant Manager of the deficiency, OEL shall deduct, from the payment for the invoice of the following month, 1% of the monthly value of the project management funds in the Notice of Award for each day the CAP is not submitted.

1.2.3. The OEL Grant Manager shall review the ELC’s CAP and provide approval or disapproval in writing to the ELC within five (5) business days. If disapproving, the response from OEL shall include details of the CAP deficiencies needing correction before the CAP can be approved.

1.2.4. In the event the ELC fails to correct an identified deficiency within the approved time period specified in the CAP, OEL shall deduct, from the payment for the invoice of the following month, 1% of the monthly value of the project management funds in the Notice of Award for each day the deficiency is not corrected.

1.2.5. In the event that the ELC does not correct all deficiencies pursuant to the CAP, for each deficiency identified in the CAP which is not corrected pursuant to the CAP, OEL shall deduct, from the payment for the invoice of the following month, 1% of the monthly value of the project management funds in the Notice of Award for each day the deficiency is not corrected.

2016-2017 Changes to the Benchmark Deliverables for Each Tier (Shown In Red)

A. Deliverables

Payment for deliverables in this Exhibit are on a cost reimbursement in accordance with the level of funding provided on the Notice of Award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Provider Benchmark Due Date Window</th>
<th>ELC Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELC STARTUP DELIVERABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU-1.</td>
<td>Validate Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 contract prerequisites.</td>
<td>Valid training certificates of completion for each participating teacher/director uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC. Confirmation of status in the ELPFP system.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 8/12/2016</td>
<td>Prior to Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 contract execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU-2.</td>
<td>Verification of ELC TA staff required credentials</td>
<td>ELC TA staff credentials in accordance with section C.5.5, provided with initial invoice.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 8/12/2016</td>
<td>Provided with first Tier 2 and Tier 3 TA visit invoice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU-3.</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider confirmed or updated the initial Classroom List in the ELPFP System. (Benchmark 1 Tier 1 in 2015-2016 Contract)</td>
<td>Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Classroom List in the ELPFP System.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 8/12/2016</td>
<td>Prior to Tier 2 and Tier 3 contract execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STU-4.</strong></td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 provider confirmed or updated the initial Instructor/Director Roster. (Benchmark 1 Tier 1 in 2015-2016 Contract)</td>
<td>Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Instructor/Director Roster.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 8/12/2016 Prior to Tier 2 and Tier 3 contract execution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIER 1 PROVIDER BENCHMARK DELIVERABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark 1 – Tier 1 Providers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1-1.1</strong></td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider certified in the ELPFP system execution of the Early Learning Performance Funding Contract.</td>
<td>Verification page completed in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC attesting that the contract has been executed OR Copy of executed ELPFP contract signature page uploaded into the ELPFP system.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016 11/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1-1.2</strong></td>
<td>Verify completion of the Introduction to the CLASS online training by each participating Tier 1 teacher/director listed in the Instructor/Director Roster of each participating Tier 1 provider.</td>
<td>Valid Teachstone Introduction to the CLASS training certificate of completion for each participating Tier 1 teacher/director uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016 11/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1-1.3</strong></td>
<td>Verify purchase of MMCI Participant Kits from Teachstone for each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 1 provider.</td>
<td>Copy of proof of purchase for each participating Tier 1 teacher/director uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016 11/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1-1.4</strong></td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 1 provider classroom participated in CLASS pre-observation or was exempt.</td>
<td>Appropriate box checked by the Tier 1 provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that CLASS pre-observations have been conducted for each participating classroom or the classroom was exempt.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016 11/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark 1 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1-1.5</strong></td>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td>Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016 11/15/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benchmark 2 – Tier 1 Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1-2.1</th>
<th>Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider updated the Instructor/Director Roster in the ELPFP System, as necessary.</th>
<th>Updated Instructor/Director Roster in the ELPFP System by the Provider and approved by the ELC.</th>
<th>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</th>
<th>1/31/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1-2.2</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System.</td>
<td>Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Classroom List.</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-2.3</td>
<td>Verify completion of at least four hours of MMCI training by each participating teacher/director listed in the Instructor/Director Roster.</td>
<td>Teachstone certificate of completion for at least 4 hours of MMCI training uploaded into ELPFP system by participating providers for each participating Tier 1 teacher/director.</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-2.4</td>
<td>Verify quality expenditures report for benchmark 1 was completed.</td>
<td>Quality Expenditures Report completed in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B2 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management

| T1-2.5 | Provide or conduct a minimum of four (4) hours of MMCI training for each director and participating classroom teacher for each participating Tier 1 provider. | Teachstone-generated certificate for each participating teacher/director documenting completion of required hours. | 11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017 | 1/31/2017 |
| T1-2.6 | Project management activities. | Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice. | 11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017 | 1/31/2017 |

