

The Mentoring Pairs
for Child Care Project



Final
Outcome
Report

Gillian Doherty, Ph.D

Submitted by:

Early Childhood Community
Development Centre

Submitted to:

Ministry of Education

May 2011

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Section 1: Introduction	6
1.1. Background	6
1.2. MPCC's goals	7
1.3. The three MPCC phases	7
1.3.a. Design, January to October, 2008	7
1.3.b. Phase I: Process evaluation, November 2008 to December 2009	8
1.3.c. Phase II: Outcome evaluation, January 2010 to March 2011	9
1.4. MPCC's conceptual framework	9
1.5. The delivery of MPCC	10
1.5.a. Provision of financial assistance to participants and their centres	10
1.5.b. Application, participant selection and matching	10
1.5.c. Preparation for participation in MPCC	11
1.5.d. The monthly meetings and between-meeting activities	11
Section 2: Method	12
2.1. Introduction	12
2.2. Sample selection	12
2.2.a. Total cohort	12
2.2.b. Observation sub-sample	13
2.3. The evaluation instruments	13
2.3.a. The four MPCC questionnaires	13
2.3.b. The psychometric properties of the OS and MAP questionnaires	14
2.3.c. The three observation instruments	15
2.3.d. The psychometric properties of the three observation instruments	16
2.4. Data collection procedures	16
2.4.a. Questionnaire completion	16
2.4.b. Collection of the observation data	16
2.4.c. Observer characteristics and training	16
2.5. Data handling and analyses	17
2.5.a. Questionnaires	17
2.5.b. Observation instruments	18
Section 3: Findings	18
3.1. Introduction	18
3.2. The post-MPCC sample	18
3.3. The evaluation framework	19
3.3.a. The project's primary goal	19
3.3.b. The project's other eight goals	21
3.4. The extent to which the project's primary goal was achieved	21
3.4.a. Level 1: Participants' reaction to MPCC	21



Table of Contents

3.4.b. Level 2: Self-reported changes in knowledge, skills and/or beliefs	23
3.4.c. Level 3: Demonstrable changes in the participant's behaviour	27
3.4.d. Level 4: Demonstrable changes in the participant's organization and/or its service delivery	29
The <i>Program Administration Scale</i>	29
The <i>Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised</i>	29
The <i>Caregiver Interaction Scale</i>	31
3.5. The extent to which MPCC achieved the project's other eight goals	33
3.5.a. Revitalize supervisors; increase their professionalism, leadership skills, and job satisfaction; and establish mentoring relationships among supervisors	33
3.5.b. Increase supervisor use of reflection	36
3.5.c. Influence organizational change and inter-relationships between community colleges and the ELCC community	37
3.5.d. MPCC's impact on the larger community	38
3.6. Summary and discussion	41
3.7. Continuing the momentum	42

Appendices

A. List of Advisory Committee members and their affiliation	43
B. List of participant communities	46
C. Psychometric properties of the OS and MAP questionnaires	47
D. Psychometric properties of the three observation instruments	48
E. The ten observers and their affiliation	49
F. The OS questionnaire	50
G. The MAP questionnaire	57
H. The 24 participating community colleges in 2010	61
I. Partners' perceptions of MPCC's impact on their community, results from 2009 and 2010 combined	62

References	63
------------------	----

List of Tables

Table 1: Inter-rater agreement	17
Table 2: The instruments used to evaluate achievement of the project's primary goal	20
Table 3: Participants' reactions to MPCC, mentors and mentees combined	22
Table 4: Self-reported OS knowledge and skills	24
Table 5: Self-Reported mentoring attitudes, behavioural predispositions and beliefs	26
Table 6: Demonstrable changes in administrative behaviour	28
Table 7: Changes in overall program quality	30
Table 8: Changes in teacher interactions with children	32
Table 9: MPCC impact on five of the other eight project goals	34
Table 10: MPCC impact on leadership skills and professionalism	35
Table 11: MPCC impact on supervisor use of reflection	36
Table 12: Partner's perception of the impact of MPCC on their community	39

Acknowledgements

The Early Childhood Community Development Centre (ECCDC) wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the Ministry of Children and Youth Services and to the Ministry of Education for their financial assistance and the encouragement given to the Mentoring Pairs for Child Care Project by their staff. We also greatly appreciate the contribution of the post-secondary institutions that hired and supervised the animators to facilitate the monthly participant meetings and provided MPCC graduates with course credits. A big debt of gratitude is owed to those centres and teachers who granted permission to observe their programs and thereby enabled completion of the evaluation. Thank you everyone for your commitment to enhancing Ontario's ELCC programs!

The Project's design and implementation benefited greatly from the extensive experience of, and the guidance provided by, its Advisory Council members. A salute to the ECCDC staff who assisted in the marketing and delivery of MPCC and the observers who collected the on-site evaluation data. Hats off for difficult jobs well done.

Our Project consultants were Elaine Ferguson, Child Care Connection NS, whose mentoring experience with Partners In Practice informed the program design, and Gillian Doherty, ELCC consultant and researcher, who was responsible for the evaluation component. Data analysis was ably provided by Jonathan Lomotey (Senior Researcher, Centre for Community Based Research). The ECCDC manager for MPCC was Glory Ressler who brought both extensive project management experience and a high level of commitment to the role.



Executive Summary

Several large, longitudinal studies document the impact of the quality of the child care programs preschoolers attend on their school-readiness at age five and subsequent academic progress (Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Thomas, 2006; U.S. National Institute of Child Health and Development (NICHD), 2005; Wylie et al. 2006). There also is strong evidence that a supervisor with effective administration and leadership skills is crucial for developing and sustaining an early learning and care (ELCC) program that enhances children's development (Best Start Expert Panel on Quality and Human Resources, 2007). Recent research provides additional evidence. For example, one study found that centre administrative quality accounted for 26% of the variance in program quality in 452 child care classrooms after controlling for factors such as lead teacher qualifications (McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership, 2010).

The Ministry of Children and Youth Services (MCYS) provided funding to the Early Childhood Community Development Centre (ECCDC) to develop and administer the Mentoring Pairs for Child Care (MPCC) project as part of its Supervisor Training Strategy. The Ministry's agreed-upon objective for MPCC was to enhance the quality of Ontario's early learning and child care centres through increasing supervisors' application of the Child Care Human Resources Sector Council's *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* (CCHRSC, 2006).

There were also eight other goals: (1) revitalize supervisor enthusiasm about working in the ELCC field; (2) increase supervisor professionalism; (3) increase supervisor leadership skills; (4) increase the level of job satisfaction among supervisors; (5) establish mentoring relationships among ELCC supervisors; (6) increase supervisors use of reflective practice; (7) influence organizational change and inter-relationships between post-secondary early childhood education programs, child care organizations, and child care practice; and (8) have a positive impact on the communities in which MPCC operated in addition to having a positive impact on MPCC participants and their centres.

The main components of MPCC were: (1) a community development approach to organizational change; (2) transmission of administrative and leadership knowledge and skills through a formal curriculum delivered to all participants; (3) replacement of the traditional 'instructor' with an 'animator' who facilitated group discussion and analysis of the information provided; (4) a strong mentoring component emphasizing collegial learning and peer support; and (5) program delivery that enabled participants to continue to work at their centres full-time.

As demonstrated in this report, MPCC successfully achieved all eight project goals. In doing so it enhanced the quality of a sub-sample of mentee graduates' centres to a degree that could not have happened simply by chance ($p < .01$) as measured on the total score for the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised* (Harms et al., 1998). There were also enhancements in mentors' centres that were not statistically significant. Demonstrating significant gains on the ECERS-R less than two months after the completion of the program is a remarkable achievement given the opinion expressed by experts that enhanced service delivery after administrator training takes time and may not be demonstrable for a year or more (Gursky, 1990, Knapp-Philo et al. 2006).

The data also demonstrate that mentors, who had five or more years of experience as supervisors, as well as mentees experienced a renewed enthusiasm for their work; and increased professionalism, leadership skills, job satisfaction and use of reflective practice. Due to the design of the program participants also obtained an ongoing peer support network.



Section 1: Introduction

Mentoring: *“A nurturing process in which a more skilled and more experienced person serving as a role model teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter’s professional and/or personal development.”*

Anderson & Shannon, 1995, p. 29.

1.1. Background

In 2005, the Ontario government launched the Best Start plan to help ensure that every child has the best possible start in life and is ready and eager to achieve success by the time they arrive in grade one. To further these goals, MCYS established a panel of experts to develop a long-term quality development strategy for early learning and child care (ELCC) as well as a comprehensive human resources strategy. The Panel noted that several research studies have found that a supervisor or senior manager with effective administration and leadership skills is crucial for developing and sustaining an ELCC program that enhances children’s development and supports their families (Best Start Expert Panel on Quality and Human Resources, 2007). However, a pan-Canadian survey completed in 2003 identified a widespread lack of training in administration and leadership among these key people right across the country (Beach et al., 2004). Therefore, it is not surprising that the expert panel expressed concern about the gap between the educational requirements and job expectations of ELCC program supervisors and the resultant negative impact on service delivery.

Recognizing that once they are in their job it is difficult for ELCC supervisors to take time off for formal courses, MCYS implemented a Supervisor Training Strategy through which several projects were funded including the Mentoring Pairs for Child Care (MPCC) Project. The Ministry’s agreed-upon objective for MPCC as outlined in the service contract was to enhance the quality of licensed child care centres in Ontario through increasing supervisors’ application of the *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* developed by the Child Care Human Resources Sector Council (CCHRSC, 2006). Consistent with the mentoring concept, MPCC was envisioned as a program that would link less experienced with more experienced supervisors to provide them with guidance, information and support.

The three-year pilot was managed by the Early Childhood Community Development Centre (ECCDC) in St. Catharines, an independent charitable organization committed to helping ELCC programs and providers expand their knowledge and skills by offering training, specialized resources, and consulting services. ECCDC also develops and leads or coordinates/administers local, provincial, and national community development and research projects such as the development and testing of its mentoring program for ELCC students and teachers by Partners in Practice in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Ontario (Schael, 1998) and the Niagara Region’s *Understanding the Early Years* research (See www.rhdcc-hrsdc.gc.ca. Early Years Reports).

Section 1: Introduction

1.2. MPCC's goals

The primary goal for MPCC was to enhance the quality of Ontario ELCC centres by increasing supervisors' application of the *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators*. The contract between MCYS and ECCDC also stated that MPCC was to:

- Revitalize supervisor enthusiasm about working in the ELCC field
- Increase supervisor professionalism
- Increase supervisor leadership skills
- Increase the level of job satisfaction among supervisors
- Increase supervisor use of reflective practice
- Establish mentoring relationships among ELCC centre supervisors
- Influence organizational change and inter-relationships between post-secondary early childhood education programs, child care organizations, and ELCC practice

Subsequently MPCC added another goal, that it would have a positive impact on the communities in which it operated in addition to having a positive impact on MPCC participants and their centres.

In May, 2010 responsibility for ELCC, including MPCC, was transferred from MCYS to the Ministry of Education (MEDU). This Ministry confirmed that the goals established for MPCC by MCYS fall under its Early Learning Division and support Dr. Charles Pascal's 2009 report, *With Our Best Future in Mind: Implementing Early Learning in Ontario*, which came into law in May 2010 as Bill 242, the Full-Day Early Learning Statute Law Amendment Act.

1.3. The three MPCC phases

The development, implementation and evaluation of MPCC was implemented through the following three phases:

1.3.a. Design, March to October, 2008

The purpose of this phase was the development of the tools, strategies and overall approach for delivery of the MPCC program. It involved the following activities:

- Consultation with stakeholders through 12 focus groups across the province in May and June, 2008 which were attended by 187 people including both francophone and First Nations participants. These focus groups enabled MPCC to build on the expertise and different perspectives of various players in Ontario's ELCC sector.
- Development of marketing materials such as brochures, and marketing strategies.
- Development of the training materials, technological infrastructure needed to deliver the program such as an on-line participants' forum, and strategies and processes for program delivery.

Section 1: Introduction

1.3.a. Design, March to October, 2008

- The securing of partnerships with MCYS licensing specialists and post-secondary ELCC training programs. These activities included providing colleges with a course outline for MPCC, obtaining post-diploma course recognition for its completion, and arranging for colleges to hire and supervise someone to facilitate program delivery in the communities involved.
- The establishment of a project advisory committee.
- Translation of all MPCC marketing and program materials into French.

The project advisory committee that was formed brought together the experience and expertise of ELCC supervisors, the Association of Early Childhood Educators, Ontario, the Child Care Human Resources Sector Council, community college ELCC training programs, community agencies engaged in promoting ELCC quality, municipal social services, and the provincial government, see Appendix A for the names and affiliations of the advisory committee members. The committee met quarterly throughout the remainder of the project and between meetings corresponded via email or conference call.

1.3.b. Phase I: Process evaluation, November 2008 to December, 2009

This purpose of this phase was the pilot-testing of the tools, strategies and overall delivery of MPCC and the identification and addressing of required amendments. It involved the following activities:

- Seeking, selecting and orienting animators ¹
- Seeking, selecting and matching mentees and mentors ²
- Delivering the mentoring program
- Completing a process evaluation focusing on the application and selection process for mentees and mentors, the orientation training given animators and mentoring participants at the beginning of the mentoring program, and the tools, strategies and overall approach used for program delivery
- Amending the materials and processes as indicated by the process evaluation

The feedback obtained from Phase I animators, mentors and mentees through a series of self-completed questionnaires resulted in a remarkably short list of suggestions for amendments, see the November 30, 2009 report to MCYS (Doherty, 2009). The questionnaire suggestions were used to make amendments as indicated prior to Phase II (Doherty, 2010).

