

Credentialing for 21st CCLC Staff
An Overview of the Benefits and Impacts

Ellen S. Gannett, Director
Sarah Mello
Elizabeth Starr

The National Institute on Out-of-School Time

Wellesley Centers for Women

Wellesley College

November 11, 2009

This report has been funded at least in part with federal funds from the US Department of Education under contract number ED08C))145. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the US Department of Education nor does mention trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

NIOST National Institute on
Out-of-School Time
at the Wellesley Centers for Women

NIOST is a program of:

35 WELLESLEY
YEARS FOR CENTERS
WOMEN

Credentialing for 21st CCLC Staff An Overview of the Benefits and Impacts

I. Introduction

In this report we summarize two long-term models of credentialing and provide an overview of the benefits and impacts of a nationally recognized credential on the field of After School and Youth Development (ASYD).¹ We explore potential barriers to credentialing and review recognized essential elements of a strong credentialing system, including detailed analysis of core competency frameworks. We describe the current state of credentialing systems in ASYD and offer a case study of the Missouri Youth Development Credential. Based upon our analysis and interviews with key informants in the ASYD field (see Appendix A), we make recommendations for next steps in moving forward with aligning the 21st CCLC online professional development portal with a nationally recognized credential.

Background on Credentialing

Credentialing can be defined as a certification that recognizes an individual's performance based on a set of defined skills and knowledge (Dennehy, Gannett & Robbins, 2006). Credentials define types of training, the number of training hours, and evidence of skill development. Credentials allow professionals to be recognized for their competence on the job (The Florida Afterschool Network, 2009). They can provide a clear and consistent path for professional development and offer recognition for individuals who demonstrate competence and skill. Research points to a strong association between high-quality programs and credentialed staff (Dennehy & Noam, 2005).

An increased focus on student academic achievement, a growing public demand for high-quality afterschool programming, and the recent development of competencies and professional development systems to hire, train, and retain staff suggest the time is ripe to formalize and professionalize the field of ASYD.

There is growing support for the idea that children need and benefit from extended learning time—more time to apply and deepen their understanding of concepts covered during the school day and opportunities to develop other social and life skills that are important to success. There is not yet consensus about what form that additional learning should take, but research suggests that the better staff are trained in youth development

¹ This report uses the term “After School and Youth Development” as an umbrella term to refer to the afterschool, school-age care, out-of-school time, youth development, recreation, prevention, and youth services fields. The term is inclusive of individuals who work with or on behalf of youth to facilitate their personal, social, and educational development and enable them to gain a voice, influence, and place in society as they make the transition from dependence to independence.

principles and other core competency areas, the better youth fare overall. Developing common language across various types of providers and programs for how best to support learning and growth may help bring consistency to training delivery and expectations for staff skills regardless of the discipline or focus of the program. The expansion of 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) programs and the rise in demand for afterschool increase the need for well-trained staff who can deliver high-quality services to support the academic development of children.

II. History of Credentialing in Two Child Care Systems

To understand the experience and potential of credentialing, it is helpful to examine two successful, long-term credentialing models. The Child Development Associate (CDA) and the Military Child Care Act (MCCA) demonstrate the impact credentials can have on programming, staffing, and training in a child care system.

Child Development Associate

The CDA credential is awarded to early childhood education professionals who have completed a list of requirements, including 120 hours of training, and who have successfully passed an observation or “verification visit” to work with Infants/Toddlers or Preschoolers.

The concept for the CDA credential was initiated in 1971 as a national movement to improve the quality of child care and was funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families. Following three years of development work, the first CDA credentials were awarded in 1975.

More than 200,000 caregivers have earned the CDA credential since the inception of the program. Furthermore, 49 states plus the District of Columbia now incorporate the CDA into their child care center licensing regulations (<http://www.cdacouncil.org>). The Council on Professional Recognition has documented that the CDA has provided a pathway to higher education and a stronger identity for the field of early childhood since its introduction in 1975. At present, all 50 states are operating components of a professional development system for early childhood education workers to support the earning of the credential. When the CDA became mandatory, new jobs for its administration were also created, strengthening and establishing the profession. A longitudinal study of CDA recipients showed that almost 77% remained in the field 10 years after receiving certification (Deen & Bailey, 2004).

While some states have begun to adapt the use of the CDA to the ASYD workforce, the CDA does not address specific skill sets ASYD workers need to support children and youth. Early childhood programs focus heavily on children's verbal development and preparation for entering school. In contrast, ASYD practitioners need skills for supporting positive youth development, developing activities and experiences that complement the

school day, and addressing the developmental needs of older children—content areas missing from the CDA (The Finance Project, The Afterschool Investments Project, 2007).

The Military Child Care Act

The MCCA was created in 1989 to mandate improvements in military child care, including increased training for child care workers. The goals of the MCCA were to improve quality, keep care affordable, and continue to expand availability. Prior to the MCCA, the US military child care system had no comprehensive standards to ensure quality. Staff lacked training and were poorly compensated. In some areas, annual staff turnover was more than 300%. When the military adapted the MCCA and tied training to wage increases, turnover was reduced from 300% to below 30% (Campbell, Appelbaum, Martinson, & Martin, 2000).

The CDA and MCCA systems demonstrate how a well-developed and supported credentialing program backed by state and federal mandates can impact the quality of programs.

III. Potential Impacts and Benefits Associated with Credentialing

In this section we present some of the potential impacts and benefits associated with credentialing by focusing on three broad areas: the ASYD field, staffing, and children and youth.

Impact and Benefits on the Field of ASYD

There are some who believe that without a shared vision and standards, the needs of young people and communities will eventually become too great for society to be able to provide the developmental, educational, and social support required (Eckles, Carpenter-Williams, Curry, Mattingly, Rybicki, Stuart, et al., 2009). A nationally recognized credential that is grounded in a set of recognized indicators of quality programming could solidify an identity for the ASYD field and help operationalize and professionalize it.

Currently there is no globally accepted definition for workers within the ASYD field. In fact, job titles for positions across organizations and systems vary so greatly that it is difficult to pinpoint clear job descriptions and appropriate training paths.

ASYD workers come to the field from a variety of disciplines with a broad continuum of training and education. This results in an inconsistent understanding of quality programming and a lack of common language to describe the profession. Even among people doing the work there seems to be a lack of clarity for how the profession is defined. In a recent survey conducted by the Academy for Educational Development Center for Youth Development and Policy Research and the National Institute on Out-of-School Time, 350 respondents reported no fewer than 207 different titles for the work they do (Dennehy et al., 2006).

A credential could help unify this diverse workforce by (1) creating professional levels of proficiency and criteria to meet those levels, based upon a set of core competencies, and (2) lending some common language to the experience of ASYD work.

Impacts and Benefits on Staffing

Although the development of ASYD standards of principles and practices is encouraging, they are dependent on practitioners that stay employed in the field and on a field which includes a future beyond minimum wage and limited career advancement (Eckles et al., 2009). One of the most noted threats to the strength of the field is the transitory nature of staff. Low wages and the lack of a clear career path lead to high turnover. The Massachusetts Afterschool Research Study (MARS) noted that afterschool programs lose a significant portion of their staff each year to these issues, yet evidence shows that the quality and continuity of programs depend on a stable workforce (Intercultural Center for Education & National Institute for Out-of-School Time, 2005).