### Benchmark 3 – Tier 1 Providers

<p>| T1-3.1 | Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider updated the Instructor/Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary. | Updated Instructor/Director Roster in the ELPFP System by the Provider and approved by the ELC. | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |
| T1-3.2 | Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System. | Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Classroom List. | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1-3.3</th>
<th>Verify each teacher/director at each participating Tier 1 provider generated a professional development plan in the statewide professional development registry system (unless exempt).</th>
<th>Checkbox in the ELPFP or System confirming the creation of a PD plan for each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 1 program.</th>
<th>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</th>
<th>4/17/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1-3.4</td>
<td>Verify the completion of at least ten (10) additional hours of MMCI training by each participating teacher/director listed in the Instructor/Director Roster (total of 14 hours)</td>
<td>Teachstone certificate of Completion for an additional 10 hours of MMCI (14 hours total) uploaded into ELPFP by provider for each participating Tier 1 teacher/director</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-3.5</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 1 provider submitted into the ELPFP system a complete and accurate Quality Expenditures Report for benchmark 2.</td>
<td>Quality Expenditures Report for each participating Tier 1 provider completed accurately in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B3 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1-3.6</th>
<th>Provide or conduct a minimum of ten (10) hours (a total of 14 hours) of MMCI training for each director and participating classroom teacher for each participating Tier 1 provider.</th>
<th>Teachstone-generated certificate for each participating teacher/director documenting completion of required hours.</th>
<th>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</th>
<th>4/17/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1-3.7</td>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td><strong>Summary report</strong> of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark 4 – Tier 1 Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1-4.1</th>
<th>Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider updated the Instructor/Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary.</th>
<th>Updated Instructor/Director Roster uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC</th>
<th>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</th>
<th>7/17/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1-4.2</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 1 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System.</td>
<td>Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Classroom List.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-4.3</td>
<td>Verify completion of an additional six (6) hours of MMCI training for a total of twenty (20) hours by each participating teacher/director listed in the Instructor/Director Roster for each participating Tier 1 provider.</td>
<td>Valid Teachstone <strong>20-hour MMCI</strong> certificate for each participating teacher/director uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-4.4</td>
<td>Verify completed CLASS post-observation provided by the OEL-contracted evaluator or ELC for each participating classroom at each participating Tier 1 provider.</td>
<td>Appropriate box(es) checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that CLASS post-observations have been conducted for each participating classroom listed in the Provider’s Classroom List in the ELPFP System.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-4.5</td>
<td>Verify demonstration of progress on professional development plan by at least 25% of the teachers/directors on the teacher/director roster at each participating Tier 1 provider (unless exempt).</td>
<td>Documentation of evidence of progress in accordance with OEL instructions.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark 4 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management**

| T1-4.7 | Provide or conduct a minimum of six (6) hours (a total of 20 hours) of MMCI training for each director and participating classroom teacher for each participating Tier 1 provider. | Teachstone-generated certificate for each participating teacher/director documenting completion of required hours. | 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017 | 7/17/2017 |
| T1-4.8 | Project management activities. | Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice. | 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017 | 7/17/2017 |
**Tier 1 – Payment of end of year bonuses**

**Administrative/Project Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1-4.9</th>
<th>T1-4.9</th>
<th>Verify Tier 1 Quality Bonus Expenditures Report submitted for bonus payment <em>(Exhibit VII, section F.)</em></th>
<th>A completed Quality Bonus Expenditure Report <em>(see Exhibit VII, section F.)</em> received and accepted by the ELC by the due date.</th>
<th>15 calendar days following ELC notification of bonus qualification to the Provider</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**TIER 2 PROVIDER BENCHMARK DELIVERABLES**

