



**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**

**2016-2017 Tracking and Reporting of  
Training Participants and Training Activities**

**April 2018**

**Reported by:**



**Child Development Training Consortium  
Yosemite Community College District**

# Quality Improvement – Professional Development Training Participants

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction and History</b> .....	1
<b>2016-17 Data Comparison</b> .....	2
<b>Report Details</b> .....	4
<b>Professional Development Provider (PDP), Abbreviation, &amp; Delivery Type</b> .....	5
<b>Regions, by County</b> .....	6
Table 1: Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants.....	7
<b>I. Quality Improvement - Professional Development Training Participants: Training Attendance</b>	
<b>Aggregate of Direct Service &amp; Infrastructure</b> .....	8
Data Table 1: Number of Participants by Training Category* .....	8
Data Table 2: Number of Participants Attending 1, 2, or 3 plus Trainings .....	8
<b>II. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs</b> .....	9
<b>Section 1: Employment Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs</b> .....	9
Data Table 3: Employment Setting .....	9
Data Table 4: Employment Setting, by Region .....	9
Data Table 5: Employment Setting, by Professional Development Provider .....	10
Data Table 6: Primary Job Position for Center Staff .....	10
Data Table 7: Primary Job Position for Family Child Care .....	11
Data Table 8: Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Region.....	11
Data Table 9: Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Professional Development Provider .....	12
Data Table 10: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL) .....	12
Data Table 11: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Primary Job Position	13
Data Table 12: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Region .....	13
Data Table 13: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Professional Development Provider .....	14
Data Table 14: Caring for Children with an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) or Individualized Education Plan (IEP) .....	14
Data Table 15: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Primary Job Position .....	15

Data Table 16: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Region .....	15
Data Table 17: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Professional Development Provider .....	16
Data Table 18: Number of Paid Hours Worked per Week .....	16
Data Table 19: Number of Months Worked per Year .....	17
Table 2: Tenure in the ECE Field, with Current Employer, and in Current Job Position, by Primary Job Position .....	18
Table 3: Mean Hourly Wages and Full-Time Equivalent Salaries, by Primary Job Position .....	19
<b>Section 2: Educational and Permit Level of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs</b> .....	20
Data Table 20: Highest Level of Education .....	20
Data Table 21: Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position .....	20
Data Table 22: Highest Level of Education, by Region.....	21
Data Table 23: Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider .....	21
Data Table 24: Current Permit Level.....	22
Data Table 25: Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position .....	22
Data Table 26: Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider .....	23
<b>Section 3: Demographic Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs</b> .....	24
Data Table 27: Gender .....	24
Data Table 28: Race/Ethnicity.....	24
Data Table 29: Race/Ethnicity, by Primary Job Position .....	25
Data Table 30: Age .....	25
Data Table 31: Age, by Primary Job Position .....	26
Data Table 32: Language Fluency .....	26
Data Table 33: Language Fluency, by Primary Job Position.....	26
Data Table 34: Language Fluency, by Region.....	27
Data Table 35: Language Fluency, by Professional Development Provider.....	27
<b>III. Quality Improvement (QI) Professional Development (PD) Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs</b> .....	28
<b>Section 1: Employment Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs</b> .....	28
Data Table 36: Employment Setting .....	28
Data Table 37: Primary Job Position .....	28

Data Table 38: Paid Hours Worked per Week .....	29
Data Table 39: Number of Months Worked per Year .....	29
Table 4: Tenure in the ECE Field; with Current Employer; and in Current Job Position, by Primary Job Position .....	30
Table 5: Mean Hourly Wages and Full-Time Equivalent Salaries, by Primary Job Position .....	31
<b>Section 2: Educational and Permit Level of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Data Table 40: Highest Level of Education .....	32
Data Table 41: Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position.....	32
Data Table 42: Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider .....	33
Data Table 43: Current Permit Level.....	33
Data Table 44: Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position .....	34
Data Table 45: Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider.....	34
<b>Section 3: Demographic Characteristics of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs.....</b>	<b>35</b>
Data Table 46: Gender .....	35
Data Table 47: Race/Ethnicity.....	35
Data Table 48: Race/Ethnicity, by Primary Job Position .....	36
Data Table 49: Age .....	36
Data Table 50: Age, by Primary Job Position .....	37
Data Table 51: Languages Spoken Fluently.....	37
Data Table 52: Languages Spoken Fluently, by Primary Job Position .....	38
<b>Appendix 1-Glossary of Terms: Professional Development Delivery Types .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix 2-Professional Development Provider Contact Information .....</b>	<b>40</b>

## **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 the federal fiscal year 2016, seven percent in quality spending was required of CCDF funds. 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 PD 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.

In 2016-17, EESD approved a data collection pilot project that allowed the Resource and Referral Network to enter data in the ECE Workforce Registry, rather than submitting the PD Profile form to CDTC.

The data collected through the Direct Service and Infrastructure PD Profiles and the data provided by the CA ECE Workforce Registry is aggregated 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 is 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 was the state's first attempt at looking across all EESD funded trainings to learn more about how the participants utilize the trainings and to collect more detailed information about the characteristics of the workforce. The report is intended to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Quality Improvement Professional Development activities as a whole. The report also indicates that many early care and education professionals utilize more than one activity. For example, in Table 1, page 7; of the 33,665 participants working in direct service programs attending trainings, 13% participated in two training categories, and 14% participated in three or more training categories. 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.

In the fifth year of tracking this information, similar data across the years has been reported, supporting the validity of the report. The 2012-13 *Tracking and Reporting of QI-PD Training Participants and Activities* is considered baseline for this and future reports. This data is a comprehensive representation of the QI-PD Participant's activities. There are some notable comparisons to the 2011-12 data through the data presented in this 2016-2017 report.

