

Mentoring



Goals

The goals of mentoring are the following: 1) to enhance the mentee's skills and knowledge and 2) to increase the individual's professional capacity.

Practice Features

Mentoring pairs a new or less experienced early childhood professional with a peer in the same role, but who has a great deal more experience. The mentor uses a relationship-based process to provide guidance and support based on his or her experience in a similar role to the less-experienced mentee.

The ideal match between a mentor and mentee is one that is agreed upon by both parties since establishing and maintaining a positive, trusting, and respectful relationship is one of the most important features of the mentoring process.¹

The process is enhanced by establishing role clarity, setting goals, and having both planned contacts and unplanned contacts when needed by the mentee. The duration of this process is ongoing and should build on previous learning.

Mentoring programs offer new early childhood professionals a practical and supportive way to learn and grow on the job. For experienced professionals, mentoring programs create an opportunity to advance their own skills, knowledge and career goals.

Target Audience

Early care and education professionals

Documented Outcomes

	Type of Study	Improved program quality*	Improved teacher practices*	Improved teacher-child interactions**
Fiene 2002 ⁱ	Experimental	✓	✓	✓
Zan & Donegan-Ritter (2014) ⁱⁱ	Experimental		✓	✓
Ota & Austin (2013) ⁱⁱⁱ	Quasi-experimental		✓	
Abell et.al. (2014) ^{iv}	Non-experimental	✓		
Doherty et.al. (2015) ^v	Non-experimental	✓		
Korkus-Ruiz (2007) ^{vi}	Non-experimental	✓		✓
Onchwari & Keengwe (2008) ^{vii}	Non-experimental		✓	

This table contains outcomes found to be associated with the program or approach. Individual studies may contain additional outcomes that were tested and not found to be associated with the program or approach.

*Aligned with Smart Start outcome *Increase/maintain program quality*

**Aligned with Smart Start outcome *Improved teacher-child interaction*

Mentoring Snapshot

- **EC Profile Indicator:** PLA40 - Average Star Rating for Children in 1-5 Star Care and Percent of Children in 4 and 5 star care or PLA50 - Average Star Rating for Subsidized Children in 1-5 Star Care and Percent of Subsidized Children in 4 and 5 star care
- **Research supports** use within the early childhood professional community for a range of outcomes of interest including improved quality of child care and improved job and career satisfaction.
- **Related Smart Start outcomes:**
 - Increase/ maintain program quality
 - Improved teacher-child interaction
- **Staff qualifications:** North Carolina TA Level 11 and TA Endorsement

Research Summary for Mentoring

- Mentoring has been linked to improved quality of care, teacher practices, teacher-child interactions, and job-satisfaction or positive career outcomes.

Review of Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Studies

Citation	Fiene, R. (2002). Improving child care quality through an infant caregiver mentoring project. <i>Child and Youth Care Forum</i>, 31, pp. 79-87.
Population and Sample	The study team followed 52 infant teachers from 27 child care centers (7 accredited by NAEYC). Teachers were randomly assigned to mentoring or non-mentoring groups.
Methodology	Experimental
Purpose	The study targeted the extent to which mentoring improved child care quality.
Measures & Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scale (ITERS) • Arnett Caregiver Observation Scale • Knowledge of Infant Development (KIDI) • Bloom Scales of Organization Climate
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The treatment group received intensive mentoring from September to December 2000. • The mentoring model was a “problem-solving approach.” • The comparison group did not receive mentoring during the study period but did have access to workshops and training. The comparison group received mentoring from March to June 2001.
Staff Qualifications	The study noted that the mentors were experienced early childhood professionals with at least 5 years of experience and experience as both a director and teacher. Further, the mentors spent time observing the treatment group participants and building a relationship with the participant, prior to offering advice and guidance (i.e., mentorship).
Key Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team found the mentoring group of teachers had higher program quality at the end of the four-month mentoring project, using the Infant Toddler Environment Rating Scale and Arnett’s Caregiver Interaction Scale. More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There were no significant differences for the treatment or comparison group on the overall ITERS, Arnett, KIDI, Bloom Scale Scores, between pre- and post-assessment. ○ Within the treatment group, there was a significant and positive change on the ITERS subscales (a) routines and (b) learning activities. ○ Within the treatment group, there was a significant and positive change on the Arnett subscales (a) sensitivity and (b) appropriate discipline. ○ Within the control group, there was a significant and positive change on the ITERS subscale interactions.

