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Building a Business: Certified Family Child Care Management

Training Series

Report of Evaluation

In 2010 a new management training series curriculum was developed for owners and operators of certified family child care facilities. To ensure positive outcomes the training was designed to be intensive, continuous, focused and relationship based. These characteristics reflect research based best practices in the professional development of childhood care and education providers (Weber & Trauten, 2008). A comprehensive formative evaluation was designed as an integral component of the training. This report presents an overview of the Building a Business training, a description of the evaluation plan, and findings of the evaluation for the first two cohorts of participants who were enrolled in the training. Recommendations and considerations informed by the findings are presented in the final section of the report.

OVERVIEW OF THE TRAINING SERIES

Curriculum

The Building a Business curriculum is approved for 60 clock hours in the core knowledge category of Program Management and is designed to be offered to cohorts. The curriculum consists of 23 individual sessions organized into five modules with the following goals:

1. Developing plans for a certified family child care home that is based on sound business practices and developmentally appropriate practices
2. Building the structure for a certified family child care home that is financially stable and reflects best practices for children, families, staff, the provider and her/his family
3. Designing the physical environments of a certified family child care home that reflect the family culture and program mission statement and philosophy and meets standards of regulation and quality
4. Planning a human environment in a certified family child care home that is productive, respectful and supportive of staff, families, own family and provider’s interests and needs
5. Developing effective ways to communicate and collaborate with families, prospective clients, professional colleagues, neighbors, and community partners

Included in Appendix A is an overview of the curriculum. Twenty two of the sessions are 2 ½ hours in length. One session is 5 hours in length. A total of 29 business documents and plans, recognized in the research as indicators of best business practices, were identified and selected to be the “outcomes” of the training program. The outcomes would suggest a sustainable family child care business that follows best practices for children, families, and staff and are congruent with Oregon Programs of Quality (OPQ) standards.
The curriculum was reviewed by an Oregon Registry Trainer Program Review Team and approved for its consistency with Set One standards for the first module of 4 sessions and Set Two standards for the subsequent four modules of 19 sessions.

**Delivery of Training and Technical Assistance**

The first cohort of 23 providers from certified family child care programs began in September of 2010 and concluded in August of 2011. The second cohort of 18 providers was completed between April, 2011, and February, 2012. Both cohorts were offered through a collaborative effort between Oregon Association for the Education of Young Children and Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education (OCCD).

The training for Cohort 1 was held once a month on Saturdays for 12 months with five hours of training per Saturday. All training sessions were conducted at the Oregon Association for the Education of Young Children offices in Gladstone, Oregon. The training for Cohort 2 was also held on Saturdays for five hours, but in a 10-month time frame. Cohort 2 met at Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon. For each cohort, lodging and travel costs were paid for participants who needed to travel from a distance. On the training days, light breakfasts and lunches were provided.

Trainers were certified Oregon Registry Master Trainers with a minimum of a bachelor’s degree in the field and experience with family child care. Seven trainers participated in the delivery of the curriculum.

Participants in both cohorts were given an option to enroll for six graduate or undergraduate credits from Portland State University through Continuing Education in the Graduate School of Education. In addition to attending the 60 hours of training, participants who enrolled in the credit option completed six assignments, which were evaluated by an instructor of record at Portland State.

A relationship-based coaching component (Boller, Blair, Del Grosso & Paulsell, 2010; Morrisey & Banghart, 2007; National Association for the Education of Young Children & National Association of Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies, 2011; Tout, Isner & Zaslow, 2011; Weber & Trauten, 2008) was built into the curriculum to lend individual technical assistance to the participants as they worked to achieve the outcomes. Coaches were required to have at least a bachelor’s degree in the field and experience with family child care. In order to develop individual relationships between coaches and participants the ratio of participants to coaches was no more than 12 or fewer participants per coach (Bromer, Van Haitsma, Daley, & Modigliani, 2008). The coaches also attended alternating training sessions to assist the trainers and to give continuity to the participants.

The coaching model as initially designed included five small group phone meetings and five one-on-one conferences per participant, including at least one home visit, interspersed throughout the training program. In response to information received from coaches and participants in their focus groups in Cohort 1, the coaching model was adjusted slightly during the course of Cohort 2. Instead of the convening the remaining small group conferences by phone, the coaches met with their small groups of participants in person during the lunch break on some Saturdays of the classes.

Logistics and arrangements for the training and coaching for both cohorts were coordinated by Oregon Association for the Education of Young Children. Development of curriculum, orientation and ongoing
support of the trainers, coach training, and program evaluation were completed by Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education at Portland State University. The development of the curriculum, coaching model, and delivery model was guided by an advisory committee that included child care resource and referral staff, Child Care Division licensing specialists, and family child care providers. A focus group of family child care providers, convened before the beginning of curriculum development, helped conceptualize the curriculum topics and delivery model.

**Preparation and Technical Assistance for Trainers and Coaches**

The Building a Business curriculum includes guides for the trainers for each session that include the session description, relevant standard from the Core Body of Knowledge for Oregon’s Childhood Care and Education Profession (Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education, 2008), session objectives, outcomes, major topics, suggested activities, suggested topical outlines, references, and resources (Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education, 2010). Using these guides, the Building a Business trainers were asked to develop their individual sessions.

Trainers and coaches attended an orientation to the curriculum in a one-day session, held a month before the beginning of the training series. The training day included a workshop session for trainers to work independently on the development of their sessions with one-on-one technical assistance from OCCD staff.

A separate training session was conducted for the coaches that included the research base and coaching model for Building a Business. The session included opportunities for coaches to practice using the coaching tools reliably with technical assistance from OCCD staff. Trainers were invited to attend the coach training, but their attendance was not mandatory.

Six of the Cohort 1 trainers continued to teach in Cohort 2. A new trainer was added to Cohort 2. Since the delivery of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 overlapped, two new coaches were brought in to Cohort 2. The Cohort 2 trainers and coaches met together with OAEYC and OCCD staff before the commencement of Cohort 2 in order to share experiences from Cohort 1 and participate in team-building experiences.

Throughout the delivery of both cohorts, trainers and coaches participated with staff from OCCD and OAEYC in idea sharing via group email exchanges following each training weekend. Following the trainings on Saturdays, those trainers and coordinators who had been present debriefed the group about successes, observations, lessons learned, and modifications made. Additionally, email exchanges and phone calls between OCCD staff, OAEYC staff and individual trainers and coaches, lent more technical assistance opportunities for the trainers and coaches on a one-on-one basis.

**Costs and Funding**

The total cost per participant for the 40 participants who remained enrolled in the two cohorts was $2,265. The cohort funders included the Oregon Child Care Division with funds from the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The Oregon Community Foundation funded Betty Gray scholarships in the amount of $675 per participant. Building a Business participants, themselves, were asked to pay $120 toward the cost of the training. The participants who enrolled for six credits from Portland State University paid an additional $330 to PSU.
Participants were given a total of 8 books, selected from a variety written especially for family child care providers to support quality and best practices. They also received a CD-Rom with sample forms, handbooks, and records that were developed for use in family child care home businesses.

Participants

**Cohort 1.** The 23 participants were selected from a pool of applicants based upon essays indicating the reasons why they felt they would benefit from the training and the skills and interests that they would bring to the cohort. Participants also were chosen based upon their availability and commitment to attend all the training sessions. They were required to have a Step 3 or higher on the Oregon Registry.

They came from 11 different counties in Oregon. In total, they were caring for 454 children. Twenty-two were female; one was male; two self-identified their ethnicity as White/Hispanic/Latino, one as Asian/Pacific Islander, one as Black/non-Hispanic/non-Latino, one as Multi-Ethnic, and 18 as White/non-Hispanic/non-Latino. Of the 23 participants, 19 completed the training series. Twelve had perfect attendance at all 60 hours of training. Three participants dropped out of the cohort, and one participated irregularly. A total of 1194 cumulative training hours were delivered to Cohort 1, averaging 51.9 hours per participant. One of the Cohort 1 participants completed the Portland State University course for six undergraduate credits.

**Cohort 2.** The 18 participants submitted similar application materials and also had a Step 3 or higher on the Oregon Registry. They came from 7 different counties in Oregon, caring for 254 children. Seventeen were female; one was male; four self-identified their ethnicity as White/Hispanic/Latino, one as American Indian/Alaska Native; and thirteen as White/non-Hispanic/non-Latino. Six completed the training series with perfect attendance. No participants dropped out; one participated irregularly. A total of 983 cumulative training hours were delivered to Cohort 2, averaging 54.6 hours per participant. Four of the Cohort 2 participants completed the Portland State University course, three for six undergraduate credits and one for six graduate credits.

**Building a Business Outcomes**

Desired outcomes of the training were selected, based upon a review of research and best practices (Copeland, 2009; Copeland, 2006; Copeland, 2009; Copeland, 1999; Copeland, T. & Millard, 2004; Morrisey & Banghart, 2007; Teaching Research Institute at Western Oregon University, 2011).

The 29 outcomes consist of business documents that indicated business quality and stability and financial sustainability. Eleven of the 29 outcomes were determined by the advisory committee to be most essential to the successful operation of a family childcare business. They are described as “key outcomes” and appear in bold in the list below. These 11 key outcomes are congruent with Oregon Programs of Quality (OPQ) standards (Teaching Research Institute at Western Oregon University, 2011) and were developed and measured to align with the indicators and performance criteria for those standards.
The 29 outcomes of Building a Business are*:

- Resume or professional autobiography
- **Mission statement**
- **Philosophy statement**
- Risk management plan
- **Written description of curriculum**
- **Child assessment plan**
- Worksheet analyzing costs of personnel
- **Budget**
- Record keeping system
- Quality improvement plan
- **Written description of physical environments**
- Health & safety improvement plan
- Emergency preparedness plan
- Environment improvement plan reflecting, Oregon Program of Quality standards & accreditation standards for environments
- Written staffing plan
- Interview protocol (if applicable)
- Staff orientation plan (if applicable)
- Job descriptions (if applicable)
- Staff policy handbook (if applicable)
- Staff evaluation plan (if applicable)
- **Professional development plans for self and staff (if applicable)**
- Family intake plan
- Contracts with families
- Ground rules for family & business boundaries
- **Family policy handbook**
- Community outreach plan
- Professional involvement plan
- **Marketing materials**
- Business plan

*Bolded outcomes are the key outcomes of the training program

**EVALUATION DESIGN**

Ongoing formative evaluation was integrated throughout the duration of the training series for Cohorts 1 and 2. The multiple perspectives of participants, trainers, and coaches were sought to develop a comprehensive assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the training. The evaluation was designed with the assistance of the advisory committee and was intended to measure the effectiveness of the training and to provide continuous feedback for the improvement of all aspects of the training. This iterative process resulted in several adjustments to the delivery model while the cohorts were in process, which will be described later in this report. The evaluation methods and analysis were designed to answer the following questions.
• How do the participant self-ratings on the outcomes change from pre-training to post-training assessment?
• How do participant self-ratings on outcomes as post-training assessment compare to coaches’ ratings at the end of the cohort?
• What were the participant satisfaction ratings of the individual training sessions?
• Do the evaluation results indicate need for changes to the Building a Business curriculum and coaching model, trainer preparation and support, coach preparation and support, delivery model, and/or logistics and facilitation?