### **2016-17 Data Comparison**

The three following tables provide a comparison of activities over the past six fiscal years. Tables A and B list activities related to training participants, providers, and activities by direct service and infrastructure programs. Table C presents the number of participants by training category.

There is a significant increase in the number of participants and number of reported training activities from 2011-12 to 2016-17 in direct service programs. The number of direct service participants attending trainings rose from 24,456 in 2011-12 to 33,665 in 2016-17. This demonstrates an increase of 9,209 additional training participants from this sector. The infrastructure sector shows a slight decrease in the number of attendees. In 2016-17, there were 1,525 training participants, which was a decrease of 412 from the 2011-12 totals of 1,937.

There is a decrease in numbers in 2016-17 due to the Registry Pilot with the R&Rs.

Another 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 22,833 to a new total of 60,580. The numbers climbed in this category each year until 2016-17, when the switch was made for some agencies to only use the Registry to collect data. The trainings attended by infrastructure professionals decreased from 2,552 in 2011-12 to 2,164 at the end of 2016-17. This is the lowest number of reported activities in this category since the PD Profile data collection process began, probably due to some agencies only using the Registry to collect.

Interestingly, 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, Data Table 3, page 10. In each year, the 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.

<b>Table A: Direct Service Participants, Providers, Activities</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
Training Participants	24,456	29,882	29,793	35,759	37,789	33,665
Percent of Training Participants	93%	95%	92%	94%	95%	96%
Training Activities	37,747	55,888	56,389	72,211	76,105	60,580
Percent of Training Activities	94%	95%	93%	96%	97%	96%
Training Providers Submitting Data	11	11	13	13	12	13
Percent Attending One Training	71%	68%	69%	67%	66%	72%
Percent Attending Two Trainings	15%	15%	14%	15%	15%	13%
Percent Attending Three-plus Trainings	13%	15%	15%	16%	17%	14%
Children Served by Training Participants	256,113	307,682	334,524	464,856	442,857	374,717

<b>Table B: Infrastructure Participants, Providers, Activities</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Training Participants	1,937	1,668	2,479	2,165	1,831	1,525
Percent of Training Participants	7%	5%	8%	6%	6%	4%
Training Activities	2,552	2,675	4,263	3,157	2,651	2,164
Percent of Training Activities	6%	5%	7%	4%	3%	4%
Training Providers Submitting Data	8	9	9	9	8	8
Percent Attending One Training	80%	70%	72%	73%	75%	83%
Percent Attending Two Trainings	10%	16%	14%	15%	15%	7%
Percent Attending Three-plus Trainings	8%	13%	13%	10%	9%	8%
Children Served by Training Participants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table C presents the number of participants by training category in a six year comparison format. These numbers have changed over the past six years, due to a change 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.

<b>Table C: Participants by Training Category</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Coaching	225	346	1	727	67	0
Fee for Service	375	2,066	4,930	3,504	6,680	5,568
Financial Support for Training	337	1,829	2,333	6,581	4,545	4,701
Mentoring	1,092	765	755	949	1,006	356
Online Training	6	225	30	79	212	65
On-Site Training / Technical Assistance	2,638	3,176	3,287	3,273	2,211	1,917

<b>Table C: Participants by Training Category</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Retention Activities	923	1,203	1,380	1,751	1,351	1,425
Stipends	15,899	16,534	15,206	15,709	17,337	16,172
Trainer of Trainers	1,458	1,374	1,510	1,729	2,336	1,101
Trainings	17,593	31,141	31,215	41,058	43,000	29,070
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,546</b>	<b>58,659</b>	<b>60,647</b>	<b>75,360</b>	<b>78,745</b>	<b>60,375</b>

## Report Details

Throughout the report the N size on tables vary 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 Data Table 19, page 26.

These Figures 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 21,919 participants responded to questions related to F-18, and 20,825 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 33,665 (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 displays by 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 for a comprehensive format to examine the training opportunities available to the field and to identify specific topics that may require additional trainings. An example of this is found in the data reported in Data Table 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 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 EESD contractors and California Quality Rating and Improvement Systems as they develop plans to increase the quality of children's programs and the early care and education workforce.

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

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

**Regions, by County**

<b>Bay Area</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Coastal Area</b>	<b>Los Angeles County</b>	<b>Northern</b>	<b>Southern</b>
Alameda	Amador	Monterey	Los Angeles	Alpine *	Imperial
Contra Costa	Calaveras	San Benito		Butte	Orange
Marin	Fresno	San Luis Obispo		Colusa	Riverside
Napa	Inyo*	Santa Barbara		Del Norte	San Bernardino
San Francisco	Kern	Santa Cruz		El Dorado	San Diego
San Mateo	Kings	Ventura		Glenn	
Santa Clara	Madera			Humboldt	
Solano	Mariposa			Lake	
Sonoma	Merced			Lassen	
	Mono*			Mendocino	
	San Joaquin			Modoc	
	Stanislaus			Nevada	
	Tulare			Placer	
	Tuolumne			Plumas	
				Sacramento	
				Shasta	
				Sierra *	
				Siskiyou	
				Sutter	
				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
<b>Total training participants</b>	33,665	1,525	35,190
<b>Percent of training participants</b>	96%	4%	100%
<b>Total training activities</b>	60,580	2,164	62,744
<b>Percent of training activities</b>	96%	4%	100%
<b>Total children reported by training participants working in direct service program</b>	374,717	n/a	374,717

