



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

California Department of Education Early Education and Support Division Quality Improvement Office

Quality Improvement—Professional Development Participation Report

2013-14 Tracking and Reporting of Training Participants and Training Activities

March 2015

Reported by:



Child Development Training Consortium
Yosemite Community College District

Quality Improvement – Professional Development Training Participants Table of Contents

Introduction and History		1
2013-14 Data Comparison		2
Report Details		3
Professional Development Provider (PDP), Abbreviation, & Delivery Type		5
Regions, by County		6
Table 1: Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants		7
I. Quality Improvement - Professional Development Training Participants: Training Attendance Aggregate of Direct Service & Infrastructure		
F-1	Number of Participants by Training Activity Category	8
F-2	Number of Participants Attending 1, 2, or 3-Plus Trainings	9
II. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs		
Section 1:		
Employment Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs		
F-3	Employment Setting	10
F-4	Employment Setting, by Region	11
F-5	Employment Setting, by Professional Development Provider	12
F-6	Primary Job Position for Center Staff	13
F-7	Primary Job Position for Family Child Care	14
F-8	Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Region	15
F-9	Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Professional Development Provider	16
F-10	Caring for Dual Language Learners (DLL)	17
F-11	Caring for DLL, by Primary Job Position	18
F-12	Caring for DLL, by Region	19
F-13	Caring for DLL, by Professional Development Provider	20
F-14	Caring for Children with an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) or Individualized Education Plan (IEP)	21
F-15	Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Primary Job Position	22
F-16	Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Region	23
F-17	Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Professional Development Provider	24
F-18	Number of Paid Hours Worked per Week	25
F-19	Number of Months Worked per Year	26
Table 2: Tenure in the ECE Field; with Current Employer; and in Current Job Position		27
Table 3: Mean Hourly Wages and Full-Time Equivalent Salary, by Primary Job Position		28
Section 2:		
Educational and Permit Level of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs		
F-20	Highest Level of Education	29
F-21	Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position	30
F-22	Highest Level of Education, by Region	31
F-23	Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider	32
F-24	Current Permit Level	33

F-25	Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position	34
F-26	Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider	35
Section 3:		
Demographic Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs		
F-27	Gender	36
F-28	Race/Ethnicity	37
F-29	Race/Ethnicity, by Primary Job Position	38
F-30	Age	39
F-31	Age, by Primary Job Position	40
F-32	Language Fluency	41
F-33	Language Fluency, by Primary Job Position	42
F-34	Language Fluency, by Region	43
F-35	Language Fluency, by Professional Development Provider	44
III. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs		
Section 1:		
Employment Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs		
F-36	Employment Setting	45
F-37	Primary Job Position	46
F-38	Number of Paid Hours Worked per Week	47
F-39	Number of Months Worked per Year	48
Table 4: Tenure in the ECE Field; with Current Employer; and Current Job Position		49
Table 5: Mean Hourly Wages and Full-Time Equivalent Salaries, by Primary Job Position		50
Section 2:		
Educational and Permit Level of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs		
F-40	Highest Level of Education	51
F-41	Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position	52
F-42	Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider	53
F-43	Current Permit Level	54
F-44	Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position	55
F-45	Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider	56
Section 3:		
Demographic Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs		
F-46	Gender	57
F-47	Race/Ethnicity	58
F-48	Race/Ethnicity, by Primary Job Position	59
F-49	Age	60
F-50	Age, by Primary Job Position	61
F-51	Languages Spoken Fluently	62
F-52	Languages Spoken Fluently, by Primary Job Position	63
Appendices		
A-1	Glossary of Terms: Professional Development Delivery Types	64
A-2	Professional Development Provider Contact Information	65

Introduction and History

California continues to allocate a portion of its federal Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) dollars to support professional development in the Early Learning System in the form of quality improvement activities. Quality investments and support systems that promote continuous quality improvement of both programs and the staff who work in them are a core element of CCDF. In 2013, the federal mandate is that at least four percent of CCDF funds are allocated to improve the quality of child care. The California Department of Education (CDE), Early Education and Support Division (EESD) provides high quality trainings and incentives with the four percent set aside of quality funds, many of which focus on professional development for the early care and education workforce.

