

FACTORS AFFECTING THE TRAINING NEEDS AND BARRIERS
OF SCHOOL-AGE CARE ADMINISTRATORS

by

LAKEISHA MARIE BLAND

(Under the Direction of David Wright)

ABSTRACT

Using Bronfenbrenner's ecological system theory, the extent to which individual, program and community-level variables affected the training barriers and training preferences of school-age care administrators was examined through a survey of 201 school-age administrators. The training topics directors preferred were significantly correlated with the problems they experienced in their programs, suggesting that program characteristics may affect training preferences. In contrast, individual and community variables appeared to have less effect on training preferences and barriers. Director education, experience and the size of the community in which they worked were related to only a few preferred training topics or methods and were unrelated to preferred training times and barriers. The results of this study support past research indicating that program characteristics may be an important variable affecting the training preferences of school-age care administrators.

INDEX WORDS: Training, School-age Care, Directors, Administrators, Child Care, Professional Development, Adult Education

FACTORS AFFECTING THE TRAINING NEEDS AND BARRIERS
OF SCHOOL-AGE CARE ADMINISTRATORS

by

LAKEISHA MARIE BLAND

B.S., Jackson State University, 2000

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2003

© 2003

Lakeisha Marie Bland

All Rights Reserved

FACTORS AFFECTING THE TRAINING NEEDS AND BARRIERS
OF SCHOOL-AGE CARE ADMINISTRATORS

by

LAKEISHA MARIE BLAND

Major Professor: David Wright

Committee: Christine Todd
Mick Coleman

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2003

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family. This accomplishment is a tribute to all the support and encouragement that I have received from them. Thank you for always believing in me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Few accomplishments in life are the result of only one individual's efforts. Accordingly, there are several people I must recognize for their part in the completion of this project.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Christine Todd for all of her support, guidance, patience, and leadership during this process. It is because of your mentorship and dedication that this project has been completed. I greatly appreciate all the time you put into helping me to get this project completed and for all that you taught me along the way. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. David Wright, Dr. Mick Coleman, and Dr. Diane Bales. Their advice and support were invaluable throughout this process.

To my parents, Leon & Jacqueline, thank you for all your love and support. It is because of you that I am who I am today. To the rest of my family, who have shown me unwavering support, what can I say? You will never know how much your love and encouragement helped me to complete this process. And last but not least, I thank my friends for supporting me and being there to help me through the rough spots. To all my supporters, cheerleaders, and everyone who pushed me to complete this project, thank you. I truly appreciate all you have done for me, and I know that you are the reason I made it. I love you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
School-Age Care Settings	3
Characteristics of Facility-Based Before and After-School Programs	8
Quality School-Age Care	12
Characteristics of School-Age Providers	14
Training of School-Age Providers	17
Proposed Study	24
3 METHODS	26
Participants	26
Instruments	26
Procedure	27
4 RESULTS	29
Preliminary Analyses	29
Training Needs and Barriers of School-Age Directors	30

5	DISCUSSION.....	49
	REFERENCES	55
APPENDICES		
A	PROGRAM SURVEY.....	61
B	TRAINNG SURVEY.....	69

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Directors Training Topic Interest by Educational Level of Director	36
Table 2: Directors Training Topic Interest by Experience Level of Director.....	37
Table 3: Directors Training Topic Interest by Community Size	38
Table 4: Preferred Training Methods by Educational Level of Director	39
Table 5: Preferred Training Methods by Experience Level of Director.....	40
Table 6: Preferred Training Methods by Community Size.....	41
Table 7: Preferred Training Times by Educational Level of Director.....	42
Table 8: Preferred Training Times by Experience Level of Director.....	43
Table 9: Preferred Training Times by Community Size.....	44
Table 10: Training Barriers by Educational Level of Director.....	45
Table 11: Training Barriers by Experience Level of Director.....	46
Table 12: Training Barriers by Community Size.....	47
Table 13: Correlations between Training Topics and Program Problems	48

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

School-age children currently spend their out-of-school time in a variety of care settings ranging from self-care to formal before and/or after-school programs. In 1995, 75% of youth between the ages of 5 and 14 years spent time in multiple care arrangements on a regular basis (Smith, 2000). The increased use of various school-age care (SAC) options for youth is due, in part, to increased maternal participation in the workforce. In 1995, 76% of mothers with children between the ages of 6 and 14 years worked outside the home (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1999). Other factors that influence care options are family resources, neighborhood characteristics, child's age, gender, individual interest (Vandell & Shumow, 1999) and family structure (Capizzano, Tout, & Adams, 2000).

Quality school-age care has been associated with positive developmental outcomes for youth (Pierce, Hamm & Vandell, 1999; Posner & Vandell, 1994, 1999; Vandell & Shumow, 1999). Higher self-esteem, better academic performance, more positive social skills, and fewer behavioral problems have been linked to participation in quality school-age care. While the link between quality of care and youth outcomes has been examined in the literature, only a few studies have examined factors that may contribute to quality school-age care (Pierce et al., 1999; Rosenthal & Vandell, 1996).

Experiences in care can vary based on program and staff characteristics. Staff are believed to be a key component of quality care (Anderson & Gore, 1994; Dryfoos, 1999; Willer, 1994). Thus, to improve program quality, it is essential to understand more about

the people who work in school-age care settings. Currently, training initiatives are being developed to enhance the competencies of school-age providers. However, little is known about the training needs of school-age staff or factors that affect their ability to attend training. The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which individual, program and community variables affect the training preferences and training barriers of school-age providers in a southern state.

Chapter 2 will present an overview of SAC programs and the characteristics and professional development needs of staff who work in school-age care. Chapter 3 will provide the methodology for the study. The results of the study will be presented in Chapter 4. A discussion of the implications of the findings will follow in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will provide an overview of the ways children spend their out-of-school time. In addition, an in-depth look at characteristics of before and after-school care programs and staff and a review of the school-age care training literature will be provided.

School-Age Care Settings

School-age youth spend their out-of-school time in a variety of supervised and unsupervised arrangements. Todd, Albrecht, and Coleman (1990) conceptualized care arrangements as following a continuum ranging from low to high levels of supervision. Indirect or no supervision (i.e. self-care) is characteristic of the care found at the low end of the continuum while adult supervision with full accountability (i.e. relative, family day care, and formal after school programs) is characteristic of care at the high end. Capizzano, Tout, and Adams (2000) reported that 54% of 6 to 12-year-olds regularly spend time in a supervised care arrangement. Younger children (ages 6 to 9 years: 62%) are more likely to be in supervised care than older children (ages 10 to 12 years: 43%).

Children spend time in an average of 1.8 care arrangements in addition to school each week (Smith, 2000). The prevalence of each type of care can vary based on the age of the child in care, the family's financial situation, family structure, and maternal work patterns (Capizzano et al., 2000). Typical out-of-school arrangements for youth and the prevalence of each is described below. Because studies differ in whether they report primary or multiple care arrangements, percentages for number of children in each care arrangement may vary.

Facility-Based Before and After-School Programs

Child care centers. Before and after-school programs constitute one type of arrangement utilized by school-age youth when not in school. Formal before and after-school programs can be found in a variety of settings including child care centers, community centers, and schools. Programs housed in *child care centers* are designed primarily to provide supervision while parents work and to support child development (Miller, 2001). These programs may also offer recreational activities and provide homework assistance for older youth (Fashola, 2002). The staff usually consist of individuals trained in early care and education, although some programs bring in individuals specifically to work with school-age youth. While early childhood professionals typically have degrees or training in child development, early childhood education, or psychology, youth workers may also come from backgrounds such as leisure studies, secondary education, juvenile justice, and social work.

Community-based before/after school programs. Youth-based programs housed in *community centers*, such as YMCA/YWCA, and prevention/intervention programs, are often designed to promote youth development and/or prevent risky behaviors (Miller, 2001). Youth care workers are the primary staff for these programs. While these programs are recreational in nature, they usually provide homework assistance as well (Fashola, 2002).

School-based programs. Programs housed in public or private schools come in a variety of forms and have varying goals. A primary goal of most programs is to improve academic achievement; however, most also offer recreational activities (Fashola, 2002; Miller, 2001). Some programs utilize school staff while others bring in paraprofessionals and other professionals to work in these programs.

Studies indicate that between 9% and 16% of youth spend time in before and after-school programs (Brimhall, Reaney, West, 1999; Capizzano et al., 2000; Hofferth, Brayfield, Delch, Holcomb, 1991; Smith, 2000). Utilizing data from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), Capizzano et al. (2000) reported that 16% of 6 to 12-year-old youth spend time in before and after-school programs as their primary care arrangement while not in school. Youth participation in programs is more prevalent among younger youth. Capizzano et al. reported that 21% of 6 to 9-year-olds participated in after-school programs as their primary care arrangement compared to only 10% of youth ages 10 to 12 years.

Home-Based Care

More youth spend time in home-based care options than in facility-based programs (Smith, 2000). These settings include relative care, sitter/nanny care, and family child care. Between 30% and 40% of youth, spend time in some form of home-based care (Brimhall et al., 1999; Capizzano et al., 2000; Hofferth et al., 1991; Marshall, Coll, Marx, McCartney, Keefe, Ruh, 1997; Smith, 2000).

Relative care. Relative care is the most utilized form of home-based care by school-age youth. Capizzano et al. reported that 11% of school-age youth were cared for by non-relative home-based caregivers, whereas 19% regularly used relative care. Capizzano et al. (2000) reported that relative care is used somewhat less often by older youth as their primary care arrangement. Twenty-one percent of 6 to 9-year-olds compared with 17% of 10 to 12-year-olds, use relative care (Capizzano et al., 2000).

Non-relative care. The use of sitter/nanny care and family child care is low among school-age youth (Capizzano et al., 2000). Only 4% of youth use sitter/nanny care and 7% are

reported to use family child care as their primary care arrangement. Use of non-relative care also decreases as children age.

Enrichment Activities

Enrichment lessons, clubs, organized sports, and individualized tutoring are all ways that school-age youth spend out-of-school time. Participation in enrichment activities is influenced by student interest and individual strengths (Mahoney & Cairns, 1997). Smith (2000) reported that 22% of youth spent time in sport activities, 16% in lessons, and 15% in club enrichment activities. While sports, clubs, and enrichment activities offer a degree of supervision, they are often only offered for limited time periods (Vandell & Shumow, 1999). A typical activity or lesson is usually offered an hour or two on one or two days each week. Some youth clubs may meet only once or twice per month. Unlike participation in before and after-school programs or home-based care, participation in enrichment activities increases as children get older (Pettit, Laird, Bates, & Dodge, 1997).

Self-Care

Before and after-school programs, home-based care, and enrichment activities are all examples of supervised care arrangements utilized by school-age youth. Although the level may vary, each carries a degree of supervision. Self-care, or latchkey care, is generally considered an unsupervised arrangement used by children when out of school. This type of care refers to children who are left without direct adult supervision. Children who are completely alone or with older siblings under age thirteen are typically classified as being in self-care. Although it is common for middle and high school children to be home alone, or caring for younger siblings, this is viewed as more developmentally appropriate and children this age typically are not included in studies of self-care.

While children in self-care are left without direct adult supervision, it is important to note that some receive supervision from a distance. “Distal supervision” as labeled by Todd et al. (1990) occurs when parents maintain contact by phone and ensure children do certain activities, such as homework, when they are alone.

In 1995, 18% of 5 to 14-year-olds spent time in self-care on a regular basis (Smith, 2000). Statistics show that this type of care is more prevalent with older children (ages 12 to 14 years: 41%) than younger children (ages 5 to 11 years: 9%) (Smith, 2000). Similar findings were also reported in other studies. Capizzano et al. (2000) reported that 35% of 10 to 12-year-olds and 10% of 6 to 9-year-olds regularly spent time in self-care although not as the primary care arrangement. They found self-care to be the primary form of out-of-school care for only 5% of 6 to 9-year-olds and 24% of 10 to 12-year-olds.

Summary of School-Age Care Arrangements

Families use a wide variety of arrangements for school-age youth. The type of care used depends on a number of variables including the child’s age, family financial situation, family structure, & maternal work patterns (Capizzano, Tout, & Adams, 2000; Vandell & Shumow, 1999). Formal after-school programs and home-based care are more prevalent among younger youth, while self-care and enrichment programs are utilized more by older youth.