Because there is not a clearly defined profession or career path, many people working in the ASYD field see it as supplemental work or a transitional position on the way to another career. The National Afterschool Association (NAA) feels it is now crucial to address the professionalization of the workforce and take steps to “ensure that afterschool work becomes a ‘destination’ occupation, not a transitory stop along the way to another career” (NAA, 2006).

There is evidence that the increased training and education that comes with credentialing can help address these issues. Both the CDA and MCCA have resulted in significant reductions in staff turnover. In addition, across the states, researchers have documented improved working conditions for staff, influences on higher education course offerings, increased staff participation in higher education, and public policy changes supporting credentialing and professional development systems (Dennehy et al., 2006).

Workers that have earned credentials report greater self-confidence and feelings of efficacy in performing their jobs, increased skills and knowledge, greater interest in pursuing higher education, and increased wages. Programs that employ credentialed staff have noted reductions in turnover rates. If given the opportunity to access training and education to advance their careers, workers will be better equipped to make a career out of working with youth (Dennehy et al., 2006).

In our interviews, one state education administrator noted that a credential that was recognized across all 21st CCLC programs would make it easy for staff to move from one 21st CCLC program to another, remaining in the field and carrying with them the experience and knowledge gained. The credential would also make it easier for program directors to identify qualified staff to hire. In a recent article, Child Trends suggested that directors look for credentials in potential hires as evidence of the right person to hire for

the job and advised directors to consider credentials criteria for hiring (Metz, Bandy, & Burkhauser, 2009).

Impacts and Benefits on Children and Youth

More than one million children and youth are served by the 21st CCLC programs in 9,634 school-based and community-based centers across the country. Systems aimed at improving the quality of these programs and increasing the skills and knowledge of the staff can have a positive impact on student growth, development, and well-being. In fact, multiple studies on children's welfare suggest that "the single most significant factor limiting child and youth care services is the availability of competent, well-prepared practitioners" (Eckles et al., 2009).

The MARS Study found that afterschool programs with more highly educated and better-paid staff were significantly better in quality. Quality programs and skilled staff make a difference. The study showed a clear link between well-trained staff, high-quality afterschool programs, and positive outcomes for youth. When staff are trained using evidence-based skill training approaches, high-quality afterschool programs consistently help youth improve in three general areas—feelings and attitudes, behavioral adjustment, and school performance (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007).

Similarly, in a recent report on professionalizing the afterschool workforce, the Florida Afterschool Network indicated well-trained, well-compensated staff are better prepared to meet diverse student needs and offer strong, predictable, and lasting relationships with children, youth, and families (The Florida Afterschool Network, 2009).

IV. Potential Barriers to Credentialing

Here we explore some of the commonly cited barriers to the implementation of a credentialing system. These challenges are important to be aware of so they can be adequately addressed by the field. Several of these challenges are further discussed in the final section of this report.

Funding to pay for the earning of credentials or incentives to staff after earning credentials

Workers or their programs may not have the resources to pursue training required to obtain a credential. If training was available for free, there would still be the question of how to reward staff for the increased training. While some experts believe that the rewards for earning a credential should be intrinsic, most agree that there should be increased compensation or bonuses for staff that hold a credential.

Difficulty attracting people to the field

Many providers report difficulty in the current environment of finding enough quality staff people to hire, and fear that an increased requirement of a credential (should it become mandatory) might turn people away if there is not any tangible financial benefit to the credential.

Few opportunities for full-time work

There continues to be a shortage of full-time career options for workers who wish to make ASYD a career. Earning the credential may not be attractive if it is not clear how it can lead to advancement.

Lack of perceived value for degreed or certified professionals

There are some who believe that certified teachers and other degreed professionals already working in afterschool programs will not see the credential as necessary or pertinent to them. Because of the lack of identity in the ASYD field, it may be challenging to convince some educators of the difference between in-school and afterschool teaching methods or the values of obtaining ASYD training.

Many afterschool programs depend on certified teachers for some part of their staffing. Teachers may serve as program directors and direct-service staff, or they may be brought in for focused activity sessions or clubs once or several times a week. A common theme among key informants was a lack of understanding among teachers of what afterschool can offer and the value it has. As one informant told us, “We’ll accept the fact that [afterschool teachers] are trained teachers, they are certified; they know all of the learning theories, but how is it different from the school day?”

Classroom teachers are already required to keep their teaching certification current and obtain ongoing CEUs, and many see their work in afterschool as merely a supplemental part-time job. Without a mandate or incentive, there is concern among the key informants that most teachers would not see the need for or benefit to earning an additional credential. A universal mandatory credential might even drive some teachers and other degreed professionals away altogether.

One suggestion from the Finance Project’s Afterschool Investment Project is to explore the possibility for states to allow teachers who earn a 21st CCLC credential to apply it to their teaching certification renewals. This connection between the 21st CCLC credential and teaching certification would add more credibility to the existing body of knowledge that identifies youth development work as a critical part of student success.

V. Essential Elements of a Credentialing System

In this section we discuss the infrastructure needed to support a credentialing system, including professional development systems, links to wage increases and incentives, links to higher education, and links to quality rating and improvement systems.

We then look more closely at one of the most important pieces of this infrastructure: core competencies. Core competencies describe what staff need to know and do. They are seen as the backbone of a professional development system, around which other components are built and organized. We provide a cross-cutting comparison of 14 core competency frameworks for ASYD professionals to understand the key content a credential should address.

Professional Development Systems

Much study and thought has been given to the key components of a strong professional development system. Bowie and Bronte-Tinkew (2006) suggest that credentials will be most successful and effective when they are part of a comprehensive professional development system that includes the following:

- **Core competencies** that define what staff need to know and do to work effectively with children and youth
- **Training system** that is grounded in the core competencies and is responsive to the diverse nature of the workforce
- **Training and trainer approval system** that ensures the quality of both the content and delivery of training
- **Professional registry** that documents all relevant training and education completed by members of the field
- **Career lattice and pathways** that link roles, responsibilities, and salary ranges

The Finance Project's Afterschool Investment Project similarly notes six key elements of a successful professional development system, which include credentialing as a part of an interconnected whole:

- Funding
- Core knowledge and competencies
- Qualifications and credentials
- Quality assurances,
- Access and outreach
- Infrastructure to support the system

(The Finance Project, Afterschool Investments Project, 2007).