Citation	Zan, B., & Donegan-Ritter, M. (2014). Reflecting, coaching and mentoring to enhance teacher–child interactions in Head Start classrooms. <i>Early Childhood Education Journal</i>, 42(2), pp. 93-104.
Population and Sample	19 mentors from 4 Head Start sites (all in Iowa) were selected and trained. 60 teachers and assistant teachers comprising 30 teams from 30 classrooms were randomly assigned to treatment (n=38) or comparison (n=22) groups.
Methodology	Experimental
Purpose	This study assessed an 8-month program that consisted of monthly self-reflection, peer coaching, and mentoring along with bimonthly workshops that targeted Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) elements. The study addressed the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Do preschool teachers who participate in an eight-month long program of intensive [professional development] PD improve their interactions with children? (2) Do teachers who possess a bachelor’s degree or higher make the same gains as teachers who have lower educational attainment?
Measures & Assessments	Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CLASS was used to track changes in teacher-child interactions on a monthly basis. • Completed teacher reflection guides, peer coaching guides, and mentoring guides served as an indicator of implementation fidelity and dosage.
Staff Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head Start education supervisors selected by directors to be trained as mentors; they received training in coaching skills and ongoing support on a monthly or as-needed basis

Key Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study team found significant increases in behavior management, productivity, language modeling and quality of feedback skills, with the treatment group exhibiting significantly higher gains than the comparison group. Findings were robust across teachers with and without college degrees. The authors concluded that teachers who received the professional development program were more likely to appropriately implement desired behaviors. The study team found that the treatment group exhibited statistically significant changes in four of ten CLASS domains, between pre- and post-assessment. More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean scores in the Behavior Management domain increased significantly from 5.4 in September to 5.8 in April ($p = .008$). In the Productivity domain, the intervention group's mean score increased significantly from 5.4 in September to 5.9 in April ($p = .008$). Quality of Feedback increased among intervention group participants from 3.2 in September to 4.1 in April ($p = .004$). Language modeling increased in the intervention group from 3.3 in September to 3.9 in April ($p = .004$). The study team found that the comparison group exhibited statistically significant changes in two of ten CLASS domains. More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative Climate increased from a mean score of 1.1 in September to a mean score of 1.5 in April ($p = .005$) (Negative Climate is reverse-scored). Regard for Student Perspective decreased in the comparison group from a mean score of 4.9 in September to a mean score of 4.4 in April. CLASS scores in the instructional support domain did not change significantly over the course of the year. The study team found that degreed and non-degreed teachers "teachers showed identical patterns of uptake of the PD." More specifically, the study team found that "significant differences were found in both groups for the domains of Behavior Management, Productivity, Quality of Feedback, and Language Modeling. No significant differences were found in the other six dimensions for either group. These results indicate that the CAMP Quality PD approach was equally effective for both degreed and non-degreed teachers."
---------------------	---

Citation	Ota, C. L., & Austin, A. M. B. (2013). Training and mentoring: Family child care providers' use of linguistic inputs in conversation. <i>Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28(4)</i> , pp. 972-983.
Population and Sample	The study enrolled family child care providers at 48 sites (23 family homes, 25 family group homes), along with children who wore audio recorders to capture language practices. Teachers were assigned to either the training alone ($n=32$), training plus mentoring ($n=32$), or a control group ($n=32$).
Methodology	Quasi-experimental
Purpose	This quasi-experimental study targeted the effectiveness of training alone versus training in combination with mentoring. The study addressed the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a significant difference in the frequency of family child care provider linguistic inputs after provider participation in a 10 hour training program as compared to a control group? Is there a significant difference in the frequency of family childcare provider linguistic inputs after provider participation in a 10 hour training program combined with on-site mentoring as compared to a control group? Is one model (training or training plus mentoring) associated with a greater increase in the frequency of provider linguistically stimulating inputs in family child care programs?
Measures & Assessments	Language practices were measured at three points in time using the LENA technology.
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication logs maintained by mentors served as a measure of fidelity for the training plus mentoring group The LENA technology records child and adult conversations and calculates frequencies of "child turns." The study team noted that "A minimum of 30 min of free-choice time was recorded, although the total recording time varied for each program depending on the length of the free-choice time at each program. Programs that had fewer than 30 min of free-choice were asked to extend their free-choice to meet the 30 min minimum. All programs complied with this request."
Staff Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early Care and Education specialists with 4-year degrees provided training. Three of the four mentors held early childhood related 4-year degrees; all had previous child care and mentoring experience as a center- or family-care provider, trainer, and mentor.