Although the number of youth who spend time in formal before and after-school programs is still comparatively low, there are several reasons why researchers are attempting to understand more about this out-of-school arrangement. Funding for and the supply of after-school programs is steadily growing. Congress increased funding for 21st Century Community Learning Center Grants from \$1 million in 1997 to more than \$800 million in 2001. Appropriated funding for the 2002 fiscal year was \$1 billion for after-school programs.

Moreover, a study by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) conducted in 2001 showed that 67% of schools compared to only 22% in 1988 offered after-school programs. These numbers support the view that public schools are offering more before and after-school programs during out-of-school time. Children who attend after-school programs often spend many hours each week in these settings (Smith, 2000). On average, youth spend approximately 11 hours per week in formal programs compared to only 6 hours in self-care or enrichment programs. Additionally, SAC program participation has been linked to positive developmental outcomes for youth (Pierce et al., 1999; Posner & Vandell, 1994, 1999; Vandell & Shumow, 1999). Higher self-esteem, better academic performance, improved social skills, and fewer behavioral problems are associated with participation in quality school-age care. Posner and Vandell (1994) found that children who attended programs had better grades, work habits, emotional adjustment, and peer relations than children in other care arrangements.

Given that the field of facility-based school-age care is rapidly growing and appears to have important effects on youth, it is imperative that we continue to increase our knowledge of this form of care. The subsequent sections of this review will provide more detail on this particular form of care.

Characteristics of Facility-Based Before and After-School Programs

Before and after-school programs come in a variety of forms. However, research has shown that all programs typically offer activities, have set locations, and usually face similar challenges. The next section will provide an overview of the general characteristics of before and after-school programs.

Program Auspice

Programs for school-age youth are operated by for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. According to a national study conducted in 1991, 66% of after-school programs were operated by not-for-profit organizations including schools, social service agencies, community organizations, and religious groups. Another 34% of programs were sponsored by for-profit programs, primarily child care centers (Seppenan, Love, & Seligson, 1993). A more recent study of a 13 county metro Atlanta area in Georgia also showed more after-school programs being operated by not-for-profit (54%) than for-profit (46%) organizations, although the magnitude of the difference was less (Todd & Brumbeloe, 2002).

Research has found that both staff (Pierce, Hamm, Sisco, & Gmeinder, as cited in Vandell & Shumow, 1999) and administrators (Todd & Brumbeloe, 2002) in non-for-profit programs were better educated than their counterparts in for-profit settings. Pierce, Hamm, Sisco, & Gmeinder (1999) also found that staff in not-for-profit programs provided more warm and positive care and the programs had lower child-staff ratios.

Program Regulation

The type of regulation that a school-age program falls under depends on the type of program and program sponsorship. School-age programs located in child care centers are often governed by the license issued to the center by the state (Bumgarner, 1999). Programs provided by service organizations or drop-in programs are typically exempt from licensing, but may have standards set by their agency that they must meet. School-run programs mostly fall under the regulations set by the school board (Seligson & Allenson, 1993). Several studies have found that 70-84% of school-age programs were regulated or licensed by a child-care licensing agency or

approved by a state department of education (Seppenan, Love, and Seligson, 1993; Todd & Brumbeloe, 2002).

Program Locations and Space

The majority of after-school programs are located in child care centers and schools (Seppenan, Love, & Seligson, 1993; Todd & Brumbeloe, 2002). Programs are more common in centers (35-44%) than public schools (27-28%). In addition, SAC programs are also run by other, primarily non-profit organizations such as YMCA/YWCA, Boys & Girls Clubs, and recreation programs.

Some programs have space dedicated specifically to the program while other programs use shared or borrowed space. Sixty-seven percent of public school programs use shared space compared to only 31% of child care centers (Seppenan, Love, and Seligson, 1993). In general, the use of shared space is more common in not-for-profit school-age programs (61%) than for-profit programs (31%) (Todd & Brumbeloe, 2002).

The physical space that a program uses has implications for several important aspects of the program. Program space influences the size of the program, the types of activities offered, and whether or not programs invest time and money into improving program facilities (Halpern, 2000). Program are less likely to invest in improving shared space.

Program Activities

Cognitive development, creative expression, and physical development activities are typical program components offered by after-school programs. A study conducted in 2001 by the National Association of Elementary School Principals found that 98% of programs offered homework help, 85% literacy/reading enrichment, 85% math activities, 78% recreation/sports, 62% computers and technology instruction, 69% science, and 63% art, music, drama, and dance.

While NAESP found that school-based programs focus on activities that are mostly educational, other studies that also included non-school settings have showed more variety in the types of activities offered. Seppenan, Love, & Seligson (1993) found that 81% offered homework help, 36% tutoring, 86% reading, 81% unstructured physical play, 61% creative arts/crafts, 54% dramatic play, 51% movement/dance, 40% music, and 36% storytelling/theatrical. The activities offered most often were free time (95% of programs), socializing (97% of programs), and board or card games (89% of programs). Similarly, Todd & Brumeloe (2002) reported that two-thirds or more of school-age programs offered activities to promote physical, cognitive, social-emotional & character development, as well as specific recreation & enrichment activities and tutoring/homework assistance.

Program Challenges

Funding and staffing consistently are the two most cited problems of programs (Halpern, 1999; NAESP, 2001; Seligson, 2001; Todd & Brumeloe, 2002). Lack of funding increases the likelihood that programs will have staffing problems, offer limited activities, and have trouble obtaining the supplies and materials needed to create appropriate environments (Halpern, 1999). Inadequate funding limits resources available to staff programs by hindering the administrator's ability to recruit, train, and retain staff.

Seligson (2001) & Todd & Brumeloe (2002) reported hiring and retaining qualified staff as the problem most cited by directors. Staff turnover is also a common problem faced by school-age programs. Halpern (2000) reported staff turnover to be as high as 40% or more each year. Similarly, O'Connor (as cited in Seligson, 2001) reported that the national turnover rate for SAC programs is 35%, due to low pay, low status, and less career potential. Sharing of space,

lack of space, transportation, keeping students' interest, and getting students to attend the program are other problems that have been reported (NAESP, 2001).

Quality School-Age Care

Quality child care, as defined in the early childhood literature, provides experiences that enhance rather than detract from children's development (Howes, 1997). Studies examining child care quality in early care and education have included both structural and process variables as measures. Process variables are assessed in terms of the nature of the children's experiences while in child care. Structural measures of quality are variables that can be controlled by government regulations.

Structural aspects of quality include having enough properly trained staff who can provide individualized attention to children and support learning, and providing facilities and equipment that allow for variety and choice in activities (Halpern, 1999). Process attributes include staff who are warm and supportive, schedules that are flexible and relaxed, and predictable environments in which youth are exposed to different cultures, and enjoy the freedom to explore ideas, feelings, and identities (Halpern, 1999).

Drawing from the field of early care and education, and what little research exists in the school-age care field, practitioners and policymakers have attempted to develop a set of standards or best practices believed to contribute to quality in school-age programs. It is generally agreed that quality programs provide safe, engaging environments, and motivate and inspire learning. Recently the National School-Age Care Alliance (NSACA) developed a set of standards believed to promote quality in school-age programs (NSACA, 1999). NSACA provided 36 keys to quality that fall under six broad categories: human relationships; indoor environment; outdoor environment; activities; safety, health, and nutrition; and administration.

In an evaluation of after-school programs serving low-income youth, two out of three programs were rated as fair to poor in quality (Halpern, 1999). This is similar to findings with child care centers serving preschool children (Cost, Quality & Child Outcomes Study Team, 1995). Three factors that influence the quality of programs include finances, facilities, and staff (Halpern, 1999). The quality of interactions between staff and youth depend on staff knowledge of child development and their ability to apply knowledge when working with youth (Fashola, 2002)

Higher quality programs tend to have warm and supportive staff, flexible relaxed schedules, and provide children with activity choices (Pierce, Ham, Vandell, 1999; Rosenthal and Vandell, 1996). Rosenthal and Vandell examined the positive and negative quality of children's interactions with staff and the flexibility and diversity of program activities in a study of 30 after-school programs. The researchers found that less-educated staff working in programs with high child-staff ratios were more negative in their interactions with youth. In contrast, staff interactions with youth were more positive in flexible programs that offered a wide range of activities.

Relation of Quality to Child Outcomes

Studies have shown that school-age children enrolled in flexible programs with positive emotional climates have better developmental outcomes and a more positive outlook on program participation (Posner & Vandell, 1994, 1999; Rosenthal & Vandell, 1994). Posner and Vandell (1994) found that low-income children who attended higher quality programs had better grades, and were rated as having better work habits and peer relations. Rosenthal and Vandell (1996) found that children in programs with more negative child-staff interactions reported that the program climate was poor and that staff were less emotionally supportive. Given that staff are

important to program quality and hence youth outcomes, the next section will examine the characteristics of school-age providers.

Characteristics of School-Age Providers

The national study by Seppenan, Love, & Seligson (1993), included information on the characteristics of the people who make up the staff in after-school programs. The study found that the majority of the staff (90%) were women and that 70% were white. Because of the part-time nature of the job, they also found that almost 40% of school-age care providers had a second job.

Individuals who work in school-age care have diverse educational qualifications and experiences (Willer, 1994). School-age providers come from a variety of backgrounds including early childhood education, elementary education, psychology, social work, and leisure and recreation (Halpern, 1999; O'Conner, 1994; Riehl, 1994). Because of the diversity of the backgrounds, workers often come with different strengths and weaknesses (Riehl, 1994). While this wide range of backgrounds provides a variety of different types of expertise, it may mean that some staff do not have adequate training in some areas.

Early childhood professionals have been trained to focus on the whole child. They understand that child development encompasses physical, social, emotional, and mental development. However, since the focus of early childhood education is birth to age 8, early childhood staff may not have much knowledge or experience working with older children. To succeed in school-age care they may need training in activity planning and behavior management for older children.

Recreation leaders often have a strong background in arts and crafts, sports, and other leisure activities. However, they may have less training in planning and implementing

developmentally appropriate activities for youth. Additionally, they may need training in behavior management and guidance for older children.

Social Workers often have experience working one on one with children and they understand the importance of working with families to ensure program success. However, they may need help with planning and running group activities for youth.

Elementary school teachers are usually experienced with curriculum planning. They also have background in teaching youth. However, they may need training in helping to promote development in non-cognitive areas such as social, emotional, and physical development.

Psychology majors, similar to early childhood professionals, understand that child development takes in physical, social, emotional, and mental development. However, they may have little training in planning developmentally appropriate activities or working with school-age youth.

Background and Education

Staff educational levels vary from more than a master's degree to less than a high school diploma (Halpern, 2000; Seppanen et al., 1993; Todd & Brumbeloe, 2002; Vandenberg & Locklear, 2000). The NSACA recommended educational level for school-age staff varies with the position, amount of experience, and level of professional preparation (Bumgarner, 1999). For example, the minimum recommendation for a program administrator with at least one year of experience is a minimum of an associate's degree in a related field, and six credit hours (3 hours in child and youth development and 3 hours in administration). Minimum recommendation for a group leader with eighteen months experience is a minimum of a high school diploma or GED and six credit hours.

In 1991, 63% of the directors held at least a bachelors degree, compared to only 37% of senior staff (Seppanen et al., 1993). These numbers are higher than those reported by Vandenberg and Locklear (2000), who found that 43% of program directors had at least a 2-year degree compared to only 17% of staff. Although few staff had an advanced degree, 37% of the staff in the study had a high school diploma and another 31% had some college education. The difference in the findings between Seppanen (1993) & Vandenberg & Locklear (2000) may be due to the samples used. The study by Seppanen et al. was based on a national sample, while the study by Vandenberg and Locklear was based on a sample restricted to North Carolina. Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) also reported differences in educational level of school-age administrators by auspice. Program directors in not-for-profit programs were twice as likely as directors in for-profit programs to have a 4-year degree (62% vs. 37%, respectively).

Experience

In a study of providers of school-age care in North Carolina, 74% of staff and 46% of directors had less than five years of experience in school-age care (Vandenberg & Locklear, 2000). Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) reported similar findings in a recent study of directors of school-age care programs in the state of Georgia. Fifty-five percent of the sample had less than five years experience in school-age care.