In 2010, the CDE, EESD developed a standardized quality improvement participant registration form, the Professional Development (PD) Profile, to be completed by all early childhood educators participating in the EESD quality funded professional development activities. There are two versions of the PD Profile. One is the Direct Service Profile that is designed to collect the pertinent data of staff working directly with children. The other, the Infrastructure Profile, is designed for use by infrastructure practitioners in the field such as trainers, faculty, and others that assist or train the direct service providers. These EESD Profiles include standard data on participants' demographics, education and training background, and employment. The form also allows for specific information needed by the individual EESD contractors who provide the professional development activities or trainings.

The data collected through the Direct Service and Infrastructure PD Profiles is now aggregated annually into the EESD Quality Improvement—Professional Development (QI-PD) Participation Report that tracks and reports information on the professional development providers, the training participants, and training/professional development activities. The data for the report are tracked and collected by the EESD contractors that conduct the activities, and the annual report is developed by the Child Development Training Consortium (CDTC).

This report is the state's first attempt at looking across all EESD funded trainings to learn more about how the participants utilize the trainings and also to gather more information about the characteristics of the workforce. The report is beginning to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Quality Improvement Professional Development activities as a whole and indicates that many early care and education professionals utilize more than one activity. For example, in 2013-14, of the 32,272 participants attending trainings, fourteen percent participated in two training categories, and sixteen percent in three or more. This confirms that the EESD funded trainings are accessible to the workforce, who are using this system to advance their careers and expertise in early education.

This is the third year of tracking this information and the report is displaying similar information across the years, which supports the validity of the data. The prior year report, the 2012-13 Tracking and Reporting of QI-PD Training Participants and Activities, is considered baseline for future reports. These data are a comprehensive representation of the activities of the QI-PD's.

There are some notable comparisons to the 2011-12 data, 2012-13 data, and the data presented in this 2013-14 report.

2013-14 Data Comparison

The three tables below provide a comparison of activities over the past three fiscal years. Tables A and B list activities related to direct service and infrastructure training participants, the training providers, and activities.

There is a significant increase in the number of participants and number of reported training activities from 2011-12 to 2013-14. The number of direct service participants attending trainings rose from 24,456 in 2011-12 to 29,793 in 2013-14. This demonstrates an increase of 5,337 additional training participants from this sector. The infrastructure sector also showed an increase in the number of attendees. In 2013-14, there were 2,479 training participants, which was an increase of 542 from the 2011-12 totals of 1,937.

Another remarkable increase in reported data is the growth in the number of training activities. In 2011-12, at the start of the data collection, there were 37,747 trainings attended by direct service providers and this number increased by 18,642 to a new total of 56,389. The trainings attended by infrastructure professionals increased from 2,552 in 2011-12 to 4,263 at the end of 2013-14. These increases signify that the EESD funded training contractors have made a conscientious effort to ensure that training participants completed the PD Profile and their data was submitted to the Child Development Training Consortium in a timely manner.

An interesting finding in the “increased” data is that the statistics and characteristics of the participants remain consistent. There is also a consistency in the information that is specific to the training providers, such as employment setting. In each year, Figure 3, page 10 in this report, indicates the majority of training participants work in a child care center with the second largest group working in family child care settings. This demonstrates that the data is valid, and if used as a sampling of the early care and education workforce, we start to see specific trends and characteristics.

Table A: Direct Service Participants, Providers, Activities	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Total Training Participants	24,456	29,882	29,793
Percent of Training Participants	93%	95%	92%
Total Training Activities	37,747	55,888	56,389
Percent of Training Activities	94%	95%	93%
Training Providers Submitting Data	11	11	13
Total Children Served by Training Participants	256,113	307,682	334,524
Percent of Participants Attending One Training	71%	68%	69%
Percent of Participants Attending Two Trainings	15%	15%	14%
Percent of Participants Attending Three-plus Trainings	13%	15%	15%

Table B: Infrastructure Participants, Providers, Activities	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Total Training Participants	1,937	1,668	2,479
Percent of Training Participants	7%	5%	8%
Total Training Activities	2,552	2,675	4,263
Percent of Training Activities	6%	5%	7%
Training Providers Submitting Data	8	9	9
Percent of Participants Attending One Training	80%	70%	72%
Percent of Participants Attending Two Trainings	10%	16%	14%
Percent of Participants Attending Three-plus Trainings	8%	13%	13%
Total Children Served by Training Participants	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table C presents the number of participants by training category in a three year comparison format. These numbers have changed over the past three years, due to an increase in the number of contractors submitting data, and an increase in trainings and participants. With 2012-13 being the baseline for the data contained within the report, there is opportunity in subsequent years to study how training participants use the various training categories.