Methodology

A mix of quantitative and qualitative data were collected before, during, and after each cohort. Sources of data included: self report surveys of outcomes by the participants; key outcomes ratings by coaches; training session evaluations by the participants; focus groups for participants, and focus groups with trainers and coaches. Data collection tools and analysis procedures for each are described below.

Data Collection and Initial Analyses

Outcomes Assessment Surveys
Self assessment surveys were used to measure changes in trainees’ appraisal of their initial status and their final achievement with regards to the 29 outcomes. To obtain this measure, training participants in both cohorts were administered a paper form pre-training survey at the end of the orientation and before the beginning of the first session. For each of the 29 desired outcomes, they were asked to select from one of three responses:

• I have one that I like.
• I have one, but I would like to improve it.
• I don’t have one.

They were also given an opportunity to make any comments or explanations for each. To assure anonymity and to facilitate comparison of their pre-training ratings to their post-training ratings, each participant assigned themselves a unique identifying “code” that consisted of the first three letters of their mother’s name and the month and day of their birthday. Participants were asked to take about 15 minutes to complete the surveys. All participants in both cohorts completed and returned the pre-training surveys--23 for Cohort one and 18 for Cohort two.

For each cohort, pre-assessment averages per outcome were computed to gain a beginning baseline. Reports of the group averages per outcome were generated and shared with trainers and coaches to inform trainers and coaches about initial strengths and needs of the cohort.

Post-training surveys that followed the same protocol were mailed to participants in both cohorts about 3 weeks after completion of the training cohort. Questionnaires were not sent to the 4 participants in Cohort 1 who had dropped out of the cohort or participated irregularly. Surveys were mailed with a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the surveys. An incentive was offered to all participants if there was 100 percent return and several email reminders were sent to the participants. For Cohort 1, of a possible 19, 17 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 89.5 percent. For Cohort 2, 15 out of 18 questionnaires were returned, yielding a response rate of 83.3 percent.
Using the unique identifying codes self-assigned by the participants, their pre and post surveys were then matched. Surveys were eliminated for participants who had completed pre but not post surveys. A total of 30 participants’ surveys (15 from Cohort 1 and 15 from Cohort 2) were included in the analysis. Participant responses were then assigned numeric codes: 2 for “I have one that I like,” 1 for “I have one but would like to improve it”; and 0 for “I don’t have one” and entered into an EXCEL database. Averages of the ratings for each outcome were computed and a comparative analysis of the averages was performed to demonstrate increases or decreases in the participants’ self-ratings on each of the 29 outcomes from pre-training to post-training.

Coaching Logs
Coaches were asked to keep coaching logs for each of their participants and to periodically review the coaching logs with their participants in order to measure progress. The coaching logs listed each of the 29 outcomes with columns for the dates and types of contact made with the participant regarding the outcome, notes about the participant’s progress toward the outcome, and the final status for each of the outcomes. For each of the 11 key outcomes specific indicators were listed with check boxes for use by the coaches to record inclusion of the indicators within the outcome document. For example, for the outcome “Philosophy statement” the following indicators were listed:

- Family centered
- Values
- Beliefs
- Program goals for children & families

At the conclusion of the cohort, coaches were asked to rate the accomplishment of each outcome for each participant. Final status was indicated as “C” if the outcome was completely accomplished, “P” if partial work was done, “NW” if no work was done on the outcome, and “NA” if the outcome was not applicable to the participant’s business (for example, if the provider had no employed staff, then s/he would not be expected to have a written staffing plan).

Coach ratings were then assigned numeric codes: 2 for “Completely accomplished,” 1 for “Partial work done” and 0 for “No work done” and entered into an EXCEL database. Averages of the ratings for each outcome were computed and a comparative analysis was performed to demonstrate variance or consistency between the coaches’ average rating and the participants’ average self rating on the post surveys for each outcome.

Training Session Evaluations
At the conclusion of each of the 23 training sessions, participants in both cohorts completed anonymous evaluations. On the first half of the evaluation, participants were asked to rate the degree to which they believed the objectives had been met; for example: I identified family child care as a professional business. Participants indicated their degree of agreement on a Likert scale of 1 (“No, not at all”) to 5 (“Yes, definitely”). The second half of the evaluation contained statements about the trainer such as: The trainer was organized and prepared to present the information. Participants chose from the same Likert scaled values to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. Participants were also given opportunities to write open-ended comments.

Session evaluation ratings were entered into an EXCEL database and averages of the ratings were computed for each query regarding objectives and trainers. Narrative comments were coded for emerging themes. The numeric data and comments were summarized and shared with the trainers for
feedback and reflection opportunities. OCCD staff was available for feedback, consultation, and technical assistance to the trainers as needed.

**Focus Groups of Participants**
At the conclusion of each cohort, participant focus groups were scheduled to obtain participants’ perspectives on the training they had experienced. To accommodate schedules and logistics, the groups were scheduled to meet via phone conferences and participants chose from a variety of dates and times. A total of 4 sessions were scheduled for Cohort 1 and two for Cohort 2. Participation in the focus groups ranged from two to six individuals per session. In total, 15 individuals from Cohort 1 and eight from Cohort 2 took part in the focus group sessions. The calls averaged one hour in length with the longest being ninety minutes. A protocol of questions was developed and used with each group. Participants received the questions in advance. The focus groups were conducted by two OCCD staff members with one directing questions to the participants and the other recording the conversations.

Analysis of the large body of participant focus group data followed standard qualitative data coding and sorting techniques to identify themes and concepts (Miles & Huberman, 1994.) A master transcript, which included the transcripts of all the sessions for both cohorts, was compiled with responses organized according to the questions asked during the focus groups. Responses were then coded for recurrent ideas or themes that emerged as the data was examined recursively. Frequent themes included such issues as “session topics,” “materials,” “logistics,” “relationships,” etc. This “start list” of codes, which was prompted in part by the subject matter of the questions asked, was then further refined. For example, “materials” was separated into “books,” “CDs,” etc. Finally, the codes were grouped into three larger categories—content, processes, and outcomes (Miles & Huberman, 1994, pp. 44 – 59.)

**Focus Group of Coaches**
A focus group/debriefing session was held with all four coaches from the two cohorts in the fall of 2011. At the time, Cohort 1 sessions had ended and their coaching logs were competed; Cohort 2 was slightly beyond the series mid-point in their sessions. The meeting was convened in person with coaches from Cohort 1, and Cohort 2 coaches joined by telephone conferencing. Subjects addressed included the coaches’ experiences with the coaching logs, conference calls with participants, site visits and coordination tasks and their general recommendations for the coaching component of Building a Business training.

The transcript of this session was analyzed following the same coding and sorting methods described above for the participant focus group. In the final grouping, the coded responses were organized into the same three categories of content, processes, and outcomes.

As a result of the initial analysis, several course corrections were made to enhance the coaching process for the remainder of Cohort 2. These are discussed in the section titled “Interim Modifications Made During Cohorts.”

**Trainer Focus Group**
In February 2011, mid-way through Cohort 1, the trainers were gathered together for a focus group. The purpose was to check-in with the trainers to learn what they were learning about the cohort, discuss training strategies that seemed to be successful, examine the participant evaluations of their sessions,
reflect upon changes that they would make, share ideas, and determine if immediate course corrections should be made in the delivery of training or the cohort model.

The transcript of this session was analyzed following the same coding and sorting methods described above for the participant and coach focus groups. In the final grouping, the coded responses were organized into the same three categories of content, processes, and outcomes.

As a result of this focus group, changes were made for the rest of Cohort 1 and for Cohort 2. These are discussed in the “Interim Modifications Made During Cohorts” section.

Final Integrated Analysis

Guided by the categories, themes and subthemes described in the initial analyses above, all of the bodies of quantitative and qualitative data were then combined for a final analysis of the efficacy and effectiveness of the content, processes, and outcomes of the Building a Business training series for Cohorts 1 and 2. Tables and figures were developed to illustrate findings of the quantitative and qualitative data. In the final analysis, prominent data points and participant quotes that would illustrate each finding were identified. These findings are presented and discussed in the following section.

**Findings and Discussion**

As described above, the themes that emerged from the various bodies of data were organized into three comprehensive categories to facilitate the final analysis. The findings are presented in accordance with same categories and serve to depict the features of the Building a Business training series—both strengths and weaknesses—from the perspectives of the participants, the trainers, and the coaches. These categories and the features within each are as follows:

1. **Content**—Knowledge and subject matter presented in the 23 training sessions. Features of the content include:
   - Accomplishment of the session knowledge objectives
   - Relevance and importance of the curriculum and subjects covered
   - Value of the materials and resources

2. **Processes**—Procedural features related to the delivery of the training. Features include:
   - Logistical issues related to time, location, etc.
   - Trainer and coach methods and techniques as they facilitated learning
   - The development of relationships

3. **Outcomes**—Results of the training including tangible products, knowledge acquired, and self-actualization. Features include:
   - Achievement of the identified outcomes for the series
   - Changes to practice resulting from the training
   - Changes to self perception -- professionalism

As these themes are described below, they are illustrated by verbatim statements, appearing in italics, made by participants, trainers, and coaches in their focus groups.
Content of the Training Sessions

Accomplishment of the Session Objectives
Each of the 23 sessions was designed to meet two or more stated objectives. As in all Oregon Registry Trainer Program approved standardized trainings, the objectives derive from the “Core Body of Knowledge for Oregon’s Childhood Care and Education Profession” (Oregon Center for Career Development, 2008) and are specifically aligned with the knowledge standards for one or more of 10 core knowledge categories. In the case of the 23 Building a Business sessions, that core knowledge category is Program Management.

After each session participants were asked to evaluate how well they had met each of the session objectives related to knowledge in that category. For example, if a session objective was: “Participants will explore samples of child care and education program philosophies and models for curriculum and assessment,” the corresponding evaluation item asks participants to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: “I explored samples of child care and education program philosophies and models for curriculum and assessment.”

A review of the session evaluation data for all 23 sessions for both cohorts indicates a high level of agreement by participants that the objectives were met.

Table 1. Participant Evaluation of Completion of Objectives

As illustrated in Table 1, with 1 being lowest degree of agreement and 5 being the highest, average ratings for Cohort 1 ranged from 4.35 to 4.98. For Cohort 2 the range was similarly narrow—4.09 to 4.92. The overall average ranking across both cohorts was 4.68 indicating that, from the perspectives of the participants, the objectives had been met.

From the trainers’ perspectives, the objectives “worked well and were appropriate, very engaging for participants.” During the trainer focus group, most agreed that the objectives were “good” and “doable” but some noted that they needed more experience “using the objectives effectively.” One offered that it was important to be “clear with the participants about these before the session started.”
Relevance and Importance of the Subject Matter

In their focus group, one of the trainers stated that the “Curriculum is a strength. Participants are getting a lot of good ideas about building their professional business.” The participants themselves report being generally pleased with the content of the training series. As one offered in the focus group: “Covered it all; great ideas.” Others added: “(I wish) I would have done this when I first started (in family child care); they need to have all providers who are just starting take this class.” “It’s like taking a parenting class before your child is born.”