Roles

Due to the unique issues associated with school-age programs, the roles and responsibilities of school-age staff are not as clearly defined as in early childhood programs. Depending on the size of the program you could have a program with an administrator and director, or an administrator/director, senior staff, and assistant or other staff. In some programs the administrator/director is also part-time lead staff.

Directors of school-age care programs are responsible for administrative tasks. In addition some also have direct responsibility for the children in their care (Bumgarner, 1999; O’Conner, 1994). Directors have overall responsibility for ensuring that programs meet the needs of staff, students, and families. Directors hire and retain staff and provide ongoing staff training and learning opportunities (Bumgarner, 1999). They are responsible for the overall direction of the program inclusive of developing the mission, goals, and policies; fiscal management and budgeting issues; staff supervision; communicating with families; building relationships with communities; and overseeing all program activities (Bumgarner, 1999).

Senior and assistant staff have the responsibility of supervising and guiding the children in the program. They are responsible for mediating conflicts, stimulating curiosity, spreading knowledge, and classroom administration (Decker & Decker, 2001). The senior staff also have an active role in program planning and in supervising support staff (Bumgarner, 1999).

In summary, the school-age care workforce is especially diverse. SAC staff vary considerably in terms of education and experience, the disciplines in which they have been trained, and the roles they play in the program.

Training of School-Age Providers

Training provides school-age staff with the skills needed to enhance youth outcomes (Beckett, Hawken, & Jackowitz, 2001). Training can range from providing learning resources to formal university-based graduate programs (VanderVen, 1993). The following section will examine training issues related to professional development for school-age care providers.

Recommended Training for School-Age Providers

Few workers have pre-service training preparing them to work in school-age care. However, according to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC),

all providers should have: a basic understanding of child development; how to establish and maintain safe and healthy environments for children; how to plan and implement developmentally appropriate curriculums; and how to establish positive relationships with youth and utilize appropriate guidance and behavioral management techniques (Willer, 1994). These core knowledge areas are generally agreed upon by most researchers and practitioners as being important for school-age care providers (Noonan, 2001; Surr, 2001).

Effective Training Strategies

While there is little research on effective training strategies for SAC workers, principles for training early childhood professionals adapted from the adult education literature seem applicable to training staff for all age groups. Alexander (1999) offered several guiding principles for providing effective training opportunities. First, it is important to recognize that adults are capable of learning new things and are willing to learn if properly motivated. Providers will be more likely to want to increase their knowledge and learn new skills if they understand why training is important and how they will benefit. Second, training should build and expand on what providers already know and should complement individual learning styles. Staff should also be provided with guidance, feedback, and reinforcement for their efforts.

Training which includes discussion, simulation, and application of concepts is more effective than training that consists only of lecture (Gomes, 1994). Training should include hands-on and interactive experiences because experiential training is linked to long-lasting learning (Stephens, 2001).

Training should also include teaching staff how to work with children, how to negotiate, how to adapt to the needs of different children at different ages, and how to implement various components of a program (Fashola, 2002).

Stephens (2001) and Kagan & Neuman (1996) provide several suggestions for choosing staff training beyond looking at current licensing requirements. When planning training the current level of staff experience and qualifications and potential access problems, such as training location and times, should be examined to tailor training to the individual needs of staff. If possible, staff should be surveyed to determine the topics, methods, and times preferred for training.

Training Topics, Method, & Times

Anderson and Gore (1994) suggest that training be conducted using a train-the-trainer model. Under this system, the director or designated person would attend training and then share their experiences and knowledge gained with the staff through in-house training sessions. This approach to training is less expensive and is useful when staff are unable to participate in half or full-day sessions.

Vandenbergh and Locklear (2000) found that training in arts and crafts and behavior management were seen as the most needed training topics in a study of North Carolina school-age care programs. Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) found training in dealing with staffing issues, guidance and behavior management, and curriculum/activity planning to be the topics viewed as most needed by school-age directors in the Georgia metro Atlanta area.

Training Currently Available

Most training and professional development for school-age staff takes place in conferences or one-day workshops (Halpern, 1999). However, Seligson (2001) reports that a number of colleges are now offering courses in school-age care, and some community colleges now offer degree and certificate programs. Nonetheless, because the perceived demand for school-age courses is still low, few community colleges or four-year colleges currently offer

them (Halpern, 1999). While educational opportunities are slowly being developed for school-age staff, presently they have to seek course work in other departments such as early childhood education or leisure and recreation.

In summary, currently we know what training is suggested for school-age care providers and recommended strategies for providing that training. We have limited understanding of what training is occurring and what training school-age providers prefer. In the next section we will consider factors that affect the likelihood that school-age providers will attend training.

Factors Affecting Participation in Training

Adults typically have specific motives for participation in adult learning activities. Cyril Houle developed a typology that he felt described the motivational orientations of adult learners (Merriam & Brockett, 1997; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). According to Houle adults are either goal, activity, or learning oriented. Goal-oriented learners seek education to meet a specific need or accomplish a clear objective such as career advancement. Activity-oriented learners participate for reasons unrelated to the purpose or content of the activity but mainly for the social interaction. Learning-oriented learners participate for the sake of obtaining knowledge.

Houle's motivation orientation typology focuses primarily on what draws people to training. Findings by Todd and Brumbeloe (2002) provide some limited support for this theory. They reported that overall, the top training topics preferred by directors were similar to the top program problems reported. This suggests that directors may have a goal-oriented motive for attending training. However, this finding must be viewed with caution because no statistical analysis was performed to determine whether a statistically significant association existed between the problems experienced by a director and their preferred training topics.

A second approach to motivation focuses on identifying barriers that inhibit full participation in training activities (Alexander, 2000). Family responsibilities, time limitations and pressures, performance concerns, fear of failure, fear of embarrassment, self-consciousness, literacy and language concerns, prior negative experiences, health issues, and physical comfort can all affect training participation (Alexander, 2000).

Several studies have examined training barriers experienced by school-age staff. Halpern (1999) indicated that few financial benefits, low wages, lack of time and low interest are some of the reasons why school-age staff chose to not attend training. Given the part-time nature of the work, most staff either have other jobs or are in school, leaving little time, energy, or incentive to participate in training (Surr, 2001).

Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) examined the characteristics and training needs of school-age program directors in the Georgia metro Atlanta area. Overall, one fourth of the directors reported that they had no problems that made it hard for them to attend training. The major barriers included training being offered at bad times or in bad locations, not knowing what training was offered, the cost, and not having substitutes to cover for them while attending training.

While there has been some research identifying specific factors affecting whether or not school-age staff attend training, and some beginning attempts for developing frameworks for understanding the motivation of providers to attend training, the theoretical base for these frameworks is not well developed. Moreover, we have little understanding of factors that affect training preferences, which in turn are likely to influence what training school-age staff actually attend. In the next section Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory will be applied to

develop a more comprehensive framework for understanding factors that affect training preferences and training barriers.

Theoretical Framework

Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory provides a useful framework for examining the training system and how individual and community characteristics may influence training preferences and barriers to participation. The major premise of ecological theory is that individuals exist within and are influenced by multiple contexts, the interrelationship among these settings, and the larger context in which they are embedded (Klein & White, 1996).

The ecological framework arranges contexts from proximal to distal environments in relation to their influences on the individual (Bubolz & Sontag, 1993). At the core of Bronfenbrenner's system is the individual, who has a unique set of characteristics that can affect and be affected by other levels of the system. For example, the education and experience of SAC staff may affect their ability to provide appropriate activities for older youth. The outcomes of those activities (either positive or negative) may in turn, motivate staff to seek higher levels of education or training. The great diversity of SAC program staff reported in previous research raises the possibility that individual characteristics may have an important effect on training preferences.

The next level of Bronfenbrenner's system, the context closest to the individual, is the microsystem. This includes any environment that includes the person directly. Examples of microsystems are family and work environments. Microsystem factors within the family may include whether or not the staff member has children and their overall family income, which may influence the ability of SAC providers to attend or pay for training. The nature of the SAC work environment may also affect training. For example, Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) found that

program auspice was related to preferred training methods and times and the perceived ability of program directors to pay for training.

The mesosystem, Bronfenbrenner's third level, is the interconnection among microsystems. While providers may want to attend training, family commitments or their financial situation may make it harder to do so. For instance, due to the low wages and part-time nature of many school-age programs, school-age staff may derive lower income from their jobs than other caregivers. Some SAC providers may have other family income from a spouse or partner, which may make the cost of SAC training more affordable. In this example it is the interaction between the wages received from the job and total family income that determine whether or not training is affordable.

The next level, the exosystem, includes settings not containing the individual that may also influence access to training. For example, the cost of training, whether or not scholarships are offered by state agencies or professional organizations to pay for training, and the times and locations in which training is offered are examples of exosystem factors that could affect training participation. It is important to recognize that in many cases, it is the interaction between the microsystem and exosystem that affect actual training outcomes. For example, whether the cost of training is affordable results from the interaction of the price training organizations charge and the disposable family income of the provider.

The macrosystem is the most distal level, consisting of society-level factors that may affect training. The economy, which may influence whether money is available to fund training or scholarships, current perceptions of the school-age field, and the value society places on training are all examples of macrosystem level variables.

Finally, Bronfenbrenner also considered the effect of time on the system, which he labeled the chronosystem. For example, when the school-age system first emerged, a major impediment to training was the small number of school-age providers in any one geographic location, which generally inhibited the use of group training formats in local communities. Now that school-age programs are found in most communities, there is a larger potential audience to support local group training efforts.

Proposed Study

Although there is a growing body of knowledge on training of school-age providers in before and after-school programs, the research is limited in two important ways. First, we know little about the training needs of school-age program administrators. Since administrators set the tone for the entire program, it is important that we better understand their needs. Second, we know little about how factors at various levels of Bronfenbrenner's ecological system affect training needs and barriers. While we know from past research that SAC administrators vary greatly in terms of education and experience, we do not know the extent to which these individual-level characteristics affect training preferences or barriers. Nor do we know how program characteristics (a microsystem variable) affect training preferences. For example, do school-age program administrators seek training that may help them overcome problems they experience with their programs? To what extent do exosystem effects, such as community size, affect the topics and training methods SAC providers prefer or their ability to access training?

The current study is designed to overcome the limitations of past research by identifying how factors at the individual, micro, and exosystem levels are associated with training preferences and the barriers experienced by SAC administrators. The specific research questions to be addressed are:

1. How do the perceived training needs and barriers of school-age directors/administrators in the Georgia metro Atlanta area differ based on two individual characteristics: years of experience and education level?
2. To what extent does community size (an exosystem variable) affect the training preferences and the barriers experienced by SAC administrators?
3. Is there an association between challenges faced by programs and training desired by directors (a microsystem effect)? Finding a relationship between program problems (a microsystem effect) and preferred training topics would provide support for both Bronfenbrenner's model and Houle's theory of goal-oriented motivation.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Permission was received from the Georgia School Age Care Association to use the data set developed by Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) to further explore the training needs and barriers of school-age program administrators. The study extends the GSACA work by considering the effects of additional individual, program, and community variables on the training preferences and barriers of school-age care administrators.

Participants

The sample consisted of 201 metro Atlanta school-age care providers who work in administrative positions. This included 138 program director/coordinators, 54 program administrators, and 9 providers who were part-time directors/lead staff. Over half the directors had less than five years experience (55%). Most providers were female (90%). Fifty-six percent of the directors were white, 38% were black (non-Hispanic), and 6% were of other race/ethnicities or multi-racial. Over two-thirds of directors worked in privately-owned child care programs or school-based programs. Fifty-four percent of the programs were not-for-profit. Almost all directors (96%) administered programs for elementary-age youth. Many fewer administrators offered programs for middle (20%) or high school (6%) youth.

Instruments

Program Survey. A seven page, 29-question instrument was developed by a committee and was tested for face validity and clarity with a subgroup of school-age care administrators. The survey was designed to assess characteristics of programs providing school-age care

(Appendix A). Directors answered three questions to determine their eligibility to complete the survey. Only programs that enrolled children in kindergarten through 12th grade and were open for at least 6 hours over a minimum of 3 days per week were included in the study. These criteria were used to limit the sample to more intensive school-age care settings, excluding short-term and single-focus activities, such as sports, music lessons and club meetings. Descriptive information including program capacity, enrollment, hours of operation, program space, focus, services provided, challenges, legal auspice, sponsorship, and staff education was gathered.