Table C: Number of Participants by Training Category	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Coaching	225	346	1
Fee for Service	375	2,066	4,930
Financial Support for Training	337	1,829	2,333
Mentoring	1,092	765	755
Online Training	6	225	30
On-Site Training / Technical Assistance	2,638	3,176	3,287
Retention Activities	923	1,203	1,380
Stipends	15,899	16,534	15,206
Trainer of Trainers	1,458	1,374	1,510
Trainings	17,593	31,141	31,215
Total	40,546	58,659	60,647

Report Details

Throughout the report the N size on tables varies depending on the number of responses to the question that produced the data. This N size also changed due to outliers of data sets that were omitted to provide more accurate percentages in tables that reflect this viewpoint. An example of N size change is found in Figure 18, page 25, and Figure 19, page 26.

These tables show number of hours worked per week (F-18) and number of months worked per year (F-19). The N size is different on the two figures as some participants did not respond to each question. A total of 19,630 participants responded to questions related to F-18, and 18,318 in F-19. In addition, the total number of participants that could have responded to these questions in order to provide a comprehensive data set was 29,793 (Direct Service). This is a representation of the variances of N size in this report. The CDTC will continue to assist the QI-PD contractors to ensure training participants complete all data fields of the EESD Profile.

The report shows a variety of information related to the training participants' demographics, education and training background, and employment. The report also displays information in categories of Region, Professional Development Providers, and Primary Job Position. For purposes of recognizing these categories throughout the report, they are color coded. You will note that all of the data presented from a regional perspective is in orange. Information presented by Professional Development Provider is shown in green, and blue represents Primary Job Position.

This report allows us to examine the training opportunities available to the field in a comprehensive format and to identify specific topics that may require additional trainings. An example of this is found in the data reported in Figure 14 on page 21. The question on the Profile asks, "Do you currently care for children who have an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) or Individualized Education Plan (IEP)?" Twenty-two percent of direct service providers indicated they do not know if the children they work with have an IFSP or IEP. It appears child care providers need training to help bring awareness to the special needs and service plans for the children in their care.

The data contained in this report should prove to be extremely beneficial to the professional development providers and EESD as they continue to build an integrated Early Learning System for California. It will also aid programs such as the EESD contractors and Race to the Top/Early Learning Challenge Regional Leadership Consortia as they develop plans to increase the quality of children's programs and the early care and education workforce.

Thank you to the Early Education and Support Division, Quality Improvement Professional Development Providers for their diligence in collecting the data, and a special thanks to the early educators who continue to participate in the training activities and enhance the quality of care for children.

Professional Development Provider (PDP), Abbreviation, & Delivery Type

Professional Development Provider (PDP)	Abbreviation	Delivery Type (Glossary of Terms, Page 64)
AB212 - Local Planning Council	AB212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coaching ▪ Financial Support ▪ Retention Activities ▪ Stipend ▪ Training
Beginning Together	BTG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On-site Training/Technical Assistance ▪ Trainer of Trainers
CA Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies	R & R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training
CA Collaborative on Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning	CCSEFEL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trainer of Trainers/Faculty ▪ Training
CA Early Childhood Mentor Program	CECMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mentoring ▪ Online Training ▪ Trainer of Trainers
CA Inclusion & Behavior Consultation Network	CIBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coaching ▪ On-site Training/Technical Assistance
CA Preschool Instructional Network	CPIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coaching ▪ Fee-for-Service ▪ Online training ▪ Trainer of Trainers/Faculty ▪ Training
CA School-Age Consortium	CaSAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fee-for-Service ▪ On-site Training/Technical Assistance ▪ Trainer of Trainers
Child Care Initiative Project	CCIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coaching ▪ Trainer of Trainers/Faculty ▪ Training
Child Development Training Consortium	CDTC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stipends ▪ Training
Desired Results Training	DR Trng	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coaching ▪ Fee-for-Service ▪ Trainer of Trainers/Faculty ▪ Training
Faculty Initiative Project	FIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trainer of Trainers Faculty ▪ Training
Family Child Care at its Best	FCCAIB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training
Program for Infant Toddler Care	PITC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On-site Training/Technical Assistance ▪ Trainer of Trainers/Faculty ▪ Training