During their focus groups, the participants were forthcoming in their responses when asked “What was your favorite topic of the sessions?” Eight individuals cited “staffing and employees.” The following are examples of their explanations:

- I liked the staffing information. It came at a very good time for me. The interview protocol—I am doing this for the first time around. I learned a lot at an appropriate time for where I was.
- Staff and risk management those were two things I never had a handbook for. I’m kind of new at staff being not family members. Getting that stuff together and going over it. I had to do that with two people and that helped me a lot.
- Anything that had to do with employees, handbook was pretty helpful. Just knowing like more of the rules with employees.
- Best part of class was learning how to deal with employees, rules around it, because there aren’t trainings for that.

The participant comments on the session evaluations for Hiring Staff corroborate the importance of the topic. Several participants mentioned the importance of BOLI and workers comp and suggested that more information was needed in that area:

- Can we bring up the BOLI website as a group? There seems to continually be questions around the topic of breaks, lunch, paid, off campus, etc.

The next most frequently mentioned “favorite topic” was marketing. Four individuals offered such comments as: “I love marketing” and “Marketing concepts were great. (They) helped me out a lot.” Their enthusiasm for the marketing session, Promoting Your Business, was also expressed on the session evaluations. They reported receiving many “great marketing ideas.” One explained: “Got many new media advertising ideas (Yelp, Hubspot, 99 Designs, etc.) that I have not thought of.”

Another favorite topic reported by two individuals in the focus groups was the tour of homes. One said, “(the) tour was nice—not only to see what other programs were doing but also hearing what other people think about it.” Another added: “When we went to [a participant’s] house we could see the connection to all of the time we spent in class and then it was ah-ha I see what works for them.” Comments on the Tour of Homes session evaluations were very enthusiastic. For example: “It was great to see the other daycare places. I got lots of ideas!” “The programs we visited were very unique. All of them had the child on mind. Great experience.” “I enjoyed the site visits when we got to get on the bus and visit several certified family child care home sites in Eugene. Very useful and good for me because it was very hands on and visual.”
Two other topics that participants report as favorites are **assessment** and **community and neighborhood**. Comments included:

*Different assessments, different ones were mentioned, some on-line. Being exposed, to me, in class—was an “ah ha” moment.*

*Session on community and bonding with my neighbors (was very helpful). I haven’t done that so I’m putting that in practice now.*

Comments on the session evaluation for *Relationships in the Neighborhood* also indicate that this was an important topic for many of the providers. One offered: “I have trouble including community into my child care curriculum. I appreciate ideas to implement into action mode.”

In focus group discussions, participants discussed areas that they felt were lacking in content. For example, **curriculum** was a topic some wanted more information on. One individual commented: “I could have used a bit more time looking at the curriculum.” Another added: “I agree on the curriculum piece. I felt like it was our job as class members to design the different types of curriculum....There was never a description of what these different curriculums were like....”

Participants also commented on the need for more information in the area of **budget and finance**. As one explained, “The financial stuff is even more important than the everyday operation of your business, because that can come back and bite you.” Another added “It’s my area of weakness. Needed more hand holding through that section.”

In the session on staffing, which many cited as the most important part of the training, several participants mentioned the need for more information on BOLI and **workers’ comp**. As one explained: “(We) could have gone into more detail about worker’s comp—policy that you keep on your employees—not just the tax that you pay.”

### Value of the Materials

In participant focus groups, the providers were asked: “Which resources did you use the most?” From their responses, it is clear that the **CD-Rom** was very useful. Twelve participants shared the utility of the CD; many spoke of its practical use in their work for the training as well as in their practice as a family childcare owner. These are a few of their comments:

*I used the CD Rom continuously. I still am continuing to use it. I love it.*

*The templates on the CD Rom were useful and make forms easy to print up.*

*CD Rom was very helpful. Amazing information to be able to locate things.*

When asked if the training should continue to provide the CDs, there was a unanimous chorus of “yes” in all of the focus group meetings.
The value of the **books** used in the training received the lengthiest discussion—most of it positive. Several commented that the books “were excellent resources,” and “extremely useful.” Within the 16 positive comments about the books it can be seen that several participants were attracted to the physical, tangible nature of the books.

*Books were great because could mark them for myself. I highlighted the areas and didn’t have to turn them in. I do continue to go back from that.*

*Books were useful because they had a lot of information in them—and they are physical so I can use them as I go back to them in later years*

*The books! Those were books I had wanted for awhile and I didn’t want to spend the money. I continue to use them. Even now I pull them out and go, “Oh, what book was that in?” and I pull them out*

While many were general in their opinion that “the books” were very valuable, others distinguished “which” books they valued most. Most agreed the Copeland books were very useful.

*I enjoyed the Copeland books, especially the one about insurance—an eye opener.*

*A good resource was the one that referred to retirement planning, because I think that is something that is not thought about normally—and (being) introduced to the topic to get people thinking about it.*

*Tom Copeland materials. They are updated regularly. They give variety of scenarios for providers. It’s just not just one way.*

There was some ambivalence about the Dischler and Green books. One provider shared that they found that “Dischler’s and Green’s books were dated in ideas, even though not that old. (They) were a bit simplistic.” Another echoed this feeling saying they were for “someone who wanted something light.”

These opinions were reiterated when the participants were asked if *Building a Business* should continue the books? Most were absolute in their opinion that books “were great” and “very helpful” and should be continued. Others qualified their judgment saying:

*Some of them. I used a lot of the Tom Copeland. I didn’t use the one with the lady on the front. (Green). I really liked the Tom Copeland. It was easy to understand and laid out nicely.*

*Definitely the Copeland materials. Depending on price of Dischler and Green books, they are helpful for new providers—if you can get good price, go ahead with them. If not, I would dump them.*

There was some variation in the participants’ opinions about the value of the **binder**, but overall, it was received with less enthusiasm. Three individuals offered positive opinions about the binder, saying:

*Great way to organize your classes.*
Great to have special places for each class. The binder was wonderful.

I liked the three-ring binder. It organized some of us. I needed that.

A few agreed the binder was “useful for organizing …class work” but often added such clarifiers as “not well organized, but all in all I think it is good.” The following remarks exemplify the ambivalence most felt about the binder:

The three ring binder was useful, although I found the topics got mixed around from session to session and I found there were materials about one topic spread throughout the binder. In the future—somehow have the material organized differently rather than having materials spread throughout the binder.

The binder was confusing to use, not knowing which module you were in, where we needed to file paperwork we were given every time.

The binder was a little confusing about how everything fit and where.

The three-ring binder was too big. I would prefer two or three smaller binders, but then it wouldn’t fit in the bag! The bag was nice.

Many of the participants reported that the binder was the item they used the least or that they encountered difficulties in using it. Some explained:

It worked but it was so cumbersome. The tabs were just numbered (and) were difficult because you had to look it up. It’s big and you have to go back and forth.

(I had the) same experience. You have to go back and forth from book and lectures—and writing on what tab it was and the outcomes were so… The labeling could be improved a little bit.

The handouts don’t go through the binder at all…. My binder is empty with a whole bag of stuff to put in there.

I had a bum one—it didn’t close well. It was kind of annoying. But a good way to keep us organized and to keep us focused in class.

Two of the participants reported they had found alternative ways of organizing their materials:

I think they thought I would put everything in that binder. But when I was putting together my staff binder I put the stuff in my own binder, because I was actually using it. The things that we would do we would use.

I agree. I did end up doing an outcomes binder. As I would complete my materials, I would file my materials in my outcomes binder rather than the big 3-ring binder. The binder didn’t necessarily relate directly one-to-one with the expected outcomes. An expected outcomes binder would be great.
One suggested file folders as an alternative saying, “Would have been fine with file folders with papers put into them. (A) folder with that day of handouts labeled with what we did that day. Easier than flipping through on tabs.”

Despite the negative feelings about the user-friendly nature of the binders, nearly all of the focus group participants felt the training should continue using binders. As one said, “It’s a great idea; it needs a bit of tweaking.” Another added: “I think it is a good idea to still use the binder because we need somewhere to put our resources, but make some changes to organize it better.” The participants offered several suggestions for improving it:

(I)t should be set up by sessions, not topic.

Just make it a little bit smaller. It was really bulky to carry around and get out each time.

I think all the power points and handouts should be ... heat bound or comb bound, and 3-hole punched to go into the binder...It’s hard to have the binder on the table. Rather than picking up at each class—into the binder at beginning.

Some of presenters had power point handouts where you could keep notes, 3-hole punched, and that was helpful. Have a hole-punch available so papers don’t fall out.

If the binder already had the resources in it, (that would be helpful). Or that we could have just put them right into them at the time. A lot didn’t have holes. I know they were passing around the hole punch. But it didn’t get done.

It would be helpful to have the session number at the top of each page (of handouts) so we could put it in the appropriate section.

Perhaps if all of the resources and power points were in the binder ahead of time so they were more refined, because every presenter brought their information in a different format. It would have been good to get it as a complete product when you first showed up. It makes more sense to me if it’s all there and in an order that is predetermined.

During the focus groups, participants were asked if there were any additional resources that should have been included. Two participants felt that more “Boli stuff needs to be included, laws about breaks; when we need to pay them, when we don’t need to pay them.” One added:

There should be a little more emphasis on insurance, workman’s comp, things that are in addition to child care division rules—very plain, and everyone knows that this is what you need to do. People in business a long time were not following even the simplest business rules.

One participant suggested requiring every trainer “to somehow list their resources” and another added, “Maybe some kind of summary of all of the website links, broken down by topic. I know that’s a lot of work.” Others spoke of the need to see more concrete example of the documents they were developing:

The one thing I liked the most was (specific trainer’s) stuff. Policy handbooks, she made them available to cut and paste.
Precise (examples) for budgeting and financing. It should be actual, specific with hard dollars – if you (have) a minimum wage employee (what) would be the exact dollar cost if you would follow a certain plan…. And same thing with budgeting, an exact budgeting and an exact way to use the budgeting. If you want to follow it you can follow it. And you can see it broken down. Otherwise it is very theoretical and difficult to conceptualize without the concrete example.

Agree—something a little more concrete. For people who don’t need the concrete, they can still learn something.

Processes

**Trainer Performance and Effectiveness**

Key to success in the learning process that takes place in training is the effectiveness of the trainer. On the post session evaluations participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements about their trainer’s knowledge, organization, experience, respectfulness, and responsiveness. The statements are:

- The trainer was knowledgeable about the topics.
- The trainer was organized and prepared to present the information.
- The trainer was experienced as a trainer and respected different learning styles.
- The trainer was respectful of differences in culture, personal backgrounds, and the ideas of others.
- The trainer responded to questions appropriately.

The participants indicated their level of agreement with the statements on a Likert scale of one to five with five being the highest level of agreement. Table 2 displays the range of the averages of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 participants’ responses for all 23 training sessions.