¹ The term ‘animator’ refers to those people hired by the community colleges to facilitate program delivery. They worked with a group of mentors and mentees during the one-year program, e.g. facilitating group training and providing support to individuals and to mentoring pairs.

² To be considered for a mentor position applicants had to have at least five years of experience as a supervisor. Applicants not accepted as mentors were given the option of participating as a mentee.

Section 1: Introduction

1.3.c. Phase II: Outcome evaluation, January 2010 to March, 2011

The primary purpose of Phase II was to evaluate the extent to which MPCC successfully achieved the primary goal of improving quality in ELCC centres by increasing supervisors' application of the Sector Council's *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators*. The process evaluation undertaken in Phase I was also repeated in Phase II. Thus Phase II involved the following activities:

- Seeking, selecting and orienting animators
- Seeking, selecting and matching mentees and mentors
- Delivering the mentoring program
- Repeating the Phase I process evaluation to determine whether the administrative and program changes made subsequent to Phase II successfully addressed the required amendments indicated by Phase I animators and participants and, if not, identifying the further amendments required
- Seeking graduate's opinion of the extent to which MPCC had supported their professional development
- Evaluating the extent to which MPCC had enhanced supervisors' application of the *Occupational Standards* and centres' program quality through on-site pre- and post-MPCC observation in a sub-group of graduates' programs. (Evaluating change in all graduates' centres would have required more resources than were available)

The feedback from Phase II animators, mentors and mentees indicated that the application, selection and matching materials and process worked well and therefore no further amendments were indicated and that the MPCC model, tools, processes, and overall approach to program delivery is ready for use with future cohorts (Doherty, 2010). They did, however, suggest some reorganization of the animator and participant manuals.

The results of the evaluation of the extent to which MPCC enhanced the administrative and mentoring knowledge and skills of the Phase II graduates and improved the overall quality of a sub-group of graduates' centres are provided in Section 3 of this report.

1.4. MPCC's conceptual framework

- A community development approach to organizational change that involved community consultation and needs assessment before and during the program, ongoing participative leadership facilitated by developing partnerships with key community ELCC stakeholders, and community involvement in the outcome evaluation.³

³ Community involvement and the use of participatory leadership continued after the completion of MPCC as a result of participant identification of a need to continue their own learning and identification of community needs for further support. As noted in section 3.7, this resulted the development of 23 'continuing the momentum' plans.

Section 1: Introduction

1.4. MPCC's conceptual framework

- Transmission of administrative and leadership knowledge and skills through a formal curriculum delivered to all participants. The MPCC curriculum is based on the Sector Council's *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* (CCHRSC, 2006) which was developed through extensive nation-wide consultation with the ELCC community. Using the *Standards* is consistent with the concept that the people working in an occupation have the best understanding of the knowledge and skills required for its effective practice.
- The replacement of the traditional 'instructor' as expert transmitting knowledge to less informed people by an 'animator' who facilitated group discussion and analysis of the information provided and encouraged the sharing of knowledge, strategies and experiences. This approach is consistent with the concept, supported by research, that adults learn best what they feel a need to know and when they play an active role in determining the structure of the learning experience (Bloom & Sheerer, 1992).
- A strong mentoring component emphasizing collegial learning and peer support facilitated by curriculum delivery in a community participant group that remained together throughout the program and used activities that required the exchange of ideas and cooperation between two or more participants. Using mentoring as one of the vehicles to deliver its program enabled MPCC to benefit from the lessons learned by previous ELCC training programs in Canada that combined a formal curriculum with mentoring (Partners in Practice, 1998).
- Program delivery in a way that enabled participants to continue working at their centres full-time while completing the program.

1.5. The delivery of MPCC

1.5.a. Provision of financial assistance to participants and their centres

Ontario government funding enabled the delivery of MPCC at no cost to the participants or to their centres. Instead, mentors and their employers each received \$750.00 for completing the full twelve-month program. Mentees each received \$500.00 and their employers received \$550.00. These honoraria were intended to help offset incidental expenses mentors or mentees might incur related to participating in the program. The honoraria for employers were intended to help offset backfill staff expenses for the times when a mentor or mentee was away from work due to their participation in the program.

1.5.b. Application, participant selection and matching

People wishing to participate in MPCC completed and submitted an application which indicated whether they wanted to be a mentor or a mentee and included questions about their ELCC training and PD, total number of years and months as a staff person in an ELCC centre, total time as a centre supervisor, preferred way of learning or teaching (depending on whether they

Section 1: Introduction

1.5.b. Application, participant selection and matching

applied to be a mentor or mentee), and which of the *Occupational Standards* (OS) they most wanted to work on.

Selection of participants from those applicants meeting the MPCC eligibility requirements was done through a random lottery. Mentoring pairs were created on the basis of geographical proximity, whether the person had applied to be a mentor or a mentee, length of time as a supervisor, preferred learning or teaching style, and self-identified administrative strengths and areas needing improvement. Custom matching was done to the extent possible when requested.

1.5.c. Preparation for participation in MPCC

Prior to the start of the program animators received two days of preparation which included training in reflective practice and an orientation to the animator role and the tools, processes and activities that would be used for program delivery.

At the beginning of the program all mentors and mentees participated in three days of preparation which included:

- Orientation to the overall MPCC program and introduction to key concepts such as a mentoring culture and reflective practice.
- Review of the program delivery methods and tools including participant binders, the monthly study groups, the on-line forum, and the use of journal entry to communicate with their mentoring partner.
- Identification of supplementary resources such as hand-out materials and key informant presentations.

In addition, mentors participated in a fourth day of training focusing on facilitation and coaching skills.

1.5.d. The monthly meetings and between-meeting activities

All the mentees and mentors in a community formed an Occupational Standards (OS) Study Group which had monthly 3-hour meetings from February to December, 2010 with their animator. The animator's role included facilitation of the monthly meetings and the provision of on-going support to the group members. The monthly meetings were intended to examine each of the *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* and their implications for practice. They also included discussion about what had been learned in the previous meeting and how the learning had been used by participants, identification of the *Standards* to be reviewed for and at the next meeting, and assignment of other work to be done between the two meetings. Processes used during the study groups included presentations by participants or experts, reviews of a case study or article, and analysis (e.g. cause and effect diagrams). In November each group held an event where its members shared their accomplishments with representatives of the broader community.

Section 1: Introduction

1.5.d. The monthly meetings and between-meeting activities

Between the monthly meetings participants were expected to engage in self-reflection and journaling, and complete assignments such as reading a specific article, reviewing or developing policies and other materials, researching an OS issue further, developing a presentation on what they accomplished for an upcoming meeting, and visiting their partner's or another centre to observe best practices. On-going communication between mentors and mentees was considered to be a vital part of MPCC and included the exchange of reflective journals, developing plans to enhance their centres, and one-to-one coaching.

Section 2: Method

2.1. Introduction

This section provides information about: (1) the sample; (2) the evaluation instruments; (3) the data collection procedures; (4) the data collector characteristics and training; and (5) the data handling and analyses.

2.2. Sample selection

2.2.a. Total cohort

Twenty-eight communities representing a cross-section of centres located in different parts of the province and in rural as well as urban communities of varying sizes were selected to participate in the 2010 MPCC cohort, see Appendix B for identification of the boundaries of each community. Selection of these particular communities resulted in 75% of Ontario's supervisors (4,505) being eligible to participate in the program. Of the 405 applications received, 403 were accepted for consideration on the basis of meeting the eligibility requirements for participation. Selection of participants from among this group was done through a random lottery, and resulted in 199 people being designated as mentors and 204 as mentees. Imbalance between mentors and mentees in a given community, either as a result of the selection process or a participant dropping out, were addressed by having a mentor paired with more than one mentee, two mentors forming a collegial mentoring pair, or an unlinked mentor still remaining in the group and participating in all aspects of the program.

Section 2: Method

2.2.b. Observation sub-sample

Before the start of the program a sub-sample of 10 communities was selected for the pre- and post-MPCC on-site observations that were part of the evaluation. They were: Barrie, Kingston, Ottawa, Peel, Peterborough, Sudbury, Timmins, Waterloo, Windsor and Youth South, see Appendix B for the areas in each. To maximize the observation sample, all 160 centres in these communities were approached for permission to observe regardless of whether the supervisor was designated as a mentee or mentor. The exceptions were francophone centres since one of the observation tools has not been translated into French. Each centre approached was sent a package that included: (1) a letter requesting its involvement; (2) information about the purpose of the evaluation; (3) identification of the evaluation instruments to be used in the centres; (4) one-page explanatory summaries for each of the centre's governing body or owner, the ELCC teachers, and the children's parents/guardians; (5) a consent form to be signed by the centre's governing body or owner; and (6) a consent form to be signed by the lead teacher in the room that would be observed. Follow-up emails to encourage participation were also sent and telephone calls made to 81 centres. Seventy-one centres agreed to be observed. Reasons for not consenting included staff going on leave, staffing issues, centre shutting down, too busy, and another site in their multi-site centre had already agreed to be observed.

2.3. The evaluation instruments

Seven instruments were used in the outcome evaluation. Four are questionnaires developed by MPCC for this Project while the other three are standardized observation scales all of which have been used in other ELCC research.

2.3.a. The four MPCC questionnaires

The *Occupational Standards (OS) Questionnaire*

The OS questionnaire is based on the necessary knowledge and skills for effective ELCC administration identified in the *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* (CCHRSC, 2006) which was developed through a Canada-wide consultation with 160 people from the field. This consultation included ELCC supervisors, faculty from community college ELCC training programs, and government officials. CCHRSC grouped the required knowledge and skills into six Standards: (1) child development and care; (2) human resources; (3) finances; (4) facilities; (5) family and community relations; and (6) governance. The Questionnaire has six subscales, one for each *Standard*. Each subscale consists of a series of statements reflecting the knowledge and skills required for competence in the *Standard* in question and asks respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree that the statement applies to them using a four-point scale of: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; and (4) strongly disagree. There is a box beside each statement that enables respondents to indicate that they found the statement difficult to interpret and therefore did not choose any of the four options.

Section 2: Method

2.3.a. The four MPCC questionnaires

The *Mentoring Attitudes and Predispositions (MAP) Questionnaire*

The MAP questionnaire consists of five subscales: (1) respectful accommodation, (2) empathetic listening, (3) reflective practice; (4) continuous growth; and (5) support and recognition. Collectively these subscales reflect the mentor behaviours found to be associated with effective ELCC mentoring by the Canadian Partners in Practice program (Ferguson et. al., 1999) and by other ELCC mentoring programs (Bellm, 1997; Whitebook & Sakai, 1995). The MAP questionnaire uses the same format and four-point rating scale for each statement as used in the OS questionnaire and also provides a box beside each statement that enables respondents to indicate that they found the statement difficult to interpret.

The *Perceived Level of Assistance with Professional Development (PD) Questionnaire*

The PD questionnaire uses the same format and four-point rating scale as used in the OS and MAP questionnaires and also provides a box beside each statement that enables respondents to indicate that they found the statement difficult to interpret. It has five subscales each of which looks at the respondent's perception of MPCC's impact on them in each of five areas: (1) degree of enthusiasm about working in the ECLC field; (2) professionalism; (3) leadership skills; (4) level of job satisfaction; and (5) mentoring relationships with other supervisors. Each of these subscales reflects one of the agreed-upon goals articulated for MPCC by MCYS in its contract with ECCDC and confirmed by MEDU when it took over responsibility for the project.

The partners' surveys

There are four surveys, one tailored for each of MPCC's four community partners: (1) Ministry program advisors and licensing specialists; (2) post-secondary institutions with an ELCC program; (3) the CMSMs, DSSABs and band councils; and (4) other community organizations promoting quality. The questionnaires consist of a mixture of statements of possible impacts from MPCC requiring respondents to indicate their level of agreement using the same four-point scale as used in the OS, MAP and PD questionnaires, questions requiring either a yes or no response, and open-ended questions.

2.3.b. The psychometric properties of the OS and MAP questionnaires

There are three basic requirements for questionnaires used in research, namely that: (1) they measure what they say they measure (Content Validity); (2) their subscales measure various aspects of the same construct e.g. administrative practice (Internal Consistency); and (3) the majority of respondents interpret their questions or statements in the same way (Consistency of Interpretation). As illustrated in Appendix C, both the OS and MAP questionnaires meet all three basic requirements. The PD questionnaire has good content validity since its statements directly relate to project goals and fewer than 3% of respondents identified any statement as difficult to interpret. Its internal consistency was not calculated.

Section 2: Method

2.3.c. The three observation instruments

Three observation instruments were used to collect on-site data before and after the supervisor's participation in MPCC: the *Program Administration Scale* (Talan & Bloom, 2004); the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised Edition* (Harms et al., 1998) and the *Caregiver Interaction Scale* (Armett, 1989).