**Benchmark 1 – Tier 2 Providers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Evidence of Completion</th>
<th>Provider Benchmark Due Date Window</th>
<th>ELC Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.1</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider certified in the ELPFP system execution of the Early Learning Performance Funding Contract</td>
<td>Verification page completed in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC attesting that the contract has been executed</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.2</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 provider has purchased a child assessment online subscription for each participating SR child.</td>
<td>Purchase receipts for registration or proof of existing license uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.3</td>
<td>Verify completion of Professional Development training on child assessment by each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider.</td>
<td>The child assessment publisher’s-generated certificate of completion submitted by each provider as evidence of child assessment training completion for each of the provider’s participating teachers/directors.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.4</td>
<td>Verify completion of reliability test on selected child assessment by each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider.</td>
<td>Certificate of Assessor Reliability Results uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.5</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 provider classroom either participated in CLASS pre-observation or were exempt.</td>
<td>Appropriate box checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that CLASS pre-observations have been conducted for each participating classroom or the provider was exempt.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.6</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 provider <strong>scheduled four (4) TA visits</strong> with ELC for each participating Tier 2 classroom.</td>
<td>Completed certification in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that the TA visits have been scheduled.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.7</td>
<td>Verify that each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider <strong>registered for ELFL Tier 2 course one.</strong></td>
<td>ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 2 teacher/director registered for ELFL Tier 2 course one by 9/25/2016</td>
<td>Between 9/5/2016 and 9/25/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.8</td>
<td>Verify that each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider began ELFL Tier 2 course one.</td>
<td>Completed certification in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 2 teacher/director began ELFL Tier 2 course one.</td>
<td>Course begins 9/26/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark 1 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2-1.9</th>
<th>Schedule four (4) TA visits with each participating classroom at each participating Tier 2 provider: Two (2) TA visits scheduled to occur in benchmark two (2) after CLASS pre-observation, and two (2) TA visits scheduled to occur in benchmark 3 before CLASS post-observation.</th>
<th>A check in the appropriate checkbox in the ELPFP System Classroom List for each participating Tier 2 provider</th>
<th>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</th>
<th>11/15/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.10</td>
<td>Register each participating Tier 2 teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider for <strong>ELFL Tier 2 course one.</strong></td>
<td>ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System confirming that the ELC registered each participating Tier 2 teacher/director for ELFL Tier 2 course one by 9/25/2016</td>
<td>Between 9/5/2016 and 9/25/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-1.11</td>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td><strong>Summary report</strong> of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Benchmark 2 – Tier 2 Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2-2.1</th>
<th>Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider updated the Instructor/Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary.</th>
<th>Updated Instructor/Director Roster in the ELPFP System by the Provider and approved by the ELC</th>
<th>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</th>
<th>1/31/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.2</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System.</td>
<td>Verification page in the ELPFP system for each participating Tier 2 provider, confirming or updating the Classroom List</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.3</td>
<td>Verify completion of ELFL Tier 2 course one by each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider.</td>
<td>Certificate of Mastery uploaded in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating teacher/director completed ELFL Tier 2 course one during the benchmark period.</td>
<td>Course one completion window – 9/26/2016 – 12/11/2016</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.4</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider registered for ELFL Tier 2 course two.</td>
<td>ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 2 teacher/director registered for ELFL Tier 2 course two by 1/15/2017</td>
<td>12/19/2016 – 1/15/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.5</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 provider conducted an initial child assessment on each participating child at each participating Tier 2 provider.</td>
<td>The Assessment Period Report (see Exhibit VII, H., I. or J.) uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.6</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 classroom on the classroom list at each participating Tier 2 provider participated in two (2) TA visits provided by the ELC.</td>
<td>Appropriate box(es) checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that TA visit has been conducted</td>
<td>After CLASS pre-observation but before 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.7</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 2 provider completed a Quality Expenditures Report for the benchmark 1 period.</td>
<td>Completed Quality Expenditures Report completed in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benchmark 2 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2-2.8</th>
<th>Register each participating Tier 2 teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider for ELFL Tier 2 course two.</th>
<th>ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that the ELC registered each participating Tier 2 teacher/director for ELFL Tier 2 course two by 1/15/2017</th>
<th>12/19/2016 – 1/15/2017</th>
<th>1/31/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.9</td>
<td>Conduct two (2) TA visits with each participating Tier 2 classroom listed on each participating Tier 2 provider’s roster.</td>
<td>Updated WELS system Quality Improvement Plan for each participating classroom reflecting the outcome of the TA visit.</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>By 1/16/2017 and results entered into WELS within 15 days of completion of each TA visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2-2.10</td>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td>Summary report for ELPFP system of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td>11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017</td>
<td>1/31/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark 3 – Tier 2 Providers