Also, in a recent study on workforce development, School's Out Washington found that the following seven elements, when combined, make for the strongest professional development system:

- **Measurement of outcomes** to demonstrate the contribution of ASYD professional development to better outcomes for children and youth
- **Core competencies** to clarify the essential knowledge and skills ASYD staff must have to be competent professionals
- **Identity of the profession** to solidify the definition and role of the profession so people within and outside of ASYD recognize the valuable impact trained professionals have on children and youth
- **Career and wage ladder** to outline the various pathways ASYD professionals can take to advance their educations and careers. This could link roles, responsibilities, and salary ranges commensurate with an ASYD professional's training, education, and experience
- **Training catalog** to describe available training and educational opportunities grounded in the core competencies and responsive to diversity of staff
- **Professional registry** to provide a centralized database of members of the ASYD field and document all relevant training and education completed by each professional
- **Quality review** of the training and educational opportunities that ensures offerings include quality of content, relevance, and effective delivery (School's Out Washington, 2008)

Links to Wage Increases and Incentives

Credentialing and associated training must be affordable to obtain. If the training is mandatory but cost prohibitive, workers required to pay for it on their own may leave the field rather than pay for coursework that does not immediately translate to higher wages. Therefore, a credential should result in financial compensation or reward. There are many examples from the early childhood field for how this might be achieved.

The national T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood[®] Project (TEACH) and North Carolina's WAGE\$ program (WAGE\$) include built-in incentives for participation. TEACH provides scholarships that childcare professionals and directors can apply towards an Associates degree in early childhood education. Funding for TEACH has come from foundations, the United Way, corporations, the Child Care and Development Block Grant, the North Carolina General Assembly, and contributions from TEACH participants and their programs.

The WAGE\$ program encourages reduced turnover among credentialed or degreed staff. Cash supplements are provided to staff that remained at one center for a minimum of six months. The turnover rate for WAGE\$ participants in the 2004–2005 year was eight percent less than that of the state average (Dennehy et. al, 2006).

In certificate and credential programs that do not offer financial incentives, staff who participated are still seeing salary increases, likely due to increased performance at their jobs. In addition, early 40% of staff who earned the New York After School credential received raises. Youth development workers participating in the BEST (Building

Exemplary Systems for Training Youth Workers) certificate program received training that enabled them to understand and value the kinds of activities and relationships that lead to positive youth outcomes. Again, this often translated into lower turnover and increased wage earning adding to the stability of the field and therefore to environments that are better able to provide children and youth with programs that can consistently support their growth and development (Dennehy et. al, 2006).

Links to Higher Education

Many existing ASYD credentials already require coursework at the college level as detailed in Appendix E. In the early childhood field, the TEACH model has resulted in a partnering of more than 400 educational institutions across the country.

In addition to providing coursework relevant to the field, higher education institutions are equipped to provide additional support services that learners might need to be successful in their own education. Remedial writing, math, ESL instruction, and health services typically offered to students will contribute to the learners' stability and make it more likely that they will continue with their education and training. These are services that smaller training organizations currently supporting the ASYD field are not able to consistently afford to provide.

If colleges are to offer degrees and certificates specifically for the ASYD field, there needs to be a dependable and steady demand for the course work. A nationally recognized credential, if it were to become a standard requirement for the field, could create such a demand. The increased diversity of college degrees would link back to better defined leadership positions in the field and could result in clarity of the profession of ASYD.

Currently, colleges report difficulty filling their ASYD certificate and degree programs. The most commonly cited barriers for continued student enrollment in these programs are poor wages and limited advancement opportunities in the field for higher trained staff. However, if the demand is present, higher education institutions will work to develop degree programs that meet the needs of the ASYD field, leading to a stronger and more comprehensive professional development system.

Links to Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS)

Quality rating and improvement systems (sometimes termed Quality Rating Systems or QRS) provide valuable information to consumers and funders about ASYD programs, as well as help programs identify areas for improvement and training. As the information from these systems become more widely available, the demand for quality programs increases, driving the need for well-trained staff. Making a nationally recognized credential an indicator on a QRIS will draw more participation; even in programs where credentialing would not be mandatory, a high rating on a QRIS would be desirable to programs seeking increased funding.

Core Competencies as a Central Component

Core competencies articulate what it is that staff need to know and do in order to deliver high-quality programming. They are different from program standards, which typically focus on what *programs* need to do to provide effective services. Competencies focus on what *staff* need to know and do.

Core competencies are often viewed as foundational to professional development systems, as they provide organizing frameworks for professional registries, training catalogues, staff assessment, and higher education coursework and degree programs. They can be connected to licensing regulations and embedded in Quality Rating and Improvement Systems. At the organizational level, core competencies can inform the development of job descriptions, the hiring process, and professional development planning.

In a recent report for School's Out Washington, the Next Generation Youth Work Coalition analyzed existing core competencies in the ASYD field from 14 different organizations or states (Starr, Yohalem, & Gannett, 2009). The 14 were selected from the frameworks being used across the country because they target professionals working with a broad range of children and youth (ages 5–18), and also include several frameworks currently used by professionals in the state of Washington. See Appendix B for a list of included frameworks.

The authors found much overlap in the content covered in various sets of core competencies. See Appendix C for a complete list of competency areas and the frameworks in which they appear. The following 11 content areas appeared in 8 or more of the frameworks reviewed:

- Curriculum
- Professionalism
- Connecting with Families
- Health, Safety, and Nutrition
- Child and Adolescent Development
- Cross-cultural Competence
- Guidance
- Professional Development
- Program Management
- Connecting with Communities
- Environment

In addition, four content areas were less common, but appeared in seven or fewer frameworks:

- Child and Youth Assessment
- Communication with Youth

- Youth Empowerment
- Connecting with Schools

Several other competency areas were outliers, appearing in individual frameworks only (see Appendix C for the complete list). These unique content areas could be enfolded in the primary content areas or could be offered as additionally recognized areas of expertise. They are likely the result of the diversity of disciplines that make up the field, and further work could be done to determine common language that would adequately capture the skills identified.

A nationally recognized credential requiring a demonstration of knowledge in the 10 commonly included core areas (Environment; Curriculum; Connecting with Families and Communities; Child and Adolescent Development; Health, Safety and Nutrition; Program Management; Cross Cultural Competence; Guidance; Professional Development; and Professionalism) could easily be supported by existing training systems in many different states.

VI. Existing Credentialing Systems

Across the country, states are conducting key work in the areas of professional development, training, certification, and credentialing. Much can be learned from this work in terms of how to build from existing models, link credentialing to core competencies, create an infrastructure to support a credential, and attend to accessibility and affordability. Appendix D summarizes key work being done by states.

In this section we present a comparison of 11 currently implemented ASYD credentialing systems, selected to represent the work being done nationwide. This analysis will aid in our understanding of state credentialing systems as we explore the viability of a nationally recognized set of credentials for 21st CCLC programs in particular and the ASYD field in general. The detailed comparison, including the list of systems reviewed, can be found in Appendix E.

These systems are compared across four areas that impact the development of a credential: (a) training requirements, (b) documentation of learning, (c) funding, and (d) administration. These areas and related considerations for the development of a credential are described below.

Training Requirements

Of the systems reviewed, most recognize a blend of college coursework and other “formal” school-age training. These trainings are generally offered through ASYD associations and may include online, classroom, and site-based instruction. Many ASYD organizations also develop and provide their own staff training. Often this training is

approved through state licensing or oversight organizations so that it can be counted towards state requirements.

