Objective 2: Easy-to-navigate trainer application and training processes

Outcome 1: All trainer applicants will be able to understand and navigate the trainer application.

Measurable Action Steps *So and so does such and such*	Theories of Action *If we do …, then we expect we would see…*	Critical Issues & Design Challenges *A known challenge preventing success* *A reason we know we can do better*	What Better Looks Like *or where we agree we are going together*
1. Revise the trainer application so that applicants have access to an overview and instructions prior to beginning the application.	If we provide an overview of the application's different sections, clear step-by-step instructions for each section as well as all supporting resources at the beginning of the application and when they are relevant again in the application, then we expect to see less confusion with navigating the application.	Applicants do not know about the education verification requirement; this process takes a long time to complete.	All trainer applicants will be able to understand and navigate the trainer application.
		Applicants do not receive clear, step-by-step instructions and do not have understanding of the expectations for the training application.	
		Applicants do not understand the training demonstration process, how long they need to present for, the format of the observation.	
		Applicants have a difficult time completing the competencies demonstration section; information is often incorrectly completed.	
		Applicants do not understand the professional development system and are not able to connect their learning objectives to the Core Competencies and other framework documents.	
2. IT developers will address navigation changes to the application.	If these changes are made in MERIT, applicants will not lose the information in their incomplete application, will be able to navigate between the pages and select items	Application times out and does not have a save function.	
		Applicants are not able to move between the application pages.	

Updated 10/14/2020

		that fit their available time, and will know what sections are necessary to complete.	Applicants do not have access to trainer modules and they do not know that they can skip them.	
3.	Develop a trainer application rubric and train staff on using it to process applications.	If a trainer application rubric is developed for all aspects of the application and shared with applicants, they will understand how they can earn points toward their application.	Lack of clarify about how different aspects of the application are counted toward the Core Competency and level assignment.	
4.	Train and assign a single point-of-contact to application-related inquiries.	If a single point-of-contact is trained and assigned to addressing inquiries regarding applications, applicants will receive timely and informed responses.	Applicants reach out to training inbox with application-related inquiries and receive a delayed or inaccurate response.	
5.	Revise the application and translate the materials into Spanish, Somali and provide interpretation service for other languages.	If we provide translation and/or interpretation support for trainer applicants, they will be more likely to understand and complete the application. This will help increase the language diversity of trainer workforce	Application is not available in other languages. The application and supporting resources are difficult to understand by applicants with limited English proficiency.	
6.	Create and consistently implement process for sharing feedback on rejected applications.	If applicants receive detailed, accurate information about why their application was rejected, they will be better prepared to resubmit their application. This will reduce barriers of entry.	Applicants do not receive detailed feedback on rejected applications and do not understand why they did not meet the standards.	

Outcome 2: State-approved trainers participate in a program that has consistent processes and procedures and expectations for all trainers.

Measurable Action Steps *So and so does such and such*	Theories of Action *If we do …, then we expect we would see…*	Critical Issues & Design Challenges *A known challenge preventing success* *A reason we know we can do better*	What Better Looks Like *or where we agree we are going together*

1. IT developers will make adjustments in training template in MERIT.	If we update the training template in MERIT, then we can expect less confusion from the field and more accurate date on training availability.	Training template delivery mode options do not match the delivery modes that are in the Standards of Practice and Professionalism	State-approved trainers participate in a program that has consistent processes and procedures and expectations for all trainers.
		Training template fields are outdated (e.g. school readiness statement) and do not collect most relevant information (e.g. alignment with trainer standards).	
2. Create an option to re-evaluate assigned competencies and levels in MERIT.	If it is easier to re-evaluate assigned competencies and levels, then trainers and staff will use less time processing new application.	State-approved trainers who complete additional education and/or training are not able to have their core competency and level assignments re-evaluated without submitting a new application.	
3. Create an option for entering trainings consisting of more than once instance in MERIT.	If trainers are able to enter series trainings in MERIT, they will be able to save data entry time and DCYF will be able to collect more accurate date on instances of available trainings.	Trainers are not able to enter trainings in MERIT that are part of a series of workshops.	
4. Create an option for reusing training templates for trainers.	If trainers are able to reuse training templates that they have previously created, they will save data entry time.	Trainers are not able to reuse templates from trainings that they have previously entered into MERIT.	

Outcome 3: State-approved Training Program is able to regulate approval of training organizations and the curricula they offer.

Measurable Action Steps *So and so does such and such*	**Theories of Action** *If we do …, then we expect we would see…*	**Critical Issues & Design Challenges** *A known challenge preventing success* *A reason we know we can do better*	**What Better Looks Like** *or where we agree we are going together*
1. Develop a training organization approval process.	If there is a training organization approval process, training organizations will be held to the training policies as well as the	Quality assurance observation feedback for online training is provided to the state-approved trainer on record. The trainer often	State-approved Training Program is able to regulate approval of training

		standards of practice and professionalism for training.	has limited ability to make changes to the training content because it is owned by the training organization. We provide quality assurance to the trainer not the organization.	organizations and the curricula they offer.
			Training organizations have reported not receiving or understanding state-approved training program and policies. Communications often go only to the trainer on record; the communication is not shared with administrators.	
2.	Conduct a quality assurance process to determine if trainers are accurately classifying trainings.	If we review the online trainings currently listed in MERIT and identify them as self-paced/ correspondence.	Online training curricula does not meet requirements for online training	
3.	Develop process for assessing quality of training curricula.	If we establish a process for approval of training organizations that includes training curricula review, we will have processes in place to regulate and provide quality assurance on the content.	There is no established process for assessing the quality of curricula.	