

2011 - 2012 Great Start Readiness Program

Program Quality Assessment

Statewide Data Report

**Prepared by
HighScope Educational Research Foundation**

**September 2012
Updated January 2013**

**Submitted to
Lindy Buch, Ph.D.
Michigan Department of Education**

Introduction

The following report summarizes Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) classroom quality data collected during the 2011 - 2012 program year. This data, for the first time, was reported and scored using HighScope's OnlinePQA¹ system. The scores on Form A are based on outside observers (e.g., education specialists), and Form B on administrator reports. The information for Form A and Form B includes end of year data only. Scores on the preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA)² range from 1 to 5, with 1 representing low quality and 5 representing exceptional quality. A useful way to interpret the PQA is that scores less than 3 indicate low quality, scores between 3 and 4.49 indicate medium quality, and scores at or above 4.5 indicate high quality. The outside observers were required to attend a four-week online preschool PQA training course and pass a reliability assessment with a score of 80 percent or higher in each of ten sections and an overall reliability score of 80 percent or higher prior to observing in GSRP classrooms.

Mean scores for the 2010-11 program years shown in Table 1 indicate that GSRP grantees considered themselves to be on average implementing high-quality programs in some areas and closely approaching high quality in all others. Mean scores for the 2011-12 program year period, using data collected by outside observers, on average show that one area of implementation meets the high-quality standard and all other areas, on average, are above a score of 4. Additionally, there are notable changes between the two time periods and different types of raters; for example, a 5.40 percent decrease in scores overall for staff qualifications and development and a 4.35 percent decrease in the average score in the area of adult-child interaction. However, there is almost no change for curriculum planning and assessment, and parent involvement and family services. Some caution should be used when reviewing the data and interpreting the changes between the two time periods and rater types. The number of classrooms (N =777) for the 2011-12 transition year is much lower than in the previous year (N=1107) and therefore, may not fully demonstrate overall program scores because of incomplete data. Also data for the 2010-2011 school year was reported at mid-year whereas the 2011-12 data is end of year data which may be contributing to scoring changes.

¹ HighScope Educational Research Foundation & Red-e Set Grow. (2012). *OnlinePQA* [Computerized assessment system]. Online at <http://www.onlinepqa.net>.

² HighScope Educational Research Foundation. (2003). *Preschool Program Quality Assessment 2nd edition*. Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press.

In PQA reports for previous years, data has been further analyzed by splitting it by program option (e.g., full-day, part-day, alternate day) and grantee type (e.g., formula and competitive). This data was not available in the OnlinePQA system, therefore subsequent PQA data in this report will not be divided by program option or grantee type.

Table 1: PQA Mean Scores and Change 2010-11 vs. 2011-12

PQA Scale	10-11	11-12	Change	% Change
	Mean Score	Mean Score		
<u>Classroom level (Form A)</u>	<i>N=1107</i>	<i>N=777</i>		
Total Score for Form A	4.28	4.12	-0.16	-3.74
I. Learning Environment	4.18	4.01	-0.17	-4.07
II. Daily Routine	4.24	4.06	-0.18	-4.25
III. Adult-Child Interaction	4.37	4.18	-0.19	-4.35
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment	4.38	4.35	-0.03	-0.07
<u>Center level (Form B)</u>	<i>N=421</i>	<i>N=319</i>		
Total Score for Form B	4.47	4.37		
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services	4.54	4.53	-0.01	-0.02
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development	4.26	4.03	-0.23	-5.40
VII. Program Management	4.57	4.46	-0.11	-2.41

Table 2 shows the percentage of classrooms at various quality levels for the PQA scale. Approximately 65 percent of the classrooms overall on Form A score within the good or excellent range (a score of 4 or higher) and for Form B, more than 80 percent score within the good or excellent range. However, on Form A, 6.3 percent of classrooms fall within the unacceptable level on the daily routine section and on Form B, 5 percent fall within the unacceptable level for staff qualifications and development.

Table 2: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Scale

PQA Scale	Level of Quality (%)			
	Unacceptable Mean < 3.00	Acceptable Mean 3.00-3.99	Good Mean 4.00-4.49	Excellent Mean ≥ 4.50
Classroom level (Form A)				
Total Score for Form A	2.8	32.6	35.9	28.7
I. Learning Environment	4.9	38.3	33.2	23.5
II. Daily Routine	6.3	31.6	30.9	31.2
III. Adult-Child Interaction	4.9	27.6	26.3	41.3
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment	3.2	14.6	33.1	49.2
Center level (Form B)				
Total Score for Form B	0.3	17.6	34.2	48.0
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services	0.3	9.6	24.2	65.8
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development	5.0	31.8	41.1	22.1
VII. Program Management	0.3	11.0	34.8	53.9

Areas In Need of Improvement

Table 3 provides information at the item level at three different thresholds that can be used to identify areas in need of improvement. The first, is the percentage of classrooms at the unacceptable level of quality (scores of 1 or 2) for a particular item. The second, the percentage of classrooms scoring at an acceptable level of quality (score of 3) and the third threshold is classrooms scoring at a good level of quality (scores of 4 or 5). The bolded areas show percentages 10 percent or greater at the unacceptable level. At the acceptable level percentages of 25 percent or greater have been bolded.