**Participant activities by professional development:**

AB212 Local Planning Council	9,853	0	9,853
Beginning Together	61	0	61
CA Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies	7,279	451	7,730
CA Collaborative on Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning	3,468	96	3,564
CA Early Childhood Mentor Program	532	27	559
CA Inclusion & Behavior Consultation Network	25	0	25
CA Preschool Instructional Network	6,825	700	7,525
CA School-Age Consortium	0	0	0
Child Care Initiative Project	14,780	793	15,573
Child Development Training Consortium	9,854	0	9,854
Desired Results Training	1,853	0	1,853
Faculty Initiative Project	13	69	82
Family Child Care at its Best	3,033	5	3,038
Program for Infant Toddler Care	635	23	658

**Percent of training participants by region of the state:**

Northern	12.23%	10.56%	n/a
Bay Area	18.67%	31.06%	n/a
Central	20.64%	20.91%	n/a
Coastal Area	8.69%	22.15%	n/a
Southern	16.60%	6.00%	n/a
Los Angeles County	23.17%	9.32%	n/a
N	21,694	483	22,177

**Percent of participants who attended:**

One training category	72%	83%	n/a
Two training categories	13%	7%	n/a
Three-plus training categories	14%	8%	n/a
N	33,665	1,525	35,190

In 2015-16, the infrastructure data collection process was modified by EESD, allowing agencies the opportunity to enter data in the CA ECE Workforce Registry. Agencies did not send any data directly to CDTC, which result in limiting access to data. The decrease in infrastructure data on Table 1 above is due to this modification of the data collection and reporting method.

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

**Data Table 1: Number of Participants by Training Category\***

N=60,375 (duplicated count)

Training Category	Activity Count
Coaching	0
Mentoring	356
Trainer-of-Trainer	1,101
Retention Activities	1,425
Technical Assistance	1,917
Financial Support for Training	4,701
Stipend	16,172
Fee-for-Service	5,568
Ongoing Training	65
Training	29,070

\*Refer to Glossary of Terms, page 39

This demonstrates 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. A significant number of practitioners are accessing stipends to increase their wages and advance their education. The most significant difference in the 2016-17 participant data is that it decreased by 18,370 from the previous year. This decrease corresponds to the modification of the data collection process for infrastructure programs. It is important to note that since the inception of the PD Profile data collection in 2012-13, the number of reported participants steadily increased each year beginning with 58,556 in 2012-13 up to 78,745 participants in 2015-16.

**Data Table 2: Number of Participants Attending 1, 2, or 3 plus Trainings**

(N=34,937)

Number of Trainings	Percent
1 training category	73%
2 training categories	13%
3 plus training categories	14%

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

The majority of participants only attended one training activity within this time period. While it is encouraging that 27% of participants attended multiple trainings, integration of EESD funded programs in support of increasing 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

#### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 3: Employment Setting**

(N=22,542)

Employment Setting	Percent
Child Care Center	74%
Family Child Care Home	14%
Informal Care	1%
Other/Not in ECE	12%

Based on available data, almost three-quarters of training participants are working in center based programs. Data Table 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.

#### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 4: Employment Setting, by Region**

Region	Child Care Center	Family child care home	Informal Care	Other/Not in ECE
Coastal Area N=1,812	69%	25%	1%	5%
Bay Area N=3,863	78%	15%	1%	6%
Southern N=3,467	78%	8%	1%	14%
Northern N=2,583	79%	15%	1%	6%
LA County N=4,911	80%	14%	1%	5%
Central N=4,298	80%	13%	1%	6%

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

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 5: Employment Setting, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	Licensed Child Care Center/Early Childhood Program	Licensed Family Child Care Home	License-Exempt Center or School-Age Program	Informal Provider	Other
<b>CCIP N=8,037</b>	18%	68%	2%	3%	9%
<b>FCCB N=1,938</b>	27%	60%	7%	2%	4%
<b>R &amp; R N=4,668</b>	47%	43%	3%	1%	5%
<b>PITC N=601</b>	63%	26%	6%	1%	4%
<b>BTG N=54</b>	80%	13%	0%	2%	6i%
<b>FIP N=8</b>	75%	13%	0%	0%	13%
<b>DR Trng N=1,567</b>	75%	13%	2%	1%	9%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,316</b>	83%	8%	4%	0%	7%
<b>AB212 N=8,686</b>	84%	6%	0%	2%	8%
<b>CDTC N=9,146</b>	83%	6%	4%	0%	7%
<b>CPIN N=4,653</b>	84%	5%	3%	0%	7%
<b>CECMP N=258</b>	88%	7%	3%	0%	2%
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	92%	0%	4%	0%	4%

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

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

(N=15,089 - Center Based Staff)

Primary Job Position	Percent
<b>Assistant Teacher</b>	42%
<b>Teacher</b>	40
<b>Site Supervisor</b>	4%
<b>Program Director</b>	5%
<b>Other</b>	9%

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

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

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

(N=4,757 -Family Child Care)

Primary Job Position	Percent
Other	14%
Assistant	19%
Owner/Operator	66%

The majority of the participants working in family child care are the owner or operator of their family child care home.

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

Region	Assistant Teacher	Teacher	Site Supervisor	Program Director	Other
<b>Coastal Area N=1,411</b>	36%	41%	7%	8%	8%
<b>Bay Area N=3,330</b>	39%	43%	4%	6%	7%
<b>Northern N=2,198</b>	40%	36%	7%	8%	9%
<b>Southern N=3,192</b>	40%	39%	3%	5%	12%
<b>Central N=3,792</b>	42%	39%	5%	6%	9%
<b>LA County N=4,399</b>	46%	38%	3%	5%	9%

*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.