**Table 2. Participant Evaluation of Trainer Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Average</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>4.24-4.74</td>
<td>3.97-4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>4.47-4.59</td>
<td>4.73-5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average ratings for Cohort 1 ranged from 4.24 to 5.00. For Cohort 2 the range was similarly narrow, but slightly lower—3.97 to 4.73. The overall average for both cohorts was 4.76 indicating that, from the
perspectives of the participants, the trainers were knowledgeable, well organized, experienced, respectful of differences, and responsive to the needs of their participants.

The participant comments on the session evaluations generally support the high ratings. Many direct their comments to the trainers saying “Thank you!”; “Great job!”; “You do awesome presentations!”; “Great class.”; “I enjoyed the way you closed the class. Very helpful -- loved the depth of the points covered.” Some referred to **positive attributes** of the good trainers in their comments.

- Loved your enthusiasm and energy. Very helpful.
- The class presentation is energetic. You keep my attention
- Great training -- good, solid information. Well presented
- Very upbeat person!
- Engaging, informative, pract(ic)al
- She is an awesome presenter.
- Great teacher and engaging.
- She was very helpful to individuals
- (She) is a blast for a teacher; she keeps us engaged.
- (She) is a very caring person.
- Good speaker.
- She was knowledgeable with lots of resources.
- Very motivating.

In addition to personal attributes, the participants called attention to the **skills and practices** that made some of the trainers stand out. One of the most often cited was the trainer’s **ability to manage and direct the flow of the session**. The following comments on the session evaluations exemplify this:

- I love the way she keeps the group focused.
- Good at keeping on topic/task nicely, but let everyone share.
- Well managed, allowed enough talk but kept us going
- Good facilitator of communication and redirecting back to focus. Thanks.
- Facilitated the group very well! Thanks.
- Much better this time with keeping the group going forward.
- Stayed on track and on topic.
- Good at keeping us on topic
- Good timekeeping - keeping us on topic.
- Thanks for keeping us on track

In their focus group, the trainers acknowledged that managing class discussions could be challenging. This is an excerpt from that exchange:

- Lively group—good, but that can bite the trainer in the behind
- Once conversation gets going, I lose track of who is talking, who hasn’t talked, who is waiting to talk.
- Is it a given that family child care providers are talkative? Not necessarily, but if they are asking to be here in this cohort, they are going to be outgoing. The isolation factor is really a key point here. We won’t have “dead groups” (groups that are quiet and non-participatory).
- Monitoring the flow of conversation, making sure people take turns and some don’t dominate.
• Ground rules—people seem to forget the ground rules—participants and trainers
• Would be helpful to discuss some of those strategies up front—what to do when...
• Need to build in ways for them to talk.
• They love to have specific assignments in the small groups. People who don’t talk much in the whole group, do participate in small groups. Small group discussions work very well. Large-group discussion is definitely where it is hard to contain (the) group.

During their focus group, the trainers shared several strategies for better management of group discussions. These included:

• Talking stick
• Go around the table and allow each person to talk
• Use small group discussions
• Parking lot
• Defer some topics to coordinators to focus on in Q&As
• Trainer move around and be in the middle of the room
• Coordinator help to moderate and remind who has not had an opportunity to talk
• Coordinator help with side talking
• Room set up to minimize small group side discussions
• Participants are given sticky notes to remind them of the topic to discuss at break

Several participants commented on particular teaching methods and techniques that they valued, such as group work, explaining it was a “good chance to talk together about our views on child care as a profession.” Other comments about this technique included:

• Good group activities with plenty of time - Enjoyed working it out in the groups -
• Creative ways of mixing up the group so we work with others we might not have chosen to work with.

Another group of comments spoke to the participants’ satisfaction with the use of various organizing tools to help direct their learning:

• I really like the handouts and class outline to follow while she is teaching - Handouts so very helpful,
• Loved all the samples & checklists - Lists to take home are great!
• The check-off lists were very helpful & valuable to go home and work on this information later.
• Lots of handouts, gave a checklist of things to change to take home
• Gave very important resources that I can actually take home and use!

Some of the participants noted their appreciation for the hands on or activity-focused style of some of the trainers. A focus group participant explained: “I appreciated trainers who gave us hands on things we could apply right away. This was reinforced on the participants’ session evaluations for some of the trainers:

• I like the paddle boards for surveys or short answers. When we use it to make lists and are away from our seated area, we lose the ability to make permanent notes to take home....it kept the sidebar conversation down.
I like having toys to keep our hands busy…. Love toys, paddles, noisemakers and (presents).
I love the hands-on tap & noise boxes. I’m a kinesthetic learner as well.
Liked the action and interacti(on); kept us awake and engaged
Thanks for the puzzle activity. Great illustration….Love the Wordle.

**Relating to the trainer on a personal as well as professional level** was very important to some of the participants. This came across clearly in both the session evaluations and the participant focus groups. As one said: “I really appreciated the trainers that had actual experience in the past in running their own family child care home because they were able to talk about the mistakes and successes they had made from the practical stand-point of having been there.” Other focus group participants added: “Their knowledge of what they were talking about was their strength.” “It always helps if the trainer is not only an effective presenter but also that I feel understands or has done what we do… comes from a place of understanding and respecting what we do.” On the session evaluations, these trainers received such remarks as:

- Personal stories were perfect and tied into the topic very well. She's the most entertaining presenter for BAB.
- I liked personal experiences that you shared. Thanks!
- Enjoy the fact that you are running a program
- Ending the session on a positive note, reflecting on good things about our jobs.

Although the positive comments about trainers were predominant, participants did note some deficiencies that negatively impacted the training process and their own learning. They described these in both session evaluations and the focus groups.

- Hands raised went unnoticed at times - some people were not recognized with their questions.
- Not all materials were copied and available for students.
- Side bar talking happened a lot today
- Too much running on of conversation -- loud -- almost tired of listening at this point.
- I felt like some discussions could be redirected instead of going on forever.
- Sometimes students share/interrupt too much.
- Too much talking from students
- Needs to speak up and take charge more.
- Some of the trainers who are not familiar with the technology and using the power point presentations and having graphic organizers.

From their comments and descriptions the participants paint a picture of the best, most effective trainer including both their personal attributes and the pedagogical techniques they use. This is depicted in Figure 1.
Focus group participants were also queried as to whether it was beneficial to have multiple trainers. Most liked the idea of having a variety of individuals as trainers and gave their reasons as follows:

I liked multiple—different mix of personalities and styles. - They all came in fresh and knew what they wanted to present.

I thought it was great to have different presenters especially if they had an affinity for a certain topic.

I would agree that multiple trainers was nice. .... (It) gave all of us the ability to relate to and bond with a trainer and ask questions that were specific to our program. And if I didn’t particularly bond with one trainer, I could bond with the next trainer and in the next month there would be a trainer I would really enjoy.

I think it is helpful to have several trainers. We learn from different styles and backgrounds and experiences.

I think it is definitely better to have lots of different trainers. Every single one had a different strength and expertise. There wouldn’t have been that richness and variations on expertise.
Multiple trainers (are) definitely better—because each has their own style of teaching. I liked the multiple trainers.

Trainers shared this same opinion in their focus group discussion stating that with the “vast amount of knowledge and ideas within this curriculum, it’s a good idea to have a variety of voices and experience and ideas to share.” Another trainer added: “It’s good to hear things coming in different ways with different voices.” They conceded, however, that “continuity is a weakness” when there are multiple trainers.

Two participants liked the idea of having fewer trainers and offered the following rationales:

I would have thought 2 or 3 or 4 trainers fewer. You would be building a relationship with them. And you would be able to pick their brain more. (It would be) more comfortable. You’ve seen them, been around them before. You could let loose more.

I think it is good to have (fewer) trainers - probably would have been a good idea because then we would have got to know them a bit better.

When trainers were asked what would help them be successful as Building a Business trainers, they offered many ideas. One had to do with addressing the continuity issue that they identified as a weakness in the process when multiple trainers are involved. These are excerpts from that conversation:

Participants are experiencing this as an ongoing thing, but for us, it is in segments. Would like to have a sense of how it all connects. There are discrete pieces in our training that they get but we don’t get from each other. Help make the connections between the pieces for trainers and coordinators. Continuity for participants is important.

My intention was to go to more than my trainings, and I haven’t had a chance to do that.

Maybe (we could use) a feedback form that trainers would fill out at the end of our sessions for the trainers that follow in the next sessions. It would be like the reflections through email, but maybe a form that we fill out that we share online after we do our training, would be very helpful.

Coaching Process

In focus groups and meeting, the participants, trainers and coaches shared their unique perspectives on the coaching component that was designed to be integral to the learning process for Building a Business.

During their focus groups, participants were asked about various features of the coaching component. There were some significant differences between the responses of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 participants. When asked if it was helpful to have a coach present at the Saturday sessions some Cohort 1 providers responded that “It was nice having them; they were a source we could go to” but “I don’t think that it was necessary for them to be there.” For the most part, Cohort 1 participants did not feel it was very helpful as it was structured. They did have several suggestions for making Saturdays more productive times with coaches:
Maybe if they split us up in groups more often with our coaches. It seemed like the coaches were just on-looking.

If our group would have met every other month during lunch time with coordinators when our coordinator was there, would have been better use of time. If we met with them every month at lunch time for even 20 minutes, we could have talked about the sessions and the previous month and if they were there every month, that would be better. (It would be) better if they were there every month.

I think that the outcome logs—they maybe could have focused a bit more on them just to keep us a little more on track. They were a great idea, but they seemed to fall by the wayside a little bit.

I agree. That would have been a good use of their time. We could give them something at the beginning and by the end of the day we could get feedback.

The Cohort 1 participants’ responses to the query: “What did you gain from the five group conference calls (Q&As) with your coaches?” are relevant to the previous comments. These are a few of their many replies regarding the conference calls:

I can honestly say I don’t think I gained anything from the phone conferences. It’s so hard when you are afraid you are going to interrupt.

Two people were having a conversation the whole time and the others just listening because you didn’t know if it was your turn to talk.

I believe phone calls weren’t helpful at all, too.

I participated in all but the final one—I didn’t find them that valuable. It was almost that we were struggling to come up with things to talk about.

I dislike the conference calls 100%. I felt that I was too tired in the evening. I just listened, put in a few words, just checking in, doing my time.

Cohort 1 participants offered an alternative to the evening conference calls:

Instead of so many calls, then every now and then have the group meet at second half of lunch. Conference calls come when we are trying to do our life stuff too.

That would be good. Time with coaches on Sat may be more valuable than these intermittent conference calls. I agree.