Training Survey. A 17-item instrument was developed to assess the training needs of program directors (Appendix B). Providers were asked a series of questions to determine what barriers, if any, kept them from attending training. These included questions related to the location of training, content of training, and other obstacles that made it hard to attend training such as finding substitutes. Additionally, information on preferences for training topics and formats (methods and times) was gathered. The questionnaire also asked about the demographic characteristics of staff. Demographic items included gender, race, current position, years of experience in current position, age group administered, highest educational level obtained, and the size of the community in which the program was located.

Procedure

A database of potential providers of school-age care was compiled by merging databases from several agencies. In March and April of 2001, surveys were mailed to 1,554 programs. Each program received the program and training surveys, a letter explaining the purpose of the study, and a postage-paid, pre-addressed envelope. Half of the programs were randomly selected to receive a director or administrator training survey; the other half received an assistant staff training survey. The training surveys were identical except the director survey asked what

administrative topics the directors were interested in for themselves and what non-administrative topics would be of interest to their staff. The assistant staff survey asked only what non-administrative topics the staff themselves were interested in.

Programs were mailed two follow-up reminder postcards approximately 10 and 20 days following mailing of the original surveys. All programs who returned the survey by the date requested were entered in a drawing for several \$100 stipends to pay for training fees or SAC materials or equipment. Follow-up phone calls were made to a large percent of programs to encourage responses. In total, 297 program surveys were obtained, which represents 20% of the 1,488 programs surveyed. Training surveys were received from 269 respondents. After eliminating non-administrator surveys & duplicate surveys from the same program, a total of 201 administrator surveys were obtained. Sixty-two percent of the administrators (125) completed the administrator version whereas 38% (76) administrators completed the staff version of the survey.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The analyses were designed to answer three questions. 1) How do the perceived training needs and barriers of school-age directors differ based on two individual characteristics: years of experience and education level? 2) Does community size affect training preferences or barriers of administrators? 3) Is there an association between the program challenges faced by directors and their training preferences?

Preliminary analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted to determine whether there was a relationship between the independent variables of education, experience, and community size. For example, it is possible that people with higher levels of education may also have more experience with school-age care, or that providers in rural areas may have lower levels of education because there may be fewer institutions of higher learning. These preliminary analyses were run to determine whether covariance issues may exist among the independent variables.

In order to use chi-square analysis no more than 20% of the cells can have expected frequencies less than five (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 2000). The ten original categories of education were therefore collapsed into five levels to have sufficient observations in each category for the chi-square analysis: 1) high school diploma or less; 2) some college; 3) CDA, CCP, Technical Certificate or Diploma, or AA degree; 4) BA/BS; and 5) some GS, Graduate Degree. Experience was measured using the original four categories: 1) less than 2 yrs, 2) 2-5 yrs, 3) 6-10 yrs, and 4) over 10 yrs. The original four categories of community size were

collapsed into three categories: 1) rural or town <10,000, 2) small city, or 3) large city, again to have sufficient observations for the chi-square analysis.

Separate χ^2 analyses were conducted between education level and experience, education and community size, and community size and experience. None of these analyses approached significance ($p > .10$), indicating that the three independent variables were not strongly associated with one another.

Training Needs and Barriers of School-Age Directors

The first two goals of the study were to determine how two individual characteristics (education and experience) and one community variable (community size) affected training needs and barriers. The dependent variables examined were training topics of interest to providers, their preferred training methods and times, and the training barriers experienced by the SAC program administrators.

Topics

On the training survey, directors were instructed to indicate whether or not they were interested in each of 37 training topics. They were also asked to indicate their top three topics. Directors indicated interest in a mean of 11.1 administrative topics (range 0 to 37). The large number of training topics preferred by SAC administrators presented some problems for data analysis. The more analyses run, the higher probability of Type I errors (or finding significant relationships by chance) (Green, Salkind, & Akey, 2000). To reduce the number of analyses run, topics were rank ordered for each subgroup of providers within each of the education, experience, and community size variables. Only topics that fell in the top three choices of any provider subgroup were analyzed. Across all education, experience, and community size subgroups there were seven training topics consistently in the top three preferences of the

directors. As can be seen in Table 1, over half of the topics pertained to staffing issues. The remaining three topics involved behavior management, funding, and family communication. These seven training topics were used in the final analysis.

Chi-square analyses conducted separately for education, experience, and community size on each of the seven training topics produced only three significant results. First, the extent to which directors wanted training in behavior management of youth and staff varied by education level [$\chi^2(4) = 12.59, p < .05$], (see Table 1). Follow-up chi-square analyses indicated that directors with a CDA or two-year credential and directors with some graduate training or a graduate degree were less likely to list “behavior management of youth or staff” among their top three preferred topics than were directors in the other educational groups [$\chi^2(1) = 11.73, p < .01$].

Second, experience level of directors was related to their interest in training on grant writing or obtaining funding [$\chi^2(3) = 12.15, p < .05$], (see Table 2). Follow-up analysis indicated that directors with six to ten years of experience were significantly less likely to be interested in training on grant writing and obtaining funding than directors with 0-5 years or over 10 years experience [$\chi^2(2) = 9.78, p < .01$].

Finally, interest level in training on encouraging professional development varied by the size of the community in which providers worked [$\chi^2(2) = 8.02, p < .05$] (see Table 3). Follow-up chi-square analysis indicated that fewer directors who worked in areas with populations under 10,000 were interested in receiving training on encouraging the professional development of their staff than were directors who worked in cities of 10,000 or more [$\chi^2(1) = 7.62, p < .01$].

Methods and Times

The next set of analyses examined the relationship between education, experience, and community size and the training methods and times preferred by directors. Directors were instructed to indicate their interest in each of 11 training methods and 5 training times. As was done for training topics, the top three training methods and times were determined for each education, experience, and community size sub-category of providers to reduce the items to a reasonable number for analyses. In total, six training methods fell in the top three choices across all subgroups of providers. As can be seen in Table 4, there was interest in both group and individual learning methods. All five training time options fell in the top three choices across the various subgroups of providers. However, as seen in Table 7 the top preference across all subgroups of providers was Saturday mornings.

Chi-square analyses conducted separately for education, experience, and community size for each of the six training methods produced only two significant results. As can be seen in Table 5, with increasing experience, SAC program directors were less likely to prefer 1½ - 2 hour training experiences [$\chi^2(3) = 10.27, p < .05$] and more likely to want full-day training [$\chi^2(3) = 14.19, p < .01$]. Follow-up chi-square analyses indicated that directors with 0-2 years of experience [$\chi^2(1) = 8.78, p < .01$] and directors with 2-5 years of experience [$\chi^2(1) = 4.89, p < .05$] were significantly more likely to prefer short workshops than were directors with over 10 years of experience. The follow-up analysis on provider's interest in full-day training indicated that directors with 6 or more years of experience were more interested in full-day training than directors with 0-5 years of experience [$\chi^2(1) = 14.14, p < .01$].

Finally, chi-square analyses were conducted separately for education, experience, and community size for each of the training times. None of the analyses approached significance.

Training Barriers

The last set of analyses examined the relationship between education, experience, and community size and the training barriers experienced by directors. On the survey instrument, directors were instructed to indicate whether or not they experienced each of 16 barriers in attending training. Directors indicated a mean of 2.4 barriers (range 0 to 16). The same data reduction procedure used to reduce the number of training topics, methods, and times was also used to reduce the number of barriers examined. As can be seen in Table 10, the barriers most likely to make it difficult for providers to attend training were access problems. These included training being at bad times or in bad locations, not knowing what training was offered, the cost of training, and not having substitutes to cover for them while attending training. Separate chi-square analyses for training barriers produced no significant results by education, experience, or community size ($p > .05$).

In summary, the results of the above analyses indicated that there is some effect of director education, experience, and community size on the topics and training methods that directors prefer. However, for the most part, these individual and community level characteristics were not strong predictors of training preferences. Moreover, there was no effect of education, experience, and community size on when directors preferred to attend training or on the extent to which directors reported they experienced particular training access barriers.

Program Problems and Training Preferences

The third goal of the study was to determine how program characteristics are associated with training preferences. We were interested in learning whether directors who reported a particular problem with their program (e.g. staff recruitment) were also more likely to want

training on that same area. If there is a relationship between perceived problems and desired training, one would expect the following pattern of results:

- 1) There should be high, significant correlations between each perceived problem and its corresponding training topic.
- 2) There should be lower, non-significant correlations for off-diagonal comparisons since these represent cases where the problem in the program and the training topics do not match.

On the program survey, directors rated how problematic 19 program characteristics were for their program, using a 4 point scale (1 = a major challenge, 2 = a challenge, 3 = a minor challenge, 4 = not a challenge). The direction of the scale was reversed prior to data analysis so that a positive correlation would mean that providers who reported greater problems also wanted training in that topic. As outlined above, they also indicated whether or not they were interested in each of 37 training topics. As can be seen in Table 13, there was a corresponding training topic for eight of the program problems. Pearson correlations were conducted between the eight program problem-training topic pairs using listwise elimination of missing data.

Overall, there was some support for the first hypothesis, that there would be significant correlations between each program problem and its corresponding training topic. As can be seen along the diagonal in Table 13, seven of the eight correlations reached significance although the magnitude of the correlation was low to moderate, ranging from .16 to .43 across the eight items.

There was less support for the second hypothesis, that correlations for off-diagonal pairs should be low and non-significant. As can be seen in Table 13, many of the off-diagonal correlations were significant and in some cases, the off-diagonal correlations were higher than the corresponding on-diagonal correlation. Examination of the pattern of off-diagonal

correlations raised the possibility that program problems may be clustered into two different factors as indicated by the two boxes in Table 13. For example, the box on the top left of Table 13 appears to focus on staffing issues. The box on the lower right may include items especially sensitive to funding and parent and volunteer involvement issues. Examination of the correlations between program problems supported this hypothesis. Correlations between staff recruitment, staff training, and staff turnover problems were very high, ranging from .63 to .69. Significant correlations ranging from .26 to .79 were also attained across the other five program problems. The correlated nature of the program problems may underlie, at least in part, the higher off-diagonal correlations between program problems and training topic preferences.

Table 1

Directors Training Topic Interest by Educational Level of Director

Topic	Total		Educational Level										Significance
			HS diploma or less		Some College		CDA/CCP/ Tech Cert, or Diploma, AA		BA/BS		Some GS, Grad Degree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Interested in Topic													
Staff morale and stability	84	67.2	11	91.7	17	68.0	14	63.6	19	63.3	23	63.9	n.s.
Getting staff off to good start	83	66.4	9	75.0	16	64.0	14	63.6	20	66.7	24	66.7	n.s.
Recruiting staff	77	61.6	9	75.0	15	60.0	11	50.0	19	63.3	23	63.9	n.s.
Behavior management	77	61.6	8	66.7	18	72.0	11	50.0	21	70.0	19	52.8	n.s.
Encouraging professional development	68	54.4	6	50.0	11	44.0	15	68.2	17	56.7	19	52.8	n.s.
Grant writing, obtaining funding	64	51.2	4	33.3	11	44.0	14	63.6	18	60.0	17	47.2	n.s.
Communicating w/parents & families	63	50.4	8	66.7	14	56.0	11	50.0	17	56.7	13	36.1	n.s.
Selected Among Top 3													
Staff morale and stability	36	32.1	5	55.6	7	29.2	6	30.0	7	24.1	11	36.7	n.s.
Getting staff off to good start	36	32.1	4	44.4	7	29.2	10	50.0	6	20.7	9	30.0	n.s.
Recruiting staff	47	42.0	5	55.6	9	37.5	6	30.0	11	37.9	16	53.3	n.s.
Behavior management	26	23.2	4	44.4	9	37.5	2	10.0	9	31.0	2	6.7	$\chi^2(4) = 12.59,$ p<.05 *
Encouraging professional development	16	14.3	2	22.2	5	20.8	3	15.0	2	6.9	4	13.3	
Grant writing, obtaining funding	20	17.9	0	0.0	2	8.3	5	25.0	9	31.0	4	13.3	
Communicating w/parents & families	6	5.4	0	0.0	3	10.3	1	5.0	2	6.7	0	0.0	*

* Analysis could not be done because over 20% of cells had expected count <5.