Most of the reviewed systems also require staff to log a substantial number of hours worked in youth development programs to earn the credential. If a nationally recognized credential for 21st CCLC programs also required demonstration of hours worked, it may be necessary to articulate what types of program hours would be accepted and whether a percentage of classroom teaching hours could be counted towards that minimum. Many of the models allow for the exchange of hours worked for coursework taken. Classroom teaching hours and ongoing training could be examined to see what competency credentials might be shared.

Documentation and Demonstration of Learning

Most systems rely on a combination of documented training hours, portfolio reviews, and assessments or observations by teams of stakeholders including state agencies, parents, mentors, and trainers.

Only one of the reviewed systems required a test of competency. Interviews with key informants suggest that there is some concern that a test would not adequately measure the competency of a staff person, as much of the work is dependent on relationships and interactions with children and their families. For the proposed system to be as meaningful and comprehensive as some of the existing programs, thought will have to be given to the establishment of partnerships with state organizations that can assist with assessment and review of a prospective credential candidate, or allow for the receipt of a portfolio showing outside evaluation of practice. A nationally recognized credential requiring less demonstration of expertise could undermine the extensive work already done in many states.

Four of these 11 systems require ongoing training and documentation to keep the credential current. Most states issue a credential for five-year terms and most credentials are targeted at entry level staff. As opportunities for growth in the field expand, a multi-tiered certification, currently only noted in Colorado and Florida in this review, would be necessary to track and encourage ongoing learning.

Funding

Naturally, there are costs associated with any credentialing process. There are administrative costs and fees for classes and workshops. For those credentials that require observations and assessments, there can be significant costs for hiring and training assessors. These costs are passed on to the candidates through tuition and application fees, but due to the low wages paid in the field, bearing the full cost is impossible to most.

Many partnerships between intermediary organizations and state human service departments already exist in states with credentials. A nationally recognized credential

that helps unite other efforts through cross-state articulation would encourage broad funding streams to support training delivery and credential administration.

Administration

Diverse partnerships have been forged for the administration of the reviewed systems. These existing partnerships could be beneficial in translating requirements across states and aligning requirements across systems. Kansas and Missouri worked together to develop their system because of the close proximity of some of their major cities. National professional organizations in afterschool and youth development regularly convene stakeholders from many states and could provide a vehicle for determining credential recognition that would cut across all states. A centralized “portal” could help categorize existing requirements and allowable substitution so that workers looking to relocate would know what, if any, additional coursework they would need in a new state.

VII. Missouri: Case Study of a Comprehensive and Seamless Credentialing System

Missouri, while still in its pilot phase, is an example of a state with a comprehensive credentialing system. Missouri offers the Youth Development Credential (YDC) both on-site and online. The YDC has many of the supporting elements of a professional development system in place, including core competencies, a career lattice, a professional achievement and recognition system, a trainer registry, a Quality Rating System, linked licensing regulations, and links to higher education. Missouri’s system is “seamless,” that is, it includes the full spectrum of ages from early childhood through school age and youth. Below we describe the YDC credential and its supporting professional development system.

The Youth Development Credential

The Missouri School Age Community Coalition (MOSAC2) developed the YDC and partnered with the Francis Institute at Metropolitan Community College–Penn Valley to prepare professionals to apply for the credential. The requirements for the YDC echo those of the already established Child Development Associate of the early childhood field. To apply for the YDC credential, an applicant must:

- obtain an advisor to mentor them through the application process
- have 120 clock hours of training (1 college credit is equivalent to 15 clock hours)
- create a professional resource portfolio
- submit an opinion questionnaire completed by parents
- have an assessment observation completed
- have an interview with a representative of MOSAC2.

The Francis Institute Resource Center has been a leader in offering training for the YDC. Through several grants they have been able to provide scholarships for the past 3 years to

put 100 youth workers through the YDC coursework at no cost. This scholarship has contributed to the success of the program.

The classes are offered both on-site and online, allowing the greatest flexibility for professionals in the field. Some support is offered for those taking the online courses, including a local advisor.

Supporting Components of a Professional Development System

Missouri's YDC credential does not stand alone—it is supported by other key components of a professional development system. The OPEN (Opportunities in a Professional Education Network) Initiative is an "umbrella" organization under which many career development efforts occur. Below, the key components of this system are briefly outlined.

Core Competencies

The Kansas and Missouri Core Competencies for Youth Development Professionals describes the knowledge and skills professionals need in order to work with youth and their families. The framework includes eight competency content areas, each of which are divided into five levels that distinguish the expectations for professionals as they progress from untrained to experienced workers. The competency areas include most of the common ground identified by Starr et al. (2009). The competencies serve as the foundation of the professional development system.

Career Lattice

The career lattice, or "Education Matrix" as it is now known, recognizes the formal education and credential levels of professionals in the early childhood and school-age/afterschool fields. The designation is determined by the number of college credits earned and the amount of college coursework that focuses on one or more of the content areas of the core competencies.

Professional Achievement and Recognition System (PARS)

Missouri's Professional Achievement and Recognition System is a database that collects and verifies education and training information for professionals in early childhood, school-age/afterschool, and youth development. The system provides a source of data that helps policy makers evaluate the strengths and needs of the workforce, allows professionals to track their career development efforts via OPEN's website, and recognizes professionals' success.

Trainer Registry

Missouri's Trainer Registry is a database system that collects and verifies education and credentials for professionals who provide training and education to ASYD program staff. The registry is an effort to put quality assurances, such as trainer qualifications, in place to guarantee statewide access to relevant and high-quality educational experiences for program staff.

Quality Rating System

The Missouri Quality Rating System (QRS) is a method to assess and continually improve the quality of early childhood and school-age/afterschool programs. Licensure by the Department of Health and Senior Services Section for Child Care Regulation licensing regulations serves as the foundation of the QRS. The core competencies are in the current proposed revisions to the state's licensing regulations, which will provide another important link to further strengthen Missouri's system.

Links to Higher Education

The state's YDC is housed at a community college. Though the credential itself is not part of a degree program, professionals often decide to further their education and obtain an Associate's or Bachelor's degree after earning the credential. The core competencies are used to develop coursework.

Missouri's credentialing system has shown early signs of success. After three years of piloting, about 80 students have received the YDC. According to key informants, large youth serving agencies are now approaching the college to seek training for their staff. Anecdotal reports of satisfaction from recipients of the credential are positive. The early success of the credentialing system can be attributed to its comprehensive and seamless nature. The state has linked many key elements of their professional development system, thus strengthening it. They have also created a seamless system that includes professionals working with the youngest children to the oldest youths, bringing professionals together to work for the common goal of creating positive outcomes for children.

VIII. Key Issues for Consideration

Based on the investigation conducted for this report and conversations with stakeholders in the ASYD field, the following issues emerge as key issues for consideration as the development of a credential moves forward. These are "lessons learned," and many address some of the barriers to implementing a credentialing system previously discussed.

Build on Existing Models

Key informants unanimously urge that any development of a nationally recognized credential for 21st CCLC programs be built on systems currently in place, finding some way of endorsing existing credentials rather than creating an entirely new one. The professional development module could be a place to review a nationally agreed upon set of core competencies and link to existing modules and training that address them.