Key Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study team found that both training alone and training plus mentoring produced improved language behaviors. However, the training plus mentoring cohort exhibited greater gains than the training only group. Of interest, mentoring services appeared relatively well-structured. There were both on-site and off-site activities including role modeling, mentor-mentee discussions, and direct feedback. Six mentoring consultations were provided (typically on-site at the child care facility) over a 12-week period with an average length of 75 minutes.
---------------------	---

Review of Meta-Analyses

None

Review of Descriptive and Non-Experimental Studies

Citation	Abell, E., Arsiwalla, D. D., Putnam, R. I., & Miller, E. B. (2014). Mentoring and facilitating professional engagement as quality enhancement strategies: An overview and evaluation of the family child care partnerships program. <i>Child & Youth Care Forum, 43(5), pp. 569-592.</i>
Population and Sample	<p>There were two studies. Study 1 incorporated licensed family child care providers and family group homes, who had been or were currently enrolled in Family Child Care Partnerships (FCCP) from June 2000 to December 2007. There were 456 providers who participated in the program during this time period and 365 (78 %) completed enrollment surveys and permitted the quality of their caregiving to be observed.</p> <p>Study 2 incorporated a sub-sample of the participants from Study 1. Study 2 participants provided additional information about their professional contacts and behaviors as part of an examination of provider professionalism and social support networks. The study team contacted 165 providers who had supplied professionalism data during program enrollment. Of these, 109 agreed to provide follow-up data, for a participation rate of 66%.</p>
Methodology	<p>Study 1: Non-experimental Study 2: Non-experimental</p>
Purpose	The study focused on a family child care mentoring program that provided weekly home visits to participating programs. Of note, the program mentors also served as a point of contact for accessing fiscal, professional development, informational, and tangible resources. The study team investigated two outcomes: Global Quality and Professional Engagement. Study 1 was designed to assess whether FCCP program participants exhibited a significant increase in the observed overall quality of their child care practices over the course of their participation. Study 2 was designed to assess whether participants' increases in observed overall quality were associated with increases in their self-reported professional engagement.
Measures & Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family Day Care Rating Scale Study interview and questionnaires
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentors were described as working with 10-15 sites on a weekly to biweekly basis with an average visit length of 2 to 2.5 hours. Mentoring consisted of a number of services including observations, needs assessment, action planning, facilitated assistance and training. Training consisted of a variety of techniques including "demonstration, modeling, reflective feedback, discussion, one-on-one teaching, and joint review of print materials or audio/visual resources." Study 1 data were collected at two time points. Time point 1 data were captured during standard FCCP program enrollment procedures. Then, within the first three months of participation in FCCP, program mentors assessed the quality of participant child care practices, using the standardized instrument. Additional observations occurred every three-four months thereafter. Time point 2 data were the latest observational assessment data on file for each participant. Study 2 data were collected at two time points. Time point 1 data were captured from the initial enrollment survey. Then, information about participant contacts with child care professionals was collected via face-to-face interviews with mentors, during the first three months of program participation. A social network grid was used to identify the relationship of each contact to the participant. Time point 2 data were collected via a self-administered questionnaire.
Staff Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study team noted that FCCP mentors "have been with the program an average of nearly 9

years (ranging from 3 to 13 years). FCCP mentors are regionally-based, drawn from communities throughout the state and selected based upon the following qualifications: (a) expertise in the areas of early child development and/or early childhood education; (b) knowledge of developmentally appropriate practice; (c) knowledge about family child care; (d) prior experience as a mentor or teacher of adult learners; and (e) the ability to work independent of direct supervision.”

- Mentors were trained by the FCCP Managing Director. There were three intensive days of pre-service training followed by field-based observations of other mentors. Key parts of this preparation included: (a) specific mentoring and relationship-building skills; (b) observational skills; (c) the use of a standardized rating scale of quality family child care practices; (d) knowledge of benchmarked accreditation quality standards developed by NAFCC; and (e) observation of in-home visits conducted by seasoned mentors.
- Mentors also attended approximately three two-day in-service training sessions per year, typically conducted by the FCCP management team.
- The FCCP management team provided support for mentors as well as oversight, feedback, and reflective supervision. The team included a Managing Director, Accreditation Specialist, and Program Specialist.
- FCCP encouraged providers to network with other child care professionals and further their professional development.