The *Program Administration Scale* (PAS)

The PAS is designed to evaluate the administrative quality in ELCC centres serving any age of child. Its 25 items are arranged in 10 subscales each of which evaluates a different aspect of administrative practice: (1) human resources development; (2) personnel cost and allocation; (3) centre operations; (4) child assessment; (5) fiscal management; (6) program planning and evaluation; (7) family partnerships; (8) marketing and public relations; (9) use of technology; and (10) staff qualifications. Administration involves a tour of the facility, including both indoor and outdoor play environments and any space designated for families or staff, an in-depth interview lasting about two hours with the supervisor about administrative practices and policies, and a review of administrative documents to verify the information provided by the supervisor. Each item is rated on a seven-point scale with 1 representing inadequate; 3 minimal; 5 good; and 7 excellent.

Three states have embedded the use of PAS in their state-wide quality rating systems: Arkansas Quality Rating System (www.arkansas.gov/childcare); Illinois Quality Counts Quality Rating System (www.inccrra.org); and Ohio Step Up to Quality (www.stepuptoquality.org). A fourth state, Tennessee, uses PAS in its director credentialing system (Mietlicki, 2010).

The *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale - Revised*

The ECERS-R is designed for evaluation of program quality in centre-based programs for children aged three to five years. It is completed through observation in a single classroom supplemented by an interview of the lead teacher regarding items that could not be observed, e.g. children's nap time when the scale is administered in the morning. It consists of 43 descriptors arranged in seven subscales: (1) space and furnishings for children; (2) personal care routines; (3) language and reasoning; (4) materials, opportunities and activities to stimulate language and reasoning; (5) other programming activities; (6) interactions between adults and children and among children; and (7) interactions with parents, among staff, and between management and staff. Each item is rated on a seven-point scale with 1 representing inadequate; 3 minimal; 5 good; and 7 excellent.

The *Caregiver Interaction Scale* (CIS)

The CIS is a measure of adult behaviour with children which is suitable for use in programs serving infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and/or school-aged children whether in ELCC centres or family child care homes. Administration involves direct observation of the teacher or child care provider for approximately two hours. The 23 items (descriptive statements of behaviour) are scored as three separate subscales: (1) sensitivity, e.g. warm, attentive, and engaged teacher behaviour; (2) harshness, e.g. critical, threatening or punitive teacher behaviour; and (3) detachment, e.g. low levels of teacher interaction with and supervision of children. After the

Section 2: Method

The Caregiver Interaction Scale (CIS)

observation each item is ranked on the extent to which it mirrors the observed behaviour using the following four-point scale: not at all; somewhat; quite a bit; and very much. Often, as was the case in this study, the CIS is used to supplement the data on teacher-child interactions obtained from the ECERS-R. When this is done data to score both instruments are collected simultaneously.

2.3.d. The psychometric properties of the three observation instruments

There are four basic requirements for observation instruments used in research, namely that: (1) they measure what they say they measure (Content Validity); (2) their subscales measure various aspects of the same construct, .e.g. overall program quality (Internal Consistency); (3) two data collectors using the instrument to rate the same situation at the same time give it the same or almost the same score (Reliability); and (4) they have the ability to distinguish between high and low quality. As illustrated in Appendix D, all three instruments meet these requirements.

2.4. Data collection procedures

2.4.a. Questionnaire completion

The questionnaires were completed on-line by the recipient. All applicants to MPCC completed the OS and MAP questionnaires when applying and program graduates were asked to complete both of them again a month after the program ended. The PD survey was circulated just prior to the end of the program and the partner surveys after the completion of MPCC.

2.4.b. Collection of the observation data

Each of the pre- and post-mentoring observations required a full day in the centre during which the data for the ECERS-R and CIS were collected in the morning and the PAS data in the afternoon. Data collection for the ECERS-R and CIS involved direct observation in a classroom and the ECERS-R also involved a follow-up interview with the lead teacher. The PAS data were collected through a combination of a tour of the facility's indoor and outdoor program areas and any space designated for families or staff, an on-site interview with the supervisor about administrative policies and practices lasting approximately two hours, and a review of administrative documents to verify the supervisor's information.

2.4.c. Observer characteristics and training

Each of the 10 data collectors had at least a two-year college diploma in early childhood education and several had a BA in child studies or a related discipline. The average length of experience in the ELCC field was 20.4 years with the range 9–40 years. All observers signed an

Section 2: Method

2.4.c. Observer characteristics and training

Observer Confidentiality Agreement before doing their first observation, see Appendix E for a list of observers and their affiliation. Before conducting the pre-MPCC observations the data collectors attended three days of training on the PAS which included establishing inter-rater reliability using the scale to rate a centre shown on video⁴, and also had two days of training on both the ECERS-R and the CIS with inter-rater reliability established through observations by teams of two in centres not participating in MPCC followed by a debriefing by the trainers. Individuals unable to demonstrate a minimum of 80% inter-rater reliability on any scale received additional training until they were able to demonstrate this level. Inter-rater reliability was again tested shortly before the post-test observations were done. The inter-rater reliability on both occasions for all three instruments is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Inter-rater agreement

Instrument	Before Pre-MPCC Observation		Before Post-MPCC Observation	
	Range	Group Mean	Range	Group Mean
PAS	81.0% – 100%	85.1%	83.0%-100%	94.9%
ECERS-R	88.0%- 97.4%	90.0%	80.0%-100%	93.0%
CIS	82.6% – 100%	89.7%	80.1%- 100%	90.8%

2.5. Data handling and analyses

2.5.a. Questionnaires

The OS, MAP, and PD questionnaires consist solely of statements that require the respondent to circle one of four possible answers and this format also was used for several questions on the partners' surveys in addition to questions requiring a yes or no answer and open-ended questions.

Data from the OS and MAP questionnaires were entered into a secure data collection page on the MPCC website and an excel report generated. The data were transferred into SPSS-X Program for Windows™ version 17, then checked for ensure data entry accuracy. In a few instances there were missing responses in the post-mentoring questionnaires. The missing data were replaced with the series mean for the subscale in question to enable analysis of all questionnaires. This involved calculating means (averages), ranges, standard deviations, frequencies of response, and tests of the degree of significance between pre- and post-mentoring scores for the total score and for each subscale.

⁴ This is the standard way of establishing inter-rater reliability on the PAS, unlike the ECERS-R and CIS which use practice observations in actual classrooms.

Section 2: Method

2.5.a. Questionnaires

The online data from the PD questionnaire and the partners' surveys were entered into EXCEL™, including verbatim transmission of the open-ended responses. The EXCEL™ data were then checked for accuracy against the original questionnaires and transferred into SPSS-X Program for Windows,™ version 17. Data from multiple-choice questions and the questions requiring a yes or no response on each questionnaire were used to generate the frequency of response means for each item. The open-ended responses from the partners' surveys were read, placed into categories, and the frequency of each category identified.

2.5.b. Observation instruments

The PAS and ECERS-R have a single score for each item, which allows for the development of subscale scores and a total scale score. Different items on the CIS are combined to provide three subscales, each of which measures a different type of teacher behaviour with each subscale reported separately rather than being combined to give a total scale score.

The scores for all three observation instruments were entered into MPCC's online reporting system and data entry accuracy checked against the original scoring sheets. The data were then transferred into SPSS-X Program for Windows,™ version 17. The analyses involved calculating the means (averages), ranges, standard deviations, frequencies of response, and tests of the degree of significance between pre- and post-mentoring scores for the whole scale and each subscale for the PAS and the ECERS-R but only for each subscale for the CIS since each measures a distinctly different type of behaviour.

Section 3: Findings

3.1. Introduction

This section provides information about: (1) the post-MPCC sample; (2) the evaluation framework; and (3) the extent to which the project's goals were achieved. It also summarizes the report's conclusions and ends with a brief discussion subsection and a section on continuing the MPCC momentum.

3.2. The post-MPCC sample

Three hundred and forty of the original 403 participants completed the whole program resulting in an attrition rate of 15.6%. The highest proportion of drop-outs, 39.7%, occurred in January after the initial orientation session. This may reflect people beginning to understand the time that would be involved and realizing that they could not make that commitment. The most commonly given reason for dropping out after the start of the program was that the person had

Section 3: Findings

3.2. The post-MPCC sample

left the participating centre (15 people). In four of these situations the participant had taken a position with a full-day kindergarten and in three cases the participant's centre closed. The most common other reasons cited were: medical or health reasons; family or personal issues; and issues at work.

Seventy-one centres granted permission for observations to be conducted in their programs. However, at the time of pre-program observations eight were not available due to scheduling or classroom availability issues, a 'flu outbreak and/or supervisor illness, one supervisor who had had lost her position, and a situation where the Board of Directors withdrew permission. At the time of post-program observation six centres out of the remaining 63 could not be used for the following reasons: two supervisors had changed centres; two centres were under quarantine; one supervisor was on medical leave; and one supervisor had withdrawn from the MPCC program. Thus, pre- and post-program evaluation observations were conducted in 57 centres, 29 whose supervisor was classified as a mentor and 30 whose supervisor was classified as a mentee.

MPCC's sample of 57 centres with both pre- and post-program observations compares very favourably with the samples of 21 or 22 obtained by three other evaluations of supervisor training that also used pre-post program observations (Bloom & Sheerer, 1992; LaFrance Associates, 2006, Shivers, 2010). Difficulties in getting permission to observe in programs reflect the reality that having a stranger in your classroom is disruptive for the children and the programming.

3.3. The evaluation framework

3.3.a. The project's primary goal

The evaluation of the extent to which the project's primary goal of enhancing quality in ELCC programs was achieved used Gursky's 1998 model of four hierarchical levels of possible outcomes from adult training. These are: (1) participants report feeling that the time was well-spent; (2) participants' report changes in knowledge, skills, and /or beliefs; (3) there are demonstrable changes in participants' behaviour; and (4) there are demonstrable changes in participants' organization and/or its service. Achievement of level 2 is dependent on having achieved level 1, achievement of level 3 is dependent on having achieved level 2, and achievement of level 4 is dependent on having achieved level 3. This model has also been used to evaluate the impact of two other training programs for ELCC centre supervisors (Bella & Bloom, 2003).

Table 2 illustrates the instrument(s) used to measure achievement at each level and provides a brief description of what is measured. See Section 2.3 for more detail about the content validity and internal consistency of these tools.

Section 3: Findings

3.3.a. The project's primary goal

Table 2: The instruments used to evaluate achievement of the project's primary goal

Level	Instrument(s)	What is Measured
1 Participant reaction to the MPCC program	The <i>Perceived Level of Assistance with PD Questionnaire</i>	The extent to which graduates feel that participation in the program was time well spent and resulted in gaining new information, knowledge or skills relevant to their needs.
2 Participant self-reported changes in knowledge, skills, and/or beliefs	The <i>Occupational Standards Questionnaire</i>	The respondents' self-perception of administrative competency as expressed through their level of agreement with statements related to the knowledge and skills required in a sub-sample of tasks from each of the <i>six Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators</i> (CCHRSC, 2006)
	The <i>Mentoring Attitudes and Predispositions Questionnaire</i>	The respondents' self-perception of the extent to which their attitudes, behavioural predispositions and beliefs reflect those associated with effective mentoring as outlined in the Partners in Practice (PIP) guiding principles (Ferguson et al., 1999)
3 Demonstrable changes in participants' behaviour	The <i>Program Administration Scale</i> (PAS) (Talan & Bloom, 2004)	The quality of administrative practices in the following areas: (1) HR development and management; (2) personnel practices; (3) facilities management; (4) child assessment; (5) budget preparation and accounting practices; (6) program planning and evaluation; (7) supporting and involving families; (8) marketing and public relations; and (9) use of technology. ⁵
4 Demonstrable changes in the organization and/or service delivery in participants' organization	The PAS	See above
	The <i>Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale- Revised</i> (Harms et al., 1998)	The overall quality of the service as measured by: (1) space and furnishings; (2) personal care routines; (3) programming to support and enhance children's development; (4) interactions; (5) programming scheduling and structure; (6) Relationships with children's families and among staff; and (7) meeting staff needs, e.g. for professional development.
	The <i>Caregiver Interaction Scale</i> (Arnett, 1989)	The extent to which staff working with children demonstrate attentive, warm and engaged behaviour with the children.

⁵ The PAS also includes a section on staff qualifications which was not used in this study because of difficulty translating American staff qualification terms into those used in Ontario.

Section 3: Findings

3.3.b. The project's other eight goals

Evaluation of the extent to which MPCC achieved the other eight project goals identified in sub-section 1.2 was based on the responses to one or more of the following questionnaires depending on the goal:

- The *Perceived Level of Assistance with Professional Development Questionnaire*
- The *Occupational Standards Questionnaire*
- The *Mentoring Attitudes and Predispositions Questionnaire*
- The *Partners' Surveys*

3.4. The extent to which the project's primary goal was achieved

3.4.a. Level 1: Participants' reactions to MPCC

The extent to which graduates felt that the MPCC program had been worthwhile was measured by asking them to complete and submit the *Perceived Level of Assistance with PD questionnaire* one month after completion of the program. This tool asks respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree with a series of statements identifying possible benefits using the 4-point scale of: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; and (4) strongly disagree.

A hundred and seventy-one of the 340 graduates submitted a completed questionnaire giving a return rate of 50.3%. This is considerably higher than the typical 30% or so return rate for voluntary self-completed and returned surveys. As indicated in Table 3, the majority of graduates reported feeling that the time spent in the MPCC program had contributed to their professional development.