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 9: Primary Job Position for Center Staff, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	Assistant Teacher	Other	Program Director	Site Supervisor	Teacher
<b>FIP N=8</b>	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	4%	0%	36%	24%	36%
<b>CCIP N=3,204</b>	25%	33%	11%	2%	29%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,174</b>	25%	16%	8%	7%	43%
<b>BTG N=52</b>	27%	10%	10%	13%	40%
<b>PITC N=475</b>	28%	15%	9%	6%	42%
<b>DR Trng N=1,392</b>	28%	11%	8%	11%	42%
<b>CPIN N=4,508</b>	31%	7%	7%	8%	46%
<b>R &amp; R N=3,080</b>	32%	16%	10%	3%	39%
<b>FCCB N=957</b>	33%	16%	9%	4%	38%
<b>AB212 N=8,245</b>	37%	6%	6%	7%	45%
<b>CECMP N=241</b>	41%	7%	24%	5%	23%
<b>CDTC N=8,720</b>	58%	9%	2%	1%	30%

*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 data tables present information about training participants caring for Dual Language Learners.*

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 10: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL)**

(N=25,651)

DLL	Percent
<b>Care for children who are DLL</b>	68%
<b>Do not care for children who are DLL</b>	22%
<b>I don't know</b>	10%

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.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:**

**Data Table 11: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	Care for children who are DLL	Do not care for children who are DLL	I don't know
<b>Family Child Care Assistant N=681</b>	61%	28%	11%
<b>Family Child Care Owner N=2,739</b>	63%	34%	3%
<b>Other N=1,656</b>	70%	21%	9%
<b>Assistant Teacher N=7,300</b>	75%	15%	11%
<b>Teacher N=7,642</b>	80%	15%	4%
<b>Director - Single Site N=307</b>	81%	18%	2%
<b>Site Supervisor N=820</b>	89%	9%	2%
<b>Director - Multi-Site N=108</b>	92%	5%	3%

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

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

**Percentage of QI-PD Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:**

**Data Table 12: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Region**

Region	Care for children who are DLL	Do not care for children who are DLL	I don't know
<b>Northern N=2,523</b>	70%	24%	7%
<b>Southern N=3,445</b>	74%	17%	10%
<b>Bay Area N=3,824</b>	75%	19%	6%
<b>LA County N=4,821</b>	76%	16%	8%
<b>Coastal Area N=1,800</b>	78%	17%	5%
<b>Central N=4,232</b>	79%	15%	6%

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.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:**

**Data Table 13: Caring for Children who are Dual Language Learners (DLL), by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	Care for children who are DLL	Do not care for children who are DLL	I don't know
<b>CCIP N=9,961</b>	56%	42%	2%
<b>CDTC N=9,142</b>	68%	19%	13%
<b>R &amp; R N=4,891</b>	71%	25%	4%
<b>CECMP N=258</b>	74%	20%	7%
<b>FCCB N=1,932</b>	74%	23%	3%
<b>PITC N=593</b>	81%	14%	5%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,505</b>	82%	15%	3%
<b>BTG N=53</b>	83%	17%	0%
<b>DR Trng N=1,571</b>	83%	12%	5%
<b>AB212 N=8,765</b>	85%	11%	4%
<b>CPIN N=4,668</b>	85%	10%	5%
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	96%	4%	0%
<b>FIP N=8</b>	100%	0%	0%

Most of the participants trained by professional development providers 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.*

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:**

**Data Table 14: Caring for Children with an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) or Individualized Education Plan (IEP)**

(N=22,141)

IFSP/IEP	Percent
<b>Care for children with IFSP/IEP</b>	41%
<b>Do not care for children with IFSP/IEP</b>	39%
<b>I don't know</b>	20%

Given that 20 percent of the participants responded they do not know whether or not they work with children who have an IFSP or IEP, more training is needed in this area.

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

Primary Position	Care for children with IFSP/IEP	Do not care for children with IFSP/IEP	I don't know
<b>Family Child Care Assistant N=672</b>	19%	46%	35%
<b>Family Child Care Owner N=2,688</b>	20%	64%	16%
<b>Assistant Teacher N=7,189</b>	40%	31%	29%
<b>Teacher N=7,564</b>	47%	38%	15%
<b>Other N=1,684</b>	54%	27%	19%
<b>Director - Single Site N=310</b>	63%	32%	5%
<b>Site Supervisor N=809</b>	68%	23%	9%
<b>Director - Multi-Site N=112</b>	90%	6%	4%

There is a significant variation 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.

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

Region	Care for children with IFSP/IEP	Do not care for children with IFSP/IEP	I don't know
<b>Bay Area N=3,789</b>	35%	42%	23%
<b>LA County N=4,810</b>	41%	37%	22%
<b>Coastal Area N=1,772</b>	42%	37%	21%
<b>Southern N=3,428</b>	43%	32%	25%
<b>Central N=4,188</b>	46%	37%	17%
<b>Northern N=2,502</b>	50%	32%	18%

There is little variation of the number of participants working with children with special needs across regions of the state.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 17: Caring for Children with an IFSP or IEP, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	Care for children with IFSP/IEP	Do not care for children with IFSP/IEP	I don't know
<b>CCIP N=7,032</b>	25%	55%	20%
<b>FCCB N=1,866</b>	25%	55%	21%
<b>R &amp; R N=4,601</b>	32%	47%	21%
<b>CDTC N=9,120</b>	33%	33%	34%
<b>CECMP N=255</b>	38%	36%	26%
<b>PITC N=591</b>	40%	41%	19%
<b>BTG N=52</b>	46%	27%	27%
<b>DR Trng N=1,545</b>	50%	33%	17%
<b>FIP N=8</b>	50%	38%	13%
<b>AB212 N=8,606</b>	51%	32%	17%
<b>CPIN N=4,561</b>	53%	31%	16%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,312</b>	56%	31%	13%
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	80%	20%	0%

There is some 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.*

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 18: Number of Paid Hours Worked per Week**

(N=21,919)

Hours per Week	Percent
<b>Less than 20 hours per week</b>	15%
<b>20-34 hours per week</b>	22%
<b>35 or more hours per week</b>	63%

The majority of the training participants work full-time: 35 or more hours per.

