

2015–2016 Great Start Readiness Program
Program Quality Assessment
Statewide Data Report

December 2016

Prepared by
HighScope Center for Early Education Evaluation

Prepared for
Michigan Department of Education



Introduction

The following report summarizes Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) classroom quality data collected during the 2015-2016 program year. The data was reported and scored using the preschool version of HighScope's OnlinePQA¹ (Program Quality Assessment) system. The data was received from Red-e Set Grow, LLC, HighScope's technology partner for OnlinePQA on September 5th, 2016. For Form A and Form B reports, the data was collected by individuals other than classroom teachers (e.g., early childhood specialists). This report summarizes end-of-year data from Forms A and B.

Scores on the Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA) range from 1 to 5, with 1 representing low quality and 5 representing high quality. PQA scores can be interpreted at two levels – item level and summary level. At the item level, 1 is low quality, 3 is medium quality, and 5 is high quality. At the summary level, an average section score is determined using the item scores from each section. All item scores are averaged to obtain overall mean scores. Using each half point as the cutoff, overall mean scores can be interpreted according to five quality levels across the continuum. Overall, mean scores range from 1.00-1.49 at the lowest level and 4.50-5.00 at the highest level. Second level mean scores range from 1.50-2.49, third level from 2.50-3.49, and fourth level from 3.50-4.49. These score ranges can be used to interpret both Form A and Form B results at the summary level only.

Prior to observing in GSRP classrooms, those collecting PQA data are required to attend a face-to-face training or a four-week online preschool PQA training course, and pass a reliability assessment with a minimum score of 80% for each of ten sections, and an overall reliability score of 80%. Those who continue to collect data from year to year are required to recertify annually by passing the reliability assessment.

Quality Levels of GSRP Programs

Table 1 presents mean PQA scores for the 2015-16 program year, compared to those for the 2014-15 year. These scores show that GSRP programs, on average, were assessed at the fourth quality level for all sections, the exceptions being curriculum planning and assessment and program management which fell in the highest quality level (4.59 and 4.55, respectively). Compared to last

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

year, at the classroom level (Form A), there was a slight positive increase in the mean score for all sections, ranging from .94% to 1.20%. At the center level (Form B) all areas measured showed positive changes or no change (program management remained at 4.55) in mean scores from last year to this year.

Table 1: PQA Mean Scores and Change (2014-15 vs. 2015-16)

PQA Scale	2014-15	2015-16	Change	% Change
	Mean Score	Mean Score		
<u>Classroom Level (Form A)</u>	<i>N</i>=2034	<i>N</i>=2245		
Total Score for Form A	4.30	4.35	0.05	1.16
I. Learning environment	4.23	4.28	0.05	1.20
II. Daily routine	4.33	4.37	0.04	0.94
III. Adult-child interaction	4.23	4.27	0.04	1.03
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	4.54	4.59	0.05	1.19
<u>Center Level (Form B)</u>	<i>N</i>=480	<i>N</i>=659		
Total Score for Form B	4.41	4.43	0.02	0.55
V. Parent involvement and family services	4.48	4.49	0.01	0.20
VI. Staff qualifications and development	4.18	4.24	0.06	1.32
VII. Program management	4.55	4.55	0.00	0.00

Table 2 shows the PQA score distribution in percentage of classrooms at each of the five quality levels. As shown, GSRP classrooms are on the higher end of the quality-rating continuum. For Form A, nearly half of the classrooms (49.7%) fell within the fourth quality level and over 95% of the classrooms had overall scores within the two highest levels (a score of 3.5 or higher). For Form B, more than 97% of classrooms scored within the two highest ranges. On both Form A and B, fewer than 1% of classrooms fell within the two lowest levels across all sections.