Section 3: Findings

3.4.a. Level 1: Participants' reactions to MPCC

Table 3: Participants' reactions to MPCC, mentors and mentees combined

Percent of respondents 'strongly agreeing' or 'agreeing' that as a result of MPCC:		
They feel	Energized and enthusiastic about being part of the ELCC system	94.6%
	More confident in their supervisor role	88.8%
	Better able to provide pedagogical leadership to their staff	92.8%
	Less job-related stress	65.5%
They learned	How to seek out various types of information	94.7%
	Strategies that will enhance their ability to problem-solve	95.3%
They gained	A better understanding of the dual role of manager and leader	95.9%
	A solidified personal philosophy of early childhood education to set goals and guide their practice	92.4%
	A broader understanding of the issues facing the ELCC sector	92.9%
	An increased ability to analyze social issues that may affect the well-being of children	90.0%
	Improved communication skills such as active listening and receiving feedback	94.1%
	Greater comfort in discussing administrative concerns with other supervisors	94.8%
	Increased confidence in their ability to support other supervisors	95.3%
	Confidence that they could obtain advice from members of their mentoring group in the future	96.5%

Conclusion

MPCC achieved level 1 of Gursky's four hierarchical levels of desirable outcomes from adult training.

Section 3: Findings

3.4.b. Level 2: Self-reported changes in knowledge, skills and/or beliefs

The extent to which level 2 was attained was determined through comparing graduates' responses to two MPCC questionnaires each completed twice, first as part of their application to MPCC and again one month after graduation:

- The *Occupational Standards (OS) Questionnaire*.
- The *Mentoring Attitudes and Predispositions (MAP) Questionnaire*.

Each questionnaire asks respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree that each of a series of statements applies to them. For example, the statement that: 'I have a solid understanding of how best to promote young children's development.' As with the PD questionnaire, respondents indicate their level of agreement using the four-point scale of: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree (3) disagree, and (4) strongly disagree.

As noted in Section 2.3.a. both of these MPCC-created questionnaires meet the three basic requirements for questionnaires used in research studies in that they have: (1) solid content validity; (2) validated high internal consistency; and (3) proven consistency of interpretation by respondents.

The O.S. questionnaire, which is based on the tasks delineated in the Sector Council's *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators* seeks respondents' self-perceived level of administrative competency. The MAP questionnaire seeks respondents' perception of the extent to which their attitudes, behavioural predispositions and beliefs reflect those associated with effective mentoring. A blank copy of the OS questionnaire is provided in Appendix F and one for the MAP questionnaire in Appendix G for readers interested in the actual statements used.

The OS questionnaire

A hundred and sixty-eight of the 340 graduates submitted a completed post-program OS questionnaire giving a response rate of 49.4%, much higher than the 30% or so rate usually obtained from voluntary, self-completed questionnaires which the respondent must submit. Table 4 compares respondents' self-evaluation of their administrative competence before and after participation in MPCC.

Section 3: Findings

The OS questionnaire

Table 4: Self-reported OS knowledge and skills

Scale	Mentees and Mentors Combined N = 168			Mentees only N = 75			Mentors only N = 93		
	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result
TOTAL SCORE (all subscales combined)	165.2	182.5	***	145.8	176.9	***	180.9	187.0	**
Child Development and Care	32.9	35.4	***	30.9	35.5	***	34.5	35.4	NS
Human Resources	37.8	40.8	***	33.4	39.3	***	41.5	42.1	NS
Finances	16.6	19.4	***	12.9	17.7	***	19.6	20.8	*
Facilities	25.7	28.6	***	23.8	28.2	***	27.3	28.9	***
Family and Community Relationships	22.7	24.9	***	20.4	24.4	***	24.6	25.3	*
Governance	29.3	33.3	***	24.2	31.6	***	33.5	34.6	*

Notes

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation NS signifies a change that is not significant.
- Shading indicates the mentee column.

Section 3: Findings

The OS questionnaire

The findings from Table 4 show that after participating in MPCC mentees⁶ had significantly greater confidence in their knowledge of and skills in applying all six OS standards. As a group, they achieved virtually the same post-MPCC scores as mentors⁷ in the areas of child development and care and providing a safe, healthy environment. The mentors had significantly greater post-MPCC confidence in their knowledge and skills in four of the six areas: finances, providing a healthy and safe environment, family and community relationships, and governance. They also gained some but not a significant degree of confidence in their knowledge and/or skills in the human resources area.

The MAP questionnaire

A hundred and fifty-three of the 340 graduates submitted a completed MAP questionnaire giving a return rate of 45.0%. Again this is considerably higher than the 30% or so rate usually obtained from voluntary, self-completed questionnaires which the respondent must submit. Table 5 compares respondents' self-evaluation before and after participation in MPCC.

The terms used in Table 5 have specific meanings, as follows:

- 'Respectful accommodation' refers to simultaneously respecting and accommodating individual differences.
- 'Empathetic listening' refers to active listening based on genuine attempts to understand the speaker's position.
- 'Reflective practice' refers to reflecting on one's own practice and its impact and using reflection as part of problem-solving.
- 'Continuous growth' refers to valuing one's own growth and that of others.
- 'Support and recognition' refers to valuing the contributions made by others and both supporting and acknowledging them.

⁶ Participants with less than five years of experience as supervisors.

⁷ Participants with five years or more experience as supervisors.

Section 3: Findings

The MAP questionnaire

Table 5: Self-Reported Mentoring Attitudes, Behavioural Predispositions and Beliefs

Scale	Mentees and Mentors Combined N = 153			Mentees only N = 69			Mentors only N = 84		
	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result
TOTAL SCORE (all subscales combined)	83.5	87.0	***	79.1	86.0	***	87.2	87.8	NS
Respectful Accommodation	14.5	14.7	NS	14.0	14.4	NS	14.9	15.0	NS
Empathetic Listening	6.7	7.3	***	7.4	7.7	NS	6.2	7.0	***
Reflective Practice	26.9	27.8	**	24.8	27.2	***	28.5	28.3	NS
Continuous Growth	28.4	29.3	***	26.9	28.9	***	29.6	29.5	NS
Support and Recognition	16.1	17.1	***	14.4	16.8	***	17.4	17.4	NS

Note

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation NS signifies a change that is not significant.

As illustrated in Table 5, mentees made significant gains in self-reported overall attitudes and the predispositions associated with effective mentoring. They also made significant gains in their: (1) use of reflective practice, (2) encouraging and supporting staff development and continuing to engage in continuous learning themselves; and (3) encouraging and building the self-confidence of less experienced staff and acknowledging the value of others' contributions. Such gains could have a positive impact on their centre's workplace environment.

Mentors' self-reports indicated a significant enhancement of their empathetic listening skills which may have a positive impact on staff morale. However, their responses did not indicate gains overall or on any other subscale.

Section 3: Findings

Summary, OS and MAP findings

The Table 4 findings indicate that mentees had greater self-confidence in their administrative knowledge and skills in all six OS Standards and mentors had greater self-confidence in their knowledge and skills in four Standards. As indicated in Table 5, mentees reported significant enhancement of their attitudes, behavioural predispositions and beliefs related to effective mentoring. Mentors reported significant enhancement of their ability to listen empathetically.

Conclusion

MPCC achieved level 2 of Gursky's 4 hierarchical levels of desirable outcomes from adult training.

3.4.c. Level 3: Demonstrable changes in the participant's behaviour

The extent to which level 3 was attained was determined by collecting pre- and post -MPCC information on the administrative practices in a sub-sample of 57 graduates' centres using the *Program Administration Scale* (PAS). The PAS contains 10 subscales with a combined total of 25 items.⁸ Each item is rated between 1 and 7 on the extent to which it meets the criteria provided in the related descriptors with 1=inadequate, 3=minimally adequate, 5=good, and 7=excellent. Administration involves a tour of the facility, including both indoor and outdoor program environments, and any space designated for families or staff, an in-depth interview with the supervisor lasting approximately two hours, and a review of administrative documents to verify the information provided by the supervisor. The PAS is scored in the same way as the ECERS-R. Information on the data collectors' characteristics and training is provided in Section 2.5.b.

Table 6 provides the data for the pre- and post-MPCC total PAS score and the scores for each subscale for mentee and mentor centres combined and for mentee and mentor centres separately. It shows that:

- Statistically significant enhancement of administrative practices occurred for mentee and mentor centres combined on the total PAS scale score and for 7 of the 9 subscales. This indicates increased supervisor application of the administrative behaviours outlined in the *OS Standards*.
- Each of the mentee and mentor centre groups showed some gains on every subscale, but the change was sometimes minimal and not always significant even when it looked substantive, e.g. child assessment.
- The most significant gains occurred in those areas over which supervisors have the most control, i.e. human resources development, fiscal management, and marketing and public relations.
- Minimal gains occurred in subscales where changes require additional resources or governance approval, e.g. personnel cost and allocation. A study using the NAEYC Administration Standards to evaluate supervisor training also reports the greatest improvement in areas such as orientation of new staff, internal communication, and family partnerships but minimal change in areas such as wages and benefits and strategic planning (Mietlicki, 2010).

⁸ MPCC did not use the tenth subscale, Staff Qualifications, due to the difficulties experienced in trying to convert American terminology into Ontario usage.

Section 3: Findings

3.4.c. Level 3: Demonstrable changes in the participant's behaviour

Table 6 also indicates that mentor centres made greater gains than mentee centres on the human resources development and marketing and public relations subscales. While both the mentee and mentor groups are small, these findings suggest that supervisors who have five or more years of experience in the role still can benefit from administrative training.

Table 6: Demonstrable changes in administrative behaviour

Scale	Mentees and mentor centres combined N = 57			Mentee centres only N = 30			Mentor centres only N = 27		
	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result
TOTAL SCORE (All subscales combined)	2.8	3.3	***	2.7	3.2	**	3.0	3.6	***
Human Resources Development	2.4	3.1	***	2.3	3.0	*	2.5	3.2	**
Personnel Cost and Allocation	2.1	2.3	NS	2.1	2.2	NS	2.1	2.3	NS
Centre Operations	3.2	3.5	*	3.1	3.4	NS	3.4	3.7	NS
Child Assessment	2.9	3.2	NS	2.6	3.1	NS	3.1	3.5	NS
Fiscal Management	3.3	3.8	*	3.0	3.4	NS	3.7	4.4	*
Program Planning and Evaluation	2.2	2.6	*	2.0	2.5	NS	2.3	2.7	NS
Family Partnerships	2.8	3.3	*	2.7	3.3	*	3.0	3.3	NS
Marketing and Public Relations	3.2	4.1	***	3.1	3.9	**	3.3	4.3	***
Technology	4.1	4.6	**	4.3	4.5	NS	4.0	4.6	**

Notes

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation 'NS' signifies a change that is not significant.
- Shading indicates the mentee column.

Conclusion

MPCC achieved level 3 of Gursky's 4 hierarchical levels of desirable outcomes from adult training and in doing so increased supervisor application of the behaviours outlined in the *Occupational Standards*.

Section 3: Findings

3.4.d. Level 4: Demonstrable change in the participant's organization and/or its service delivery

The extent to which level 4 was achieved was determined using the PAS data discussed above plus pre- and post-MPCC information from the same 57 centres using the ECERS-R and the CIS.

The Program Administration Scale (PAS)

As noted above, the PAS pre- and post-MPCC data found clear evidence of enhanced administrative practices in both mentee and mentor centres. Since changes in administrative practices often require changes in the organization's policies and/or practices, for example the policy on staff development or financial management practices, the PAS can be used as a measure of organizational change. Thus the enhanced administrative practices noted above indicate demonstrable organizational changes. The speed with which they appear to have occurred indicates that at least some changes must have been initiated while the supervisors were still participating in MPCC.

Conclusion

MPCC achieved that part of Gursky's level 4 of desirable outcomes from adult training pertaining to positive organizational change.

The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised (ECERS-R)

The ECERS-R was used to determine the extent and type of changes in centres' service delivery, specifically the quality of its overall program. This scale consists of 43 items arranged in seven subscales. Each item is rated between 1 and 7 on the extent to which it meets in criteria provided in the related descriptors with 1=inadequate, 3=minimal, 5=good, and 7=excellent. Administration involves observation in a single classroom supplemented by an interview of the lead teacher regarding items that could not be observed, e.g. children's nap time when the scale is administered in the morning.

Table 7 provides the data for the pre- and post-MPCC total ECERS-R score and each subscale score for mentee and mentor centres combined and for mentee and mentor centres separately. It shows that:

- Statistically significant gains occurred for mentee and mentor centres combined on 4 of the 7 subscales.
- The mentee centre group showed gains on each subscale with the changes on 4 of them reaching the significant level.
- The most significant gains for the sample as a whole and for the mentee centre group occurred in the subscales that evaluated the provision of activities to support and stimulate child development, the use of space and furnishings, personal care routines, and provisions for parents and staff needs.
- Subscales in which minimal gains occurred were at the 'good' or higher level at pre-test, i.e. interaction and program structure, or close to it, i.e. language and reasoning.

Section 3: Findings

The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised (ECERS-R)

- The mentor centre group made some gains on all subscales except Interaction but the gains did not achieve the level of statistical significance.