Table 2

Directors Training Topic Interest by Experience Level of Director

Topic	Experience Level										Significance
	Total		Less than 2 years		2-5 years		6-10 years		Over 10 years		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Interested in Topic											
Staff morale and stability	84	67.2	18	81.8	32	68.1	9	60.0	25	61.0	n.s.
Getting staff off to good start	83	66.4	17	77.3	32	68.1	10	66.7	24	58.5	n.s.
Recruiting staff	77	61.6	14	63.6	30	63.8	11	73.3	22	53.7	n.s.
Behavior management	77	61.6	12	54.5	32	68.1	9	60.0	24	58.5	n.s.
Encouraging professional development	68	54.4	10	45.5	27	57.4	9	60.0	22	53.7	n.s.
Grant writing, obtaining funding	64	51.2	11	50.0	24	51.1	2	13.3	27	65.9	$\chi^2(3) = 12.15, p < .05$
Communicating w/parents & families	63	50.4	14	63.6	25	53.2	3	20.0	21	51.2	n.s.
Selected Among Top 3											
Staff morale and stability	36	32.1	9	40.9	12	30.0	4	33.3	11	28.9	n.s.
Getting staff off to good start	36	32.1	10	45.5	14	35.0	3	25.0	9	23.7	n.s.
Recruiting staff	47	42.0	7	31.8	18	45.0	8	66.7	14	36.8	n.s.
Behavior management	26	23.2	5	22.7	11	27.5	5	41.7	5	13.2	n.s.
Encouraging professional development	16	14.3	1	4.5	7	17.5	0	0.0	8	21.1	*
Grant writing, obtaining funding	20	17.9	5	22.7	7	17.5	2	16.7	6	15.8	*
Communicating w/parents & families	6	5.4	0	0.0	5	12.5	1	8.3	0	0.0	*

* Analysis could not be done because over 20% of cells had expected count <5.

Table 3

Directors Training Topic Interest by Community Size

Topic	Total		Rural or town		Community Size Small city		Large city		Significance
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Interested in Topic									
Staff morale and stability	84	67.2	16	66.7	14	66.7	50	68.5	n.s.
Getting staff off to good start	83	66.4	13	54.2	13	61.9	52	71.2	n.s.
Recruiting staff	77	61.6	11	45.8	12	57.1	50	68.5	n.s.
Behavior management	77	61.6	14	58.3	12	57.1	51	69.9	n.s.
Encouraging professional development	68	54.4	7	29.2	14	66.7	43	58.9	$\chi^2(2) = 8.03, p < .05$
Grant writing, obtaining funding	64	51.2	12	50.0	10	47.6	37	50.7	n.s.
Communicating w/parents & families	63	50.4	12	50.0	8	38.1	41	56.2	n.s.
Selected Among Top 3									
Staff morale and stability	36	32.1	7	33.3	5	29.4	22	32.4	n.s.
Getting staff off to good start	36	32.1	7	33.3	5	29.4	20	29.4	n.s.
Recruiting staff	47	42.0	7	33.3	7	41.2	30	44.1	n.s.
Behavior management	26	23.2	7	33.3	3	17.6	16	23.5	n.s.
Encouraging professional development	16	14.3	2	.5	6	35.3	8	11.8	*
Grant writing, obtaining funding	20	17.9	4	19.0	3	17.6	11	16.2	*
Communicating w/parents & families	6	5.4	1	4.8	0	0.0	5	7.4	*

* Analysis could not be done because over 20% of cells had expected count <5.

Table 4

Preferred Training Methods by Educational Level of Director

Method	Total		Educational Level										Significance
			HS diploma or less		Some College		CDA/CCP/ Tech Cert, or Diploma, AA		BA/BS		Some GS, Grad Degree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Video based self-study	145	80.6	16	69.6	34	87.2	21	70.0	31	81.6	43	86.0	n.s.
Half-day (3 hours)	137	70.3	14	58.3	31	67.4	21	70.0	33	76.7	38	73.1	n.s.
1-1/2 to 2 hour single session	112	57.4	15	62.5	27	58.7	16	53.3	31	72.1	23	44.2	n.s.
Internet course	98	54.4	10	43.5	22	56.4	18	60.0	21	55.3	27	54.0	n.s.
CD Rom Computer-based	86	47.8	10	43.5	19	48.7	16	53.3	19	50.0	22	44.0	n.s.
Full-day (6 hours)	69	35.4	9	37.5	15	32.6	10	33.3	19	44.2	16	30.8	n.s.

Table 5

Preferred Training Methods by Experience Level of Director

Method	Experience Level										Significance
	Total		Less than 2 years		2-5 years		6-10 years		Over 10 years		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Video based self-study	145	80.6	32	82.1	46	75.4	22	88.0	45	81.8	n.s
Half-day (3 hours)	137	70.3	22	53.7	49	75.4	21	72.4	45	75.0	n.s.
1-1/2 to 2 hour single session	112	57.4	30	73.2	41	63.1	15	51.7	26	43.3	$\chi^2(3) = 10.27, p < .05$
Internet course	98	54.4	24	61.5	35	57.4	8	32.0	31	56.4	n.s.
CD Rom Computer-based	86	47.8	18	46.2	26	42.6	15	60.0	27	49.1	n.s.
Full-day (6 hours)	69	35.4	10	24.4	15	23.1	14	48.3	30	50.0	$\chi^2(3) = 14.19, p < .05$

Table 6

Preferred Training Methods by Community Size

Method	Total		Rural or town		Community Size Small city		Large city		Significance
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Video based self-study	145	80.6	23	74.2	29	82.9	86	80.4	n.s
Half-day (3 hours)	137	70.3	23	63.9	26	65.0	83	74.1	n.s
1-1/2 to 2 hour single session	112	57.4	19	52.8	19	47.5	70	62.5	n.s
Internet course	98	54.4	15	48.4	18	51.4	61	57.0	n.s
CD Rom Computer-based	86	47.8	14	45.2	15	42.9	55	51.4	n.s
Full-day (6 hours)	69	35.4	14	38.9	13	32.5	38	33.9	n.s

Table 7

Preferred Training Times by Educational Level of Director

Time	Educational Level												Significance
	Total		HS diploma or less		Some College		CDA/CCP/ Tech Cert, or Diploma, AA		BA/BS		Some GS, Grad Degree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Sat morning	102	53.1	14	58.3	26	57.8	18	60.0	22	51.2	22	44.0	n.s.
Weekday morning	71	37.0	7	29.2	19	42.2	7	23.3	19	44.2	19	38.0	n.s.
Weekday evening	54	28.1	6	25.0	10	22.2	9	30.0	16	37.2	13	26.0	n.s.
Sat afternoon	48	25.0	9	37.5	14	31.1	9	30.0	8	18.6	8	16.0	n.s.
Weekday afternoon	41	21.4	2	8.3	12	26.7	6	20.0	8	18.6	13	26.0	n.s.

Table 8

Preferred Training Times by Experience Level of Director

Time	Experience Level										Significance
	Total		Less than 2 years		2-5 years		6-10 years		Over 10 years		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Sat morning	102	53.1	22	55.0	28	44.4	16	55.2	36	60.0	n.s.
Weekday morning	71	37.0	14	35.0	24	38.1	11	37.9	22	36.7	n.s.
Weekday evening	54	28.1	12	30.0	16	25.4	7	24.1	19	31.7	n.s.
Sat afternoon	48	25.0	11	27.5	17	27.0	7	24.1	13	21.7	n.s.
Weekday afternoon	41	21.4	12	30.0	17	27.0	4	13.8	8	13.3	n.s.

Table 9

Preferred Training Times by Community Size

Time	Total		Rural or town		Community Size Small city		Large city		Significance
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Sat morning	102	53.1	18	51.4	20	50.0	59	53.6	n.s.
Weekday morning	71	37.0	15	42.9	12	30.0	42	38.2	n.s.
Weekday evening	54	28.1	8	22.9	12	30.0	33	30.0	n.s.
Sat afternoon	48	25.0	7	20.0	11	27.5	28	25.5	n.s.
Weekday afternoon	41	21.4	5	14.3	9	22.5	26	23.6	n.s.

Table 10

Training Barriers by Educational Level of Director

Barrier	Total		Educational Level										Significance
			HS diploma or less		Some College		CDA/CCP/ Tech Cert, or Diploma, AA		BA/BS		Some GS, Grad Degree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Barrier													
Not at good times	75	37.7	9	37.5	16	34.8	10	33.3	16	36.4	24	43.6	n.s.
Locations not easy to get to	71	35.7	9	37.5	22	47.8	12	40.0	13	29.5	15	27.3	n.s.
No substitute	58	29.1	6	25.0	15	32.6	11	36.7	13	29.5	13	23.6	n.s.
Don't know what's offered	51	25.6	5	20.8	12	26.1	5	16.7	10	22.7	19	34.5	n.s.
Too expensive	46	23.1	6	25.0	9	19.6	12	40.0	9	20.5	10	18.2	n.s.
Among Top 3 Barriers													
Not at good times	65	33.0	9	37.5	11	23.9	8	27.6	15	34.1	22	40.7	n.s.
Locations not easy to get to	61	31.0	8	33.3	21	45.7	10	34.5	12	27.3	10	18.5	n.s.
No substitute	45	23.0	3	13.0	10	21.7	10	34.5	11	25.0	11	20.4	n.s.
Don't know what's offered	41	20.9	4	17.4	10	21.7	3	10.3	8	18.2	16	29.6	n.s.
Too expensive	40	20.3	4	17.4	7	15.2	12	40.0	8	18.2	9	16.7	n.s.

Table 11

Training Barriers by Experience Level of Director

Barrier	Experience Level										Significance
	Total		Less than 2 years		2-5 years		6-10 years		Over 10 years		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
A Barrier											
Not at good times	75	37.7	16	38.1	31	46.3	10	34.5	18	29.5	n.s.
Locations not easy to get to	71	35.7	13	31.0	25	37.3	14	48.3	19	31.1	n.s.
No substitute	58	29.1	11	26.2	17	25.4	11	37.9	19	31.1	n.s.
Don't know what's offered	51	25.6	13	31.0	19	28.4	4	13.8	15	24.6	n.s.
Too expensive	46	23.1	6	14.3	16	23.9	9	31.0	15	24.6	n.s.
Among Top 3 Barriers											
Not at good times	65	33.0	12	29.3	26	38.8	9	32.1	18	29.5	n.s.
Locations not easy to get to	61	31.0	13	31.7	23	34.3	11	39.3	14	23.0	n.s.
No substitute	45	23.0	7	17.5	12	17.9	10	35.7	16	26.2	n.s.
Don't know what's offered	41	20.9	11	27.5	15	22.4	2	7.1	13	21.3	n.s.
Too expensive	40	20.3	5	12.2	14	20.9	6	21.4	15	24.6	n.s.

Table 12

Training Barriers by Community Size

Barrier	Total		Rural or town		Community Size				Significance
	N	%	N	%	Small city		Large city		
					N	%	N	%	
A Barrier									
Not at good times	75	37.7	11	30.6	17	42.5	46	40.0	n.s.
Locations not easy to get to	71	35.7	12	33.3	15	37.5	42	36.5	n.s.
No substitute	58	29.1	9	25.0	12	30.0	37	32.2	n.s.
Don't know what's offered	51	25.6	8	22.2	12	30.0	30	26.1	n.s.
Too expensive	46	23.1	8	22.2	12	30.0	25	21.7	n.s.
Among Top 3 Barriers									
Not at good times	65	33.0	9	26.5	16	40.0	39	33.9	n.s.
Locations not easy to get to	61	31.0	11	32.4	14	35.0	34	29.6	n.s.
No substitute	45	23.0	5	14.7	7	17.9	33	28.7	n.s.
Don't know what's offered	41	20.9	7	20.6	10	25.6	23	20.0	n.s.
Too expensive	40	20.3	7	20.0	9	23.1	23	20.0	n.s.