(...) sometimes in the evening I would still be working and I had to hire on staff (in order to participate in the conference calls).
When the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 coaches met for a debriefing/focus group after the completion of Cohort 1 and midway through 2, they also discussed the issue of the conference calls and reported similar disappointment. They reported low number of participants for the calls—from as low as three to 13 and noted that the numbers “dribbled down” as time went on. They commented further on their experience with the calls saying:

*First one, maybe all but two (called in), and I had never done that kind of thing before, so it felt awkward and I didn’t know how to structure it. And in reflection, there wasn’t enough relationship between me and the participants and it was hard to get it going.*

*For the first Q&A(conference call)there was lots of background noise. (They) tucked kids into bed. They were doing lots of activities rather than sitting and engaging on the telephone.*

*They did not go well overall and were not very well liked by the participants*

*I had two non-native English speakers in my group. I could not get them to talk.*

The coaches offered a solution very much like the participants from Cohort 1: “If I could change project any way, I would get rid of Q&As (by) phone and do more connecting at the training sessions.” Another said: *(The) benefit of them hearing each other face to face is good. Maybe it would cut down on some of the clique stuff. Maybe lunch together five times throughout the training. Get it all done while they are here.*

Midway through Cohort 2, this change was effected—the last conference calls were replaced by lunch-time meetings during the Saturday session. This change is a factor to consider when analyzing the answers given by the Cohort 2 participants to the queries about their coaching experiences during the focus group. The following are a sample of their responses:

*I think it was helpful having coaches. I don’t know that they needed to be there every Saturday. I don’t think we interacted with them every time. But just having a coach was great because I was able to check in and ask about outcomes, and it was helpful.*

*I’m not sure the conference calls were successful, because I don’t think people were all there on the conference call. I think the lunch meetings were more successful because people are physically there and they have to focus on the meetings.*

*I agree with ... Have the meetings at lunch time.*

One participant, however, did not agree that lunch-time meetings were a good solution. She explained: “We had some phone conversations, group conferences. We had one or two group meetings at class and I didn’t like the time that (it) ate into my networking.”

The other feature of the coaching process that participants were asked to comment on was the “site visit.” Again they had varying opinions about the value of the visit. This is an example of the positive feedback:
I liked it because it was an opportunity for this person to come and see me and give me ideas about what I could be and how to manage my business different. It was really good to have one on one time in my place.

I agree. My favorite part of the class.

I thought it was wonderful. I loved having her come out. I thought it made—she had good advice, it made me feel good. I liked having her here. I felt support.

I think when she came to my program, she realized everything I had been working on and this is my work and my work place. She understands more about family child care. She saw my space and she likes it and she makes good comments

It did have an effect. I enjoyed having (her) as a coach. I enjoyed her visit. She spent maybe an hour with me. She interacted with the children, checked my documentation, gave me feedback. It was a wonderful visit.

For some of the participants, the site visit did not have as much value:

My coach, ... had told me from the beginning that she would not need to do an on-site visit, perhaps there was miscommunication about that. She suggested we meet in a coffee shop. After a couple of postponements, she did meet with me at my program but it was during my winter break, was very inconvenient, and I would have appreciated that it be spelled out better. I did not get much from my on-site visit.

(It was) nice but not that valuable except for having it done.

I didn't get anything from that at all.

The participants offered several suggestions to improve the site visit experience:

I think they need to be done in beginning, then a follow-up later to see what you need. Mine wasn’t till June and it was over! A lot too late.

But it should have been earlier and built connections with coaches early on instead of later.

It would be nice to have it at beginning and at the end

It would be more helpful to have feedback all along so at the final visit you would be showing your final work.

I think maybe if they would have had it earlier on rather than at the end.

That would have been good to have it early. Like a before and after—to see how we have changed and how we’ve grown with our business practices
I think the site visits should happen early on in the program, and perhaps later on in the program to see if it can be seen what has changed—so the coach is more aware of where the student is coming from and can better support each provider. Early on in the session would be better to coach better.

I agree, wholeheartedly. The OPQ process, may have tainted my view. I agree that an initial view on-site would develop the relationship between coach and classmates, and one later would be a really good idea.

The coaches reported very rich and positive experiences with their site visits. One suggested it was the “most exciting part of project.” Others shared the following:

I loved doing the site visits. They strengthened connections that I already had and formed connections with those that I didn’t have connections with.

Some were reluctant to have a home visit. They seemed to be embarrassed that their outcomes weren’t ready, but I found them to be completed, they just didn’t look like what others looked like. They were surprised at how many outcomes they had in place.

I never left any home in under 2 hours. In one case I stayed 5 hours (but averaged) 2 to 2 ½ hours. They wanted to show me their whole program and what they do with their kids. (It took) at least an hour to see the outcomes.

People were glad to have me to show off what they were doing. They asked for input on specific issues they were having on things. In terms of having outcomes ready, they were ready. It made a huge difference in the relationship with the providers. One provider went from not liking me to taking suggestions from me—a whole turn-around. The relationship piece was huge (and) helped me understand more about what they do to be able to their program and I could support them better.

When questioned about the overall effect of having a coach on their experience in Building a Business, the participants again held differing opinions. Some simply said, “No, not really”; besides her coming out to visit me, I don’t think there was much of a need otherwise.” Others perceived it as a more positive experience saying:

I think it was very helpful to have a coach because then you have someone to turn to and ask questions and find some resources and answers from a person who is knowledgeable and a person who can have more resources for you.

It was somebody I could feel comfortable emailing or asking questions if I was having difficulty with an outcome or understand what I was supposed to be doing. It was helpful to have somebody to clarify things.

Relationship Development
It was hoped from the beginning that the structure of the Building a Business training would facilitate the process of forming relationships within a community of like-minded childcare professionals. This did
happen to a greater or lesser degree for all of the participants and evolved in different ways depending on a number of factors.

In the focus groups, participants were asked about their relationships within the cohort. Their responses fill several pages and are all positive. The following excerpts give a feeling for the value they placed on the relationships with their fellow participants:

The most valuable thing for me was to be in that room on a Saturday with all the wealth of experience of all the other providers—what their experiences were—I think I gained the most from the other providers and what they have already gone through.

It was nice to meet people who were at my level—connect with certified providers. I have already emailed people and asked what would you do, what is your form like? It’s been really helpful.

The best part for me was to get together with colleagues from different parts of Oregon. I did not know them. It was helpful to have them come because I learned a lot from all of them.

I think that was one of the most beneficial parts for me. I text a lot of them now still.... I visited some of their homes. I got some encouragement. It helped me take some big steps in my business.

Forming relationships with other cohort members was helpful, because I got a lot of information from them, but it was also just nice to talk to people who have been through what I’ve been through and understand like no one else in my life understands. I am developing a relationship with one cohort member in particular who is adding on to her program, and she might offer me a job in her program in this coming year. It’s exciting that that might happen.

Many indicated that they plan to continue their relationships into the future and one noted that they appreciated “at the beginning, getting the green sheet with everyone’s contact info.” The following comments are illustrative of their plans to continue their relationships beyond the training.

(I) made notes on what people were strong on so I can contact them in the future.

Everybody has strong points—will ask someone strong with curriculum for help.

I feel like we were just getting to know each other by the end of the thing. I would hope there would be some things along the way that would keep us together to build the relationships. (What would be a good thing to do to make that happen?) A meeting or something every once in a while.

I got an email today, there is a reunion on Friday night. Yes. I would attend. (I think Merrily might be planning something at the OAEYC conference. Do you think you’ll attend?) Yeah!

I know... and I are going to do a poster for the OAEYC conference in October. That will help with our Director Credential. I know I can bounce ideas off somebody who has also been through it.
As things come up, I’ll contact people that will be valuable for that situation. We will meet at conferences and stuff like that.

We’re connected through email, we can share resources. All of you guys know you have a bed at my place for conferences in Portland. Hope we can continue relationships at whatever level.

In their meeting, trainers acknowledged that the cohort model facilitated relationship building among participants. They reported that they have “watched people bonding together” and that “lots of providers have visited each other’s homes”; “have called each other” and “are sharing knowledge and information.” One trainer offered: “They are learning from each other, probably more from each other than from the training sessions.”

Trainers, coaches and participants were asked if the size of cohort was workable and most responded affirmatively saying it was “good”; “great”; or “perfect.” A participant from Cohort 1 said “I think it would have been nice if it was smaller. (There were 23 and two people had to drop in the end it was 21) Be easier to work in a group when it was smaller.” Two individuals in Cohort 1 spoke of the physical capacity of the room to accommodate 21 or 23 participants.

The rectangular format (arrangement of tables) made it easy to get to know each other. I don’t think you could have much more than that in the size of the room. It felt like a good size to get the diversity—small enough to get to know everybody.

I liked it. I liked it once the tables were redesigned into the semi-circle. Before that we were looking at the back of people’s heads. This way you could see everybody. I felt much more like a group after we did that.

Participants in Cohort 2 spoke of the effectiveness of splitting the cohort into two groups and the advantages of smaller groups:

A smaller number is better because they already split us into two groups. It was split most of the time, I felt. We did have interaction across groups. A smaller group would have more closeness. But it was a good group. Fantastic.

We want to have enough perspectives and experiences, but I’m thinking maybe 12 would be good. And if possible it would be good for networking and relationship building to have the group closer geographically, so classmates would have more time to get together and network.

I think the groups were picked if they weren’t in competition with each other. It’s good to be in tune with people who are close to you geographically. You can get to know each other and recommend each other too.

I agree with that, but I also agree that I have several friends now that aren’t in my area and I appreciate knowing them. I can write to her any time.

The trainers commented that “having 12 per small group is the right size. Twenty-two for the whole group is a good size. Not larger; 22 is max.”
The participants also reported developing strong relationships with their trainers and many described their plans to continue those relationships.

I believe that some trainers really engaged in relationship with us—and were so friendly. They would be the first person I would contact in the future. I know I have a pool of people to go to.

Definitely—They all were strong on their area they presented on. Feel all would be open to receiving an email asking for information. They seem really accessible.

Agree. I like that they are people I could call if I needed advice on something. I would feel free to do that.

There are a couple of them that I have called on. That's why I was thinking that having (fewer) trainers would have been a more of a personal relationship with them.

Yes. I find they are really good trainers who are valuable and they make it clear that we can contact them if we have questions. Of course I am going to take advantage of that.

Most of the participants were also very positive in their descriptions of relationships with their coaches:

Yes. I have great experience with (my) coach—flexible, able to work with my ability, we could really work together, it (was a) nice experience and helpful to me. It was good to have my coach. Very positive.

Mine was helpful. She was there when I needed her. When I sent email, she answered right away. And she would answer my phone call.

I enjoyed my coach. It would be better if we could see them more often—more one on one with them.

Yes. I felt like it was positive, and she will always be a resource for me.

She got to know me better. And now I am a part of one of her networks. She offered me to be a part of her network and now we are working together.

Others were doubtful that they would maintain relationships with their coaches:

I will be happy to see her at conferences and other professional things, but I don’t think I’ll be calling on her for a resource.

I didn’t find my coach to be helpful at all and I don’t plan anything. I don’t mean that negatively. It’s just that it wasn’t a helpful part of it for me.