Table 7: Changes in overall program quality

Scale	Mentee and mentor centres combined N = 57			Mentee centres only N = 30			Mentor centres only N = 27		
	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result
TOTAL SCORE (All subscales combined)	4.6	4.9	***	4.5	5.0	**	4.7	4.9	NS
Space and Furnishings	4.7	5.0	*	4.6	5.0	*	4.8	5.0	NS
Personal Care Routines	4.3	4.6	*	4.1	4.7	*	4.4	4.6	NS
Language-Reasoning	4.6	4.6	NS	4.5	4.9	NS	4.7	4.9	NS
Activities	3.5	3.8	**	3.3	3.9	***	3.6	3.7	NS
Interaction	6.0	6.2	NS	5.9	6.3	NS	6.0	6.0	NS
Program Structure	5.4	5.6	NS	5.3	5.6	NS	5.5	5.6	NS
Parents and Staff	5.2	5.5	**	5.2	5.5	*	5.2	5.4	NS

Notes

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation 'NS' signifies a change that is not significant.
- Shading indicates the mentee column.

Section 3: Findings

The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised (ECERS-R)

Demonstrating significant gains on the ECERS-R in less than two months after conclusion of the training program is a remarkable achievement. Professional development experts believe that enhanced service delivery as a result of director or supervisor administrative training is unlikely until *“sufficient time has passed to allow participants to adapt new ideas and practices to their setting”* (Gursky, 2006, p.4). Speaking specifically about ELCC programs, Knapp-Philo et al. (2006, p. 47) suggest that significant change in a program may take well over a year because the recipients of administrative training require time to *“practice and master new skills and integrate the new skills into daily routines [and their] organizations need time to reframe their structures and processes to facilitate and support change.”* These expert opinions support the expectation that MPCC participants’ centres will continue to improve their program delivery as their supervisors continue to make administrative changes that are enablers of quality programming and increase their expectations of frontline staff practices.

The Caregiver Interaction Scale (CIS)

The CIS was used to supplement the data on teacher-child interaction obtained by the ECERS-R. It has a total of 23 items spread across three subscales: (a) sensitivity - the extent to which the teacher is warm, attentive and engaged with the children; (b) harshness – the extent to which the teacher sounds irritated, critical or hostile when speaking to children or demonstrates threatening or punitive behaviour; and (c) detachment – the extent to which the teacher appears to be uninterested in children’s activities and spends considerable time in activities not involving the children. The data are collected through direct observation in a classroom; scoring is done by identifying the extent to which observed behaviour reflects a list of statements using a 4-point scale where 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=quite a bit, and 4=very much. Thus higher scores are better for Sensitivity but not for the other two subscales. Because each subscale measures a different type of behaviour the subscale scores are never combined for a total score as is done with the ECERS-R and the PAS. Instead CIS findings are reported for each of the three subscales separately.

Table 8 provides the data for the pre- and post-MPCC scores for each of the CIS subscales for mentee and mentor centres combined and for the mentee centre group and the mentor centre group separately. It shows:

- Statistically significant improvement in teacher sensitivity and decreased harshness in both mentee and mentor centres.
- Significant decrease in teacher detachment for the sample as a whole, a non-significant decrease in mentee centres and no change in mentor centres which already had an excellent score of 1.2 out of a possible total of 4.0.

Section 3: Findings

The Caregiver Interaction Scale (CIS)

Table 8: Changes in teacher interactions with children

Scale	Mentee and mentor centres combined N = 57			Mentee centres only N = 30			Mentor centres only N = 27		
	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	T-test result
Sensitivity	2.9	3.4	***	2.9	3.5	****	2.9	3.4	***
Harshness	1.1	0.5	***	1.1	0.5	***	1.1	0.5	***
Detachment	1.3	1.1	*	1.3	1.1	NS	1.2	1.2	NS

Notes

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, * = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation NS signifies a change that is not significant.
- Shading indicates the mentee column.

The discrepancy between the degree of change in the detachment score for the combined sample and the mentee centres only sample, even though the scores are identical, is a statistical artefact arising from the differences in sample sizes.

Summary

Achieving the final level of Gursky's 4 levels of desirable outcomes from adult education requires demonstrating changes in the participant's organization and/or its service delivery. As documented in this report, MPCC obtained reliable data showing:

- Enhancement of administrative practices in the MPCC graduates' centres (PAS). Since administrative changes often require prior policy changes, this finding indicates changes in centre organization.
- Enhancement of the overall program quality in MPCC graduates' centres (ECERS-R and CIS).

Section 3: Findings

Summary

Conclusion

MPCC achieved the final level of Gursky's 4 hierarchical levels of desirable outcomes from adult training. In so doing, it achieved its primary goal of enhancing ELCC centre quality.

3.5. The extent to which the project's other eight goals were achieved

3.5.a. Revitalize supervisors; increase their professionalism, leadership skills, and job satisfaction; and establish mentoring relationships among supervisors

The extent to which the above five goals were achieved was measured by having graduates complete and submit the *Perceived Level of Assistance with Professional Development (PD) Questionnaire* one month after the MPCC program finished. This questionnaire has five subscales, one for each of the five goals, and asks respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree a statement pertains to them using the same four-point scale used in the OS and MAP questionnaires.

Table 9 provides the findings from the PD questionnaire and shows that after graduating from MPCC the majority of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that as a result of MPCC: (1) they felt energized and enthusiastic about working in the ELCC field; (2) their professional knowledge and/or behaviour associated with being a professional had increased; (3) they had gained knowledge and skills that enhance their leadership abilities; (4) their job-related stress level has decreased; (5) they feel more confident in their supervisor role; and (6) they are confident that they would be able to obtain advice from their mentoring group in the future.

Feeling more enthusiastic about your work, more confident in your role, and less stressed by the job realistically could be expected to be associated with increased level of job satisfaction.

Section 3: Findings

3.5.a. Revitalize supervisors; increase their professionalism, leadership skills, and job satisfaction; and establish mentoring relationships among supervisors

Table 9: MPCC impact on five of the other eight project goals

Goal	Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Revitalize enthusiasm about working in ELCC	1. I feel energized and enthusiastic about being part of the early childhood education system	117/169 (69.2%)	43/169 (25.4%)	5/169 (3.0%)	4/169 (2.4%)
Increase professionalism	2. I have solidified a personal philosophy of early childhood education to set goals and guide my practice	85/170 (50.0%)	72/170 (42.4%)	12/170 (7.1%)	1/170 (0.6%)
	3. I have gained knowledge of how and confidence in seeking out various types of information	102/169 (60.4%)	58/169 (34.3%)	7/169 (4.1%)	2/169 (1.2%)
	4. I intend to seek out opportunities to further my formal education in early learning and child care	83/168 (49.4%)	61/168 (36.3%)	21/168 (12.5%)	3/168 (1.8%)
	5. I have a broader understanding of the issues facing child care	102/170 (60.0%)	56/170 (32.9%)	10/170 (5.9%)	2/170 (1.2%)
	6. I have begun to advocate for quality ELCC or increased my involvement in this activity	63/170 (37.3%)	67/170 (39.6%)	36/170 (21.3%)	3/170 (1.8%)
Increase leadership skills	7. I have a better understanding of the dual role of manager and leader	110/171 (64.3%)	54/171 (31.6%)	4/171 (2.3%)	3/171 (1.8%)
	8. I have learned strategies that will enhance my ability to problem-solve	99/171 (57.9%)	64/171 (37.4%)	7/171 (4.1%)	1/171 (0.6%)
	9. My communication skills such as active listening and giving and receiving feedback have improved	91/171 (53.2%)	70/171 (40.9%)	8/171 (4.7%)	2/171 (1.2%)
	10. I feel better able to provide pedagogical leadership for my staff	79/168 (47.0%)	77/168 (45.8%)	10/168 (6.0%)	2/168 (1.2%)
	11. My ability to analyze social issues that may affect the well-being of children has improved	72/170 (42.4%)	81/170 (47.6%)	15/170 (8.8%)	2/170 (1.2%)
Increase level of job satisfaction	12. I feel that my job related stress level has decreased	41/168 (24.4%)	69/168 (41.1%)	48/168 (28.6%)	10/168 (6.0%)
	13. I am more confident in my supervisor role	87/169 (51.5%)	63/169 (37.3%)	15/169 (8.9%)	4/169 (2.4%)
Establish mentoring relationships among supervisors	14. I am more comfortable in discussing administrative concerns with other supervisors	115/171 (67.3%)	47/171 (27.5%)	5/171 (2.9%)	4/171 (2.3%)
	15. I have gained confidence in my ability to support other supervisors	107/171 (62.6%)	56/171 (32.7%)	6/171 (3.5%)	2/171 (1.2%)
	16. I feel that I could obtain advice from members of my mentoring group in the future	143/171 (83.6%)	22/171 (12.9%)	0	6/171 (3.5%)

Notes

- Respondents could indicate that they found an item difficult to interpret instead of using the four-point rating scale. As a result not all 171 respondents used the rating scale for every item.
- Percentages do not always add up exactly to 100 due to rounding.

Section 3: Findings

3.5.a. Revitalize supervisors; increase their professionalism, leadership skills, and job satisfaction; and establish mentoring relationships among supervisors

The indication from the PD questionnaire responses that MPCC successfully established mentoring relationships among ELCC supervisors is supported by comments from the mentoring group animators (facilitators) and the words and activities of the participants themselves. People who were animators in the same community for both the 2009 and 2010 cohorts report that most 2009 groups maintained contact in 2010 through email or telephone and in at least one case through regular group meetings. The 2009 graduates also reached out to the 2010 participants through sharing information and tips during the initial skills training, study groups and/or through site visits. The 2010 Southwestern First Nations group developed a supervisor network. The final word goes to a mentee who said, *“I came into this [MPCC] hoping to connect with my mentoring partner – to have one person to be able to call when something comes up that I need a second opinion on – ultimately I have made that connection with 19 somebodies.”*

In addition, the impact of MPCC on leadership skills was evaluated by combining the scores from specific items from the OS and the MAP questionnaires related to level of professionalism into a single composite score and comparing the score after graduation with the score obtained prior to program participation. The same process involving both questionnaires also was used to evaluate the program’s impact leadership skills. Table 10 provides the results from this combining of specific items from both the OS and MAP questionnaires and indicates that both mentees and mentors believed that MPCC had increased their level of professionalism and mentees also believed it had increased their leadership skills.

Table 10: MPCC impact on leadership skills and professionalism

Scale	Mentees and mentors combined			Mentees only			Mentors only		
	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	t-test result	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	t-test result	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	t-test result
Level of professionalism	40.7	45.0	***	36.1	43.9	***	44.4	45.9	**
Leadership skills	64.3	70.1	***	57.7	68.9	***	69.6	71.0	NS

Notes

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation NS signifies a change that is not significant.
- Shading indicates the mentee column.

Section 3: Findings

3.5.a. Revitalize supervisors; increase their professionalism, leadership skills, and job satisfaction; and establish mentoring relationships among supervisors

Conclusion

MPCC achieved the five other project goals of: (1) revitalizing supervisors; (2) increasing supervisors' level of professionalism; (3) increasing supervisor leadership skills; (4) increasing supervisors' job satisfaction; and (5) establishing mentoring relationships among supervisors.

3.5.b. Increase supervisor use of reflection

The extent to which MPCC increased supervisor use of reflection was evaluated by combining the scores from specific items on the MAP questionnaire into a single score and comparing the resultant combination score after graduation with that obtained just before the start of the mentoring program. As illustrated by Table 11, the scores for the mentees and mentors combined and for the mentees alone indicate that MPCC increased supervisor use of reflective practice. However, when the mentor and mentee groups were separated, there was no pre-post change among the mentors.

Table 11: MPCC impact on supervisor use of reflection

Scale	Mentees and Mentor combined			Mentees only			Mentors only		
	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	t-test result	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	t-test result	Pre-test mean	Post-test mean	t-test result
Use of reflective practice	26.9	27.8	**	24.8	27.2	***	28.5	28.3	NS

Notes

- The number of asterisks reflects the degree of significance, that is the degree to which the pre-post difference could not have occurred simply by chance, ** = $p < 0.01$; and *** = $p < 0.001$. The lower the p value the more likely that the difference reflects something other than chance. The notation 'NS' signifies a change that is not significant.
- Shading indicates the mentee column.

Conclusion

MPCC achieved the project goal of increasing supervisor use of reflection among those graduates who were designated as mentees.

Section 3: Findings

3.5.c. Influence organizational change and inter-relationships between community colleges and the ELCC community

The seventh secondary goal for MPCC was: “To influence organizational change and inter-relationships between post-secondary early childhood education programs, child care organizations, and child care practice.”

This actually is a three-part goal, namely to influence:

- Organizational change.
- Inter-relationships between community college (ELCC) programs and child care organizations.
- Child care practice.

MPCC’s positive influence on child care practice is discussed above. The program’s influence on organizational change and on inter-relationships between post-secondary ELCC programs and other child care organizations is addressed in this sub-section through the write-in responses provided to a questionnaire sent to the 24 post-secondary ELCC programs that participated in MPCC in 2010, 12 of which responded. See Appendix H for a list of all the 24 partner community colleges that hired and supervised the monthly focus group animators and provided course credits for MPCC graduates.