| T2-3.1 | Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider updated the Instructor/Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary. | Updated Instructor/Director Roster for each participating Tier 2 provider in the ELPFP System, approved by the ELC | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |
| T2-3.2 | Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System. | Verification page in the ELPFP system for each participating Tier 2 provider, confirming or updating the Classroom List | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |
| T2-3.3 | Verify each participating Tier 2 teacher/director at each participating provider began ELFL course two. | Completed certification in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 2 teacher/director began ELFL course two. | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |
| T2-3.4 | Verify that each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider generated a professional development (PD) plan in the statewide PD Registry. | Appropriate box checked certifying that a PD Plan for each participating teacher/director has been generated in the statewide registry system unless teacher/director is exempt. | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |
| T2-3.5 | Verify each participating classroom at each participating Tier 2 provider participated in two (2) TA visits with ELC. | Appropriate box(es) checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that TA visit has been conducted | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |

**Benchmark 3 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management**

| T2-3.7 | Conduct two (2) TA visits with each participating Tier 2 classroom listed on each participating Tier 2 provider’s classroom list | Updated WELS system Quality Improvement Plan for each participating classroom reflecting the outcome of the TA visit. | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | By 3/31/2017 and results entered into WELS within 15 days of completion of each TA visit |
| T2-3.8 | Project management activities. | Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice. | 1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017 | 4/17/2017 |

**Benchmark 4 – Tier 2 Providers**

| T2-4.1 | Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider updated the Instructor/Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary. | Updated Instructor/Director Roster in the ELPFP System by participating Tier 2 providers and approved by the ELC. | 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017 | 7/17/2017 |
| T2-4.2 | Verify that each participating Tier 2 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System. | Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Classroom List. | 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017 | 7/17/2017 |
| T2-4.3 | Verify each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 2 provider completed ELFL Tier 2 course two. | Certificate of Mastery uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 2 teacher/director completed ELFL Tier 2 course two during the benchmark period. | Course 2 completion window – 3/7/2017 – 4/30/2017 | 7/17/2017 |
### T2-4.4
Verify completion of reliability test on each participating Tier 2 provider's chosen child assessment by each participating Tier 2 teacher/director.

**Certificate of Assessor Reliability Results for each participating Tier 2 teacher/director** uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.

- 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017
- 7/17/2017

### T2-4.5
Verify each participating Tier 2 provider conducted a final child assessment on all participating SR children in participating Tier 2 classrooms.

**Completed Assessment Period Report** *(see Exhibit VII, H., I. or J.)* uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.

- 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017
- 7/17/2017

### T2-4.6
Verify each participating Tier 2 provider classroom participated in a CLASS post-observation.

**Appropriate box checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that CLASS post-observations have been conducted for each participating classroom.**

- 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017
- 7/17/2017

### T2-4.7
Verify demonstration of progress on professional development plan by at least 50% of the teachers/directors on the teacher director roster at each participating Tier 2 provider (unless exempt).

**Documentation of evidence of progress in accordance with OEL instructions.**

- 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017
- 7/17/2017

### T2-4.8
Verify each participating Tier 2 provider completed a Quality Expenditures Report for the benchmark 3 period.

**Completed Quality Expenditures Report completed in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.**

- 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017
- 7/17/2017

### B4 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management

**T2-4.9**
Project management activities.

**Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.**

- 4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017
- 7/17/2016
## Tier 2 – Payment of end of year bonuses

**Administrative/Project Management**

| T2-5.0 | **Verify Tier 2 Quality Bonus Expenditures Report submitted for bonus payment (Exhibit VII, section F.)** | A completed Quality Bonus Expenditure Report (see Exhibit VII, section F.) received and accepted by the ELC by the due date. | 15 calendar days following ELC notification of bonus qualification to the Provider | TBD |