Credentials earned in one state could be nationally endorsed and thus be accepted in any other state.

Use the Influence of 21st CCLC Programs

“If 21st CCLC said you have to have staff who are highly qualified and this is what highly qualified is for afterschool, then they would jump right on it.”—Key Informant

While 21st CCLC programs are relative newcomers to the ASYD field, they are one of the more influential systems. Policies and decisions endorsed by 21st CCLC influence funders and can quickly impact the broader ASYD landscape. Some state boards of education have not been interested in credentialing for their 21st CCLC programs, and some teachers and school staff do not see the need or value in a separate ASYD credential. 21st CCLC has the opportunity to define high-quality afterschool staff in alignment with existing core competencies and then require it for their programs.

Ensure Enough Resources before Beginning

One state administrator recalled a fiasco in her state when the CDA requirements were instituted without systemic support to help make it happen. There weren't enough classes available to get everyone the training that was required, there were no scholarships available, and there was no means of accounting for prior experience in the field. The nationally recognized credential should be well thought out and supported with resources and infrastructure before it is publicly required or promoted.

Make It Mandatory to 21st CCLC Programs and Accessible to Everyone

While some feel making a mandatory credential might turn people away from the field, there are examples of people pursuing credentials and certificates now because of the link to higher education and increased professional identity. The general consensus of those interviewed was that without a mandate, people are going to be unwilling or uninterested in earning the credential.

Require Documentation of Competence

Recent research suggesting that “certification of teachers bears little relationship to teacher effectiveness,” as measured by impacts on students’ achievement, seemingly brings into question the effectiveness of certification (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006). This research has shifted the focus nationally from pre-service qualifications to actual job performance, supporting the notion that comprehensive systems that include experience, portfolios, interviews, and observation are much more powerful than a paper and pencil test. The quality of the preparation is critical, not the credential itself.

Most key informants we spoke with felt strongly that a test of knowledge of quality practices is an insufficient measure of a person's abilities. They instead suggested that a nationally recognized credential include some sort of demonstration of skills, through portfolios, observations, or peer and stakeholder assessments. Other suggested methods

for demonstrating skills included essays, electronic portfolios, letters of recommendation, surveys, videotaped observations, online interviews, and oral assessments.

Connect the Credential to Quality Capacity Building (ongoing training, coaching, and mentoring)

In order for staff to become and remain skilled, they need access to a range of existing professional development opportunities (Bowie & Bronte-Tinkew, 2006). Many of the key informants consider a credential to be one of the first formal steps toward acquiring the body of knowledge required in the afterschool field. Most key informants felt that simply taking training or earning a credential would not impact quality practice and that training alone “doesn't stick.”

Credentials in most states are entry- to mid-level in scope, covering a baseline of knowledge on youth development and best practices. Many states offer continued training and support through the use of coaches and mentors who advise program staff and model best practice.

Creating a mentor/advisor component to a credential also serves to create career opportunities. Mentor/student relationships between certified teachers and credentialed ASYD workers might help bridge communication between the two systems and promote cross-pollination of teaching styles and approaches to help make a child's learning day seamless. Face-to-face coaching may be cost prohibitive, so models of online coaching should be researched.

Consider Tiered Credentials and Credit for Experience

Professional development enhances the skills of both new and longtime staff. A tiered credentialing program linked to a career lattice would encourage people to remain in the field and provide incentive through higher paying jobs and careers to pursue further credentialing. A tiered credential could also help address the challenge of requiring certified teachers to pursue additional certifications when they are already required to earn CEUs.

People who have earned degrees or who have been working in the field for some time should have a way to demonstrate their knowledge for an entry-level or early level credential. Missouri includes a test, interviews, and portfolio review to determine a credential without requiring classes. Requiring some level of credential for everyone who works in afterschool sets the work apart from school-day teaching. Building in increasing levels of certification can create incentives for continuing training and recognition. The North American Certification Project (NACP), sponsored by the Association for Child & Youth Care Practice (ACYCP), offers an example of a more advanced credential, at the baccalaureate level or higher. Including such a credential in a national system would extend the career lattice further (Eckles et al., 2009).

While there is limited empirical research on effective ASYD program administration, a study in 2006 on skills needed by program administrators suggests that there are additional skills that directors need that would not be captured in a basic level credential (Collins & Metz, 2009). An advanced or director credential could target skills in working with stakeholders, training and supporting staff, using data to make decisions, and promoting effective organizational culture.

IX. Summary and Next Steps

In response to the growing demands on afterschool programs to extend the learning day for children and to meet the growing public demand for high-quality afterschool experiences, many states have made important strides in developing professional development systems that refine and define the field and support the development of core skills and knowledge while striving to provide viable career paths. Issues like low wages, varied staff experience, and differing professional development goals across program types have created barriers, but states have been able to move forward with certificate programs, credentials, training, and career paths that have brought heightened visibility, increased awareness, and new relationships to the field (Starr, Gannett, & Garza, 2008).

Based on the information reviewed in this report and key informant interviews, we suggest the following next steps in addressing the issue of a nationally recognized credential:

1. Convene a group of stakeholders to help shape the efforts and get buy-in

Unite stakeholders at local, state, and national levels to advise and respond to the proposed plan to align the professional development modules with a nationally recognized 21st CCLC credential.

2. Come to consensus on a national set of competencies and modules

With stakeholders, determine a national set of standards for ASYD workers, based on existing models, and identify available training delivery methods to meet them.

3. Determine who will need the credential and if it will be mandatory

Recognize that participants come with diverse sets of skills and experiences. This diversity can be seen as adding value to the field, and should be considered when considering the multiple pathways toward earning a credential.

4. Research existing alternative methods of demonstrating competence

Look to the Missouri model for online training, testing, and portfolio assessments. Consider what can be learned from the early childhood and education fields.

5. Explore existing funding models to support incentives

Recognize the power and limitations of government involvement and also look to the private sector to participate (Dennehy et al., 2006).

6. Explore how to leverage public policies and/or mandates for earning of credential (licensing, exemptions, DOE, etc.)

Look to the No Child Left Behind Act, Washington STARS, and other states for information on getting legislation to support professional development.

7. Pilot a credential in a subset of interested states

Identify interested states that have an existing infrastructure to test the viability of a nationally recognized credential. Learn as much as possible before recommending the credential goes to scale.

8. Track and document the impact of credentialing on quality programming

Build in a means of researching and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of credentials. Program directors want to know credentialing makes a difference before they support it.