Key Findings

- The study team reported that mentoring participants demonstrated significant improvements in quality (as assessed using the Family Day Care Rating Scale). More specifically:
 - The average number of months between Time 1 and Time 2 data points was approximately 21 months.
 - The average FDCRS score at Time 1 was 4.3 and the average FDCRS score at Time 2 was 5.2.
 - There was significant pre-to-post change in child care quality from Time 1 to Time 2 ($p < .001$).
 - When the number of months in the program was added as a control, a higher number of months in the program was associated with lower Time 1 global quality ($p < .01$) and predicted positive change in quality from Time 1 to Time 2 ($p < .001$).
 - The significant negative association between Time 1 quality and change in quality at Time 2 indicated that lower initial level of quality at program entry was associated with a higher increase in quality at Time 2.
 - Thirty-seven percent of the variance in change in global quality was predicted by the final model ($p < .001$).
- The study team reported that there was a positive increase in membership in professional engagement (as assessed by number of professional contacts and membership in a professional organization). More specifically:
 - The subsample of participants in Study 2 participated a longer time in the program—41 months (range = 11–73 months).
 - There was a significant increase pre-to-post change in child care quality from Time 1 to Time 2 ($p < .001$).
 - Unstandardized coefficients indicate that providers’ average quality rating increased by one full point.
 - The significant negative association between Time 1 quality and change in quality at Time 2 ($p < .001$) indicates that higher quality at Time 1 was associated with a lower rate of change in quality at Time 2.
 - After time was added as a control, there was significant change in both quality ($p < .001$) and the number of associations ($p < .001$) from Time 1 to Time 2, after accounting for other variables in the model.
 - The average number of associations was .82 and the number of associations increased by .62 from Time 1 to Time 2.
 - An increase in caregiving quality was associated with a simultaneous increase in the number of associations ($p < .05$).
 - Fifty-four percent of the variance in change in global quality ($p < .001$) and 39 % of the variance in change in provider engagement ($p < .001$) was predicted by the final model.
 - The number of professional contacts at Time 1 was negatively associated with change in professional contacts ($p < .001$), and there was a significant increase in quality from Time 1 to Time 2 after accounting for other variables in the model.
 - Professional contacts did not change significantly over time and there was no association between changes in global quality and changes in professional contacts.

Citation

Doherty, G., Ferguson, T. M., Ressler, G., & Lomotey, J. (2015). Enhancing child care quality by director training and collegial mentoring. *Early Childhood Research & Practice, 17*(1).

Population and Sample	<p>The program enrolled 403 directors or assistant directors from 28 locations across Ontario, ensuring representation across urban and rural locations. 340 of the original 403 participants completed the project.</p> <p>For the study, a sub-sample of 10 of 28 participating areas was selected, to allow for on-site pre- and post-training observations at centers. A total of 71 centers agreed to be observed, but 14 sites did not complete all observations, for a final sample of 57 centers.</p>
Methodology	<p>Non-experimental</p>
Purpose	<p>The study focused on the processes and potential impacts of providing child care directors with training in administration and leadership skills. The study addressed the following questions:</p> <p>(1) To what extent did graduation from the program enhance directors’ administrative practices? (2) To what extent did graduation from the program enhance the classroom global quality in directors’ centers? (3) Did the program study groups result in local director support networks that continued after graduation?</p>
Measures & Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Administration Scale • Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale – Revised
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study utilized both a formal training curriculum (developed by Bloom and colleagues at the McCormick Center for Early Childhood Leadership at National-Louis University) and mentoring (Partners in Practice Mentoring Model). Key aspects of the mentoring program included a focus on peer support and collegial learning, use of facilitated study groups, year-long monthly 3-hour meetings, participation self-reflection and journaling, and group or team work on shared assignments. • The study team noted that the facilitators were “college instructors with child care education and/or management experience and were hired to be responsible for program delivery in a specific area.” Facilitators received two days of group orientation before the program started. • All participating directors (mentors and mentees included) received 21 hours of preparation (across three days) at the start of the program, including “an orientation to MPCC, introduction to key concepts (e.g., leadership, mentoring, reflective practice, career development, and systems thinking), and review of the training methods and tools they would be using.” • Mentors received an additional several hours of preparation, including “training in mentoring techniques and facilitating reflective practice. Both participant orientations were provided by the facilitators for the group of participants they would be working with.” • The program involved study groups, which ranged in size from six to 22 participants. Study groups met monthly, for three-hours meetings, from February to December. • Facilitators received a facilitator manual for use during the program.
Staff Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentees were directors or assistant directors with less than five-years’ experience. Mentors were more experienced directors from the same geographic area. Mentor-mentee pairing was based upon factors such as nature and extent of formal professional training, areas in which mentees identified needs and mentors identified strengths, and teaching-learning style preferences for both mentor and mentee.
Key Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary study outcomes were statistically significant improvements in leadership and administration skills as assessed using the Program Administration Scale and improvements in program quality as assessed using the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale—Revised. Moderate effect sizes were calculated for both outcomes. <p>Administrative Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team noted that, post-intervention, there were significantly higher scores on the total PAS and seven of its subscales ($d=.57, p<.001$). More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The most significant PAS changes occurred in those areas where directors have the most control: human resources development, use of technology, and marketing and public relations. ○ Change was not significant for two subscales: child assessment and personnel cost and allocation, which includes salaries and benefits. <p>Classroom Global Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team noted that “director graduation from [the program] was associated with significant enhancement of global classroom quality on the total ECERS-R scale ($p<.01$)...and four of its subscales.” More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The effect size for the total ECERS-R was $d = 0.44, p < .01$. ○ The most significant changes occurred in the ways space and furnishings were used, personal care routines, provision of activities to support child development, and provisions for meeting