### TIER 3 BENCHMARK DELIVERABLES

**Benchmark 1 – Tier 3 Providers**

<p>| T3-1.1 | <strong>Verify that each participating Tier 3 provider certified in the ELPFP system execution of the Early Learning Performance Funding Contract</strong> | Verification page completed in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC attesting that the contract has been executed | Contract start date – 8/01/2016 | 11/15/2016 |
| T3-1.2 | <strong>Verify each participating Tier 3 provider has purchased a child assessment online subscription for each participating B-5 child enrolled at the provider.</strong> | Purchase receipts for registration or proof of existing license uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC | Contract start date – 10/31/2016 | 11/15/2016 |
| T3-1.3 | <strong>Verify completion of reliability test on selected child assessment by each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider.</strong> | Certificate of Assessor Reliability Results uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC. | Contract start date – 10/31/2016 | 11/15/2016 |
| T3-1.4 | <strong>Verify each participating Tier 3 provider classroom at each participating Tier 3 provider either participated in CLASS pre-observation or was exempt.</strong> | Appropriate box checked by the participating Tier 3 Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that CLASS pre-observations have been conducted for each participating classroom or the classroom was exempt. | Contract start date – 10/31/2016 | 11/15/2016 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3-1.5</th>
<th>Verify each participating Tier 3 provider scheduled four (4) TA visits provided by the ELC for each participating classroom.</th>
<th>Completed certification in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that the TA visits have been scheduled.</th>
<th>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</th>
<th>11/15/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3-1.6</td>
<td>Verify that each participating teacher/director and each participating Tier 3 provider registered for ELFL Tier 3 course one.</td>
<td>ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 3 teacher/director registered for ELFL Tier 3 course one by 9/25/2016</td>
<td>Between 9/5/2016 and 9/25/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-1.7</td>
<td>Verify that each participating teacher/director and each participating Tier 2 provider began ELFL Tier 3 course one.</td>
<td>Completed certification in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 3 teacher/director began ELFL Tier 3 course one.</td>
<td>Course begins 9/26/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B1 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3-1.8</th>
<th>Schedule four (4) TA visits with each participating classroom at each participating Tier 3 provider. Two (2) TA visits scheduled to occur in benchmark two (2) after CLASS pre-observation, and two (2) TA visits scheduled to occur in benchmark 3 before CLASS post-observation.</th>
<th>A check in the appropriate checkbox in the ELPFP System Classroom List for each participating Tier 3 classroom.</th>
<th>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</th>
<th>11/15/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3-1.9</td>
<td>Register each participating Tier 3 teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider for ELFL Tier 3 course one.</td>
<td>ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System confirming that the ELC registered each participating Tier 3 teacher/director for ELFL Tier 3 course one by 9/25/2016</td>
<td>Between 9/5/2016 and 9/25/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-1.10</td>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td>Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td>Contract start date – 10/31/2016</td>
<td>11/15/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark 2 – Tier 3 Providers**

| T3-2.1 | Verify each participating Tier 3 provider updated the Instructor/ Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary. | Updated Instructor/ Director Roster in the ELPFP System by each participating Tier 3 Provider and approved by the ELC | 11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017 | 1/31/2017 |
| T3-2.2 | Verify that each participating Tier 3 provider confirmed or updated the initial Classroom List in the ELPFP System. | Verification page in the ELPFP system for each participating Tier 3 provider, confirming or updating the Classroom List. | 11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017 | 1/31/2017 |
| T3-2.3 | Verify completion of ELFL Tier 3 course one by each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider. | Certificate of Mastery uploaded in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 3 teacher/director completed ELFL Tier 3 course one during the benchmark period. | Course one completion window – 9/26/2016 – 12/11/2016 | 1/31/2017 |
| T3-2.4 | Verify each participating Tier 3 teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider registered for ELFL Tier 3 course two. | ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 3 teacher/director registered for ELFL Tier 3 course two by 1/15/2017 | 12/19/2016 – 1/15/2017 | 1/31/2017 |
| T3-2.5 | Verify each participating Tier 3 provider conducted an initial child assessment on each enrolled B-5 child at each participating Tier 3 provider. | The Assessment Period Report (see Exhibit VII, H., I. or J.) uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC. | 11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017 | 1/31/2017 |
### T3-2.6
**Verify each participating Tier 3 classroom on the classroom list at each participating Tier 3 provider participated in two (2) TA visits provided by the ELC.**
- Appropriate box(es) checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that TA visit has been conducted
- **After CLASS pre-observation but before 1/16/2017**
- **1/31/2017**