References

- Bowie, L., & Bronte-Tinkew, J. (2006). The importance of professional development for youth workers (*Research to Results*, December). Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Campbell, N., Appelbaum, J., Martinson, K., & Martin, E. (2000). *Be all that we can be: Lessons from the military for improving our nation's child care system*. Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center.
- Collins, A., & Metz, A.J.R. (2009). How program administrators can support out-of-school time staff (*Research to Results*, June). Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Council for Professional Recognition (2009). *History of CDA*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdacouncil.org>
- Deen, M.K., & Bailey, S.J. (2004). *4-H Youth development apprenticeship final evaluation report*. Bozeman, MT: Montana State University Department of Health and Human Development.
- Dennehy, J., Gannett, E., & Robbins, R. (2006). *Setting the stage for a youth development associate credential: A national review of professional development credentials for the out-of-school time workforce*. Wellesley, MA: National Institute on Out-of-School Time.
- Dennehy, J., & Noam, G. (2005). *Evidence for action: Strengthening after-school programs for all children and youth: The Massachusetts out-of-school time workforce*. Boston, MA: Achieve Boston.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning.
- Eckles, F., Carpenter-Williams, J., Curry, D., Mattingly, M., Rybicki, M., Stuart, C., et al. (2009). Final phases in the development and implementation of the North American Certification Project (NACP). *Journal of Child and Youth Care Work*, 22, 120-151.
- The Finance Project, Afterschool Investments Project. (2007). *Using a state child care quality rating system to promote quality in afterschool programs*. Washington, DC: Author.
- The Florida Afterschool Network (2009). *A statewide model for professionalizing the afterschool workforce in Florida*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

- Intercultural Center for Research in Education and National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2005). *Pathways to success for youth: What counts in afterschool*. Boston, MA: United Way of Massachusetts Bay.
- Kane, T.J., Rockoff, J.E., & Staiger, D.O. (2006). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City. Working Paper 12155. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Metz, A.J.R., Bandy, T., & Burkhauser, M. (2009). Staff selection: What's important for out-of-school time programs? (*Research to Results*, February). Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- National Afterschool Association (2006). *Understanding the afterschool workforce: Opportunities and challenges for an emerging profession* (commissioned by Cornerstones for Kids). Washington, DC: Author.
- National Institute on Out-of-School Time & AED Center for Youth Development and Policy Research (2003). *Strategic plan: Building a skilled and stable out-of-school time workforce*. Wellesley, MA: Author.
- National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2006). *Youth worker and SAC credentials matrix*. Wellesley, MA: Author.
- School's Out Washington. (April, 2008). *A well-prepared workforce brings out the best in our kids: A framework for professional development for the afterschool and youth development workforce by Washington State*. Seattle, WA: Author.
- Starr, E., Gannett, E., & Garza, P. (2008). *Clear policies for career pathways: Lessons learned*. Washington, DC: The Next Generation Youth Work Coalition.
- Starr, E., Yohalem, N. & Gannett, E. (2009). *Youth work core competencies: A review of existing frameworks* (commissioned by School's Out Washington). Seattle, WA: Next Generation Youth Work Coalition.
- Stone, B., Garza, P., & Border, L. (2004). Attracting, developing and retaining youth workers for the next generation. *Proceedings from the Wingspread Conference*. Washington, DC: National Collaboration for Youth/National Assembly.
- Yohalem, N., & Pitman, K. (2006). *Putting youth work on the map: Key findings and implications from two major workforce studies*. Washington, DC: Forum for Youth Investment.

Appendix A: Key Informants

The following informants are from the Career Pathways group, a network created to identify and build upon efforts underway around the country to establish comprehensive workforce development systems for the youth work field. These experts are among those who have been working together on professional development issues for the past three years:

Deborah Craig, *Forum for Youth Investment*
 Terri Foulkes, *OPEN Initiative, Missouri*
 Cece Gran, *University of Minnesota, Youth Work Institute*
 Jackie Hyllseth, *School's Out Washington*
 Shevaun Keough-Walker, *Rhode Island After School Plus Alliance*
 Ruth Matthews, *Vermont Agency of Human Services, Child Development Division*
 Emil Morales, *Illinois Network of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies*
 Mari Offenbecher, *School's Out Washington*
 Leslie Roesler, *Pennsylvania Key*
 Vicki Stein, *Metropolitan Community College, Francis Institute, Missouri*
 Kristen Urso, *Pennsylvania Statewide Afterschool Youth Development Network*
 Nicole Yohalem, *Forum for Youth Investment*

This paper also draws on interviews Ellen Gannett conducted with the following experts in the field:

Jackie Ascrizzi, *21st CCLC Coordinator, Rhode Island Department of Education*
 Suzanne Birdsall, *21st CCLC Coordinator, New Hampshire Department of Education*
 Karyl Resnick, *21st CCLC Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*
 Lauren Sterling, *21st CCLC Coordinator, Maine Department of Education*
 Lorraine Thoreson, *21st CCLC Coordinator, Michigan Department of Education*

Ken Anthony, *Connecticut Afterschool Network*
 Lori Connors-Tadros, *The Finance Project's Afterschool Investment Project*
 Michelle Cunningham, *Connecticut Afterschool Network*
 Jenifer Gager, *The Finance Project's Afterschool Investment Project*
 Shawn Stelow, *The Finance Project's Afterschool Investment Project*

Appendix B: List of Core Competency Frameworks Included in Analysis

- Indiana Youth Development Credential Core Competencies (IYD)
- Achieve Boston Competency Framework (Boston)
- Kansas/Missouri Core Competencies for Youth Development Professionals (KS/MO)
- New York City Department of Youth and Community Development (NYC)
- Colorado School Age/Youth Development Core Knowledge & Standards (CO)
- Palm Beach County Core Competencies for After School Practitioners (Palm Beach)
- Rhode Island Core Competencies for Afterschool and Youth Development Professionals, 2009 Draft (RI)
- North American Certification Project Competencies for Professional Child and Youth Work Practitioners (NACP)
- Mott Foundation Core Competencies for Afterschool Educators (Mott)
- National Collaboration for Youth Professional Development Competencies (NCY)
- 4-H Professional Research and Knowledge Base (4-H)
- Military School-Age Assessment System and Competency Standards (Military)
- Washington STARS (WA STARS)
- Washington School-Age Skill Standards (WA Skill Standards)

**Appendix C: Review of Core Competency Frameworks
(Starr, Yohalem, & Gannett, 2009)**

This chart lists the competency areas identified in 2 or more of the 14 frameworks reviewed. The frequency with which each competency area appears and the relevant frameworks are indicated. This will allow interested readers to compare how different organizations define specific competencies. Note that the outliers, competency areas that appeared in individual frameworks only, are listed following the chart.