The post-secondary ELCC program questionnaire included asking whether participation in MPCC had led to changes to the curriculum in the college’s ELCC programs and/or encouraged or supported the development of new ELCC administrative courses or programs, a positive response to either question would indicate organizational change. Fifty percent of the respondents reported that MPCC had influenced one or both changes. One program that currently is not offering a post-diploma administration course reported that it is discussing collaborating with some other post-secondary institutions to jointly develop and provide such a course. Another has updated and re-launched its administration program. A third ELCC program reported it will begin an Early Childhood Leadership Degree program this September. Three colleges reported revising either their pre- or post-diploma programs to include the Sector Council’s *Occupational Standards* and/or material related to mentoring. In response to another question, six of the 12 respondents made comments to the effect that participation in MPCC had both increased communication between them and other community ELCC agencies and enhanced their relationships with them. Comments related to this included:

“Involvement with MPCC has done a lot to develop an even more positive view of the college ECE program.”

“[MPCC] helped strengthen our community partnerships with placement agencies.”

“MPCC allowed us to be a leader, a supporter, a mentor to our community, what we receive back is far more than what we gave. “

Section 3: Findings

3.5.c. Influence organizational change and inter-relationships between community colleges and the ELCC community

Eleven of the 12 post-secondary ELCC program respondents noted that their animator had gained knowledge and skills through being involved in the delivery of MPCC and that this would benefit the college's students. Other benefits from involvement with MPCC included increased opportunities to inform the community about the college services and a noticeable increase in interest among community supervisors in the post-graduate programs available. As noted by one college respondent:

"It [MPCC] has brought our ECE community together and enhanced the quality of our programs, which in turn enhances the quality of the field experiences for our students placed in participating agencies."

Conclusion

MPCC achieved its seventh goal of influencing change and inter-relationships between community colleges and the ELCC community.

3.5.d. MPCC's impact on the larger community

MPCC's eighth secondary goal was to have a positive impact on the communities in which it operated. The extent to which it achieved this goal was determined by circulating questionnaires seeking opinion on MPCC's impact from each of its four community partners: (1) post-secondary ELCC programs; (2) MEDU/MCYS field staff; (3) CMSM's/DSSAB's/Band Councils; (4) other community organizations engaged in promoting quality ELCC. The main findings from the questionnaire sent to the post-secondary ELCC programs are noted in the previous subsection.

Circulation and response rates for the three other 2010 community partners were:

- 80 to MEDU/MCYS field staff, 8 (10%) of whom responded.
- 93 to CMSM/DSSAB/Band Council representatives, 6 (6.4%) of whom responded.
- 37 to community organizations, 2 (5.4%) of whom responded.

In 2009, responses to the same questionnaires were obtained from 10 (19%) of Ministry field staff, 8 (18%) of CMSM/DSSAB/Band Council representatives, and 6 (40%) of organizations involved in the promotion of quality. The lower response rates in 2010 may reflect one or more of: (1) the fact that 11 communities had participated in 2009 and some recipients in them may have felt that they did not need to respond a second time; (2) many of the representative from other community organizations have multiple roles, e.g. also work for a CMSM, and may have

Section 3: Findings

3.5.d. MPCC's impact on the larger community

felt it was only necessary to respond to one questionnaire; and (3) as a result of the transfer from MCYS to MEDU, some MCYS staff may have felt it was inappropriate for them to respond since they were no longer officially involved and some MEDU staff may have felt that they could not respond due to insufficient experience with MPCC.

Since the same questionnaire was used in both 2009 and 2010, this report combines the findings from both years to obtain a more complete picture, see Table 12. Appendix I provides the questionnaire responses for each community partner separately.

Table 12: Partners' perception of the impact of MPCC on their Community, 2009 and 2010, three partners combined

Benefits to centres from supervisor participation in MPCC	Benefits to the local ELCC community from the presence of MPCC
<p>Percent of the three partners agreeing that in centres where the supervisor had participated in MPCC there was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased application of best <i>administrative</i> practices – 77.8%• Improved overall centre quality – 73.8%• Improved supervisor leadership skills - 73.8%• Increased mutual support among centres – 58.8%• Increased outreach to and partnerships with families – 52.9%• Increased use of best <i>programming</i> practices – 41.2%	<p>Percent of the three partners agreeing that the operation of MPCC in their community had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A positive impact on the local ELCC community – 88.1%• Improved relationships among ELCC partners – 69.1%• Increased joint endeavours between ELCC community partners – 69.1%• Assisted in the systems level of management of child care – 44.1%

Note

The question exploring the extent to which MPCC had assisted at the systems level of management of child care asked whether the respondent was personally aware of this having occurred. As a result some instances of MPCC assisting the community in this way would not be reported by respondents because they were unaware of this having occurred.

Section 3: Findings

3.5.d. MPCC's impact on the larger community

As illustrated in Table 12, the questionnaire responses were positive. This perception is supported by partner comments such as:

MEDU/MCYS respondents

"MPCC provided a link to support new/less experienced supervisors resulting in increased confidence and understanding of position requirements."

"More centres are collaborating, suggestions got passed around, supervisors' knowledge increased."

"As a program advisor I had dreamed of a project like this and am so glad it has been done so well."

"We are anticipating significant supervisor and staff turnover and challenges in recruiting qualified employees. New supervisors need lots of support in a range of areas such as administration, finance, personnel, leadership."

CMSM/DSSAB/Band Council respondents

"The use of the Occupational Standards has increased the level of care, health and safety of the programs. Supervisors have reported that they are becoming proficient as mentors/coaches which they attribute to the training."

"[Both] programs involved with MPCC have stated that it has been a very positive experience. It connected them to a local community college and has been a good opportunity to share wisdom."

"We saw great value in the program and are disappointed that more supervisors will not have the opportunity."

Other community agencies engaged in promoting quality ELCC

"[MPCC] has enhanced partnerships among service groups and raised the profile of child care."

"[MPCC] has strengthened partnerships and developing plans in the interest of the community rather than the individual centre."

"The program enhanced our local quality assurance project in that it worked to support local ECE supervisors with training, mentorship, resources, and support."

Conclusion

MPCC had a positive impact on both the ELCC participant centres in the communities in which it operated and on the community ELCC system as a whole.

Section 3: Findings

3.6. Summary and discussion

The project's primary goal was to enhance the quality of Ontario ELCC centres by increasing supervisors' application of the *Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators*; its eight other goals were to:

- Revitalize supervisor enthusiasm about working in the ELCC field.
- Increase supervisor professionalism.
- Increase supervisor leadership skills.
- Increase the level of job satisfaction among supervisors.
- Increase supervisor use of reflective practice.
- Establish mentoring relationships among ELCC centre supervisors.
- Influence organizational change and inter-relationships between post-secondary early childhood education programs, child care organizations, and ELCC practice.
- Have a positive impact in the communities it which it operated as well as on MPCC participants and their centres.

As documented in this Section, MPCC achieved all nine goals. This included successfully addressing the isolation inherent in being the senior administrator in an organization though linking supervisors together in an OS group which, in the case of the first cohort in 2009, has in many cases continued to maintain contact.

Demonstrating significant gains on the ECERS-R in less than two months after conclusion of the training program is a remarkable achievement. Professional development experts are of the opinion that enhanced service delivery as a result of director or supervisor administrative training requires sufficient time for the impact of changed policies and expectations to trickle down to the front line (Gursky, 2006; Knapp-Philo et al., 2006). These expert opinions suggest that MPCC participants' centres will continue to improve their program delivery as their supervisors continue to make administrative changes that are enablers of quality programming and increase their expectations of frontline staff practices

The evaluation of the extent to which the primary goal was met through the use of well-respected, reliable observation instruments and the ELCC experience and solid inter-rater agreement of the observers add confidence in the centre findings. However, the data cannot be assumed representative of all supervisors and their centres due to the unavoidable self-selection and voluntary participation of the participants and the limited number of centres that could be approached for pre- and post-program observations. An attempt was made to be as representative of Ontario's supervisors and child care centres as possible by involving a group of communities that collectively contain 75% of Ontario's child care programs and represent different parts of the province and community types and sizes and by approaching every centre in the 10 observation communities for permission to use them in the evaluation.⁹

⁹ Francophone centres could not be approached since one of the observation tools, the PAS, has not been translated into French.

Section 3: Findings

3.7. Continuing the momentum

Many participants recognized the importance of continuing to learn in a knowledge-based environment and expressed a desire to maintain the momentum of their professional growth after completing MPCC. This led to a variety of consultation activities to identify potential needs, e.g. supporting isolated supervisors, and discussing how graduates' administrative and mentoring knowledge and skills could be leveraged with community partners to meet local needs and goals without duplicating existing resources. As a result, the ECCDC identified dollars, ongoing services and resources that could be provided to support the initiative and a request for proposals. Twenty-three 'continuing the mentoring momentum' plans, involving all 28 MPCC groups in 2010, were submitted and approved. These cover a range of areas including but not limited to: (1) assessing and addressing local professional development needs; (2) working with ECEs and assistant supervisors interested in becoming supervisors in the future in order to retain such people in the field and address succession planning; (3) providing training in the CCHRSC's *Occupational Standards* and promoting the use of the companion Checklists; (4) supporting and promoting post-secondary partners in the ECE programs, e.g. student placements and marketing ECE programs; (5) developing a community list of mentors available for informal support; (6) supporting and enhancing the work of existing community quality initiatives and supervisor networks; and (7) engaging MPCC graduates as local ELCC leaders and to engage new, immigrant or currently non-participating supervisors and centres in local mentoring circles, networks and committees.

Appendix A: List of Advisory Committee members and their affiliation

Child care centre administrators

West Ferris Day Nursery, North Bay ■ Kelli Couroux, Director, March 2008 to March 2011

Schoolhouse Playcare Centre of Lakehead, Inc, Thunder Bay ■ Kelly Massaro, Executive Director, March 2008 to March 2011

Municipal Early Learning and Child Care Centres, City of Windsor ■ Theresa Kralovensky, Manager, March 2008 to June 2008

First Nations/Aboriginal representative

Lu Ann Hill, Brantford, Consultant, March 2008 to March 2011

Francophone representative

Raymonde Lafond, Directrice Générale, La Boîte à Soleil Coop Inc., Welland, October 2008 to June 2010

Lily Boucher, Program Advisor/Conseillère de programs, Licensing and Compliance Unit, MCCS/MCYS, North Bay, November, 2010 to March 2011

Child Care Human Resources Sector Council (CCHRSC)/Labour

Jamie Kass, Board of Directors, CCHRSC, Child Care Coordinator CUPE, representative, Canadian Labour Congress, March 2008 to March 2011

Professional associations

Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care ■ Kira Heineck, Executive Director, March 2008 to October 2008

Association of Early Childhood Educators, Ontario ■ Christina Oliveira, Registration and Certification Analyst, October 2008 to November, 2009 ■ Bernadette Summers, Membership Coordinator, March, 2010 to March 2011

Canadian Child Care Federation ■ Anne Maxwell, Senior Director of Projects, Programs and Services March 2008 to June 2009

Appendix A: List of Advisory Committee members and their affiliation

Community College early childhood education programs

a) Anglophone programs

Fanshawe College, London ■ Sheryl Ragobar, Coordinator, ECE program, March 2008 to March 2011

George Brown College, Toronto ■ Karen Chandler, Faculty, Centre for Early Childhood Development, March 2008 to March 2011

Niagara College, Welland ■ Allison Soave, Coordinator ECE program, March 2008 to March 2011

Sheridan College, Brampton ■ Velma Doran, Faculty, ECE program, March 2008 to March 2011

b) Francophone program

La Cité collégiale, Ottawa ■ Thérèse Labonté, Enseignante, Éducation en services à l'enfance, March 2008 to March 2011

Municipal social services

Regional Municipality of Peel ■ Lorna Reid, Director, Early Years Integration, Human Services Department, October, 2008 to June 2010

Halton Region ■ Gillian Burns, Manager of Program Support Services Team, Children's Services Department, November 2010 to March 2011

Community agencies

Today's Family, Hamilton ■ Marni Flaherty, CEO, March 2008 to March 2011

Child Care Development Resource Connection, Peel ■ Jane van Berkel, Executive Director, March 2008 to March 2011

Child/Youth and Family Development, Greater Toronto YMCA ■ Lorrie Huggins, General Manager, March 2008 to March 2011

Provincial Government¹⁰

Ministry of Children and Youth Services (MCYS)

a) Field Staff

Suzanne Boyer, Program Advisor, Sault Ste. Marie local office, June 2008 to January 2010

Bonnie Corey, Program Review and Compliance Unit, Central West Region, June 2008 to December 2009

Sue Ewen, Program Review and Compliance Unit, Central West Region, January 2010 to April 2010

¹⁰ Responsibility for MPCC was officially transferred from the Ministry of Children and Youth Services to the Ministry of Education in May 2010.