Table 13

Correlations between Training Topics and Program Problems

Training Topics Selected	Program Problems							
	Recruiting Staff	Training Staff	Staff Turnover	Getting Equipment	Family Involvement	Recruit Volunteer	Train Volunteer	Funding
Recruiting staff	.28**	.13	.34**	.04	.20	.09	.13	-.01
Encouraging professional dev.	.19	.27**	.21*	.19	.28**	.13	.24*	.14
Staff morale & stability	.38**	.31**	.29**	.21*	.27**	.16	.12	.19
Choosing equipment	.12	.09	.04	.32**	.02	.11	.09	.17
Parent involvement	.02	.06	.22*	.27**	.37**	.27**	.32**	.25*
Volunteer recruitment	.10	.14	.05	.25*	.24*	.43**	.46**	.23*
Volunteer training	-.04	.12	-.03	.19	.16	.33**	.36**	.22*
Grant writing, obtaining funding	.11	.08	.11	.27**	.30**	.20	.28**	.16

N = 96. *p<.05. **p<.01.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Because the field of school-age care is rapidly growing and appears to have important effects on youth, it is imperative to increase our knowledge of this form of care. Staff are believed to be a key component of quality in school-age care programs (Anderson & Gore, 1994; Dryfoos, 1999; Willer, 1994). Thus, to improve program quality, it is essential to understand more about the people who work in school-age care settings.

Within the early childhood field, staff training has been shown to be associated with higher program quality, which in turn, is associated with better outcomes for children (NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 1998, 2000). Unfortunately, we know little about factors that motivate school-age staff to attend training. Understanding the motives of program administrators is especially important because they set the tone for what goes on in the program. This study examined how factors at three levels of Bronfenbrenner's ecological system affected the training preferences of school-age care directors and the training barriers they experienced.

Surprisingly, individual characteristics played little role in determining training preferences or barriers of the providers in the current study. Director's education level had little effect on their training preferences and barriers, producing only one significant finding. Directors with a CDA or two-year credential and directors with some graduate training or a graduate degree were less likely to list "behavior management of youth or staff" among their top three preferred topics. The significance of this finding is not obvious and it is possible that, due to the large number of analyses conducted, the result was significant by chance alone.

The second individual characteristic, experience, played more of a role in determining training preferences. Directors with between 6 to 10 years of experience were less likely to want training in grant writing, and obtaining funding. This finding could be due to chronosystem effects. Data for the current study were collected in 2001, a time when there was increasing funding for school-age care just following a period when many new programs were being developed in the metro Atlanta area (Todd & Brumbloe 2002). It is possible that directors in newly created programs may not yet have a firm funding base while directors in more established programs may desire to take their program to another level during periods of strong funding opportunities. Both of these groups may therefore be especially interested in training on funding opportunities. In contrast, directors who had been in their programs long enough to establish a firm funding base for their program but not yet ready to expand in new directions may be less interested in training on funding opportunities.

Experience also was related to preferred training methods. As directors gain more experience, they were less likely to prefer short, one to two hour training and more likely to want full day training. This finding suggests that with experience, directors want more in-depth training.

The community level variable examined in this study was not a strong predictor of training preferences or barriers. The only effect of community size was the finding that directors from urban areas over 10,000 were more likely than directors from less populated areas to want training on encouraging the professional development of their staff. It is possible that in more urban areas there are more school-age programs and the opportunities to move up in the field is greater. There may also be more training and education opportunities available in urban areas

which may also motivate directors to place greater emphasis on the professional development of staff.

The final goal of the study was to determine whether a program level factor -- the problems experienced in the program -- was related to training preferences. In particular, we investigated the hypothesis that directors would seek training in areas where they were experiencing problems. The results provide some support for a link between program challenges and training preferences of directors. Seven out of the eight program problem-training topic pairs showed a moderate correlation. This finding also provides some support for Houle's motivation theory. Directors appeared to be goal directed by selecting training topics that matched the problems they experienced in their program.

However, significant correlations were also obtained between some problems and training topics that were different from that problem. Examination of the relationships between the program problems themselves indicated that some of the problems were highly correlated with one another. For example, correlations on the order of .60 to .70 were obtained between the problems of recruiting staff, training staff, and staff turnover. The correlated nature of the problems may account for why we observed significant correlations between a problem and some training topics that were not a direct match. It appears that directors may recognize the complexity and interconnections between program problems and may also realize that they need training in multiple areas in order to address the challenges they are experiencing in the program.

Todd & Brumbeloe (2002) also reported differences in training preferences and barriers by program auspice, another program effect. Whether a program was for-profit or not-for-profit was associated with directors preferring different training methods and the training barriers they experienced. The fact that two program level variables -- program problems and program

auspice – have been shown to be related to training preferences and challenges suggest that the characteristics of the work site may play an especially important role in the professional development preferences of program directors. Whether program variables play as great a role in affecting the preferences of their staff is unknown. Program characteristics may be especially related to training preferences of directors because administrators are responsible for creating and maintaining viable programs. Program characteristics may have less effect on staff because they typically have less responsibility for program outcomes.

Although this study provides important new information on training issues, several limitations should be noted. First, the providers were not a randomly selected sample and all resided in one state. Moreover, only 20% of the programs responded to the survey. In addition, because two versions of the training surveys were used, the sample sizes for some analyses were less than the total N of 201. As a result of these limitations we cannot generalize from this study to school-age directors as a whole.

A second limitation was that this study only looked at two individual and one community variable. It is possible that other individual variables (i.e. age or gender) and community variables (i.e. access to a community college; available low cost transportation) may result in a stronger link between individual and community variables and training preferences.

Finally, because we used an existing data set that was not specifically designed to test the link between program problems and preferred training topics, there were some differences in wording between problems and their corresponding training topics. This may have contributed to the lower correlations between the matched problem-training topic pairs.

Despite the limitations of this study, the results provide some implications for future training of school-age directors. First, the finding that program-level characteristics appear to

have effects on training preferences and barriers suggest that trainers may wish to give attention to program issues in designing training. In particular, assessments of the training needs of program directors should include identification of the problems directors experience with their program.

It is also important to note that, consistent with the findings of Todd & Brumbeloe (2002), the top training method preferred by all subgroups of directors was video-based self-study. Clearly, more consideration should be given to investigating the usefulness of using video-based self-studies with directors of school-age programs

The finding that barriers to training were consistent across all subgroups of providers and were mostly access problems suggests that the training system itself may be an important community level variable in need of more attention. Trainers should examine what steps can be taken to ensure that providers are able to access the training that they need. This means finding ways to offset training cost, making locations more accessible, providing training at times that are convenient for providers, and developing individual study materials for providers unable to access formal trainings.

The results of this study also suggest that training methods must be carefully tailored to the experience levels of directors. Less experienced providers are more likely to attend short workshops whereas more experienced directors are more likely to want in-depth training. Offering a variety of training methods will be needed to motivate school-age directors to engage in professional development.

The results of this study also raise new questions for future research. In particular, the correlated nature of program problems suggests that directors may view their program as a complicated system. Additional research using factor analysis and other related data analysis

techniques is needed to determine how program problems are related and to better understand how training curricula for administrators can incorporate a systems approach to addressing the professional development needs of providers.

This study was a beginning attempt to use Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory to better understand the factors affecting training participation of school-age administrators.

Understanding the underlying issues affecting training will allow us to better serve providers of school-age care. This in turn, will allow them to provide more developmentally appropriate care to youth, resulting in more positive outcomes for youth, their families, and the communities in which they live.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, N. (1999). Understanding adults as learners. *Child Care Information Exchange*, 130, 82-84.
- Anderson, C. L., & Gore, J. S. (1994). Staff development for providers of school-age care. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 86, 13-21.
- Beckett, M, Hawken, A., & Jackowitz, A. (2001). *Accountability for after-school care*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Brimhall, D., Reaney, L., & West, J. (1999, August). Participation of kindergartners through third-graders in before- and after-school care. Retrieved February 26, 2002, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=1999013>
- Bubolz, M., & Sontag, S. (1993). Human ecology theory. In P. Boss, W. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. Schumm, & Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp.419-448). New York: Plenum.
- Bumgarner, M. A. (1999). *Working with school-age children*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1999, August). *Employment status of women by presence and age of youngest child, March 1975-98*. Labor Force and Women Branch.
- Capizzano, J., Tout, K., & Adams, G. (2000). *Child care patterns of school-age children with employed mother*. Occasional Paper Number 41. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

- Cost, Quality & Child Outcomes Study Team. (1995). *Cost, quality & child outcomes in child care centers, public report, (2nd ed.)*. Denver: Economics Department, University of Colorado at Denver.
- Decker, C. A. & Decker, J. R. (2001). *Planning and administrating early childhood programs (2nd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dryfoos, J. G. (1999). The role of the school in children's out-of-school time. *The Future of Children: When School Is Out, 9(2)*, 117-134.
- Fashola, O. (2002). *Building effective afterschool programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Green, S., Salkind, N., & Akey, T. (2000). *Using SPSS for windows: Analyzing and understanding data*. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gomes, S. (1994). Evaluation of the Rhode Island child care training system. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED391585)
- Halpern, R. (1999). After-school programs for low-income children: Promises and challenges. *The Future of Children: When School Is Out, 9(2)*, 81-95.
- Halpern, R. (2000). The promise of after-school programs for low-income children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 15*, 185-214.
- Hofferth, S.L., Brayfield, A., Deich, S., & Holcomb, P. (1991). *National child care survey, 1990*. Urban Institute report 91-5. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Howes, C. (1997). Children's experiences in center-based child care as a function of teacher background and adult: child ratio. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 43*, 404-425.
- Kagen, S. & Neuman, M. (1996). The relationship between staff education and training and quality in child care programs. *Child Care Information Exchange, 107*, 65-70.

- Klein, D.M. & White, J. M. (1996). *Family theories: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mahoney, J.L., & Cairns, R. B. (1997). Do extracurricular activities protect against early school dropout? *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 241-253.
- Marshall, N. L., Coll, C. G., Marx, F., McCartney, K., Keefe, N., Ruh, J. (1997). After-school time and children's behavioral adjustment. *Merrill -Palmer Quarterly*, 43, 497-514.
- Merriam, S. B. & Brockett, R. G. (1997). *The profession and practice of adult education: An introduction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, B. (2001). The promise of after-school programs. *Educational Leadership*, 58, 6-12.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2001). *Principals and after-school programs: A survey of pre-K - 8 principals*. Washington, DC: Belden Russonello & Stewart.
- National School-Age Care Alliance. (1999). *The NSACA standards for quality school-age care*. [Brochure]. Boston: Author.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1998). Early child care and self-control, compliance and problem behavior at twenty-four and thirty-six months. *Child Development*, 69, 1145-1170.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2000). The relation of child care to cognitive and language development. *Child Development*, 71, 960-980.

- Noonan, Anne. (June, 2001). *From contrast to concrete: Issues in building a skilled and stable out-of-school time workforce*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-Of-School Time.
- O'Connor, S. (1994). Professional development for school-age child care. In J. Johnson & J. B. McCracken (Eds.), *The early childhood career lattice: Perspectives on professional development* (pp. 121-125). Washington, DC: National Associations for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).
- Pettit, G. S., Laird, R. D., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (1997). Patterns of after-school care in middle childhood: Risk factors and developmental outcomes. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *43*, 515-538.
- Pierce, K. M., Hamm, J. V., & Vandell, D. L. (1999). Experiences in after school programs and children's adjustment in first-grade classrooms. *Child Development*, *70*, 756-767.
- Posner, J. K., & Vandell, D. L. (1994). Low-income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs? *Child Development*, *65*, 440-456.
- Posner, J. K., & Vandell, D. L. (1999). After-school activities and the development of low-income urban children: A longitudinal Study. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*, 868-879.
- Riehl, P. (1994). Selecting staff. Retrieved April 15, 2002, from http://www.nncc.org/SACC/sac21_select.staff.html
- Rosenthal, R., & Vandell, D. L. (1996). Quality of care at school-aged child-care programs: Regulatable features, observed experiences, child perspectives, and parent perspectives. *Child Development*, *67*, 2434-2445.
- Seligson, M. (2001). School-age child care today. *Young Children*, *56*, 90-94.