Competency Area	Frequency	Frameworks
Curriculum	14 of 14	CO, Palm Beach, IYD, Boston, KS/MO, NYC, RI, WA STARS, WA Skill Standards, NACP, NCY, MOTT, Military, 4-H
Professionalism	14 of 14	CO, IYD, Boston, NYC, WA STARS, WA Skill Standards, NACP, NCY, Mott, Military, 4-H, KS/MO, RI, Palm Beach
Connecting with Families	12 of 14	CO, Palm Beach, IYD, Boston, KS/MO, RI, WA STARS, WA Skill Standards, NCY, Mott, Military, NACP
Health, Safety, and Nutrition	12 of 14	CO, Palm Beach, Boston, KS/MO, NYC, RI, WA STARS, WA Skill Standards, Military, IYD, NACP, Mott
Child and Adolescent Development	12 of 14	CO, Palm Beach, IYD, Boston, KS/MO, RI, NYC, WA STARS, NACP, NCY, 4-H
Cross-Cultural Competence	11 of 14	CO, Boston, NYC, WA STARS, NACP, NCY, 4-H, Palm Beach, IYD, RI, Mott
Guidance	10 of 14	CO, Boston, NYC, WA STARS, NCY, Military, Palm Beach, IYD, KS/MO, NACP
Professional Development	10 of 14	Palm Beach, Boston, KS/MO, RI, WA Skill Standards, Mott, CO, IYD, NYC, NACP
Program Management	9 of 14	CO, Palm Beach, Boston, KS/MO, RI, WA STAR, WA Skill Standards, Military, 4-H
Connecting with Communities	8 of 14	CO, Palm Beach, IYD, KS/MO, RI, NCY, WA Skills, 4-H

Environment	8 of 14	Palm Beach, IYD, Boston, KS/MO, Military, WA STARS, CO, NACP
Child and Youth Assessment	6 of 14	Palm Beach, KS/MO, WA STARS, IYD, NYC, NACP
Communication with Youth	5 of 14	Palm Beach, Boston, KS/MO, WA STARS, NACP
Youth Empowerment	4 of 14	NYC, NCY, 4-H, Mott
Connecting with Schools	2 of 14	RI, Boston

Thirteen other competency areas were outliers, or appeared in individual frameworks only. These unique content areas could be enfolded in the primary content areas or could be offered as additionally recognized areas of expertise. They are likely the result of the diversity of disciplines that make up the field, and further work could be done to determine common language that would adequately capture the skills identified.

- Mental Health
- Workers as Community Resources
- Building Leadership and Advocacy
- Risk Management
- Volunteerism
- Organizational Alliances
- Organizational Effectiveness
- Personal Effectiveness
- Communication Strategies
- Preventing/Reporting Child Abuse and Neglect
- Situation Analysis
- Support Each Child
- Ability to Work Well with Diverse Children & Youth

Appendix D: Highlights of Key Work in States

In the following section we provide a brief overview of some of the key work in the areas of professional development, training, certification, and credentialing being done in several states. This list is not exhaustive but is intended to highlight important work being done. Each description is followed by a “key finding” or lesson that can be learned from that state experience.

Arkansas: Arkansas State University Childhood Services offers a Childcare Specialist Certificate and plans to make its school-age specialist training modules available online. The state also maintains a training registry system that is a part of the Early Childhood Training Registry System. The University is conducting an interest survey about a School-Age Credential. *Feasibility of online coursework; Training registry; Information about potential audiences for a credential*

California: The California School-Age Consortium (CalSAC) manages the School-Age Provider Professional Development Project to implement agency-wide professional development training plans and offers training opportunities through a training resource guide. Staff members who complete their professional development plans and stay in their jobs for the entire school year may receive up to \$1,000 in stipends. Project managers are also eligible for these staff stipends, in addition to receiving \$1,500 for fulfilling project manager duties. *Incentives for training and turn-over reduction; Tailored comprehensive professional development plans; Aligning existing experience to training opportunities*

Colorado: The Colorado Office of Professional Development awards the School-Age and Youth Credential, and has developed a school-age/youth development career lattice that is built on the state’s early childhood credentialing system. The Core Knowledge and Standards apply to those who work with children and youth ages 5–18, and the credential is inclusive of alternative ways of meeting educational requirements. The Colorado Office of Professional Development is housed at the Community College of Denver, providing opportunities to link to higher education. *Building from an early childhood system; Including the full spectrum of ages; Connections to higher education systems*

Connecticut: Offers the Connecticut Credential in After School Education Child Development Associate. This credential was created via a partnership among Charter Oak State College, the Connecticut School-Age Care Alliance, the Connecticut After School Network, and Connecticut Charts-a-Course. All of the required coursework is offered through the distance learning program at Charter Oak State College. Connecticut Charts-a-Course, the statewide professional development system, has provided scholarships for the credential program. *Online learning; Effective partnerships with stakeholders; Funding and scholarships*

Florida: The Florida School-Age Professional Certificate Program is a voluntary two-level, non-credit certification funded by the Florida Department of Children and Families. Prime Time, a non-profit organization devoted to quality afterschool programs, partnered with Palm Beach Community College in 2006 to establish an articulated pathway toward certification and degrees for the afterschool workforce. They have recently established a Youth Development College Credit Certificate, an A.S. degree in human services with a specialty in youth development, and a B.A.S. degree in human services with a specialty in youth development. Palm Beach County has devoted county funds to help workers pay for community college courses in school-age care, and is currently piloting the TEACH model with youth workers. *Tiered credential; Municipal funding for coursework; County mandates for training; Funding and scholarships*

Georgia: The Georgia Afterschool Investment Council (GAIC) conducted a multi-level stakeholder assessment with their network partners (including afterschool providers, afterschool and youth development organizations, and public agencies that fund professional development for child care providers) to determine the professional development system that would best serve the needs of its stakeholders. *Processes for engaging stakeholder networks; Building from existing systems*

Illinois: Stakeholders from around the state gathered in October 2006 for a School-Age Credential Symposium to examine the supports needed for a credential. The Illinois School-Age & Youth (I-SAY) Committee was formed to work directly on these issues. This year, I-SAY has been primarily focused on the development of school-age and youth core competencies and aligning these competencies with Gateways to Opportunity, the existing professional development system for early childhood in Illinois. They are also planning to pilot a level 1 credential in the near future, and will be developing and piloting additional levels. *Processes for engaging stakeholder networks*

Indiana: The Indiana Youth Development Associate (IYDA) targets low-paid staff and directors without college degrees or without degrees in the ASYD field. It is funded and administered by a grant through the Indiana Child Care Fund. *Funding training for entry-level workers*

Kansas: Worked with Missouri to develop bi-state core competencies and is considering adopting Missouri's Youth Development Credential. *Cross-state articulation of competencies and credentials*

Maine: "Maine Roads to Quality," the state's professional development system for early childhood education and school age care is housed at the University of Maine Muskie Institute. Maine Roads to Quality is in the process of developing a Youth Development/School Age Credential that would be aligned with their current early childhood credential, as well as their Quality Rating System standards. *Links to higher education; Building from an early childhood system*

Massachusetts: Achieve Boston recently developed a School-Age and Youth Development (SAYD) credential. The credential is modeled after the Indiana Youth Development Credential and requires a mix of college-level coursework and training, as well as experience working with children and youth. Participants gain college credits and earn a \$2,000 bonus for completing the community-based training program. *Aligning formal and non-formal training; Incentives; Diverse funding streams*

Michigan: The Michigan School-Age/Youth Development Credential Assessment System is administered by the Michigan 4C Association and funded by the Michigan Department of Human Services and Michigan 4C Association. They offer both a certificate and a credential. *Diverse funding streams; Tiered credential*

Minnesota: Offers the School-Age Care Certificate which is run by Concordia University. Youth Work Institute, at the University of Minnesota, offers degrees in youth development. *Links to higher education*