I thought my coach was great, although I don’t know that I will necessarily continue contacts with her.
One participant offered this thought about the relationships she developed during the training:

*With this job, I feel alone a lot the time and I appreciated the opportunity to be with trainers and coaches and participants. It gave more humanity to the experience of being a child care provider. I am sad that it ended.*

**Logistical Matters**

Participants and trainers alike were generally positive in their assessment of the effectiveness of the logistical processes related to delivery of the training. Coming on **Saturdays once a month** seemed to work for nearly everyone though they noted that it made for a “long day” but they liked getting it over with in one day instead of stringing it out. One of the participants shared that “It was not too much, and I and enjoyed getting out of town once a month.” Another added, “I traveled from Eugene and I definitely looked forward to it. I appreciated being able to come up the day before.” Most agreed that one Saturday a month was good. Some felt that **a year** was a long time however, and shared their circumstances:

*It was difficult to do it for 12 months. Summer was difficult because summer weekends are all booked up. We do chores and errands on the weekend. In the summer, have shorter lunches so we could get out earlier.* (Cohort 1 participant)

*It was a little hard on Saturday morning. I have children on Friday till 6:00 pm. Saturday morning was a little hard because I needed to drive an hour and a half. When weather was bad, we took more time driving. In two months, we had two classes. For me, keep one class per month.*

(Cohort 2 participant)

*I would like it better if it were Friday and Saturday, for shorter time, not 12 months. 12 months seemed like a long time for me, personally.* (Cohort 1 participant)

The trainers discussed the Saturday scheduling and came to the conclusion that “many are tired because they have had “a full week already” but for most “it is the only day in the week without kids.”

Trainers and participants felt that the **length of the training day** was workable. Many were “thankful done at 3 and not 4 or 5.” As one participant explained, “It didn’t go too late in the afternoon so you didn’t feel your whole Saturday was gone.” Trainers expressed concern that session times were a little tight and that you “have to be careful to get your content done. Don’t know how much actual discussion is going to happen, so that changes your time line.” They concluded that it is “better to have 3 hour sessions (since) most trainers have run short of time.”

With one or two exceptions, most participants agreed that the **hour for lunch** was adequate, but they expressed the desire to use that time as working lunches—time to meet with coaches, to talk with coordinators, etc. One person explains:

*Only time it was a problem was when we had some other pressing duties during our lunch break. Our small group met with our coach. One time we met with Bev about the PSU credit. It was difficult to have enough time to network with colleagues during that time if there were other things that we had to do. It was long enough, but if we were able to meet before, after, or the*
Friday evening before for the other commitments, like talking to Bev, or meet with our coach that might be easier. We aren’t used to sitting so long in a day, so that combined with trying to catch up with our colleagues in class, it kind of ate up our time.

All of the participants who commented on lodging had positive experiences to report: “I loved the Holiday Inn... Logistics were wonderful.” Another added: “The lodging was generous. I liked it. It gave us time to get to know people—and time and space to get the outcomes done.” One participant said of the lodging experience:

Fabulous. It was close. I did all my travel the day before which was nice. They guaranteed me a late check-in. I tried to leave by 2 or 3 but sometimes I had to leave a bit later. I always knew I had a room no matter what time I arrived. I only had one time I had to change rooms because my heater or air conditioner didn’t work. They changed it quickly. They were friendly and it was clean. I didn’t have any concerns about my vehicle or my safety in traveling up to the room. It was good. And I really appreciated not only lodging was covered but the per diem so I didn’t have to worry about that and I had enough to pay for my dinner the night before.

The location was acceptable for all of the participants who took part in the focus groups. A few said they “would always want it to be a little bit closer but it wasn’t bad.”

It is evident from the focus group conversation that the food served during trainings met everyone’s need. Some noted it was a good mix of healthy and a little bit of junk food. One participant with special dietary needs appreciated that they were accommodated:

Yes. For the most part, I’m gluten free. Anything is going to be hard to find. Yeah it was perfect—the shrimp, meat, cheese, fruits and vegetables.

Another expressed the gratitude she felt for being “taken care of”:

I was pleased that Merrily provided us with a page early on to identify how we wanted the food to change or what we wanted different. And by next session they were immediately corrected. So that was great. And with the traveling it was great to have the breakfast and lunch and snacks and not to worry about that. It made it so much easier to participate because I didn’t have to worry about providing my own lunch or even worry about whether it was going to be food I liked. The fact that they not only provided food but provided food to our preference was really... I’m not used to be cared for. I am the caretaker and it was nice to have someone take care of me. It was really sweet and kind and made me feel good.

Participants were unanimous in their response when asked if they found it helpful to receive email reminders from Merrily: “Yes.” And many described how highly they value the managing and coordinating she carries out from the OAEYC office:

She was great. She was timely on her emails.

I think Merrily is awesome. She is so organized. When she says she is going to do something she does. She never forgets. I appreciate (it).
Emails are helpful for what we are covering and bringing in.

I thought she did amazing She’s always extremely well organized and very quick to follow up on anything. It was helpful to me. (For) finishing up steps on the registry, she was very helpful; she sent emails to Patsy and answered my many, many questions. She was wonderful!

I really appreciated her emails so I knew it was handled—for my lodging. I didn’t have to worry about it. I didn’t have to drive to Portland wondering about it. I didn’t have to call her and ask. it was very efficient and clear and she was very easy to work with

Outcomes of the Training

Achievement of the 29 Identified Outcomes
The desired outcomes of Building a Business, which consist of business documents that indicated business quality and stability and financial sustainability, were identified to participants at the outset of the training. The participants were administered a pre-training survey on which they were asked to rate their status with regards to the 29 outcomes. For each document they could select “I don’t have one;” “I have one but would like to improve it,” or “I have one that I like.” At the completion of training they were administered the same assessment. The two responses, having been assigned numerical equivalents of 0 – 2, were then compared. Tables 3 and 4 present the average scores for Cohort 1 and 2 respectively and the average amount of change experienced by all members of that cohort on each of the 29 outcomes. Ratings were eliminated for participants who did not complete both pre and post-assessments. The final numbers included for analysis were 15 for Cohort 1 and 15 for Cohort 2.
Table 3. Cohort 1 - Comparison of Averages of Participant Self-Ratings on 29 Outcomes at Pre- and Post-Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome*</th>
<th>Pre-Training Average Score Per Outcome</th>
<th>Post-Training Average Score Per Outcome</th>
<th>Average Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resume or professional autobiography</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy statement</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management plan</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of curriculum</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child assessment plan</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet analyzing costs of personnel</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>1.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping system</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement plan</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of physical environments</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; safety improvement plan</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness plan</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment improvement</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written staffing plan</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview protocol (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff orientation plan (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff policy handbook (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff evaluation plan (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development plans for self and staff (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family intake plan</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts with families</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground rules for family &amp; business boundaries</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family policy handbook</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach handbook</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional involvement plan</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.662</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.691</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.029</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key outcomes are bolded

Cohort 1 participants’ average self-ratings on all outcomes increased from pre-training to post-training by over a point (1.029). For four of the outcomes, 100 percent of the participants rated themselves as “having one that they liked” at post-training (Mission statement, Philosophy statement, Family intake plan, and Family policy handbook). For all the rest of the outcomes, participants’ averages suggested
that at the very least they now have the documents, with some of them still wanting to work to improve them.

The greatest increase in average rating was 1.750 for the “Family intake plan,” with most participants saying they did not have one at pre-training (0.250) to 100 percent of the participants saying that they have one that they like (2.000) by the end of the training. The least amount of change for Cohort 1 outcomes is 0.317 for “Contracts with families.” However, most of the participants at pre-training indicated they had “one they liked” or had “one they wanted to improve” for an average pre-assessment rating of 1.563 thus limiting the potential for increase in the rating.

It is significant to note that of the 11 key outcomes, three were given average post training ratings of 2.00, meaning that all of the participants asserted they had successfully completed their Mission Statement, Philosophy Statement, and Family Policy Handbook. The average post training rating for the other eight key documents ranged from 1.533 to 1.867 meaning that participants reported that they were well on the way to having documents they liked for the Written description of Curriculum, Child Assessment Plan, Budget, Record Keeping System, Quality Improvement Plan, Description of Physical Environment, Professional Development Plan, and Marketing Material.
### Table 4. Cohort 2 Comparison of Averages of Participant Self-Ratings on 29 Outcomes at Pre- and Post-Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Pre-Training Average of Score Per Outcome</th>
<th>Post-Training Average of Score Per Outcome</th>
<th>Average Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resume or professional autobiography</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>1.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy statement</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management plan</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>1.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of curriculum</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child assessment plan</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet analyzing costs of personnel</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping system</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement plan</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>1.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of physical environments</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>1.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; safety improvement plan</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness plan</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment improvement</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written staffing plan</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview protocol (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff orientation plan (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff policy handbook (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff evaluation plan (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development plans for self and staff (if applicable)</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family intake plan</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts with families</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground rules for family &amp; business boundaries</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family policy handbook</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach handbook</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional involvement plan</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.596</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.564</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.968</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key outcomes are bolded

The average increase for all Cohort 2 self ratings on all 29 outcomes increased only slightly less than in Cohort 1. The greatest increase in average rating was 1.533 for the Written description of physical environments. The least amount of change from pre to post for Cohort 2 outcomes is 0.400 for “Interview Protocol.” The total average self-reported increase for all outcomes for Cohort 1 was 0.968.
None of the 11 key outcomes were given the highest average rating of 2.00 for Cohort 2. However, the average post training rating for all of the key outcomes ranged from 1.357 to 1.923. The four highest ranged from 1.846 to 1.923 indicating that most participants reported they had developed a Mission Statement, Philosophy, Written description of physical environments and Family policy handbook that they liked and were moving close to completion of the others.

As described in the Methodology section of this report, coaches kept an outcome log for each participant and assigned final status ratings to the outcomes for each at the end of the cohort. The rating scale and coding was similar to that of the participants. A coach rating of “no work” was coded a 0; a score of a rating of “partially completed” was coded a 1, and a rating of “completed” was coded a 2. Tables 5 and 6 present a comparison of the coaches’ final average ratings to the participants’ post training self-ratings on each of the 11 key outcomes.

Table 5. Cohort 1 Comparison of Averages of Final Coach Ratings to Averages of Participant’s Self-Ratings at Post-Training on 11 Key Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Coach Ratings</th>
<th>Average Participant Ratings</th>
<th>Comparison of Average Ratings (Coach to Participant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy statement</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of curriculum</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child assessment plan</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping system</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement plan</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of physical environments</td>
<td>1.882</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development plans for self and staff (if applicable)</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family policy handbook</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.793</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.790</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.003</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 illustrates a high level of consistency between coach ratings and participant self-ratings after training for the 11 key outcomes with an average total variation of only 0.003. Coach ratings were slightly lower than the participants’ for seven of the key outcomes and slightly higher than the participants’ for three of the outcomes. They were consistent on one outcome, Marketing Material. This comparison suggests verification by coaches of the participants’ self-ratings on these key outcomes.
Table 6. Cohort 2 Comparison of Averages of Final Coach Ratings to Averages of Participant’s Self-Ratings at Post-Training on 11 Key Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Coach Ratings</th>
<th>Average Participant Ratings</th>
<th>Comparison of Average Ratings (Coach to Participant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission statement</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy statement</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of curriculum</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child assessment plan</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>(0.290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping system</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement plan</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>(0.411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written description of physical environments</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>(0.422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development plans for self and staff (if applicable)</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family policy handbook</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.654</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.727</strong></td>
<td><strong>(0.073)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 illustrates slightly more variance between coach ratings and Cohort 2 participant’ final self-ratings, but still a high level of consistency with an average total variation of only 0.073. Coach ratings were slightly lower than the participants’ for six of the key outcomes and slightly higher than the participants’ for five of the outcomes. As for Cohort 1, the participants’ self-ratings were verified by the coaches on these 11 outcomes.