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

(N=20,825)

<b>Months worked per year</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>9 months or less</b>	14%
<b>10 months</b>	21%
<b>11 months</b>	8%
<b>Full year - 12 months</b>	57%

Just over half of the training participants work a full year: 12 months.

**QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Table 2: 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 statistics from other data sources, 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	6,849
	Teacher	5	7,298
	Site Supervisor	7	791
	Director - Single Site	6	294
	Director - Multiple Sites	7	108
	Family Child Care Owner	9	2,142
	Family Child Care Assistant	4	621
	Other	4	1,592
Tenure in the ECE Field	Assistant Teacher	7	6,949
	Teacher	11	7,412
	Site Supervisor	20	808
	Director - Single Site	17	302
	Director - Multiple Sites	19	109
	Family Child Care Owner	12	2,436
	Family Child Care Assistant	5	579
	Other	13	1,542
Tenure with Current Employer	Assistant Teacher	5	6,936
	Teacher	7	7,369
	Site Supervisor	10	809
	Director - Single Site	9	299
	Director - Multiple Sites	12	112
	Family Child Care Owner	9	2,372
	Family Child Care Assistant	4	629
	Other	6	1,624

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

<b>Job Position</b>	<b>Mean Hourly Wage</b>	<b>Full-Time Equivalent Salary</b>	<b>N</b>
Assistant Teacher	\$13	\$26,787.67	6,077
Teacher	\$16	\$33,542.26	5,558
Site Supervisor	\$20	\$41,408.59	503
Director - Single Site	\$21	\$43,893.11	127
Director - Multiple Sites	\$26	\$54,335.40	31
Family Child Care Owner	\$12	\$25,617.53	520
Family Child Care Assistant	\$12	\$24,186.55	472
Other	\$16	\$34,107.17	1,030

## 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.

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 20: Highest Level of Education**

(N=24,466)

Highest Level of Education Attained	Percent
High School/GED or less	47%
Associate's Degree	24%
Bachelor's Degree	23%
Graduate Degree	6%

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

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 21: Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	High School/GED or less	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree
Director - Multi-Site N=115	5%	7%	43%	45%
Director - Single Site N=314	9%	18%	49%	24%
Site Supervisor N=809	11%	35%	45%	10%
Teacher N=7,656	28%	31%	33%	8%
Other N=1,779	37%	16%	31%	17%
Assistant Teacher N=7,324	62%	23%	13%	2%
Family Child Care Owner N=2,809	65%	19%	13%	3%
Family Child Care Assistant N=703	72%	15%	12%	1%

Family child care owners and assistants, along with center assistant teaching staff, have a significantly lower number of a college degrees.

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

Region	High School/GED or less	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree
<b>Bay Area N=12,067</b>	44%	24%	26%	6%
<b>Northern N=8,275</b>	44%	30%	22%	4%
<b>Central N=15,815</b>	45%	32%	20%	3%
<b>Southern N=8,373</b>	46%	24%	23%	7%
<b>Coastal Area N=5,812</b>	49%	25%	20%	6%
<b>LA County N=10,060</b>	50%	23%	21%	5%

The percentage of training participants working in direct service programs with a degree does not vary much by region.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 23: Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	High School/GED or less	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	0%	16%	44%	40%
<b>FIP N=13</b>	8%	15%	31%	46%
<b>CPIN N=5,051</b>	29%	33%	30%	8%
<b>DR Trng N=1,663</b>	31%	26%	32%	12%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,603</b>	33%	28%	30%	9%
<b>AB212 N=9,006</b>	37%	28%	27%	7%
<b>PITC N=633</b>	44%	25%	25%	6%
<b>CECMP N=486</b>	50%	20%	19%	11%
<b>BTG N=52</b>	54%	33%	4%	10%
<b>R &amp; R N=5,280</b>	56%	24%	17%	3%
<b>CDTC N=9,703</b>	61%	21%	15%	2%
<b>FCCB N=2,018</b>	62%	19%	15%	3%
<b>CCIP N=11,632</b>	66%	18%	12%	3%

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.*

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:**

**Data Table 24: Current Permit Level**

(N=23,770)

Current Permit Level	Percent
No Permit	45%
Assistant Teacher Permit	6%
Associate Teacher Permit	13%
Teacher Permit	13%
Master Teacher Permit	3%
Site Supervisor Permit	14%
Program Director Permit	4%
Children's Center Permit	1%

Fifty-four percent 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.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:**

**Data Table 25: Current Permit Level, by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	No Permit	Assistant/ Associate Teacher Permit	Teacher/ Master Teacher Permit	Site Supervisor	Program Director	Children's Center Permit
Site Supervisor N=807	7%	2%	3%	72%	14%	1%
Director - Multi-Site N=114	15%	0%	2%	12%	69%	2%
Director - Single Site N=305	24%	2%	3%	32%	39%	1%
Teacher N=7,615	24%	15%	32%	24%	4%	1%
Assistant Teacher N=7,303	53%	32%	12%	3%	0%	0%
Other N=1,722	58%	10%	8%	15%	8%	1%
Family Child Care Owner N=2,616	58%	23%	10%	5%	3%	1%
Family Child Care Assistant N=681	72%	20%	6%	1%	0%	0%