Appendix A: List of Advisory Committee members and their affiliation

Ministry of Children and Youth Services (MCYS)

b) Queen's Park Staff

Cynthia Abel, Manager, Strategic Policy and Planning Division, Early Learning and Child Development Branch, March 2008 to November 2009

Mikael Gariepy, Policy Analyst, Strategic Policy Unit, Strategic Policy and Planning Division, Early Learning and Child Care Branch, March 2008 to June 2009

Rachel Deans, Senior Policy Analyst, Strategic Policy Unit, Strategic Policy and Planning Division, Early Learning and Child Care Branch, October 2008 to June 2009

Laura Gray, Senior Policy Analyst, Strategic Policy Unit, Strategic Policy and Planning Division, Early Learning and Child Care Branch, July 2009 to November 2009

Barbara Dominick, Senior Policy Analyst, Strategic Policy and Planning Division, Early Learning and Child Care Branch, December 2009 to April 2010

Ministry of Education (MEDU)

Harriett Grant, Manager, Child Care, Early Learning Division, May 2010 to December 2010

Keya Mitra-Selby, Policy Analyst, Early Learning Division, June 2010 to December 2010

Michelle Braakman, Manager, Early Learning and Child Care Program and Evaluation, Early Learning and Child Care Policy and Programs Branch, January 2011 to March 2011

Daniela Kiguel, Senior Policy Advisor, Early Learning Planning & Design, Early Learning Policy and Programs Branch, January 2011 to March 2011

Project Consultants

Partners in Practice (PIP) Mentoring Model ■ Elaine Ferguson, Chair, Partners in Practice Program, March 2008 to March 2011

Research ■ Gillian Doherty, ELCC consultant and researcher, March 2008 to March 2011

ECCDC support staff for MPCC

Tammy McCormick Ferguson, Executive Director, ECCDC, March 2008 to March 2011

Glory Ressler, Community Development & Projects Manager, ECCDC, March 2008 to March 2011

Appendix B: List of participant communities

Community	Areas involved
Barrie (2 groups, one urban, other rural)	Orillia, Innisfil, Collingwood, Midland, Penetanguishene, Keswick, Parry Sound, Gravenhurst, Wasaga Beach, Bracebridge, Huntsville, Meaford, Owen Sound
Belleville	Cobourg, Napanee, Trenton
Etobicoke	Etobicoke
Halton	Acton, Burlington, Georgetown, Halton Hills, Milton, Oakville
Kingston	Kingston, Gananoque, Brockville,
London	Aylmer, Ingersoll, Port Stanley, St. Mary's, St. Thomas, Stratford, Strathroy, Tillsonburg, Simcoe, Goderich, Woodstock, Delhi
Niagara	St. Catharines, Welland, Niagara Falls, Grimsby, Fort Erie, Pelham, Lincoln, West Lincoln, Port Colborne, Wainfleet, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Thorold
Southwestern ON First Nations	South western and south central, Hamilton, Six Nations
North Bay	Callander, Powasson, Mattawa, Verner, Englehart, Haileybury, North Cobalt, New Liskeard
Oshawa/Durham	Pickering, Ajax, Whitby, Bowmanville, Port Hope
Ottawa English	Arnprior, Rockland, Carleton Place, Russell, Perth, Smith Falls, Renfrew, Petawawa, Pembroke
Ottawa French	Arnprior, Rockland, Carleton Place, Russell, Perth, Smith Falls, Hawkesbury, Pembroke, Cornwall
Peel	Bolton, Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga, Orangeville, Shelburne, Kleinburg, Palgrave
Peterborough/Kawartha Lakes	Lindsay, Haliburton, Minden, Bancroft, Cardiff
Sarnia	Forest, Wyoming, Alvinston, Petrolia, Wallaceburg
Sault Ste. Marie	Wawa
Scarborough	North York
Sudbury English	Elliot Lake, Val Caron, Hanmer, Lively, Espanola, Garson, Little Current, Gore Bay, Chelmsford, Dowling, Capreol, Massey
Sudbury French	Elliot Lake, Val Caron, Hanmer, Lively, Espanola, Garson, North Bay
Thunder Bay and District	Atikokan, Beardmore, Geraldton, Longlac, Marathon, Nipigon, Schreiber, Terrace Bay, Thunder Bay, Dorion, Nakina, Upsala, Manitouwadge
Timmins	Kapuskasing, Kirkland Lake, Cochrane, Iroquois Falls
Toronto Inner City	Toronto inner city
Northwestern Ontario	Dryden, Fort Frances, Kenora, Sioux Lookout
Waterloo Region	Guelph, Cambridge, Fergus, Elmira, Durham, Listowel
Windsor	Amherstburg, Essex, Kingsville, Leamington, Chatham-Kent
York South	Markham, Richmond Hill, Whitchurch-Stouffville, Woodbridge, Thornhill, Maple, Unionville
York North	Newmarket, Aurora, East Gwillimbury, Bradford, Holland Landing, Uxbridge, King City, Alliston, Port Perry

Appendix C: Psychometric properties of the OS and MAP questionnaires

Property	OS questionnaire	MAP questionnaire
Content validity	Statements based on the required knowledge and skills in the CCHRSC <i>Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators</i>	Statements based on the characteristics found to be associated with effective ELCC mentoring by the Canadian Partners in Practice mentoring program (Ferguson et al, 1999) and other mentoring programs (Bellm, 1997; Whitebook & Sakai, 1995)
Internal consistency	Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the total questionnaire of .95; subscale alphas ranging from .82 to .91	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the total questionnaire of .84; subscale alphas ranging from .63 to .83.
Consistency of interpretation	Fewer than 5% of respondents at both pre- and post-test rated any of the statements in either the French or English versions as difficult to interpret (Doherty, 2010)	Fewer than 5% of respondents at both pre- and post-test rated any of the statements in either the French or English versions as difficult to interpret (Doherty, 2010)

Note

Computation of Cronbach's Alpha coefficients based on the number of graduates who completed the questionnaires both pre-and post-mentoring (N = 168 for the OS questionnaire and N = 153 for the MAP questionnaire).

Appendix D: Psychometric properties of the three observation tools

Property	PAS	ECERS-R	CIS
Content Validity	Measures the skills and knowledge considered by a panel of experts to be key requirements for effective ELCC administration (Talan & Bloom, 2004). Consistent with the <i>Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators</i> (CCHRS, 2006)	Seventy-four percent agreement between the total score on the original ECERS and an assessment by experts of the overall quality in a group of centres (Harms & Clifford, 1980). Note that the developers of the ECERS-R consider it to be a revision of the original ECERS, not a new scale (Harms et al. 1998). High positive correlation between scores on the original ECERS and the ECERS-R when both administered simultaneously (Sakai, 2003)	Consistent with the three distinct patterns of parenting identified as influencing children's well-being and development in a series of studies by the Canadian National Longitudinal Study of Children and Youth (e.g. Thomas, 2006).
Internal Consistency ¹¹	Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the total scale of .87, subscale alphas ranging from .20 to .59 (MPCC data) The authors, Talan & Bloom, 2004, report Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .85 for the total scale, no data provided for the subscales	Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the total scale of .95; subscale alphas ranging from .67 to .86 (MPCC data) The authors, Harms et al. 1998, report Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .92 for the total scale; subscale alphas ranging from .71 to .88	Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .90 for the Sensitivity subscale, .72 for the Harshness subscale, and .66 for the Detachment subscale (MPCC data) The author, Arnett, 1989, does not address internal consistency
Reliability (level of inter-rater agreement)	Group mean of 90% within one point for each item, range for individuals from 81% to 95% (Talan & Bloom, 2004)	Mean of 86.1% within one point for total ECERS-R scale with no item having an inter-rater reliability score below 70% (Harms et al., 1998)	Inter-rater reliability 80% or higher for all items (Arnett, 1989)
Ability to distinguish between high and poor quality programs	Comparison of 32 programs with NAEYC accreditation and 35 without found that the accredited programs obtained significantly higher PAS scores (Talan & Bloom, 2004). Other studies have confirmed this ability to distinguish high and low quality (Keystone Research Corporation, 2007; Lower & Cassidy, 2007)	Multiple studies report the ability of the original ECERS to distinguish between high and poor quality programs (e.g. Peisner-Feinberg & Burchinal, 1997; Whitebook et al, 1990)	Significant correlations between the ECERS-R subscales and each of the CIS subscales (Goelman et al., 2000)

¹¹ Computation of the Alpha coefficients for each observations tool done using data from the 57 graduates whose centres were observed pre- and post-MPCC.

Appendix E: The ten Observers and their affiliation

BARRIE	Shelley Glenn Supervisor, Locomotion Day Care Centre
KINGSTON	Darlene Armer Faculty Member, St. Lawrence College
OTTAWA	Valeda Steinberg Executive Director, Wise Owl Day Care Centre
PEEL	Andrea Davis Manager, Early Childhood Centres, Sheridan College
PETERBOROUGH	Leslie LeClair Early Childhood Quality Assurance Consultant, Community Living, Kawartha Lake
SUDBURY	Marilyn Robb Retired, Previously Manager, Child Development Centre, Sault College
TIMMINS	Chantal Martin Supervisor, Oppekehawso Wedamik Centre
WATERLOO	Judy Arnott Program Support Manager, ECCDC
WINDSOR	Bernadette Dzugan Manager, Children's Programs and Services, New Canadians' Centre of Excellence Inc.
YORK SOUTH	Jinder Virdee Professor, Seneca College

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Occupational Standards (OS)

Knowledge/Skills

This questionnaire is designed to obtain your perception of your administrative strengths and the administrative areas in which you may be less confident about your knowledge and/or abilities. For your convenience, it is set up in a way that permits multiple entries and exits so that you can complete individual sections as your time permits. Your level of agreement with a statement should be based on your judgement of the extent to which you think it reflects you.

Section A: Child Development And Care

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
A.1. I have a solid understanding of how best to promote young children's development.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.2. I am skilled at evaluating the quality of interactions between staff and children.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.3. I am able to guide staff who need assistance in improving the quality of their interactions with children.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.4. I know how to plan indoor and outdoor environments so that they support children's development.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.5. I am able to assist staff in the creation and implementation of developmentally appropriate programming.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.6. I have the knowledge to guide staff in the implementation of an inclusive curriculum.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.7. I am aware of the cultural backgrounds of the children in the program and able to use this knowledge to assist staff to use culturally-responsive practices.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Section A: Child Development And Care

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
A.8. I am knowledgeable about various child development assessment instruments and procedures and their appropriateness for use with children at different developmental levels.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
A.9. I am able to observe and match staff abilities, skills and interests to program requirements.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
A.10. I am confident of my ability to evaluate the extent to which the centre program is meeting its goals.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Section B: Human Resources

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
B.1. I am skilled at developing job descriptions and personnel policies and practices that are consistent with child care legislative requirements and the needs of the program.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
B.2. I have a good understanding of the provisions of the different pieces of legislation related to human resources and employment standards.		1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.3. I am able to ensure that personnel records are accurate, current and complete and that staff confidentiality is protected.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Section B: Human Resources

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
B.4. My orientation procedure gives new staff a good understanding of the centre's philosophy and policies and their own roles and responsibilities.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.5. I am able to maintain a supportive, collaborative work environment.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.6. I am skilled in monitoring staff performance and providing constructive feedback.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.7. In staff meetings I am able to keep the discussion on track while also providing everyone with opportunities for input.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.8. I am skilled at actively engaging staff in identifying their strengths and the areas in which they need additional knowledge or skills.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.9. I have the ability to assist staff develop and implement professional development plans.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.10. When staff behaviour issues arise I am able to communicate expectations tactfully and offer guidance in ways that do not offend.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.11. I know how to document a behaviour concern clearly and concisely in a staff member's file and also my actions related to the issue.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.12. My mediation and conflict resolution skills are strong.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Section C: Finances

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
C.1. I competently develop annual operating and capital budgets taking into account revenue from fees and other sources, fixed operational expenses and the possibility of unpredicted costs.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.2. I am able to review and analyze financial statements to identify variance from the budget and then take corrective action as indicated.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.3. I am skilled at identifying new sources of revenue or in-kind contributions and obtaining them.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.4. I am comfortable managing accounts receivable including taking remedial action on delinquent accounts.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.5. I know where and how to find information about community trends that might impact on my centre's enrolment.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.6. I am able to obtain competitive prices for supplies and equipment.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.7. I know what financial information is required by the auditor during an audit and the administration's rights and responsibilities in the process.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Section D: Facilities

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
D.1. I am able to identify and plan to prevent or minimize potential risks to the health or safety of children and staff both within the centre and in its outdoor area.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2. My knowledge of the emergency services and resources in my community is current and my skills in evaluating emergency situations good.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3. I am able to provide my staff with appropriate training to minimize the likelihood of physical or emotional trauma in the program.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.4. I am skilled in identifying infections and minimizing the spread of infectious diseases.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5. I am able to ensure that teaching and support staff and volunteers engage in safe food handling.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.6. I am able to ensure the provision of nutritious meals and snacks that conform to the special dietary needs of each child and reflect the community's cultural diversity.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.7. I have a solid understanding of safety codes and regulations as well as installation standards and am able to use this knowledge to ensure that all equipment and its installation or repair compliance.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.8. I am able to interpret municipal, provincial and federal building regulations and codes and identify their relevance for child care.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Section E: Family and Community Relations

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?	
E.1. I have a good knowledge of inclusive and anti-bias theories and practices.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E.2. I am skilled at supporting the families in our community in determining their needs and expressing their preferences.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E.3. I am confident in my ability to guide staff in the use of respectful communication strategies with families.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E.4. I have been able to implement ways to involve families meaningfully in the overall operation of the centre.		1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E.5. I am able to assist families or support my staff in assisting families to identify and access other community resources.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E.6. I have the skills to establish and maintain collaboration partnerships with other community agencies and resources.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E.7. I use a number of approaches to advocate for quality ECEC.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section F: Governance

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
F.1. I am able to interpret the child care and other relevant legislation and identify the implications for child care policies and practices.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix F: The OS Questionnaire

Section F: Governance

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
F.2. I keep up-to-date with legislative changes and new regulations so that I can understand their implications for the centre.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.3. I am skilled at monitoring and evaluating the continued appropriateness and/or effectiveness of centre policies.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.4. I am confident in my ability to recommend new policies or policy amendments to the governing body in all areas of the centre's operations.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.5. I have the requisite knowledge and skills to identify changes in the community that indicate a need to modify centre services and/or program approaches.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.6. I know how to develop a strategic plan for the centre.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.7. I am able to design communication plans that have clear messages and are in the style most suited to the target audience.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.8. I understand the differences in roles between board/owner and the administration and act accordingly.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.9. I have the skills to provide the governing body with accurate and timely enrolment and financial information and clarify the implications of new regulations.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
F.10. I am an effective liaison between the government body and the staff and between the organization and the licensing officials.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix G: The MAP Questionnaire

This questionnaire looks at some of the attitudes and actions that influence mentoring practice. It uses the Partners In Practice (PIP) principles. Your level of agreement with a statement should be based on your judgment of the extent to which you think it reflects you.