Missouri: The Youth Development Credential is a state-wide credential, developed by the Missouri School-Age Community Coalition. Coursework is offered at Metropolitan Community College–Penn Valley in Kansas City and St. Louis Community College. Missouri also offers the Youth Development Worker Certificate through the Kansas City B.E.S.T. initiative. It is a 12-credit hour certificate awarded by the Human Services department of the Metropolitan Community Colleges. *Cross-state articulation of competencies and credentials*

New Hampshire: New Hampshire is working with the Finance Project's Afterschool Investment Project to develop state-level core competencies and a credential model building from the Mott Core Competencies. *Building from an established model*

New York: The New York State School-Age Credential is administered and funded by the NYS Office of Children and Family Services, New York State School-Age Care Coalition, and Cornell University Early Childhood Program. It includes opportunities for blending community-based training with independent study. The Center for After School Excellence, an initiative of the After School Corporation, is developing credit-bearing college programs for frontline youth workers and providing scholarships, educational supports, and career-advancement opportunities to participating students. *Variety of training methods; collaborative administration*

North Carolina: The North Carolina School-Age Credential is issued by the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services upon completion of 5 credit hours from a community college. In addition to the certificate, North Carolina started the School-Age Enhancement Project in 2004 to improve the quality and availability of training for afterschool programs throughout the state. One of the goals of the project is to make sure trainings are available in all 100 of the state's counties. *Monitoring the*

quality of training provided; Access and outreach; Partnering with schools to develop training

Ohio: Ohio has developed an online professional development registry that catalogs, tracks, and registers training. *Training registry*

Pennsylvania: Keys to Professional Development is a statewide system for professional development that builds off Keystone Stars, Pennsylvania's quality improvement system. The state is piloting the TEACH model with afterschool and youth development workers. *Linking credentialing to quality assurance; Building an infrastructure*

Vermont: A committee of afterschool stakeholders developed a set of core competencies that was used to design an online, three-credit, entry-level course for afterschool providers through Community Colleges of Vermont. Vermont has been moving forward on multiple fronts to define a common set of competencies for youth workers and to develop a professional credential that is accepted by the state's various child development and youth worker stakeholders. The state is also succeeding in leveraging several existing compensation-based retention incentives for early childhood and other youth services to incorporate the after-school workforce. *Building strategic partnerships; Links to higher education; Core competencies*

Washington: The State Training and Registry System (STARS) is a career development system for the early care, education, and afterschool fields that was established through statewide legislation. Components of Washington STARS include an online registry of trainings, scholarships for training participants, and a trainer approval system. Led by School's Out Washington, a statewide intermediary organization, the state is currently working on improving the professional development system by focusing first on core competencies and the issue of the identity of the field. *Leveraging state legislation; Advocacy efforts to support career development*

Wisconsin: The Wisconsin School-Age Credential, administered by the Wisconsin After-School Association, includes a self-assessment and review by a local assessment team. *Documentation of competency*

In addition to the state models, one national model deserves mention because of its online capacity:

North American Certification Project (NACP): Sponsored by the Association for Child & Youth Care Practice (ACYCP), the North American Certification Project (NACP) is a pilot program that defines a full range of skills and knowledge needed across a variety of child and youth care environments (including early care and education, community-based child and youth development programs, parent education and family support, school-based programs, community mental health, group homes, residential centers, day and

residential treatment, early intervention, home-based care and treatment, psychiatric centers, rehabilitation programs, pediatric health care, and juvenile justice programs).

Over a seven-year process, the project engaged more than 100 practitioners, administrators, and educators nationwide in defining the field of practice, identifying a common set of competencies, and creating an online assessment method. The online assessment method includes a scenario-based exam, supervisor assessments, and an electronic portfolio coupled with submission of education/experience, references, and documentation of specific training in required competency domains (Eckles et al., 2009).

Online assessment

Appendix E: Comparison of ASYD Credentialing Systems*

*This is an updated analysis based on work done by the National Institute on Out-of-School Time (National Institute on Out-of-School-Time, 2006).

CCASE-CDA – Connecticut Credential in After School Education- Child Development Associate

CSAYDC – Colorado School Age/Youth Development Credential

FSAC – Florida School Age Credential

IYDA – Indiana Youth Development Associate

MSACAS – Michigan School-Age Credential Assessment System

MnSAC – Minnesota School-Age Care Certificate (run by Concordia University)

MYDC – Missouri Youth Development Credential (Pilot Phase)

NCSAC – North Carolina School Age Credential

NYSSAC – New York State School-Age Credential

SAYD – Achieve Boston School-Age and Youth Development Credential (Pilot Phase)

WSAC – Wisconsin School Age Credential

CRITERIA	CREDENTIALING SYSTEM										
	CCASE-CDA	C SAYDC	F SAC	I YDA	M SACAS	Mn SAC	M YDC	NC SAC	NYS SAC	SAYD	W SAC
Training Requirements											
College courses required	CCASE-CDA	CSAYDC		IYDA	M SACAS	Mn SAC		NC SAC		SAYD	
Non-credit training		CSAYDC	FSAC	IYDA	M SACAS	Mn SAC	MYDC		NYS SAC	SAYD	WSAC

Combined college / workshops etc.				IYDA			M YDC				
Hours worked in a program	CCASE-CDA	CSAYDC	FSAC	IYDA	M				NYS		WSAC

	CDA (120+)	(480 +)	(480+)	480+)	SACAS (480+ in 5 yrs.)				SAC (480+in 3 yrs.)		(480+ in 5 yrs)
Documentation / Demonstration required for proof of competency											
Portfolios			FSAC	IYDA	M SACAS	Mn SAC	M YDC		NYS SAC	SAYD	WSAC
Self Assessment									NYS SAC	SAYD	
Outside Assessment / interviews/ observations		CSAYDC	FSAC	IYDA	M SACAS	Mn SAC	MYDC		NYS SAC	SAYD	WSAC
Membership in a professional organization				IYDA							
Resource files	CCASE- CDA	CSAYDC	FSAC	IYDA	M SACAS	Mn SAC	M YDC		NYS SAC	SAYD	WSAC
Competency Test			FSAC								
Recognizes other certifications		CSAYDC (Montessori Certificate for Elem Ed. or U.S. Army School Age Credential)									
Re-Credentialing required		CSAYDC	FSAC	IYDA					NYS SAC		
Multi-leveled/ Tiered Certification		CSAYDC	FSAC								

Funding Issues

Application fees / tuition	CCASE- CDA		Recently waived			Mn SAC	M YDC	NC SAC	NYS SAC		
Subsidized				I YDA	M SACAS				NYS SAC		WSA C

				(TEACH)							
Funding sources											
State Childcare grants				IYDA							
ASYD Care Organizations					M SACAS				NYS SAC		
State Child and Family Services Depts.		CSAYDC	FSAC		M SACAS		M YDC		NYS SAC		
Universities							M YDC		NYS SAC		
Private							M YDC				
Administration											
Grant				IYDA							
College/University	CCASE- CDA	CSAYDC				Mn SAC			NYS SAC		
ASYD Organization	CCASE- CDA		FSAC		M SACAS		M YDC		NYS SAC	SAYD	WSA C
State Municipality or initiative (Human Services etc.)	CCASE- CDA	CSAYDC	FSAC					NC SAC	NYS SAC		