staff needs.

- There was little change in adult-child interaction which, with a pre score of 6.0, was already good.

Development of Director Support Networks

- The study team noted that, 18 months after the program ended, “most graduates reported they were still in contact with their study group members and reported having sought and given assistance and been involved in joint projects. These projects included (a) providing training sessions for other directors on the Occupational Standards for Child Care Administrators and/or using the PAS to evaluate one’s own administrative quality and identify areas needing attention, (b) developing and circulating a list of directors in their area who were available for informal support, (c) mentoring assistant directors interested in becoming directors, and (d) reaching out to new or nonparticipating directors to engage them in director support networks.”

Citation	Korkus-Ruiz, S., Dettore, E., Bagnato, S. J., Yeh-Ho, H. (2007). Improving the quality of early childhood education programs: Evaluation of a mentoring process for staff and administrators. Early Child Services, 1(1), pp. 33-48.
Population and Sample	The study incorporated six child care centers and nine family daycare centers. A total of 45 caregivers and five child care administrators participated in mentoring. The study team also noted that 11 teachers from two communities received mentoring over an 18-month period.
Methodology	Non-experimental
Purpose	The study assessed the impact of a mentoring program on teacher behavior and overall program quality.
Measures & Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale—Revised (ECERS-R) ● Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale (ITERS) ● Family Day Care Environment Rating Scale (FDCERS) ● Caregiver Interaction Scale (modified for the study; CIS)
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The mentoring activities were focused on director and teacher capacities (e.g., administration and leadership, classroom environment). ● The mentors “conducted classroom observations, completed a program quality assessment, developed a quality enhancement plan, and collaborated with teachers and center directors to address the strategies and goals identified in the enhancement plans.” ● Assessments were completed at five time-points throughout the study, at six month intervals.
Staff Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program quality was assessed by early childhood professionals from universities, agencies, and professional organizations, and early childhood education undergraduate students. ● Follow-up assessments were completed by early childhood professionals, including project consultants, quality assurance coordinators, assistant teachers from other programs, early intervention specialists and project directors.
Key Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The study team reported significant improvements in overall quality and several subscales in particular, including space and furnishings, personal care routines, language and reasoning, learning activities, and adult needs. The study team also noted improvements on the Caregiver Interaction Scale. ● While all classroom types exhibited improvements, the greatest improvements were noted in infant-toddler classrooms. <p>Classroom Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The study team noted that program participants exhibited statistically significant increases in mean scores on the ECERS-R, ITERS, FDCERS, and CIS. More specifically, there were statistically significant increases in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seven of seven ITERS subscales (Furnishings and Displays, Personal Care Routines, Listening and Talking, Learning Activities, Interaction, Program Structure, Adult Needs, and Total Score) ○ Five of seven ECERS-R subscales (Space and Furnishings, Personal Care Routines, Activities, Program Structure, Parents and Staff, Total Score) ○ Four of six FDCER subscales (Space and Furnishings, Personal Care, Language and Reasoning, Learning Activities, Total Score) <p>Teacher-Child Interactions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The study team noted that there were not improvements in interactions or social development, as assessed with the ECERS-R and FDCERS.