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 26: Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	No permit	Assistant/ Associate Teacher Permit	Teacher/ Master Teacher Permit	Site Supervisor	Program Director	Children's Center Permit	Not Specified
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	0%	0%	20%	36%	44%	0%	0%
<b>BTG N=54</b>	15%	28%	31%	24%	2%	0%	0%
<b>CPIN N=4,973</b>	22%	18%	26%	27%	7%	0%	0%
<b>AB212 N=8,949</b>	25%	23%	26%	22%	4%	0%	0%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,596</b>	28%	18%	20%	26%	8%	0%	0%
<b>DR Trng N=1,629</b>	28%	18%	20%	24%	10%	0%	0%
<b>FIP N=13</b>	31%	15%	8%	8%	31%	0%	0%
<b>PITC N=584</b>	35%	22%	20%	15%	7%	0%	0%
<b>R &amp; R N=5,005</b>	44%	20%	16%	16%	4%	0%	0%
<b>FCCB N=1,924</b>	48%	23%	14%	9%	4%	0%	0%
<b>CECMP N=485</b>	59%	8%	16%	8%	8%	0%	0%
<b>CDTC N=9,651</b>	63%	23%	11%	3%	0%	0%	0%
<b>CCIP N=10,937</b>	69%	13%	9%	5%	3%	0%	0%

### 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.

#### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

##### Data Table 27: Gender

(N=20,380)

Participant Gender	Percent
Male	33%
Female	67%

In 2016-17, the data shows the highest number of male participants reported in the workforce since the inception of this report. The number of males reported in 2012-13 was 18%. And the number increased in just one year by 13% from 2015-16.

#### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

##### Data Table 28: Race/Ethnicity

(N=24,419)

Race	Percent
Latino/Hispanic	54%
Asian	10%
White/Caucasian	23%
Multi-racial and other	6%
Black/African American	7%

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

Race/ethnicity of participants has remained steady, within only a couple percentage points difference, from year to year.

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

Primary Position	Asian	Black/African American	Latino/Hispanic	Multi-racial and other	White/Caucasian
<b>Director - Multi-Site N=115</b>	6%	8%	37%	5%	44%
<b>Other N=1,759</b>	8%	8%	50%	7%	27%
<b>Site Supervisor N=810</b>	9%	6%	50%	7%	28%
<b>Assistant Teacher N=7,348</b>	9%	6%	60%	6%	19%
<b>Family Child Care Owner N=2,835</b>	9%	7%	60%	4%	19%
<b>Director - Single Site N=312</b>	10%	11%	22%	7%	50%
<b>Teacher N=7,660</b>	11%	8%	49%	7%	26%
<b>Family Child Care Assistant N=708</b>	12%	8%	60%	4%	16%

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

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 30: Age**

(N=29,396)

Age Range	Percent
<b>29 years or younger</b>	22%
<b>30-39 years</b>	23%
<b>40-49 years</b>	23%
<b>50-59 years</b>	22%
<b>60 years or older</b>	10%

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

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.

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 31: Age, by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	29 years or younger	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60 years or older
<b>Director - Multi-Site N=108</b>	4%	22%	37%	27%	10%
<b>Family Child Care Owner N=2,689</b>	5%	19%	33%	31%	12%
<b>Site Supervisor N=788</b>	11%	25%	27%	27%	10%
<b>Director - Single Site N=302</b>	12%	21%	25%	29%	14%
<b>Teacher N=6,832</b>	22%	26%	25%	20%	7%
<b>Other N=1,597</b>	29%	26%	21%	17%	7%
<b>Assistant Teacher N=6,629</b>	37%	23%	19%	16%	5%
<b>Family Child Care Assistant N=646</b>	43%	21%	17%	13%	6%

*In the next few data tables, 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.*

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 32: Language Fluency**

(N=23,268)

Language	Percent
<b>English</b>	81%
<b>Spanish</b>	56%

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

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:

**Data Table 33: Language Fluency, by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	English	Spanish
<b>Family Child Care Owner N= 3,549</b>	44%	56%
<b>Family Child Care Assistant N= 875</b>	52%	48%
<b>Assistant Teacher N= 10,013</b>	58%	42%
<b>Site Supervisor N= 1,117</b>	62%	38%
<b>Teacher N= 10,282</b>	63%	37%
<b>Other N= 2,406</b>	63%	37%
<b>Director - Multi-Site N= 161</b>	74%	26%
<b>Director - Single Site N= 404</b>	80%	20%

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

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

Region	English	Mandarin/Cantonese	Spanish
<b>Coastal Area N=2,721</b>	46%	0%	54%
<b>LA County N=6,691</b>	51%	2%	47%
<b>Central N=6,533</b>	57%	0%	43%
<b>Bay Area N=4,699</b>	59%	11%	30%
<b>Southern N=4,875</b>	60%	1%	40%
<b>Northern N=3,294</b>	77%	0%	23%

The Bay Area region consistently reports the most fluency in Mandarin/Cantonese of all regions.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Direct Service Programs:****Data Table 35: Language Fluency, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	English	Spanish
<b>FCCB N=2,015</b>	49%	65%
<b>CCIP N=11,223</b>	55%	61%
<b>BTG N=53</b>	58%	91%
<b>PITC N=630</b>	66%	69%
<b>R &amp; R N=5,192</b>	67%	61%
<b>AB212 N=8,951</b>	76%	59%
<b>DR Trng N=1,636</b>	76%	46%
<b>CPIN N=5,005</b>	78%	55%
<b>CCSEFEL N=2,583</b>	79%	57%
<b>FIP N=13</b>	85%	31%
<b>CDTC N=9,622</b>	86%	45%
<b>CECMP N=484</b>	87%	33%
<b>CIBC N=25</b>	96%	20%

### 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

##### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:

**Data Table 36: Employment Setting**

(N=346)

Setting	Percent
4-Year College/University	5%
Training Organization	6%
Community College	17%
Other	22%
K-3 Setting	23%
R&R	27%

Although the number of participants has dropped from 1,264 in 2015-16 to 446, the data shows that over 50 percent of training participants working in an infrastructure program are consistently employed through Resource & Referral or other training organizations.

##### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:

**Data Table 37: Primary Job Position**

(N=335)

Position	Percent
Consultant	3%
Trainer	8%
K-3 Teacher	8%
Coach/Mentor	9%
Director/Executive Director	10%
Program Staff	10%
Other	17%
Manager/Coordinator	17%
College Faculty	18%

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

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

(N=672)

Hours per Week	Percent
Less than 20 hours per week	9%
20-34 hours per week	12%
35 or more hours per week	79%

Most training participants work full time: 35 or more hours per week.

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

(N=672)

Months per Year	Percent
9 months or less	5%
10 months	20%
11 months	9%
Full year - 12 months	64%

Most training participants work a full year - 12 months. The 2016-17 data shows six-percent increase of 12 month employees, and a decrease of participants working 10 months or less.

**QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:****Table 4: 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	5	24
	Consultant	3	10
	Director/Executive Director	7	27
	Trainer	7	26
	Program Staff	6	36
	Manager/Coordinator	4	53
	College Faculty	9	61
	Coach/Mentor	4	28
	Other	6	48
Tenure in the ECE field	K-3 Teacher	12	24
	Consultant	31	9
	Director/Executive Director	18	26
	Trainer	18	25
	Program Staff	13	32
	Manager/Coordinator	17	51
	College Faculty	24	61
	Coach/Mentor	18	29
	Other	13	53
Tenure with current employer	K-3 Teacher	11	27
	Consultant	3	10
	Director/Executive Director	15	29
	Trainer	9	26
	Program Staff	8	36
	Manager/Coordinator	9	53
	College Faculty	11	61
	Coach/Mentor	6	28
	Other	9	51

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

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

<b>Job Position</b>	<b>Mean Hourly Wage</b>	<b>Full-Time Equivalent Salary</b>	<b>N</b>
K-3 Teacher	\$28	\$58,606.72	22
Consultant	\$31	\$65,008.82	9
Director/Executive Director	\$30	\$62,706.99	27
Trainer	\$24	\$50,762.22	23
Program Staff	\$18	\$37,577.89	32
Manager/Coordinator	\$30	\$61,764.44	51
College Faculty	\$45	\$93,260.51	48
Coach/Mentor	\$30	\$63,202.48	25
Other	\$22	\$46,213.85	45

*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.

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

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:

**Data Table 40: Highest Level of Education**

(N=851)

Education	Percent
High School/GED or less	30%
Associate's Degree	15%
Bachelor's Degree	31%
Graduate Degree	24%

People working in infrastructure organizations tend to have a higher level of education than the workforce that works directly with children. Twenty-four percent have graduate degrees compared to six percent of direct service participants. This compares to thirty percent reported High School/GED or less, compared to forty-seven percent of direct service participants.

### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:

**Data Table 41: Highest Level of Education, by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	High School/GED or less	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree
Consultant N=9	0%	0%	22%	78%
College Faculty N=61	2%	0%	2%	97%
K-3 Teacher N=28	4%	11%	57%	29%
Trainer N=27	4%	7%	52%	37%
Manager/Coordinator N=58	5%	9%	40%	47%
Director/Executive Director N=31	6%	10%	35%	48%
Coach/Mentor N=29	7%	21%	48%	24%
Other N=57	28%	18%	35%	19%
Program Staff N=35	34%	11%	40%	14%

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:****Data Table 42: Highest Level of Education, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	High School/GED or less	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree
<b>FIP N=69</b>	0%	0%	6%	94%
<b>CCSEFEL N=66</b>	5%	12%	42%	41%
<b>CECMP N=22</b>	9%	0%	32%	59%
<b>CPIN N=435</b>	14%	19%	44%	23%
<b>PITC N=23</b>	22%	17%	17%	43%
<b>CCIP N=481</b>	56%	14%	27%	3%
<b>R &amp; R N=265</b>	60%	16%	15%	9%

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

(N=802)

Permit	Percent
<b>No Permit</b>	44%
<b>Assistant Teacher Permit</b>	5%
<b>Associate Teacher Permit</b>	6%
<b>Master Teacher Permit</b>	2%
<b>Site Supervisor Permit</b>	17%
<b>Program Director Permit</b>	17%
<b>Children's Center Permit</b>	1%

Forty-eight percent of the training participants hold a current permit, with the greatest percentage reporting a site supervisor or program director permit. However, both permit levels also show a decrease from the previous year, thirteen percent and eight percent respectively. This may be due to the decrease in the participant data received for infrastructure programs.

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

Primary Position	No Permit	Site Supervisor Permit	Program Director Permit	All Other Permits
<b>College Faculty N=57</b>	28%	7%	61%	4%
<b>Director/Executive Director N=27</b>	30%	19%	52%	0%
<b>Coach/Mentor N=30</b>	33%	37%	20%	10%
<b>Consultant N=7</b>	43%	0%	43%	14%
<b>Manager/Coordinator N=55</b>	53%	16%	29%	2%
<b>Other N=53</b>	53%	15%	19%	13%
<b>Program Staff N=31</b>	65%	26%	6%	3%
<b>Trainer N=26</b>	65%	15%	12%	8%
<b>K-3 Teacher N=26</b>	73%	8%	0%	19%

**Percentage QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:****Data Table 45: Current Permit Level, by Professional Development Provider**

PD Provider	Program Director Permit	Site Supervisor Permit	All Other Permits	No Permit
<b>CCIP N=458</b>	2%	6%	23%	69%
<b>R &amp; R N=240</b>	5%	6%	27%	62%
<b>CPIN N=415</b>	19%	26%	28%	28%
<b>PITC N=21</b>	29%	10%	24%	38%
<b>CCSEFEL N=65</b>	34%	17%	2%	48%
<b>CECMP N=22</b>	55%	23%	0%	23%
<b>FIP N=64</b>	63%	11%	3%	23%

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

#### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:

**Data Table 46: Gender**

(N=795)

Gender	Percent
Male	41%
Female	59%

The male representation jumped to forty-one percent of the training participants, an increase of twenty-seven percent from the previous year. However, this may also be due to the overall decrease in participant data received for infrastructure programs. It's hard to know with a difference of 339 total participants calculating the percentage.

#### Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:

**Data Table 47: Race/Ethnicity**

(N=900)

RACE	Percent
Latino/Hispanic	55%
Asian	9%
White/Caucasian	27%
Multi-racial and other	5%
Black/African American	4%

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

This figure demonstrates the majority of participants' race/ethnicity as Latino/Hispanic, with a twenty-one percent increase and a nineteen percent decrease of White/Caucasian from the previous year. The N number also reflects a decrease of 642 total participants reporting data.

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

Position	White/ Caucasian	Latino/ Hispanic	Asian	Black/African American	Multi-racial and other
<b>Trainer N=27</b>	30%	52%	0%	7%	11%
<b>Program Staff N=35</b>	34%	43%	11%	6%	6%
<b>Coach/Mentor N=29</b>	34%	48%	3%	3%	10%
<b>Other N=57</b>	39%	42%	4%	5%	11%
<b>College Faculty N=60</b>	43%	27%	8%	18%	3%
<b>Manager/Coordinator N=57</b>	49%	44%	0%	4%	4%
<b>Director/Executive Director N=30</b>	60%	23%	7%	0%	10%
<b>Consultant N=9</b>	67%	11%	11%	0%	11%
<b>K-3 Teacher N=26</b>	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:****Data Table 49: Age**

(N=1,353)

Age Range	Percent
<b>29 years or younger</b>	7%
<b>30-39 years</b>	20%
<b>40-49 years</b>	31%
<b>50-59 years</b>	28%
<b>60 years or older</b>	15%

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

Similar to the direct service participants, most of the participants working in infrastructure organizations are women and over 40 years of age.

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:**

**Data Table 50: Age, by Primary Job Position**

Primary Position	29 years or younger	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60 years or older
<b>Consultant N=9</b>	0%	22%	0%	33%	44%
<b>Coach/Mentor N=29</b>	0%	24%	38%	31%	7%
<b>College Faculty N=58</b>	2%	16%	22%	29%	31%
<b>Manager/Coordinator N=56</b>	5%	23%	23%	30%	18%
<b>Director/Executive Director N=31</b>	6%	13%	35%	29%	16%
<b>Trainer N=25</b>	8%	24%	32%	24%	12%
<b>Other N=54</b>	11%	13%	44%	24%	7%
<b>Program Staff N=32</b>	13%	34%	19%	25%	9%
<b>K-3 Teacher N=28</b>	14%	21%	32%	18%	14%

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

**Percentage of QI-PD Training Participants Working in Infrastructure Programs:**

**Data Table 51: Languages Spoken Fluently**

(N=807)

Language	Percent
<b>English</b>	78%
<b>Spanish</b>	61%

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

The percentage of participants working in infrastructure organizations and direct service programs are almost identical.

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

<b>Primary Position</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Spanish</b>
<b>K-3 Teacher N=34</b>	91%	9%
<b>Consultant N=11</b>	82%	18%
<b>Director/Executive Director N=37</b>	76%	24%
<b>Trainer N=28</b>	54%	46%
<b>Program Staff N=42</b>	64%	36%
<b>Manager/Coordinator N=79</b>	70%	30%
<b>College Faculty N=65</b>	77%	23%
<b>Coach/Mentor N=43</b>	72%	28%
<b>Other N=58</b>	78%	22%

## 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)	<a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/lpccontacts.asp">www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/lpccontacts.asp</a>
Beginning Together (BTG)	<a href="http://www.cainclusion.org/bt">www.cainclusion.org/bt</a>
CA Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies (R&R)	<a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/rragencylist.asp">www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/rragencylist.asp</a>
CA Collaborative on Social & Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CCSEFEL)	<a href="https://cainclusion.org/camap/center-on-the-social-and-emotional-foundations-for-early-learning/">https://cainclusion.org/camap/center-on-the-social-and-emotional-foundations-for-early-learning/</a>
CA Early Childhood Mentor Program (CECMP)	<a href="http://www.ecementor.org">www.ecementor.org</a>
CA Inclusion & Behavior Consultation Network (CIBC)	<a href="http://www.cibc-ca.org">www.cibc-ca.org</a>
CA Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN)	<a href="http://www.cpin.us">www.cpin.us</a>
CA School-Age Consortium (CalSAC)	<a href="http://www.calsac.org">www.calsac.org</a>
Child Care Initiative Project (CCIP)	<a href="http://www.rnetwork.org/ccip_quality">http://www.rnetwork.org/ccip_quality</a>
Child Development Training Consortium (CDTC)	<a href="http://www.childdevelopment.org">www.childdevelopment.org</a>
Desired Results Training (DR Training)	<a href="http://www.wested.org/desiredresults">www.wested.org/desiredresults</a>
Faculty Initiative Project (FIP)	<a href="http://www.wested.org/facultyinitiative">www.wested.org/facultyinitiative</a>
Family Child Care at its Best (FCCB)	<a href="https://humanservices.ucdavis.edu/programs/center-excellence-child-development/family-child-care-its-best">https://humanservices.ucdavis.edu/programs/center-excellence-child-development/family-child-care-its-best</a>
Program for Infant Toddler Care (PITC)	<a href="http://www.pitc.org/pub/pitc_docs/home.csp">http://www.pitc.org/pub/pitc_docs/home.csp</a>