Regions, by County

Northern	Bay Area	Central	Coastal Area	Southern	Los Angeles County
Alpine *	Alameda	Amador	Monterey	Imperial	Los Angeles
Butte	Contra Costa	Calaveras	San Benito	Orange	
Colusa	Marin	Fresno	San Luis Obispo	Riverside	
Del Norte	Napa	Inyo	Santa Barbara	San	
El Dorado	San Francisco	Kern	Santa Cruz	Bernardino	
Glenn	San Mateo	Kings	Ventura	San Diego	
Humboldt	Santa Clara	Madera			
Lake	Solano	Mariposa*			
Lassen	Sonoma	Merced			
Mendocino		Mono*			
Modoc		San Joaquin			
Nevada		Stanislaus			
Placer		Tulare			
Plumas		Tuolumne			
Sacramento					
Shasta					
Sierra *					
Siskiyou					
Sutter					
Tehama					
Trinity					
Yolo					
Yuba					

*No participants reported working in these counties

Table 1: Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants

	Work in Direct Service Programs	Work in Infrastructure Programs	Total
Total training participants	29,793	2,479	32,272
Percent of training participants	92%	8%	100%
Total training activities	56,389	4,263	60,652
Percent of training activities	93%	7%	100%
Total children served by training participants working in direct service program	334,524	N/A	334,524

Participant activities by professional development :

AB212 Local Planning Council	8,307	418	8,725
Beginning Together	55	272	327
CA Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies*	148	49	197
CA Collaborative on Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning	4,772	1,143	5,915
CA Early Childhood Mentor Program	879	251	1,130
CA Inclusion & Behavior Consultation Network	17	0	17
CA Preschool Instructional Network	11,083	965	12,048
CA School-Age Consortium	0	0	0
Child Care Initiative Project	15,176	775	15,951
Child Development Training Consortium	10,618	0	10,618
Desired Results Training	18	0	18
Faculty Initiative Project	3	144	147
Family Child Care at its Best	3,135	0	3,135
Program for Infant Toddler Care	2,167	246	2,413

Percent of training participants by region of the state:


Northern	13.08%	13.49%	
Bay Area	22.99%	33.73%	
Central	17.41%	13.82%	
Coastal Area	8.91%	5.94%	
Southern	19.72%	19.92%	
Los Angeles County	17.88%	13.09%	
N	20,945	1,245	22,190

Percent of participants who attended:

One training category	69%	72%	
Two training categories	14%	14%	
Three-plus training categories	15%	13%	
N	29,793	2,479	32,272


* A portion of CA Child Care Resource & Referral activities are reported under Child Care Initiative Project

**I. Quality Improvement - Professional Development Training Participants:
Training Attendance Aggregate of Direct Service & Infrastructure**



***Refer to Glossary of Term, page 64**

This figure will allow EESD to better understand the types of professional development activities utilized by practitioners. In this example, most practitioners are participating in direct training as opposed to most other type of activities, including retention activities. Many practitioners are accessing stipends to increase their wages and advance their education.




The total N size for California displayed in Figure 2 is less than the N size displayed in Figure 1. This is because Figure 1 reports a duplicated count of participants as they attend multiple activities.

The vast majority of participants only attended one training activity within this time period. While it is encouraging that 30% of participants attended multiple trainings, integration of EESD funded programs in support of quality child care is necessary.

II. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs

Section 1: Employment Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs

Figure 3: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Employment Setting




■ Child Care Center
 ■ Family Child Care Home
 ■ Informal Care
 ■ Other/Not in ECE

N=20,271


Based on available data, over three-quarters of training participants are working in center based programs. Figure 3 is helpful to determine which sectors of the workforce are currently being served in EESD training programs. This will promote development of strategies to encourage all sectors of the workforce to attend the trainings.

Figure 4: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Employment Setting, by Region




The percentage of training participants working in direct service programs does not vary by region, with the exception of the Coastal Area, where a slightly greater percentage of family child care home providers are being served.

Figure 5: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Employment Setting, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)



It is evident that two training providers, Child Care Initiative Project (CCIP) and Family Child Care at its Best (FCCAIB), serve a large percentage of family child care while most primarily serve participants employed in center based programs.

Figure 6: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Primary Job Position for Center Staff




N=13,924 - Center Based Staff

Director includes: Teacher director, assistant director, director single site, director multiple sites, executive director. Other includes: Specialized teaching staff, professional support staff, others.


This figure shows that the vast majority of center based training participants work as assistant teacher or teacher.