Table 2: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Scale 2015-16

PQA Scale	Level of Quality (%)				
	Mean Scores 1.00-1.49	Mean Scores 1.50-2.49	Mean Scores 2.50-3.49	Mean Scores 3.50-4.49	Mean Scores 4.50-5.00
<u>Classroom Level (Form A)</u>					
Total Score for Form A	0.0	0.3	4.3	49.7	45.7
I. Learning environment	0.0	0.2	8.2	51.9	39.8
II. Daily routine	0.0	0.4	4.9	42.8	51.9
III. Adult-child interaction	0.0	0.6	8.6	47.0	43.8
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	0.0	0.4	2.0	29.4	68.2
<u>Center Level (Form B)</u>					
Total Score for Form B	0.0	0.0	2.6	43.1	54.3
V. Parent involvement and family services	0.0	0.5	4.4	29.3	65.9
VI. Staff qualifications and development	0.0	0.8	8.8	54.2	36.3
VII. Program management	0.0	0.0	2.1	34.6	63.3

Areas In Need of Improvement

Table 3 presents three thresholds for identifying areas in need of improvement at the item level. The first threshold is the percentage of classrooms at an unacceptable level of quality (scores of 1 or 2) for a particular item. The second is the percentage of classrooms scoring at an acceptable level of quality (score of 3). The third threshold is the percentage of classrooms scoring at a good level of quality (scores of 4 or 5). The bolded areas show percentages 10% or greater at the unacceptable level and 25% or greater at the acceptable level.

Table 3: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Item

PQA Item	Level of Quality (%)		
	Level 1 & 2	Level 3	Level 4 & 5
Form A			
I. Learning Environment			
A. Safe and healthy environment	6.1	4.3	89.6
B. Defined interest areas	0.8	12.7	86.4
C. Logically located interest areas	0.9	13.9	85.2
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	7.6	3.4	89.0
E. Organization and labeling of materials	1.5	25.4	73.1
F. Varied and open-ended materials	1.3	17.9	80.8
G. Plentiful materials	1.1	13.0	85.9
H. Diversity-related materials	2.4	38.5	59.0
I. Displays of child initiated work	4.4	24.8	70.8
II. Daily Routine			
A. Consistent daily routine	1.1	12.0	86.9
B. Parts of the day	0.3	3.3	96.3
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	2.5	19.7	77.8
D. Time for child planning	2.4	22.3	75.3
E. Time for child-initiated activities	0.3	6.9	92.8
F. Time for child recall	4.0	19.6	76.4
G. Small-group time	9.7	4.1	86.2
H. Large-group time	6.4	18.6	75.0
I. Choices during transition times	6.4	26.5	67.2
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	1.3	9.8	89.0
K. Snack or mealtime	2.4	6.8	90.9
L. Outside time	4.5	9.9	85.6
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs	3.8	2.6	93.6
B. Handling separation from home	1.1	6.9	92.1
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	1.8	5.2	93.0
D. Support for child communication	2.2	23.6	74.3
E. Support for non-English speakers	3.7	21.2	75.1
F. Adults as partners in play	1.5	30.9	67.7
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	1.0	18.7	80.3
H. Support for child learning at group times	5.3	26.9	67.8
I. Opportunities for child exploration	2.3	22.5	75.2
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	5.8	21.9	72.3
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	0.7	17.6	81.7
L. Independent problem solving	0.9	11.4	87.6
M. Conflict resolution	9.4	43.5	47.1

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

PQA Item	Level 1 & 2	Level 3	Level 4 & 5
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment			
A. Curriculum model	1.6	6.2	92.2
B. Team teaching	5.3	18.6	76.2
C. Comprehensive child records	0.3	1.3	98.4
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	3.8	11.9	84.3
E. Use of child observation measure	0.9	0.4	98.7
Form B			
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement	1.7	14.7	83.6
B. Parents on policy-making committees	11.7	24.0	64.3
C. Parent participation in child activities	0.0	5.8	94.2
D. Sharing of curriculum information	5.2	18.2	76.6
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	0.2	11.2	88.6
F. Extending learning at home	0.8	14.1	85.1
G. Formal meetings with parents	0.6	0.5	98.9
H. Diagnostic/special education services	1.4	5.5	93.2
I. Service referrals as needed	1.2	16.7	82.1
J. Transition to kindergarten	4.4	14.9	80.7
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	32.3	8.8	58.9
B. Instructional staff background	14.4	14.4	71.2
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	1.1	3.5	95.4
D. Ongoing professional development	2.4	4.1	93.5
E. In-service training content and methods	5.5	4.9	89.7
F. Observation and feedback	2.7	4.6	92.7
G. Professional organization affiliation	23.5	11.1	65.4
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed	0.3	0.3	99.4
B. Continuity in instructional staff	20.0	0.5	79.5
C. Program assessment	4.4	6.1	89.5
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	2.1	9.0	88.9
E. Operating policies and procedures	7.1	1.1	91.8
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	3.5	2.4	94.1
G. Adequacy of program funding	4.1	10.6	85.3