- The study team noted significant changes in permissive, punitive, detached, social, and cognitive subscales, as well as total score.

Citation	Onchwari, G., & Keengwe, J. (2008). The impact of a mentor-coaching model on teacher professional development, <i>Early Childhood Education Journal</i>, 36(1), pp. 19-24.
Population and Sample	44 Head Start teachers in two mid-western states, with a focus on teachers who participated in the Early Literacy Mentor-Coaches program
Methodology	Qualitative
Purpose	The study assessed the impact of the Early Literacy Mentor-Coaches program. Six interview questions were used: (1) Is the mentor-coach initiative continuing in your program? (2) What forms of training and materials did you receive or have you received in the process of the mentor-coach initiative? (3) How often did you receive this support during the mentor coach process? (4) How helpful was the mentor-coach initiative in supporting and enhancing your literacy practices? (5) What are some of the aspects of the mentor-coach initiative training that you have implemented in your teaching and classrooms? (6) What challenges did you face in implementing the strategies learned in the mentor-initiative; what other concerns do you have about the initiative?
Measures & Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews
Study Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study incorporated teachers who received mentoring from the Early Literacy Mentor-Coaches. • The study team conducted one-on-one interviews with each participating teacher. • The study team also conducted classroom observations after the interviews
Staff Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team noted a “train the trainer” model was used to develop mentors and that enrollment in the Mentoring-Coaching program was slow at first but gained momentum among Head Start teachers over time. • Mentors were teachers who attended a training developed by the Center for Improving the Readiness of Children for Learning and Education (CIRCLE) for the Strategic Teacher Education Program (STEP) Early Literacy Mentor-Coach initiative model. • In the training, the participating teachers learning a number of literacy-supportive techniques, including “ways of providing appropriate literacy environments and routines, phonological awareness, written expression, language development, print and book awareness, motivation to read, read aloud, letter knowledge, and literacy mentoring areas strategies.” • After completing the training, the teachers were considered Early Literacy Mentor-Coaches and expected to provide support to two or more teachers in their programs. • Ongoing support was provided by regional centers. The regional Quality Improvement Center (QIC) supplied Mentor-Coach Specialists (MCS) to provide additional support and training on STEP materials.
Key Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study team reported that, within 6 months of participating in the Mentoring-Coaching program, participants provided positive feedback about the program (23 of 44 indicated the program was very helpful and 15 of 44 indicated the program was somewhat helpful) and were able to identify program-related improvements in classroom literacy practices.

End Notes

¹National Association for the Education of Young Children, & National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies. (2011). Early childhood education professional development: Training and technical assistance glossary. Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved from <http://www.naeyc.org>.

ⁱ Fiene, R. (2002). Improving child care quality through an infant caregiver mentoring project. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 31, pp. 79-87.

ⁱⁱ Zan, B., & Donegan-Ritter, M. (2014). Reflecting, coaching and mentoring to enhance teacher-child interactions in Head Start classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 42(2), pp.

93-104.

ⁱⁱⁱ Ota, C. L., & Austin, A. M. B. (2013). Training and mentoring: Family child care providers' use of linguistic inputs in conversation. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28(4), pp. 972-983.

^{iv} Abell, E., Arsiwalla, D. D., Putnam, R. I., & Miller, E. B. (2014). Mentoring and facilitating professional engagement as quality enhancement strategies: An overview and evaluation of the family child care partnerships program. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 43(5), pp. 569-592.

^v Doherty, G., Ferguson, T. M., Ressler, G., & Lomotey, J. (2015). Enhancing child care quality by director training and collegial mentoring. *Early Childhood Research & Practice*, 17(1).

^{vi} Korkus-Ruiz, S., Dettore, E., Bagnato, S. J., Yeh-Ho, H. (2007). Improving the quality of early childhood education programs: Evaluation of a mentoring process for staff and administrators. *Early Child Services*, 1(1), pp. 33-48.

^{vii} Onchwari, G., & Keengwe, J. (2008). The impact of a mentor-coaching model on teacher professional development, *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 36(1), pp. 19-24.

Additional Resources

Fixsen, D. (2009). *Scaling-Up Brief: Intensive technical assistance*. Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute: Chapel Hill North Carolina.

Ng, T. W. H., Eby, L. T., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, pp. 367-408.

Note: Research summaries could include verbiage directly reproduced from the research literature. Quotes and italics may be used to show a direct quote but not always.

Published: July 2018