- Seligson, M. & Allenson, M. (1993). *School-age child care: An action manual for the 90s and beyond*. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Seppanen, P., Love, J. M., deVries, D. K., & Bernstein, L. (1993) *National study of before- and after-school programs. Final report to the Office of Policy and Planning, U.S. Department of Education, Contract No. LC89051001*. Portsmouth, NH: Research Corporation and School-Age Care Project, Wellesley College.
- Smith, K. (2000). *Who's minding the kids? Child care arrangements: Fall, 1995*. Current Population Reports, P70-70. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Stephens, K. (2001). Creative staff training is key to quality. *Child Care Information Exchange*, 142, 27-30.
- Surr, W. (2001, March). *Ready to roll: Five cities share their experience with recruiting, orienting and first year training of after-school staff*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-Of-School Time.
- Todd, C., Albrecht, K., & Coleman, M. (1990, Spring). School-age care: A continuum of option. *Journal of Home Economics*, 46-52.
- Todd, C. & Brumbeloe, S. (2002, December). *The characteristics and training needs of school-age care programs in the metro-Atlanta area*. (Available from the Georgia School-Age Care Association, 246 Sycamore Street, Suite 252, Decatur, GA 30030)
- Vandell, D. L., & Shumow, L. (1999). After-school child care programs. *The Future of Children: When School Is Out*, 9(2), 64-80.
- Vandenbergh, B., & Locklear, E. (2000). A profile of school-age care programs. *Journal of Extension*, 38(6). Retrieved December 9, 2001, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2000december/a1.html>

VanderVen, K. (1993). Advancing child and youth care: A model for integrating theory and practice through connecting education, training and the service system. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 22(4). 263-284.

Willer, B. (1994). A conceptual framework for early childhood professional development. In J. Johnson & J. B. McCracken (Eds.), *The early childhood career lattice: Perspectives on professional development* (pp. 4-23). Washington, DC: National Associations for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

APPENDIX A
PROGRAM SURVEY

Program Survey
March, 2001

Please fill out this survey about the out-of-school program you offer at this site for children/youth in elementary school, middle school and high school. If there are two or more separately administered programs offered at this site, each program director/site director/site coordinator should complete a separate survey. (Call 404/373-7414 If you need more copies of the survey).

You may use pen or pencil to complete the survey. Be sure to keep all marks within the boxes provided for each question since we will scan the surveys to record your responses. Your response is voluntary. You may leave blank any questions you do not want to answer.

STEP#1: Place an "X" in the appropriate box for each of the following three questions.

Yes No

- Are any children/youth in Kindergarten -12th grade enrolled in this program?
- Do you offer this program at this site for at least 6 hours each week during the calendar year, academic year, OR summer?
- Do you offer this program at this site for at least 3 days each week during the calendar year, academic year. OR summer?

If you checked "**NO**" to any of the above three items, you do not need to complete any more questions. Please return the surveys in the attached envelope so that we do not bother you with follow up phone calls about the survey. THANK YOU!

If you checked "YES" to all three questions about your program, go on to Question #1 below.

1. Do any outside organizations provide activities or services for your program (e.g., sports, art/music, youth clubs such as Scouts or 4-H, parent education, health or family services)? No Yes

If yes, please list each organization below:

Name of Organization	Type of Active	Hrs/week offered	Ages of youth served

TOTAL CAPACITY AND ENROLLMENT AT THIS SITE:

2. What is the total capacity and current enrollment in your program at this site? How many youth are on waiting lists? Enter a three-digit number (e.g., 025, 125, etc.).

Enter '000' If none in a category.

Age Group	Total Capacity	Current Enrollment	Number on a Waiting List
Elementary School:	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
Middle School:	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
High School:	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

3. Check the age groups of preschoolers also at this site. (Put an X by all that apply)

- None 0-2 years 3-5 years (non-PreK) Pre-K

4. How many enrolled youth have disabilities?

5. How many enrolled youth are eligible for free/reduced price lunch?

6. How many enrolled youth receive childcare subsidies?

7. What is the approximate racial/ethnic make-up of youth in your program? Enter a three-digit number for the percentage of youth in each racial/ethnic group (e.g., 100, 028, 001, 000, etc.).

Percentage that are:

African American

Hispanic/Latino (a)

Asian/Pacific Islander

American Indian/Alaskan Native

Caucasian/European-American

Multi-racial

= 100%

8. In what year was your program established? (e.g., 1993)

HOURS OF OPERATION AND SPACE

9. How many total hours per week does your program run at this site?
 Enter a three-digit number for the hours per week (e.g., 138, 015, 006,000 hours).

During the academic year: Hours per week

During the summer Hours per week

10. Is the program at this site offered during:

Holidays No Yes

Winter break No Yes

Spring break No Yes

11. Check the times of the day and days of the week you operate your program during the academic year and summer. (Put an X by all that apply)

	During the Academic Year			During the Summer		
	Before School	After School	Evenings/ Nights	Full Day	Part Day	Evenings/ Nights
Monday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tuesday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wednesday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thursday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Friday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Saturday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sunday	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Is your program space: Totally dedicated to the program
 Shared space

13. Given the other demands for space at this location, is there enough room to expand your programming if you wanted to?

- Definitely not
- Probably not
- Unsure
- Probably yes
- Definitely yes

PROGRAM FOCUS AND SERVICES:

14. Check all of the items below that describe your program.

- 01 A program to meet the needs of working parents or parents going to school.
 02 An out-of-school enrichment or education program.
 03 An out-of-school recreation program.
 04 An out-of-school prevention/intervention program for youth at risk.
 05 A youth leadership program.
 06 A religious program.

15. List the two-digit number to the left of the two statements in Question #14 (above) that best describe your program (e.g., 03, 05).

Statement number: Statement number:

16. Check all the items below that are a major focus in your program for each age group you serve:

(EL = elementary school youth; MS = middle school youth; HS = high school youth).

EL MS HS

- Recreation and leisure activities (e.g., sports, hobbies, clubs)
 Artistic; and creative expression (e.g., art, drama, photography, design)
 Physical development, health, fitness (e.g., exercise, hygiene, nutrition & health education)
 Cognitive development (e.g., paying attention, remembering, decision-making)
 Social/emotional development (e.g., cooperation, friendships, peer pressure, handling emotions, self-concept, self-esteem, conflict management, problem-solving)
 Character development/ moral development/spiritual development
 Literacy/reading/language arts
 English as a second language
 Foreign languages
 Math/science
 Social studies/history
 Computers and technology
 Tutoring/homework assistance
 College preparation/ college counseling/ GED classes
 Family living skills for youth (e.g., family relationships, dating & marriage, parenting, childcare training, financial management, consumer education, clothing selection/care)
 Environmental awareness
 Global or international awareness
 Job Preparation/ career counseling/ entrepreneurial training
 Leadership development/ peer education/ peer mentoring
 Community involvement (e.g., community service, service learning, field trips)
 Cultural awareness programming
 Intergenerational programming
 Supporting/involving families (e.g., family involvement, leadership; parent education; referrals)
 Prevention Programming (Drop-out, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, HIV/AIDS/STD, violence, crime, gang prevention)
 Mental health services/counseling

17. Check all transportation & food services you currently provide ON-SITE for the program:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation to and/or from school | <input type="checkbox"/> Lunch |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation to and/or from home | <input type="checkbox"/> Afternoon snack |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Breakfast | <input type="checkbox"/> Dinner |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Morning snack | <input type="checkbox"/> Evening snack |

18. In which USDA food programs are program participants enrolled? Check programs on which you want more information.

- | Currently enrolled | Want more Information |
|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School Breakfast Program | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> National School Lunch Program | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Summer Food Service Program | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Child & Adult Care Food Program | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Milk Program | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know | |

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS:

19. How are youth enrolled in the program at this site: (Check all that apply for each age group) (EL = elementary school youth; MS = middle school youth; HS = high school youth).

EL MS HS

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Drop in, as interested |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Must enroll for specific days |

20. The program is: (Check all that apply)

- Federally licensed/registered
- State licensed/registered
- Exempt from state license or registration
- Must meet the program standards of my agency/organization

21. Is your program accredited by any national professional organization?

- No Yes If yes, what site accreditations do you hold?
- National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
 - National School Age Care Alliance (NSACA)
 - American Camping Association (ACA)
 - National Child Care Association (NCCA)
 - Other Please List _____

22. What type of organization/business is your program part of?

- Private, non-profit
- Private, for-profit
- Public, non-profit

23. Is your organization/business: Minority owned? No Yes Not sure
 Female owned? No Yes Not sure

24. Who has legal responsibility for your program? (Check ONE)

- A private owner/operator
- A child care organization
- A youth-serving organization (e.g. YMCA, 4-H, Scouts, Boys/Girls Club, Campfire)
- A faith-based organization
- A primary/secondary school
- A post-secondary school (e.g. Technical college, 2-or 4-year institution)
- A family services organization/agency
- Other social service or community service organization
- A private employer (e.g., a private business offers this program for their employees)
- Other (Please list) _____

25. How many site directors/coordinators, assistant staff, and volunteers work in your program at this site when: a) fully staffed and b) currently.

	Site directors/coordinators		Assistant Staff		Volunteers	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
A. Fully Staffed:	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
B. Currently:	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

26. How many of the current full- and part-time site directors/coordinators and assistant staff have the following education/training? How many have less than a high school diploma/GED?

(Do NOT include volunteers in this question.)

<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	High school diploma	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Taking the required DHR training	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Technical Certificate in school-age & youth care	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Technical Certificate in child care	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Technical Diploma in child care	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Child Development Associate (CDA)	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Child Care Professional Credential (CCP)	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	2-year Associates Degree	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	4-year Bachelors Degree	
<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Graduate Degree	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Number with less than a high school diploma/GED

27. To what extent is each of the following a challenge faced by your program?

	A Major Challenge	A Challenge	A Minor Challenge	Not a Challenge
01 Inadequate space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02 Recruiting youth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03 Offering engaging & challenging activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04 Behavior management of youth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05 Getting materials for the program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06 Getting equipment for the program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07 Transportation of youth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08 Offering nutritious meals/snacks kids like	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09 Obtaining adequate ending for the program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 The high cost of the program for fancies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 Recruiting staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 Training staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13 Staff turnover	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14 Finding substitutes for staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 Recruiting volunteers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16 Training volunteers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17 Volunteer turnover	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18 Getting parents/families involved	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19 Making connections with the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

28. List below the two-digit number to the left of the three items in Question #27 (above) that are your greatest challenges (e.g., 06,15, 20, etc.)

Challenge #1:

Challenge #2:

Challenge #3:

29. Would you like your program listed in any Metro Atlanta Directories or Web sites we develop?

No

Yes

Thank you! You are now done with this survey. Attach the completed training survey.
Mail both surveys and the card for the drawing in the ore-addressed envelope to:
Georgia School Age Care Association, 246 Sycamore Street, Ste. 252, Decatur, GA 30030.
Questions? Contact GSACA (404) 373-7414.

Both completed surveys and the card must be postmarked by April 16 to be eligible for the drawing.

APPENDIX B
TRAINING SURVEY

Site Director/Coordinator Training Survey

Please answer the following questions about 1) your need for training and 2) the training needs of your staff. Your response is voluntary. You may leave blank any questions you do not want to answer.