Table 3: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Item

PQA Item	Level of Quality (%)		
	Unacceptable Level 1 & 2	Acceptable Level 3	Good Level 4 & 5
I. Learning Environment			
A. Safe and healthy environment	5.7	8.2	86.1
B. Defined interest areas	4.5	21.8	73.7
C. Logically located interest areas	3.5	21.4	75.1
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	5.4	6.7	87.9
E. Organization and labeling of materials	6.9	37.2	55.9
F. Varied and open-ended materials	8.1	23.9	68.0
G. Plentiful materials	1.9	14.6	83.5
H. Diversity-related materials	10.8	49.2	40.0
I. Displays of child initiated work	13.9	38.2	47.9
II. Daily Routine			
A. Consistent daily routine	2.7	13.0	84.3
B. Parts of the day	2.3	11.8	85.9
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	2.3	15.1	82.6
D. Time for child planning	12.4	38.7	48.9
E. Time for child-initiated activities	1.4	15.8	82.8
F. Time for child recall	16.7	34.7	48.6
G. Small-group time	28.9	5.6	65.5
H. Large-group time	11.1	21.4	67.5
I. Choices during transition times	15.9	29.5	54.6
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	2.9	10.2	86.8
K. Snack or meal time	15.2	10.0	74.8
L. Outside time	11.7	15.6	72.6
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs	3.7	3.2	93.1
B. Handling separation from home	0.7	13.2	86.1
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	2.2	5.6	92.2
D. Support for child communication	3.7	24.7	71.5
E. Support for non-English speakers	3.5	21.4	75.1
F. Adults as partners in play	4.9	30.3	64.8
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	2.1	21.1	76.8
H. Support for child learning at group times	9.5	26.8	63.7
I. Opportunities for child exploration	5.5	32.3	62.2
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	13.3	32.3	54.4
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	2.3	20.9	76.8
L. Independent problem solving	1.4	16.2	82.4
M. Conflict resolution	10.1	36.8	53.1

Table 3: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Item (continued)

PQA Item	Unacceptable Level 1 & 2	Acceptable Level 3	Good Level 4 & 5
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment			
A. Curriculum model	9.4	8.7	81.9
B. Team teaching	13.8	28.0	58.2
C. Comprehensive child records	0.1	2.3	97.6
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	10.2	16.0	73.8
E. Use of child observation measure	3.1	1.0	95.9
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement	0.0	9.3	90.7
B. Parents on policy-making committees	24.5	27.6	47.9
C. Parent participation in child activities	0.3	2.8	96.9
D. Sharing of curriculum information	3.4	13.5	83.1
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	0.0	1.5	98.5
F. Extending learning at home	0.6	17.0	82.4
G. Formal meetings with parents	1.9	0.0	98.1
H. Diagnostic/special education services	0.0	2.8	97.2
I. Service referrals as needed	4.7	21.5	73.8
J. Transition to kindergarten	2.2	8.4	89.4
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	20.3	8.0	71.7
B. Instructional staff background	12.7	7.7	79.6
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	2.2	4.7	93.1
D. Ongoing professional development	6.5	8.7	84.8
E. In-service training content and methods	13.4	20.5	66.1
F. Observation and feedback	7.8	15.2	77.0
G. Professional organization affiliation	33.6	36.1	30.2
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed	0.6	0.0	99.4
B. Continuity in instructional staff	9.3	0.3	90.3
C. Program assessment	1.9	16.4	81.8
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	7.5	13.8	78.6
E. Operating policies and procedures	10.2	0.0	89.8
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	3.8	7.5	88.7
G. Adequacy of program funding	6.9	29.2	63.8

Characteristics of GSRP Teaching Staff

In addition to PQA scores from the OnlinePQA system, information on the characteristics of GSRP programs and teaching staff was available from the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS). The remaining tables in this report provide descriptive statistics on a range of information gathered from MEGS. Tables 4 and 5 provide credentialing status, qualification information, and highest level of education for teaching staff. For credentialing status, in Table 4 the categories are mutually exclusive and a majority of center-based and sub-contracted lead and associate teachers met the credentialing criteria within their program type. Overall 83.5 percent of lead teachers met their credential requirement and 89.5 percent of associate teachers met their credential requirement. For those that did not meet the requirements, approximately 20 percent of lead teachers and 100 percent of associate teacher have a compliance plan in place.