### B2 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management

#### T3-2.7
**Register each participating Tier 3 teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider for ELFL Tier 3 course two.**
- ELFL LMS screen shot uploaded in the ELPFP System confirming that the ELC registered each participating Tier 2 teacher/director for ELFL Tier 3 course two by 1/15/2017
- **12/19/2016 – 1/15/2017**
- **1/31/2017**

#### T3-2.8
**Conduct two (2) TA visits with each participating Tier 3 classroom listed on each participating Tier 3 provider’s roster.**
- Updated WELS system Quality Improvement Plan for each participating classroom reflecting the outcome of the TA visit.
- **11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017**
- By 1/31/2017 and results entered into WELS within 15 days of completion of each TA visit

#### T3-2.9
**Project management activities.**
- Summary report for ELPFP system of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.
- **11/1/2016 – 1/16/2017**
- **1/31/2017**

### Benchmark 3 – Tier 3 Providers

#### T3-3.1
**Verify each participating Tier 3 provider updated the Instructor/ Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary.**
- Updated Instructor/ Director Roster for each participating Tier 3 provider in the ELPFP System, approved by the ELC.
- **1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017**
- **4/17/2017**

#### T3-3.2
**Verify that each participating Tier 3 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System.**
- Verification page in the ELPFP system for each participating Tier 3 provider, confirming or updating the Classroom List
- **1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017**
- **4/17/2017**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3-3.3</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 3 teacher/director at each participating provider began ELFL Tier 3 course two.</td>
<td>Completed certification in ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 3 teacher/director began ELFL Tier 3 course two.</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-3.4</td>
<td>Verify that each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider generated a professional development (PD) plan in the statewide PD Registry.</td>
<td>Appropriate box checked certifying that a PD Plan for each participating teacher/director has been generated in the statewide registry system unless teacher/director is exempt.</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-3.5</td>
<td>Verify each participating classroom at each participating Tier 3 provider participated in two (2) TA visits provided by the ELC.</td>
<td>Appropriate box(es) checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that TA visit has been conducted</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B3 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3-3.6</td>
<td>Conduct two (2) TA visits with each participating Tier 3 classroom listed on each participating Tier 3 provider’s classroom list.</td>
<td>Updated WELS system Quality Improvement Plan for each participating classroom reflecting the outcome of the TA visit.</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>By 4/17/2017 and results entered into WELS within 15 days of completion of each TA visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-3.7</td>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td>Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td>1/17/2017 – 3/31/2017</td>
<td>4/17/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark 4 – Tier 3 Providers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.1</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 3 provider updated the Instructor/ Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary.</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 3 provider updated the Instructor/ Director Roster form in the ELPFP System, as necessary.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.2</td>
<td>Verify that each participating Tier 3 provider confirmed or updated the Classroom List in the ELPFP System.</td>
<td>Verification page in the ELPFP System confirming or updating the Classroom List.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.3</td>
<td>Verify each participating teacher/director at each participating Tier 3 provider completed ELFL Tier 3 course two.</td>
<td>Certificate of Mastery uploaded in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC confirming that each participating Tier 2 and Tier 3 teacher/director completed ELFL course two (2) during the benchmark period.</td>
<td>Course 2 completion window – 3/7/2017 – 4/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.4</td>
<td>Verify completion of reliability test on each participating Tier 3 provider’s chosen child assessment by each participating Tier 3 teacher/director.</td>
<td>Certificate of Assessor Reliability Results for each participating Tier 3 teacher/director uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.5</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 3 provider conducted a final child assessment on all enrolled B-5 children in all Tier 3 provider classrooms.</td>
<td>Completed Assessment Period Report (see Exhibit VII, H., I, or J.) uploaded into the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.6</td>
<td>Verify each participating Tier 3 provider classroom participated in CLASS post-observation.</td>
<td>Appropriate box checked by the Provider in the ELPFP System and approved by the ELC certifying that CLASS post-observations have been conducted for each participating classroom</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-4.7</td>
<td>Verify demonstration of progress on professional development plan by at least 75% of the teachers/directors on the teacher director roster at each participating Tier 3 provider (unless exempt).</td>
<td>Documentation of evidence of progress in accordance with OEL instructions.</td>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 – ELC Service and Administrative/Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T3-4.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report of evidence of completion for all participating providers for all project tasks due during the benchmark period, submitted with the invoice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/01/2017 – 6/30/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>