Figure 7: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Primary Job Position for Family Child Care



Almost three-quarters of the participants working in family child care are the owner or operator of their family child care home.


Figure 8: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Region



Director includes: Teacher director, assistant director, director single site, director multiple sites, executive director. Other includes: Specialized teaching staff, professional support staff, other.

There is little variation across regions in the percentage of training participants by job position. In all regions, assistant teachers and teachers make up the largest proportion of training participants.


Figure 9: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)



Director includes: Teacher director, assistant director, director single site, director multiple sites, executive director. Other includes: Specialized teaching staff, professional support staff, faculty.


There is significant variation among professional development providers in the type of job positions held by their training participants.

The next four figures present information about training participants caring for Dual Language Learners.



The vast majority of training participants report working with children who are dual language learners. It is important that training opportunities related to serving these children are available to the workforce.


Figure 11: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Caring Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Primary Job Position



Other includes: Professional support staff, Assistant Director, Specialized teaching staff.


Across job positions, the vast majority of training participants are working with children who are dual language learners.

Figure 12: Percentage of QI-PD Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Caring for Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Region




The percentage of training participants working with children who are dual language learners does not vary significantly by regions of the state. This implies that training specific to working with children who are dual language learners would be useful in all parts of the state.

Figure 13: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Caring for Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Professional Development Provider (PDP)




Most of the participants trained by PDPs provide care for Dual Language Learners.

Working with children with special needs is an important factor for California to consider when developing trainings. These next four figures detail this component.




Given that 22 percent of the participants responded that they do not know whether they work with children who have an IFSP or IEP, more training is needed in this area.

Figure 15: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Primary Job Position




There is a significant variation of more than 60 percent between the Site Supervisor/Director and Family Child Care positions caring for children with an IFSP or IEP, therefore it is important to target training to directors.

Figure 16: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Region



There is some variation of the number of participants working with children with special needs across regions of the state. Almost one-half of participants in the northern part of the state reported caring for children with an IFSP or IEP compared to in Los Angeles County.


Figure 17: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)



There is also variation among PDPs in the percentage of participants working with children with an IFSP or IEP. Individual providers should pay attention to this as they design their training programs.


Full-time/part-time status, tenure and wages

The following section provides information about the employment status of the training participant.



The vast majority of the training participants work full-time: 35 or more hours per week and 12 months per year.

Figure 19: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Number of Months Worked per Year



N=18,318

Table 2: QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs; Tenure in the ECE Field, with Current Employer, and in Current Job Position, by Primary Job Position

Table 2 and Table 3 indicate that most participants have been in the early childhood education field, with their current employer, and in their current position a substantial amount of time. Similar to other statistics, salaries of teacher and teacher assistants are very low.

Tenure Category	Job Position	Mean Number of Years	N
Tenure in Current Position	Assistant Teacher	4	5,649
	Teacher	6	6,500
	Site supervisor	7	657
	Director - single site	6	362
	Director - multiple sites	7	120
	Family Child Care Owner	8	2,217
	Family Child Care Assistant	3	639
	Other	4	1,140
	Tenure in the ECE Field	Assistant Teacher	6
Teacher		11	6,720
Site Supervisor		16	679
Director - Single Site		19	374
Director - Multiple Sites		19	124
Family Child Care Owner		10	2,520
Family Child Care Assistant		4	596
Other		12	1,117
Tenure with Current Employer		Assistant Teacher	5
	Teacher	7	6,641
	Site Supervisor	11	682
	Director - Single Site	10	366
	Director - Multiple Sites	13	121
	Family Child Care Owner	8	2,521
	Family Child Care Assistant	3	671
	Other	6	1,153


Table 3: QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs; Mean Hourly Wages and Full-Time Equivalent Salaries, by Primary Job Position

Job Position	Mean Hourly Wage	Full-Time Equivalent Salary	N
Assistant teacher	\$12	\$24,746.47	4,672
Teacher	\$15	\$31,294.88	4,889
Site supervisor	\$19	\$39,274.69	394
Director - single site	\$20	\$41,543.47	158
Director - multiple sites	\$24	\$48,947.77	28
Family Child Care Owner	\$13	\$26,058.77	621
Family Child Care Assistant	\$11	\$22,386.24	408
Other	\$15	\$31,885.98	737

II. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs

Section 2: Educational and Permit Level of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs

The next set of figures display information about the participants' highest level of education.