1. Check (with an X) all the things that make it hard for you personally to attend training?

- 01 I don't have a way to get to training.
- 02 I don't know what training is offered.
- 03 Training isn't offered at good times.
- 04 The training offered is too long or too short.
- 05 Training is too expensive.
- 06 The topics I am interested in are not offered.
- 07 The training is not useful or is of poor quality.
- 08 Training locations are not easy to get to.
- 09 I can't find a substitute to cover for me to attend training.
- 10 I'm too tired to attend training.
- 11 Training isn't offered in my language.
- 12 The written training materials are too hard to read.
- 13 The training offered is too advanced.
- 14 The training offered is not challenging enough.
- 15 I don't know what training I should be taking.
- 16 The training offered doesn't provide the kind of hours (CEUs/SDUs) or credit I need.
- 17 Other: _____

2. Of the problems listed in Question #1, which three make it hardest for you to attend training?

(Enter the two-digit number to the left of the item in Question #1, e.g. 03, 10, 16)

Problem #1: Problem #2: Problem #3:

3. When would be the best times for you to attend training? (Check all that you would attend)

- Weekday morning Weekday evening Saturday afternoon
- Weekday afternoon Saturday morning

4. What type of training would you attend? (Check all you would seriously consider)

- 1-1/2 to 2 hour single session
- Half-day (3 hours)
- Full-day (6 hours)
- Two-day conference (10 hours-note, only 6 hours can be used for DHR/OSR Licensing credit)
- 10 hour series (2 hours each week for 5 weeks)
 - degree credit non-degree CEUs/SDU's training credit
- Semester degree credit course (3 hours/week for 16 weeks)

Continue on the next page

5. What other training methods would you use? (Put an X next to all you would seriously consider)

- | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Video-based self-study | Check if you have a VCR: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Televised self-study | Check if you have a TV: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence course | Check if you prefer to work on this: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CD Rom computer-based | Check if you have a computer w/CD Rom: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internet courses | Check if you have Internet access: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |

6. What program management training topics are you interested in?

(Check all you would seriously consider)

- 01 None, I am not interested in management training at this time
- 02 Recruiting good staff
- 03 Getting new staff off to a good start
- 04 Encouraging professional development, helping staff obtain certifications
- 05 Maintaining staff morale and stability; dealing with burnout
- 06 Program Accreditation
- 07 Legal concerns and obligations; risk management
- 08 Understanding/obtaining liability insurance
- 09 Understanding/obtaining health care coverage and other benefit packages for employees
- 10 Budgeting, fiscal management, accounting
- 11 Developing an organizational structure
- 12 Program management and administration
- 13 Choosing equipment
- 14 Classroom set up; using shared space
- 15 Developing homework, tutoring programs and promoting academic success
- 16 Behavior management, conflict management skills, mediation with youth and/or staff
- 17 Communicating and problem solving with parents and families
- 18 Parent Involvement and Parent Leadership
- 19 Learning about specific cultures: Which? _____
- 20 Insuring access and equity for all youth/families
- 21 Recruiting and programming for youth from high risk environments
- 22 Understanding the ADA; inclusion of youth with special needs, special education
- 23 Volunteer recruitment
- 24 Volunteer training
- 25 Conducting community, youth or family needs assessments
- 26 Promoting strong linkages with schools
- 27 Linking schools, families, & communities »
- 28 Grant writing, obtaining funding
- 29 Program evaluation and improving programs
- 30 Marketing your program
- 31 Communicating with funders, decision-makers
- 32 Using technology in the program; computer-based education; software programs for youth
- 33 Using computer software for program management and/or budgeting
- 34 Using computer software to creating newsletters, brochures, handbooks, overheads
- 35 Developing middle school or high school programs .
- 36 Advocating for the needs of school-age care and other out-of-school programs
- 37 Theories and approaches to out-of-school programs for K-12 youth
- 38 Other: _____

7. In the next year, what three training topics are you most interested in?

(Enter the two-digit code to the left of the item listed in Question #6, e.g. 08, 11, 20)

First Choice: Second Choice: Third Choice:

8. In the next year, what training topics would you like your staff to have?

(Check all you would seriously consider)

- 01 Creating healthy and safe environments (meals/snacks, playground safety. CPR/First aid).
- 02 Creating effective learning environments (indoor/outdoor space, room arrangement).
- 03 Youth development/ developmentally appropriate practice.
- 04 Curriculum and activity planning.
- 05 Adapting activities for developmental level/ability level.
- 06 Guidance and behavior management
- 07 Promoting the physical development, health, fitness of youth.
- 08 Promoting cognitive development and academic success (e.g.. academic subjects, homework).
- 09 Promoting social, emotional and character development of youth.
- 10 Promoting artistic and creative expression in youth (e.g., art. music, drama, photography).
- 11 Providing recreation and leisure activities for youth (e.g., sports, hobbies, games, clubs).
- 12 Family living skills for youth (e.g., parenting, child care. managing money, consumer educ).
- 13 Environmental education, global awareness, international experiences for youth.
- 14 Career education, career counseling, entrepreneurial training for youth.
- 15 Promoting youth leadership.
- 16 Promoting community involvement among youth.
- 17 Prevention programming: Teen Pregnancy Substance Abuse
 School-failure violence/gang/crime HIV/AIDS/STDS
- 18 Supporting families and promoting family Involvement & leadership in the program.
- 19 Communicating & problem-solving with families.
- 20 Communicating & problem-solving with schools.
- 21 Communicating & problem-solving with community groups.
- 22 Communicating and problem-solving with supervisors & other staff.
- 23 Theories and approaches to out-of-school programs for K-12 youth..
- 24 Advocating for the needs of school-age care and other out-of-school programs.
- 25 Other: _____

9. In the next year, what three training topics would you most like your staff to have?

(Enter the two-digit code to the left of the item listed in Question #8. e.g. 08, 17, 23)

First Choice: Second Choice: Third Choice:

Continue on the back

10. What is the most you (or your agency) would pay per hour for -you to attend training?
- \$20 (\$40 for a 2-hour training, \$80 for a half-day training)
 - \$15 (\$30 for a 2-hour training, \$60 for a half-day training)
 - \$12.50 (\$25 for a 2-hour training, \$50 for a half-day training)
 - \$10 (\$20 for a 2-hour training, \$40 for a half-day training)
 - \$7.50 (\$15 for a 2-hour training, \$30 for a half-day training)
 - \$5 (\$10 for a 2-hour training, \$20 for a half-day training)
 - My agency (or I) am not able to pay for training.
11. What is your current position? (Fill in ONE)
- Administrator
 - Site Director/Coordinator
 - Part-time Director/Part-time Lead staff
 - Lead staff
 - Assistant staff
 - Other: _____
12. Years of experience in this position: (Fill in ONE)
- Less than 2 years
 - 2 - 5 years
 - 6-10 years
 - Over 10 years
13. What age group(s) do you work with or administer? (Fill in ALL that apply)
- Birth - 3 years (pre-school, full-day)
 - 4-5 year olds (Pre-K, part-day)
 - Elementary youth (including Kindergarten)
 - Middle-school youth
 - High School youth
14. I am: (Fill in ONE)
- Male
 - Female
15. Check your highest educational level.
- Some high school
 - High school diploma or GED
 - CDA/CCP
 - Technical School Certificate
 - Technical School Diploma
 - Some college
 - Associates or Professional Degree
 - 4-year Bachelors Degree
 - Some graduate school
 - Graduate Degree
16. I work in a: (Fill in ONE)
- Rural area or small town <2,500
 - Large Town (2,500 - 9,999)
 - Small City (10,000-49,999)
 - Large City (50,000 & over) or suburb of a large city
17. My race/ethnicity is: (Fill in ONE)
- Black (non-Hispanic)
 - White (non-Hispanic)
 - Hispanic/Latino(a)
 - American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - Asian or Pacific Islander
 - Multi-Racial

Put this survey in the envelope to be mailed to GSACA, along with the Program Survey.

Assistant Staff Training Survey

Please answer the following questions about your need for training. Your response is voluntary. You may leave blank any questions you do not want to answer.

1. Check (with an X) all the things that make it hard for you personally to attend training?

- 01 I don't have a way to get to training.
- 02 I don't know what training is offered.
- 03 Training isn't offered at good times.
- 04 The training offered is too long or too short.
- 05 Training is too expensive.
- 06 The topics I am interested in are not offered.
- 07 The training is not useful or is of poor quality.
- 08 Training locations are not easy to get to.
- 09 I can't find a substitute to cover for me to attend training.
- 10 I'm too tired to attend training.
- 11 Training isn't offered in my language.
- 12 The written training materials are too hard to read.
- 13 The training offered is too advanced.
- 14 The training offered is not challenging enough.
- 15 I don't know what training I should be taking.
- 16 The training offered doesn't provide the kind of hours (CEUs/SDUs) or credit I need.
- 17 Other: _____

2. Of the problems listed in Question #1, which three make it hardest for you to attend training?
(Enter the two-digit number to the left of the item in Question #1, e.g. 03, 10, 16)

Problem#1: Problem #2: Problem #3:

3. When would be the best times for you to attend training? (Check al[that you would attend)

- Weekday morning Weekday evening Saturday afternoon
- Weekday afternoon Saturday morning

4. What type of training would you attend? (Check a// you would seriously consider)

- 1-1/2 to 2 hour single session
- Half-day (3 hours)
- Full-day (6 hours)
- Two-day conference (10 hours-note, only 6 hours can be used for DHR/OSR Licensing credit)
- 10 hour series (2 hours each week for 5 weeks)
 - degree credit non-degree CEUs/SDU's training credit
- Semester degree credit course (3 hours/week for 16 weeks)

Continue on the next page

5. What other training methods would you use? (Check all you would seriously consider)

- | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Video-based self-study | Check if you have a VCR: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Televised self-study | Check if you have a TV: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence course | Check if you prefer to work on this: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CD Rom Computer-based | Check if you have a computer w/CD Rom: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internet courses | Check if you have Internet access: | <input type="checkbox"/> At work | <input type="checkbox"/> At home |

6. In the next year, what training topics would you like to have?

(Check all that you would seriously consider)

- 01 Creating healthy and safe environments (meals/snacks, playground safety, CPR/First aid).
- 02 Creating effective learning environments (indoor/outdoor space, room arrangement).
- 03 Youth development/ developmentally appropriate practice.
- 04 Curriculum and activity planning.
- 05 Adapting activities for developmental level/ability level.
- 06 Guidance and behavior management.
- 07 Promoting the physical development, health, fitness of youth.
- 08 Promoting cognitive development and academic success (e.g., academic subjects, homework,
- 09 Promoting social, emotional and character development of youth.
- 10 Promoting artistic and creative expression in youth (e.g., art, music, drama, photography).
- 11 Providing recreation and leisure activities for youth (e.g., sports, hobbies, games, clubs).
- 12 Family living skills for youth (e.g., parenting, child care, managing money, consumer educ).
- 13 Environmental education, global awareness, international experiences for youth.
- 14 Career education, career counseling, entrepreneurial training for youth.
- 15 Promoting youth leadership.
- 16 Promoting community involvement among youth.
- 17 Prevention programming: Teen Pregnancy Substance Abuse
 School-failure Violence/gang/crime HIV/AIDS/STDS
- 18 Supporting families and promoting family involvement & leadership in the program.
- 19 Communicating & problem-solving with families.
- 20 Communicating & problem-solving with schools.
- 21 Communicating & problem-solving with community groups.
- 22 Communicating and problem-solving with supervisors & other staff.
- 23 Theories and approaches to out-of-school programs for K-12 youth.
- 24 Advocating for the needs of school-age care and other out-of-school programs.
- 25 Other: _____

7. In the next year, what three training topics are you most interested in?

(Enter the two-digit code to the left of the item listed in Question #6, e.g.. 08,11,20)

First Choice: Second Choice: Third Choice:

8. What is the most you (or your agency) would pay per hour for you to attend training?

- \$ 20 (\$40 for a 2-hour training, \$80 for a half-day training)
- \$15 (\$30 for a 2-hour training, \$60 for a half-day training)
- \$12.50 (\$25 for a 2-hour training, \$50 for a half-day training)
- \$10 (\$20 for a 2-hour training, \$40 for a half-day training)
- \$7.50 (\$15 for a 2-hour training, \$30 for a half-day training)
- \$5 (\$10 for a 2-hour training, \$20 for a half-day training)
- My agency (or I) am not able to pay for training.

9. What is your current position? (Fill in ONE)

- Administrator
- Site Director/Coordinator
- Part-time Director/Part-time Lead staff
- Lead staff
- Assistant staff
- Other: _____

10. Years of experience in this position: (Fill in ONE)

- Less than 2 years
- 2 - 5 years
- 6-10 years
- Over 10 years

11. What age group(s) do you work with or administer? (Fill in ALL that apply)

- Birth - 3 years (pre-school, full day)
- 4-5 year olds (Pre-K, part-day)
- Elementary youth (including Kindergarten)
- Middle-school youth
- High School youth

12. I am: (Fill in ONE)

- Male
- Female

14. I work in a: (Fill in ONE)

- Rural area or small town <2,500
- Large Town (2,500 - 9,999)
- Small City (10,000 - 49,999)
- Large City (50,000 & over) or suburb of a large city

13. Check your highest educational level.

- Some high school .High school diploma or GED
- CDA/CCP
- Technical School Certificate
- Technical School Diploma
- Some college
- Associates or Professional Degree
- 4-year Bachelors Degree
- Some graduate school
- Graduate Degree

15. My race/ethnicity is: (Fill in ONE)

- Black (non-Hispanic)
- White (non-Hispanic)
- Hispanic/Latino(a)
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Multi-Racial

Return this survey to your Director to be mailed to GSACA, along with the Program Survey.