A. PIP principle 1: Building relationships

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
A.1. Understanding and accommodating the different ways in which people are most comfortable functioning greatly enhances the effectiveness of how they work together.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.2. I work with my staff to develop a real team in which members learn from each other's insights, questions and life experiences.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.3. Sometimes I fail to stop and really listen to what a staff member is struggling with so as not to jump in too quickly with my "solution."	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.4. I find balancing objectivity and emotion sometimes difficult when working with parents or the centre's governing body.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.5. I am comfortable with the fact that people differ in their preferred approaches to learning new skills.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.6. The uniqueness of each individual means that the way we see and interpret things will differ.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A.7. I sometimes get impatient with the multiple perspectives on an issue that can arise during staff meetings.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix G: The MAP Questionnaire

B. PIP principle 2: Reflective practice

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
B.1. When faced with a problem that has surfaced before in a similar context, I re-analyze the situation and look for new approaches.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
B.2. I am confident in my ability to think about and question what I am doing, analyze the impact of my actions and plan modifications as indicated.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
B.3. I recognize when situations have ethical components and use ethical decision-making in my problem solving.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
B.4. I am comfortable with the reality that many administrative issues in ECE are complex and need to be viewed from multiple perspectives.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
B.5. I make time on a monthly basis to think about, analyze, and question my administrative practices.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

C. PIP principle 3: Continuous growth and learning

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
C.1. I encourage teachers to share ideas and materials and to perceive their colleagues as important resources in enhancing their teaching practice.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix G: The MAP Questionnaire

C. PIP principle 3: Continuous growth and learning (continued)

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
C.2. Generally as long as child is not endangered, I am comfortable giving a teacher my "blessing" to try something new.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.3. I am comfortable with sharing personal and professional experiences with other ECE practitioners and what I have learned from these experiences.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.4. I recognize staff members' developmental and career stages and use this knowledge to maximize the effectiveness of our joint planning for their professional development.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.5. I appreciate that there is not always a single correct or best approach to dealing with an issue.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.6. I assess the usefulness of new material that comes my way to determine how it might contribute to the knowledge and/or skills of me and my staff.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.7. I pass on resources, information and development opportunities to colleagues and staff.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.8. I tend to feel stressed when things are not done the same way each time.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
C.9. I have developed some learning goals for myself for the coming year.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Appendix G: The MAP Questionnaire

D. PIP principle 4: Support and recognition

Please select the appropriate number with 1 = strongly disagree and 4 = strongly agree. If you find a particular statement difficult to interpret, please check the box provided for that statement, otherwise leave it blank.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	Did you find this statement difficult to interpret?
D.1. I am skilled at questioning staff about their practice in a supportive and non-threatening way.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
D.2. I am confident in my ability to provide open and honest but respectful feedback to staff.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
D.3. My ability to provide encouragement and reassurance assists me to build the self confidence of less experienced staff.		1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.4. I look for opportunities to acknowledge the value of what our support staff bring to the program.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
D.5. I seek out opportunities to give public recognition to the contribution made to children, families and the community by early childhood practitioners in general.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Appendix H: The 24 participating community colleges in 2010

College	Community
Algonquin	Ottawa (English)
George Brown	Toronto – Inner City
Cambrian	Sudbury (English)
Canadore	North Bay
Centennial	Scarborough
Collège Boréal	Sudbury (French)
Conestoga	Waterloo Region
Confederation	Thunder Bay and District
Durham	Oshawa
Fanshawe	London
Fleming	Peterborough
Georgian	Barrie Urban and Barrie Rural
Humber	Etobicoke
La Cité Collégiale	Ottawa (French)
Lambton	Sarnia
Loyalist	Belleville
Niagara	Niagara
Northern	Timmins
Sault Ste. Marie	Sault Ste. Marie
Seneca	York North and York South
Sheridan	Halton and Peel
Six Nations Polytechnic	Niagara/Hamilton First Nations
St. Clair	Windsor
St. Lawrence	Kingston

Appendix I: Partners' perception of MPCC's impact on their community, results from 200 and 2010 combined

Impact level	Item	Partners			Totals per item
	Number of respondents to each survey agreeing that MPCC had:	MEDU/MCYS N = 18	CMSM-DSSAB-Band Council N = 16	Community quality organizations N = 8	
Centre-specific	Increased the application of best <i>administrative</i> practices in centres whose supervisor participated in the MPCC program	14/18 (77.8%)	Not asked	Not asked	14/18 (77.8%)
	Increased the use of best <i>programming</i> practices in centres whose supervisor participated in the MPCC program	5/18 (27.8%)	9/16 (56.3%)	Not asked	14/34 (41.2%)
	Improved the leadership skills of MPCC participants	15/18 (83.3%)	10/16 (62.5%)	Not asked	25/34 (73.6%)
	Increased outreach to and partnerships with families in centres whose supervisor participated in the MPCC program	9/18 (50.0%)	9/16 (56.3%)	Not asked	18/34 (52.9%)
	Improved overall quality in centres whose supervisor participated in the MPCC	14/18 (77.8%)	9/16 (56.3%)	8/8 (100%)	31/42 (73.8%)
	Increased mutual support among centres within the community, e.g. establishment or strengthening of a supervisor network, sharing of resources among centres	12/18 (66.7%)	9/16 (56.3%)	Not asked	20/34 (58.8%)
System-wide	A positive impact on the local early learning and child care (ELCC) community	16/18 (88.9%)	13/16 (81.3%)	8/8 (100%)	37/42 (88.1%)
	Improved relationships among ELCC partners, e.g. Colleges, Municipalities/Bands, other quality enhancement organizations	13/18 (72.2%)	10/16 (62.5%)	6/8 (75.0%)	29/42 (69.1%)
	Been associated with more joint endeavours between ELCC community partners	15/18 (83.3%)	7/16 (43.6%)	7/8 (87.5%)	29/42 (69.0%)
	Assisted at the systems level of management of child care	9/18 (50.0%)	6/16 (37.5%)	Not asked	15/34 (44.1%)

Notes

- A place was provided for respondents to indicate that they felt unable to make a judgment about a specific item. This accounts for the variation in number of responses to each item.
- The final question asked whether the respondent is personally aware of MPCC assisting at the systems level. It actually may have done so in more situations than respondents knew about.

References

- Anderson, E.A., & Shannon, A.L. (1995). Towards a conceptualization of mentoring. In Kerry, T., & Mayes, A.S. (Eds.). *Issues in mentoring*. London: Rutledge.
- Arnett, J. (1989). Caregivers in child care centers: Does training really matter? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 10, 541-552.
- Beach, J., Bertrand, J., Forer, B., Michal, D., & Tougas, J. (2004). *Working for change: Canada's child care workforce: Labour market update study*. Ottawa, Ontario: Child Care Human Resources Sector Council.
- Bella, J., & Bloom, P.J. (2003). *Zoom: The impact of early childhood leadership training on role perceptions, job performance, and career decisions*. Wheeling, IL: The Center for Early Childhood Leadership, National-Louis University.
- Bellm, D. (1997). *The early childhood mentoring curriculum: A handbook for mentors*. Washington, DC: National Center for the Early Childhood Workforce.
- Best Start Expert Panel on Quality and Human Resources. (2007). *Investing in quality: Report of the Expert Panel on Quality and Human Resources*. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Children and Youth Services.
- Bloom, P.J., & Sheerer, M. (1992). Changing organizations by changing individuals: A model of leadership training. *The Urban Review*, 24 (4), 263-286.
- Child Care Human Resources Sector Council (CCHRSC). (2006). *Occupational standards for child care administrators*. Ottawa, Ontario: Author.
- Doherty, G. (2009). *The Mentoring Pairs for Child Care Project: Interim evaluation report phase I and II process evaluation*. St. Catharines, Ontario: Early Childhood Community Development Centre. Requests for this report should go to the Ministry of Education.
- Doherty, G. (2010). *The Mentoring Pairs for Child Care Project: Final process evaluation report*. St. Catharines, Ontario: Early Childhood Community Development Centre. Requests for this report should go to the Ministry of Education.
- Ferguson, E., McCormick-Ferguson, T., Singleton, C., & Soave, A. (1999). *Partners in Practice Mentoring Model: Reflection*,
- Goelman, H., Doherty, G., Lero, D.S., LaGrange, A., & Tougas, J. (2000). *Caring and learning environments: Quality in child care centres across Canada*. Guelph, Ontario: Centre for Families, Work and Well-Being, University of Guelph.
- Gursky, T.R. (1990). The age of our accountability, *Journal of Staff Development*, 19(4), on-line journal retrieved November 25, 2009 from: <http://www.nsd.org/news/gursky194.cfm>.
- Harms, T., & Clifford, R.M. (1980). *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale*. (1980). New York: Teachers College Press.

References

- Harms, T., Clifford, R.M., & Cryer, D. (1998). *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Helburn, S.W. (Ed.). (1995). *Cost, quality and child outcomes in child care centers*. Denver, CO: Department of Economics, Center for Research and Social Policy, University of Colorado at Denver.
- KeyStone Research Corporation. (2007). *Final report: Evaluation of the Arkansas Early Childhood Professional Development System (AECPPS)*. Erie, Pennsylvania: Author.
- Knapp-Philo, J., Hindman, J., Stice, V., & Turbiville, V. (2006). Professional development that changed practice and programs: Five successful strategies. *Zero to Three*, January. 43-49.
- Lower, J.K., & Cassidy, D.J. (2007). Child care environments: The relationship with learning environments. *Journal of Research in Child Care Education*, 22(2), 189-204.
- LaFrance Associates. (2006). *Evaluation of Every Child Counts First 5 Alameda Children and Families Commission's Every Director Counts Project*. San Francisco, CA: Author. Unpublished report downloaded on August 10, 2010 from: <http://www.acdkids.org>.
- McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership. (2010). *Head Start administrative practices, director qualifications, and links to program quality*. Research Notes, Winter, 2010. Wheeling, Illinois: Author, National-Louis University.
- Mietlicki, C. (2010). *Tennessee Early Childhood Program Administrator Credential: TECAC year two evaluation report*. Nashville, TN: Center of Excellence for Learning Sciences, State University of Tennessee. Prepared for the Tennessee Department of Human Services.
- Pascal, C. (2009). *With our best future in mind: Implementing early learning in Ontario*. Toronto: MEDU.
- Partners in Practice. (1998). *Survey of mentoring initiatives in Canada*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Child Care Connections NS.
- Peisner-Feinberg, E.S., & Burchinal, M.R. (1997). Relations between preschool children's child-care experiences and concurrent development: the Cost, Quality and Outcomes Study, *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43, 451-477.
- Peisner-Feinberg, E.S., Burchinal, M.R., Clifford, R.M., Culkin, M.L., Howes, C. & Kagan, S.L. (2001). The relationship of preschool child-care quality to children's cognitive and social developmental trajectories through second grade. *Child Development*, 72(5), 1534-1553.
- Sakai, L. (2003). Evaluating the Early Childhood Rating Scale. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18, 427-445.
- Schael, J. (1998). *Partners in Practice Mentoring Project: Data analysis report*. Fort Kent, Maine: University of Maine.

References

Shivers, E.M. (2010). Early Education Emergent Leaders Program evaluation report. Phoenix, Arizona: Indigo Cultural Center.

Talan, T.N., & Bloom, P.J. (2004). Program Administration Scale. New York: Teachers College Press.

Thomas, E.M. (2006). Readiness to learn at school among five-year-old children in Canada. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Special Surveys Division, Children and Youth Research Paper Series, Catalogue no. 89-599-MIE-No.004.

U.S. National Institute of Child Health Research Network. (2005). Child care and child development: Results from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development. New York: The Guildford Press.

Whitebook, M., & Sakai, L. (1995). The potential of mentoring: An assessment of the California early childhood mentor teacher program. Washington, DC: National Center for the Early Childhood Workforce.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C., & Phillips, D. (1990). Who cares? Child care teachers and quality of care in America. Final report of the National Child Care Staffing Study. Oakland, CA: Child Care Employee Project.

Wylie, C., Hodgen, E., Ferral, H., & Thompson, J. (2006). Contributions of early childhood education to age-14 performance. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.