A review of these data suggest achievement of the outcomes was very successful in both Cohorts; however, there were apparent difficulties encountered in the process, especially for Cohort 1. As evidenced in comments at the coaches’ meeting, as well as in the trainer and the participant focus groups, there were some misunderstandings about the roles of trainers and coaches as well as concerns by the participants regarding expectations for outcomes. The coaches spoke of some confusion surrounding the use of the coaching logs and as well as the participants’ working records (or logs) called “My Professional Journey.”

*Early on I began using the logs, mainly at the Q&A (and) would center our Q&A around them. At the trainings, people would bring outcomes to the trainers, and I would use the coaching logs. I tried to keep abreast of how they were doing on the outcome logs as they were doing the module. To be sure people were completing the assignments or knew how to complete the assignments.*

*I was still emailing people the “my professional journey” logs after the training ended. One of our suggestions is to have a meeting at the beginning when they are given the journey logs, and let them know what they can use them for. Some of the participants really didn’t use their coaching log and didn’t hardly know that they existed.*
On my conference calls, I always give them a new copy as a part of a conference call—and we go over where they are at on it—as a group...

I touch base with the professional journey at the end of each module.

I don’t know if they are actually using this log. I use it on their one-on-ones, but I don’t know if they are actually using it as well. I think it’s a good suggestion to focus more attention on it at the beginning.

I like (specific coach’s) suggestions that for every Q&A attach it to an email, maybe even break it down by module so they have it right there. So they keep seeing it. And give it at their very first meeting.

Both trainers and coaches spoke of participants being “overwhelmed” by the number of outcomes and confused by what was expected.

Module 2, more of my providers struggled with it, (there was) no basis for it,(it) had nothing about their curriculum plan and describing their room arrangements. That whole section felt overwhelming and it is in the module where there were so many outcomes.

Should there be closer to the same number of outcomes per module? Some of the items didn’t seem that they fit into the same theme. Amount of outcomes was overwhelming.

(The) list is freaking them out. The environment plan, nobody really has that. It’s a good thing to have, but which priority is it? Module 2 has curriculum, plan, and financial things—maybe making module 3 the budget and combining the curriculum pieces and the environment should be in the same module.

Providers are feeling that the amount of outcomes is overwhelming. Somehow paring them down or consolidating might be a good suggestion. Some have them already. Some might be redundant... So many outcomes, they throw up their hands—so much to look at.

Maybe when people apply and people get a copy of the outcomes before they start, it would really be clear. Know what they are getting themselves into.

The business plan really threw people, and I wonder why it is there (in the log). The resume might be redundant with the business plan.

One of the participants confirmed this confusion stating:

Early in the class, there was something handed out that was meant to help us create our business outline, but in our binder for our expected outcomes it said at the end of each unit “business plan outline,” but it was never readdressed in any additional classes. So I found myself at the end having key expected outcomes complete but I not really having a business plan outline I felt that I could take to someone else to look at and interpret. I understood it but I’m not sure it was clear, so that I could take that to the next level.
Misunderstanding about the roles of coaches and trainers and the need to coordinate their work was addressed by the coaches:

Misunderstandings do occur. A trainer has said, “Your coach will work with you on that,” but coaches aren’t necessarily working on that.

Trainers need to be paying attention to the outcomes so participants gain knowledge of the outcomes in the training sessions. Participants have said, “I don’t know what an assessment is. Can you tell us what an assessment is?” Trainers need to be using the language of the outcomes.

A little more communication with coaches and trainers together to clarify roles and responsibilities to get participants to reach the outcomes.

Trainers need to know their role in homework and participant reminders.

Outcomes were challenging at the beginning. I am understanding my role as a coach better and trainers are getting clearer as they go along.

Changes to Practice Resulting from the Training

In the focus groups, participants reported making many changes to their family childcare businesses over the course of the training series. Many spoke of becoming more organized in all aspects of their business and “getting things in writing—health and safety policy, interview for parents, family handbook.” As reflected in the tables above, many talked about the changes they had made to key documents:

I updated everything—mission statement, philosophy, handbook, how I do assessments, how I keep my records. I had all those systems in place and they all needed fine-tuning. Getting things in writing, strong policies, contract—everything was changed with a professional touch—and knowing ways to protect yourself.

I think I did improve my parent handbook. I added new policies. I learned a lot from other colleagues.

I made changes in my contracts (and) parent handbook. I am starting to do staff policies. I did a lot of changes in my program. I feel more professional now.

I changed my philosophy and mission statement. That was wonderful that we did this. I had a change in understanding my insurance. I had insurance but now I have much more in-depth. And the resources that are available to all of us.

Everything that was in my head is currently now on paper. If someone isn’t happy, I say, “Oh, this is in the parent handbook or in the employee handbook.”
I got more in writing and official—like handbooks—everything had been fairly casual—class made me realize that I had to get something that everybody had read and signed—and made me proactive so I wouldn’t have to deal with problems.

When I started the cohort, I already had a parent handbook, but I did improve my parent handbook. I made some improvement with my parent relationships. Everything was more clear, expectations, because not misunderstandings from the contracts. They see me as a more honest and professional and they are open to bring me any questions and concerns and I do the same with them. I think because expectations are clearer up front, I think building a relationship is easier.

Got a mission, philosophy statement, risk management plan, and business plan. After seventeen (years), I haven’t had that before.

Several of the participants undertook major changes to the structure of their businesses.

I am running a smaller more effective program with less stress. But I’m getting paid the same amount of money.

I took on (fewer) hours, more kids with special needs

Let go of staff

Opened a second home, right across the street from me—it is an infant and toddler home. I separated my age groups.

I reduced ages of children. I was serving children from 6 weeks to 12 years old. I changed my aging group to 1 to 8 years old. I changed my financing to have minimum payment and so the only school-age children I have are special needs. Those were the only parents willing to pay the minimum monthly amount. It was a big change for me.

Many spoke proudly of the changes they made to improve their financial stability and sustainability of their programs:

I am doing budget, cash flow, checking my business income and expenses, everything looks more organized now. Good to have access to have this for my program.

I would agree that most of it I did before, but I do it more organized now, if someone else came in they would know what I was doing and thinking.

It was nice that when I was (absent from work), my staff was able to pick up and do it for me, this class helped me do that. Prior to that I organized my paperwork, and I had been training them more so they would know where things were. It made things go much easier.

Partially because of OPQ funds and Building a Business, I purchased Quickbooks and doing all of that on my computer instead of only by hand. (I) can’t let go of the by-hand part because of “what-if.” I am doing more of my accounting piece on the computer.
I am more aware of where my money goes now. I haven’t changed anything as far as, It hasn’t really changed anything; but I’m just more aware.

I have been able to budget more—able to account for every dollar—more so than wanting to buy a new bookshelf and just doing it; but having it more laid out. Being able to see where things go and how much things cost. And thinking more about my future. As far as being able to retire eventually....Being in that class helped me think about the future and how budgeting plays a big role in that.

Changes to curriculum were challenging but very rewarding for many of the participants.

The biggest change is doing a curriculum on my own. Before I don’t think I would have had the inspiration to do it on my own.

This is the area of most work I’ve been doing. I put in writing my mission, philosophy, made plan for assessment, and investigated...different approaches and decided on one curriculum. It was really helpful and inspiring to be able to know about all these philosophies in early childhood education....I understand the importance of working with curriculum that’s research based. I am using it right now and my clients are really happy with the changes that are happening in my program.

Changes to Self Perception -- Professionalism
I think the biggest change for me was the confidence that I got from the class. It made me feel like a professional and like, before when people came for an interview, they were interviewing me, and now when they come for an interview I am interviewing them. That’s been the biggest change.

The words spoken by this participant are echoed throughout the participant focus group conversations. Many spoke of changes to their perceptions about their own abilities:

I have a lot more confidence in myself and I feel more like a professional and that attitude is conveyed to other people, more than before.

Definitely the (gain in) confidence and meeting other providers and knowing we’re not alone. And just seeing that there are people who think like I do. Being able to hold myself taller. I feel more professional for sure.

I felt a lot more confident in what I do, knowing I am doing the right thing because of this class. It was very enlightening and I learned a lot

It makes me realize I can achieve my goals. I do feel proud of myself and I feel that being a fcc (provider) I can go all the way I want to go. I can reach my goals...

I just feel I am proud of myself for what I have accomplished. I didn’t realize what a big deal it was until I started thinking about it. (It) helps me view myself as a business owner and a
professional early childhood business owner. (I have) pride in what I do and how I run my business. Being able to sit down and officially planning where I want to be in 2 years and 5 years—having an actual plan and not just “someday.”

For some of the participants, Building a Business was the beginning of a journey toward greater professional development and higher education:

I decided I needed to go back to school full time so I have been going to school full time and working in the day care.

It inspired me to do things I had been working on for a lot of years. It inspired me to do things that I thought I never had time for. On Oregon Registry, I was a (Step) 3 when I started. I had just got to a 3. I had 20 years of certificates. I believe I’m close to an (Step) 8.

I had been in day care for about 10 years, taking advantage of every training offered in my community, and college classes, I can see how the training is having good professional results in terms of managing my business. So, I am sure I will continue doing it. I have commitment to my profession now. I will keep taking as many classes as I can for my life. I like it. I enjoy it.

Now I am seeing myself as a business owner. I have always thought of my professional development as how I spend my time in the classroom—now thinking of how I spend my time in my office. I like it. It’s opened my horizons. I am looking forward to getting a Director Credential (and) professional development plan. I’m surprised at what I’m looking at. But I see the value of all this now.

I feel like the class inspired me to just take my professional development more seriously.

I may go to grad school this fall, but if not I know I understand how my training each year can add up to more than training hours—I can get a CDA or something that shows better accomplishment.

**INTERIM MODIFICATIONS MADE DURING COHORTS**

Because this evaluation was a formative evaluation, adjustments were made for Cohort 2 in response to data received during Cohort 1. These changes included:

- Training of Cohort 2 coaches was scheduled earlier and prior to the start of Cohort 2. The training for Cohort 2 coaches was more comprehensive than that for Cohort 1 coaches.
- In response to a suggestion from the trainer focus group, the orientation for Cohort 2 participants was held a month prior to the start of Cohort 2 and was more comprehensive with a stronger focus on the outcomes and expectations.
- In response to Cohort 1 participant focus groups and the coach focus group, the Cohort 1 group phone conferences were dropped and replaced with small group meetings at lunch time.
- Technical assistance was given to trainers in response to email debriefings and reviews of participants’ session evaluations. Additionally, trainers and coaches were provided with new information and resources as they became available.
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In response to Cohort 1 participant focus groups, email reminders to Cohort 2 participants regarding assignments were sent a week earlier in order to give them more time to complete readings and other assignments before their Saturday sessions.