Slightly more than one-half (53%) of the participants have a degree. However, this varies greatly by job position and by PDP.

Figure 21: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position




Figure 22: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Highest Level of Education, by Region






Figure 23: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)



It is important for PDPs to know the education level of their participants as they develop their training materials and training techniques. As indicated, the educational level varies widely across PDPs.

The next three figures display information regarding attainment of the Child Development Permit.



The vast majority of training participants hold a permit. This varies widely by job position and PDP, with family child care the least likely to report having a permit.

Figure 25: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position





Figure 26: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)




- Children's Center Permit
- Program Director
- Site supervisor
- Teacher/Master Teacher Permit
- Assistant/Associate Teacher Permit
- No permit


II. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs

Section 3: Demographic Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs

The next figures are related to gender, race/ethnicity, and age.




Reflecting the workforce as a whole, the majority of participants are women of color and 40 years or older. Race, ethnicity, and age vary by job position.




Other includes: Native American/Alaskan; Pacific Islander and other.

Figure 29: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Race/Ethnicity, by Primary Job Position




Excludes "outliers" - participants are less than 16 years old or older than 95 years old.




Excludes "outliers" - participants are less than 16 years old or older than 95 years old.

Figure 31: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Age, by Primary Job Position




In the next few figures, the percentage total is more than 100% due to the multi-select option on the EESD Profile question that addresses language fluency. N is based on all direct service activities for selected FY.



Participants report fluency in English and Spanish. However, more than two-thirds of training participants speak Spanish fluently, reflecting the demographics of California. This varies by job position, region, and PDP.

Figure 33: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Language Fluency, by Primary Job Position



Family child care owners are the most likely to report fluency in Spanish.

Figure 34: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Language Fluency, by Region






Figure 35: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs: Language Fluency, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)




III. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs

Section 1: Employment Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs




Over 75 percent of training participants working in an infrastructure program are employed through Resource & Referral or other training organizations.




There is a wide variety of job positions held by training participants working in infrastructure organizations.

Figure 38: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Paid Hours Worked per Week



Most training participants work full time: 35 or more hours per week and 12 months per year.

Figure 39: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Number of Months Worked per Year



Most training participants work a full year - 12 months.

Table 4: QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Tenure in the ECE Field; with Current Employer; and in Current Job Position, by Primary Job Position

Tenure Category	Job Position	Mean Number of Years	N
Tenure in current position	K-3 Teacher	7	59
	Consultant	6	61
	Director/Executive Director	7	111
	Trainer	6	75
	Program Staff	7	160
	Manager/Coordinator	6	150
	College Faculty	8	99
	Coach/Mentor	5	149
	Other	6	181
Tenure in the ECE field	K-3 Teacher	13	57
	Consultant	17	61
	Director/Executive Director	19	112
	Trainer	18	75
	Program Staff	13	158
	Manager/Coordinator	19	152
	College Faculty	21	99
	Coach/Mentor	17	154
	Other	13	173
Tenure with current employer	K-3 Teacher	11	64
	Consultant	7	63
	Director/Executive Director	11	111
	Trainer	8	74
	Program Staff	9	164
	Manager/Coordinator	10	154
	College Faculty	10	99
	Coach/Mentor	6	154
	Other	8	180

Participants working in infrastructure organizations report substantial tenure in their current position, in the ECE field, and with their current employer.

Table 5: QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Mean Hourly Wages and Full-Time Equivalent Salaries, by Primary Job Position

Job Position	Mean Hourly Wage	Full-Time Equivalent Salary	N
K-3 Teacher	\$28	\$57,737.12	58
Consultant	\$30	\$63,176.29	48
Director/Executive Director	\$29	\$60,880.91	95
Trainer	\$29	\$60,302.28	67
Program Staff	\$19	\$39,429.53	152
Manager/Coordinator	\$29	\$61,043.65	132
College Faculty	\$36	\$75,042.50	86
Coach/Mentor	\$27	\$55,619.02	136
Other	\$23	\$48,632.07	145

To calculate mean hourly wage, hourly responses were combined with annual salary responses converted to hourly wage based on hours worked per week and months worked per year. To calculate full-time equivalent salaries:


Mean hourly wage X 40 hours per week X 4.33 weeks per month X 12 months per year

Note that wages less than \$8/hour and over \$100/hour were excluded from report.

Participants working in infrastructure organizations report substantially higher salaries than participants working in direct service settings.


II. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs

Section 2: Educational and Permit Level of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs



People working in infrastructure organizations tend to have a higher level of education than the workforce that works directly with children. More than one-third has graduate degrees compared to six percent of direct service participants. This varies by job position and PDP.

Figure 41: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position



- Graduate Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Associate's Degree
- High School/GED or less

Figure 42: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)





Figure 43: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Current Permit Level



Fifty-three percent of the training participants have a current permit, with the greatest percentage reporting a site supervisor or program director permit. This varies by job position and PDP.

Figure 44: Percentage QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position






Figure 45: Percentage QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider (PDP)



III. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs


Section 3: Demographic Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs

Figure 46: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Gender



N=1,492


Figure 47: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Race/Ethnicity




Other includes: Native American/Alaskan; Pacific Islander and other.

Similar to the direct service participants, most of the participants working in infrastructure organizations are women and over 40 years of age. Twenty-five percent of training participants working in direct service report being White/Caucasian, compared to 41 percent of participants working in infrastructure organizations.

Figure 48: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Race/Ethnicity, by Primary Job Position







Excludes "outliers" - participants are less than 16 years old or older than 95 years old.

Close to 50 percent of the training participants are 40 plus years old. This indicates that the field needs to be prepared to recruit new faculty and trainers as this group begins to retire.

Figure 50: Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Age, by Primary Job Position




This figure again demonstrates the need to focus on leadership training. The majority of faculty and directors are approaching retirement age.



The percentage total is more than 100% due to the multi-select option on the EESD Profile.

Over one-third of participants working in infrastructure organizations report speaking Spanish fluently compared to over one-half of direct service training participants.

Figure 52: Percentage of QI PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs: Languages Spoken Fluently, by Primary Job Position



Appendix-1

Glossary of Terms: Professional Development Delivery Types

Coaching is a relationship-based process led by an expert with specialized and adult learning knowledge and skills, who often serves in a different professional role than the recipient(s). * Coaching includes work done via telephone or e-mail.

Fee-for-Service refers to training or services provided at cost that are above and beyond the level of service funded by CDE. This category is intended to capture data on unfunded need for California residents.

Financial Support for training refers to the use of professional development financial support funding, such as AB212, that is used to sponsor a training, host a training, pay for substitutes, or similar support.

Mentoring is a relationship-based process between colleagues in similar professional roles, with a more-experienced individual with adult learning knowledge and skills, the mentor, providing guidance and example to the less-experienced protégé or mentee.*

Online Training is any learning experience provided through Webinar or coursework conducted through Web access.

On-site Training/Technical Assistance (TA) is training or technical assistance provided in the program's setting that impacts that site **and** site personnel for the benefit of that program. Technical Assistance is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills to develop or strengthen processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients.*

Retention Activities refers to participant-specific career or professional development support, such as professional growth advising.

Stipend is a payment, scholarship or grant to a student or eligible participant.

Trainer of Trainers/Faculty refers to training provided to individuals who will in turn train others on the specific subject matter involved.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills or dispositions, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills.*

* Quoted from *Early Childhood Education Professional Development: Training and Technical Assistance Glossary*, a joint project of National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (NACCRRA) 2011.

Appendix-2 Professional Development Provider Contact Information

Professional Development Provider	Website
AB212 - Local Planning Council (AB212)	www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/lpcccontacts.asp
Beginning Together (BTG)	http://www.cainclusion.org/bt
CA Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (R &R)	http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/rragencylist.asp
CA Collaborative on Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CCSEFEL)	http://cainclusion.org/camap/cacsefel.html
CA Early Childhood Mentor Program (CECMP)	http://www.ecementor.org/
CA Inclusion & Behavior Consultation Network (CIBC)	http://www.cibc-ca.org/
CA Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN)	http://www.cpin.us
CA School-Age Consortium (CaSAC)	http://www.calsac.org/
Child Care Initiative Project (CCIP)	http://www.rrnetwork.org/about-the-rr-network/current-programs/ccip.html
Child Development Training Consortium (CDTC)	https://www.childdevelopment.org
Desired Results Training (DR Training)	http://www.wested.org/desiredresults
Faculty Initiative Project (FIP)	http://www.wested.org/facultyinitiative
Family Child Care at its Best (FCCAIB)	https://humanservices.ucdavis.edu/programs/center-excellence-child-development/family-child-care-its-best-program
Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC)	http://www.pitc.org