In previous PQA reports, teacher experience has also been reported. However, there were no values for this variable in the MEGS and thus nothing to report regarding teacher experience.

Table 4: Teacher Credential Status

Type of Teachers	Total N	Met Requirement		Credential Requirement
		N	%	
Lead Teacher	1173	979	83.5	
Teacher in center-based program	1046	876	83.7	Teaching certificate + ZA endorsement
Teacher in sub-contracted program	127	103	81.1	Teaching certificate + ZA or CDA; or bachelor's degree
Associate Teacher	1157	1035	89.5	Associate's degree or above; or CDA; or 120 documented clock hours
Home Visitor	7	7	100.0	Associate's degree; or CDA

Note. Fifty-five lead teachers who checked both center-based and sub-contracted programs were recoded as sub-contracted program only. For teachers who did not meet the credential requirement, 37 of 194 lead teachers and all 122 associate teachers have a compliance plan in place.

Table 5: GSRP Lead and Associate Teacher Highest Level of Education

Type of Teachers	N	%	Definition Notes
Lead Teacher			
Master's degree	345	29.4	For teachers with degrees below a master's degree, limitations in the coding system exist; therefore, some education levels cannot be categorized. Bachelor's degree without teacher certification is not an available choice for center-based teachers and associate's degree is not an available choice for center-based or sub-contracted teachers.
Bachelor's degree	777	66.3	
CDA	0	0	
Other (unidentifiable)	51	4.3	
Total	1173	100.0	
Associate Teacher			
Bachelor's degree	198	17.1	Master's degree is not an available code. Bachelor's degree includes those with a teaching certificate.
Associate's degree	227	19.6	
CDA	397	34.3	
120 hours documented	213	18.5	
Completed one course	63	5.4	
No course completed	59	5.1	
Total	1157	100.0	

Tables 6 and 7 contain compensation information. In addition to describing teacher compensation, a test for statistically significant differences in compensation by program type was conducted. As indicated in Table 7, lead teachers in formula grant programs make significantly higher hourly wages and annual salaries than their competitive grant program counterparts. Their hourly rate is a full \$11.07 more per hour than competitive grant programs. Annual salary averages are also significantly more per year for formula grant program lead teachers than for competitive grant teachers (\$12,264 more per year). Also associate teachers in competitive grant programs on average make a significantly higher annual salary than do formula grant teachers (\$9,698 more per year). As for hourly rates for associate teachers, both grant program types make about the same amount (\$11.88 for formula grantees vs. \$11.60 for competitive grantees). Finally, Table 8 shows the prevalence of the types of benefits staff receive.

Table 6: Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	Lead Teacher			Associate Teacher		
	Mean	S.D.	<i>N</i>	Mean	S.D.	<i>N</i>
Hourly salary	26.53	12.19	527	11.85	2.13	926
Annual salary	44,846	17,081	604	17,625	6,906	160
Hours worked per week	35.11	6.74	1139	32.34	7.38	1103
Weeks worked per year	37.49	4.29	1136	36.89	4.22	1104
Total Benefits Received	5.41	2.19	1143	4.00	2.26	1104

Table 7: Teacher Compensation by Program Type

Type of Compensation	Formula Grantee		Competitive Grantee	
	Mean	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>N</i>
Lead Teacher				
Hourly salary***	28.37	439	17.30	88
Annual salary***	45,698	562	33,434	42
Associate Teacher				
Hourly salary	11.88	822	11.60	104
Annual salary***	16,473	141	26,171	19

Note. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Table 8: Teacher Benefits

Benefits Received	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	N	%	N
Health insurance				
Yes	77.6	887	49.2	543
No	22.4	256	50.8	561
Dental insurance				
Yes	74.2	848	49.4	545
No	25.8	295	50.6	559
Vision insurance				
Yes	70.1	801	47.7	527
No	29.9	342	52.3	577
Disability insurance				
Yes	52.9	605	31.6	349
No	47.1	538	68.4	755
Vacation days				
Yes	36.5	417	33.6	371
No	63.5	726	66.4	733
Sick days				
Yes	92.7	1060	86.3	953
No	7.3	83	13.7	151
Retirement				
Yes	81.2	928	71.5	789
No	18.8	215	28.5	315
Tax annuity				
Yes	22.3	255	7.7	85
No	77.7	888	92.3	1019
Dependent care				
Yes	15.5	177	6.4	71
No	84.5	966	93.6	1033
Cafeteria benefits				
Yes	10.9	125	9.7	107
No	89.1	1018	90.3	997
Other benefits				
Yes	7.0	80	7.2	79