### Summary and Implications

From the voices of the participants, coaches and trainers who have taken part in the evaluation process, we have learned many positive things about Building a Business. Looking first at the content of the training, we have learned that the objectives are appropriate and are successfully achieved. The curriculum is seen as strong and relevant with two exceptions. The participants speak of a need for more information around the subjects of budget and finance, BOLI and workman’s comp and curriculum models. Many of the materials and resources were found to be useful and were well-received by most of the participants. Some indicated that the Green and Dischler books were of minor importance to the learning experience and could be dispensed with if budget issues suggested it. The major problem with materials was the binder—participants found it unwieldy and generally not user-friendly. Many had developed alternative methods for organizing training materials so they would not have to struggle with the binder.

A review of the data related to the processes involved in the delivery of Building a Business reveals that the trainers were highly valued by the participants, and the participants appreciated having multiple trainers. Participants were very discerning in identifying trainers’ strengths and weaknesses and the attributes, skills, and abilities that contributed to the trainers’ effectiveness.

A review of the outcomes data at post-training suggests that participants in both cohorts made positive steps toward meeting outcomes. The outcomes with the greatest percentage of change for Cohort 1 from the self-assessment data were:

- Family intake plan
- Quality improvement plan
- Professional development plan
- Professional involvement plan
- Risk management plan

The outcomes with greatest changes for Cohort 2 were:

- Written description of physical environments
- Health & safety improvement plan
- Mission statement
- Risk management plan

Self-ratings of Cohort 1 at post-training indicated that 100 percent of the participants had completed four of the outcomes, meaning that they rated them “I have one that I like.” The three bolded outcomes are key outcomes.

- **Mission statement** (changing an average of 0.750 point)
- **Philosophy statement** (changing an average of 0.733 point)
- Family intake plan (changing an average of 1.750 points)
- **Family policy handbook** (changing an average of 1.000 point)
Cohort 2 rated themselves a bit lower at post-training than Cohort 1. The outcomes with the highest average ratings for Cohort 2 were:

- **Mission statement**, with an average rating of 1.923, changing an average of 1.352
- **Written description of physical environment**, average rating 1.867, changing an average of 1.533
- **Family policy handbook**, average rating 1.857, changing an average of 0.990
- **Philosophy statement**, average rating 1.846, changing an average of 0.918

All four are key outcomes. The high degree of congruence between the coaches’ ratings and the participants’ ratings for both cohorts at post-training seems to verify the accuracy of participants’ self-perceptions about achievement of the key outcomes.

The data suggest that the training and coaching model is effective to help participants make positive changes in their business documents and practices practices. Trainers were emphasizing the importance of the outcomes and helping participants explore the concepts and ways to accomplish the outcomes in the training. Coaches were working with the participants on a one-to-one basis giving technical assistance and feedback as participants were working to improve their own business documents and practices. The high degree of agreement between the coaches’ ratings and participants’ ratings in the key outcomes at post-training indicates clear communication between the coaches and the participants regarding the criteria for achieving these outcomes.

From the perspective of the participants’ satisfaction with the coaching process, some modifications are indicated. Although many liked their coaches personally and some felt they had benefitted from their support, they cited instances of miscommunication, unresponsiveness, or ineffective activities and interactions. Coaches also reported difficulties with the coaching component and suggested several possible actions to improve coordination, communication, and general effectiveness of the coaching process. It should be noted that modifications were made mid-way through the second cohort in response to feedback from Cohort 1 participant focus groups and the coach focus group. Specifically, conference calls were replaced with lunchtime meetings with coaches during the training sessions. This did satisfy one major complaint, but issues of coordination and communication remained.

Relationship development was another significant strength of the training from the perspectives of participants, trainers, and to some extent, coaches also. Participant suggested several alterations to schedules and activities to further enhance the relationship process.

Participants and trainers alike were generally positive in their assessment of the effectiveness of the logistical processes related to delivery of the training—the time, location, length of sessions, lodging, etc. This was true for both cohorts held in two separate locations.

Looking to the statistical data related to outcomes, the training was highly successful. However, the narrative data tells the story of difficulties encountered in the process of achieving the outcomes. These again relate to the roles of trainers vs. coaches and the communication around those roles. The participants’ accounts of the positive changes they have experienced, both personally and professionally stand as testament laudable to the success of Building a Business. The data also indicate the need for some modifications to further enhance the effectiveness of the training.

1. Trainers can make slight modification of content in a few sessions to respond to participants’ suggestions. More content on BOLI requirements, for example, should be included.
2. Coaching is a vital component of relationship-based professional development, which provided the conceptual framework for the delivery of Building a Business. However, it was not utilized to the fullest extent. The coaching and training processes need to be more closely aligned with the two roles re-imagined as a “training team.” Coaches attended the trainer orientation to the curriculum, for example, to gain a comprehensive understanding of the content of the training. But trainers were not required to attend the coach training component. Perhaps if they did, trainers would have a clearer understanding of the coaches’ role, could more frequently emphasize the coaching process in the training sessions, and gain a more cohesive understanding of the collective emphasis on achieving outcomes. This will require sessions scheduled before the beginning of each training cohort for the organization and preparation of the trainers and coaches and will necessitate periodic gatherings and debriefings of the “training team” to confer on content and progress of the participants.

3. Coaching was effective in helping participants further define the outcomes and encouraging participants on a one-to-one basis to work toward reaching the outcomes. The high degree of agreement between coach ratings and participant post-training self-ratings suggest an alignment of opinions that likely arose from the one-on-one conferences and site visits. The coaching model appears to be viable; however, indications are that coaches need more opportunities to receive support and technical assistance throughout the process. The stronger linkages of the “training team” as envisioned above would help to accomplish this.

4. The model showing what participants see as effective trainers should be shared with trainers and coaches.

5. The 29 outcomes, while relevant to the development of a sound and sustainable family child care business, seem to be overwhelming in number to both participants and coaches. Paring them down to those most connected to the former Oregon Program of Quality (OPQ) standards and Oregon’s evolving Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System (TQRIS) standards would help facilitate an increased focus for trainers, coaches, and participants.

6. Expectations around the production of outcomes must be more effectively communicated before any training or coaching commences. This might include description of the expectation in the application packets as well as a thorough orientation for participants, devoted to presenting the outcomes and answering questions about the outcomes, the coaching logs and the participant tracking journals and co-facilitated by the coaches and trainers for the cohort.

7. As standards for coaching and other technical assistance strategies are developed, they can be incorporated into the coaching model for this training curriculum. Participants will benefit from earning additional training hours for the time spent one-on-one with their coaches.

8. Trainers and coaches can be watchful for the need to refer participants for further training to gain more depth in other core knowledge categories, such as Learning Environments & Curriculum, where they could explore such topics as curriculum models. Trainers can end each training day with a moment for participants to reflect, plan, and share ideas about next steps for training that will further their professional knowledge.
9. The final recommendation is less extensive, but deserves consideration—modification of the binder. The participants offered some creative alternatives which deserve consideration.

This evaluation has found that Building a Business: Certified Family Child Care Management Series has been highly successful in meeting the needs of Oregon’s family child care community. Evaluation has been formative throughout its operation and has resulted in continuous improvement and fine-tuning of the curriculum and processes for delivery. Time and effort spent in addressing the modifications and improvements indicated by the findings will enhance its effectiveness further.
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## APPENDIX A – BUILDING A BUSINESS OVERVIEW

### Building a Business:
Certified Family Child Care Management Training

60 Hours  
Core Knowledge Category: Program Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laying the Foundation</th>
<th>Building the Framework</th>
<th>Moving In</th>
<th>Setting Your Style</th>
<th>Creating a Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set One</strong> 10 hours</td>
<td><strong>Set Two</strong> 15 hours</td>
<td><strong>Set Two</strong> 10 hours</td>
<td><strong>Set Two</strong> 15 hours</td>
<td><strong>Set Two</strong> 10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Developing plans for a certified family child care home that is based on sound business practices and developmentally appropriate practices</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Building the structure for a certified family child care home that is financially stable and reflects best practices for children, families, staff, the provider and her/his family</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Designing the physical environment of a certified family child care home that reflects the family culture and program mission statement and philosophy and meets standards of regulation and quality</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Planning a human environment in a certified family child care home that is productive, respectful and supportive of staff, families, own family and provider’s interests and needs</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Developing effective ways to communicate and collaborate with families, prospective clients, professional colleagues, neighbors, and community partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 sessions; 22 @ 2 ½ hours; one double session @ 5 hours = 60 hours total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Titles</th>
<th>Session Titles</th>
<th>Session Titles</th>
<th>Session Titles</th>
<th>Session Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Business Owners in a Caring Profession</td>
<td>2.1 Planning Your Curriculum</td>
<td>3.1 Planning Your Child Care Space</td>
<td>4.1 Hiring Staff</td>
<td>5.1 Communicating with Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Program Values, Mission &amp; Philosophy</td>
<td>2.2 Staffing Your Program</td>
<td>3.2 Managing Your Physical Environments</td>
<td>4.2 Building Your Team</td>
<td>5.2 Relationships in the Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Legal Responsibilities &amp; Risk Management</td>
<td>2.3 Building Your Budget</td>
<td>3.3 Tour of Homes</td>
<td>4.3 Supervising Others</td>
<td>5.3 Connecting to the Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Foundation for Your Business Plan</td>
<td>2.4 Keeping Records</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Supporting Professional Development</td>
<td>5.4 Promoting Your Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sessions 2 ½ hours

First two sessions are 2 ½ hours; third session is 5 hours

All sessions 2 ½ hours

All session 2 ½ hours
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laying the Foundation</th>
<th>Building the Framework</th>
<th>Moving In</th>
<th>Setting Your Style</th>
<th>Creating a Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resume or professional autobiography</td>
<td>• Written description of curriculum</td>
<td>• Written description of physical environments</td>
<td>• Written staffing plan</td>
<td>• Family policy handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mission statement</td>
<td>• Child assessment plan</td>
<td>• Health &amp; safety improvement plan</td>
<td>• Interview protocol (if applicable)</td>
<td>• Community outreach plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Philosophy statement</td>
<td>• Balance sheet analyzing costs of personnel</td>
<td>• Emergency preparedness plan</td>
<td>• Staff orientation plan (if applicable)</td>
<td>• Professional involvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk management plan</td>
<td>• Budget</td>
<td>• Environment improvement plan reflecting, Oregon Program of Quality standards &amp; accreditation standards for environments</td>
<td>• Job descriptions (if applicable)</td>
<td>• Marketing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business plan outline</td>
<td>• Record keeping system</td>
<td>• Business plan outline</td>
<td>• Staff policy handbook (if applicable)</td>
<td>• Final business plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality improvement plan</td>
<td>• Outline of staff policy handbook (as relevant)</td>
<td>• Environment improvement plan reflecting, Oregon Program of Quality standards &amp; accreditation standards for environments</td>
<td>• Staff evaluation plan (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outline of family policy handbook</td>
<td>• Business plan outline</td>
<td>• Professional development plans for self and staff (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business plan outline</td>
<td>• Quality improvement plan</td>
<td>• Family intake plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Written description of physical environments</td>
<td>• Business plan outline</td>
<td>• Contracts with families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ground rules for family &amp; business boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Business plan outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ground rules &amp; etiquette</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
<td>• Greetings &amp; news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
<td>• Successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
<td>• Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
<td>• Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
<td>• Peer mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
<td>• Suggestions &amp; questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
<td>• Encouragement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Q&amp;A Meeting</th>
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