Characteristics of GSRP Teaching Staff

Information about teacher credentialing status for GSRP teaching staff was downloaded on October 17, 2016 from the Michigan Electronic Grants System and provided by the Michigan Department of Education. Additional information about District/PSA and Community Based Organizations was received on November 28, 2016. In this year's report, credentialing status is subdivided by program, those from a District/PSA and those from a Community Based Organizations (CBO). As shown in Table 4, on average overall, 93.9% of lead teachers met their credential requirement (94.4% for District/PSA and 92.9% for CBO), and 81.3% of associate teachers met their credential requirement (80% for District/PSA and 83.4% for CBO). Compared to the 2014-15 program year, GSRP teachers meeting their credential requirement remained nearly the same for lead teachers (a slight decrease of 0.8%) and decreased by 4.2% for associate teachers.

Table 4: Teacher Credential Status

	Credential Status	District/PSA	Community Based Organization	Total
Lead	Total N	1,493	850	2,343
	N meeting qualification^a	1,409	790	2199
	% meeting qualification	94.4%	92.9%	93.9%
	N with compliance plan^b	84	60	144
	Teaching certificate with ZA/ZS	<u>1,200</u>	<u>295</u>	
	Teaching certificate with CDA	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	
	BA (ECE/CD) with specialization in preschool teaching	<u>190</u>	<u>475</u>	
	Teaching certificate with approval	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	
	Teaching certificate within 1-2 courses of ZA	84	60	
	Associate	Total N	1397	811
N meeting qualification^c		1118	676	1794
% meeting qualification		80.0%	83.4%	81.3%
N with compliance plan^d		279	135	414
AA		<u>544</u>	<u>351</u>	
CDA		<u>467</u>	<u>319</u>	
120 hours approval from MDE		<u>107</u>	<u>6</u>	
Minimal qualification with compliance plan		279	135	

Note. Underlined entries indicate the qualification was met.

^aLead teachers are coded as qualified if they had 1) a Michigan teaching certificate with an Early Childhood Education (ZA) endorsement; 2) a Michigan teaching certificate with an Early Childhood-General and Special Education (ZS) endorsement; 3) a Michigan teaching certificate with a Child Development Associate (CDA); 4) a Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood Education/Child Development (ECE/CD) with a specialization in preschool teaching. Lead teachers are coded as qualified if they met the requirements for one of the first four categories listed above.

^bAll lead teachers with a Michigan teaching certificate within 1–2 courses of a ZA are coded as having a compliance plan.

^cAssociate teachers with one of the first three credentials are considered to be qualified.

^dAssociate teachers who met minimum qualifications and had a compliance plan on file with their Early Childhood Specialist (ECS) are considered to have a compliance plan.

Information about teacher compensation and benefits was downloaded on August 30, 2016 from the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) and provided by the Michigan Department of Education. Table 5 shows that approximately 87% of teachers (89.7% for lead teachers and 84% for associate teachers) have one year or more of GSRP teaching experience, approximately two-thirds of both lead teachers and associate teachers also have additional teaching experience (65.5% and 60.1%, respectively). Less than half of the teachers have union contract coverage (38.9% for lead teachers and 37% for associate teachers).

Table 5: Teacher Experience and Contract Coverage

Teacher Characteristics	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>
GSRP Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	10.3	235	16.0	354
1-2 years	37.0	841	39.2	870
3-4 years	21.4	486	16.9	374
4-5 years	9.8	222	7.2	160
More than 5 years	21.5	489	20.7	460
Additional Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	34.5	783	40.0	884
1-2 years	21.0	478	16.5	365
3-4 years	10.4	236	8.8	196
4-5 years	5.9	134	5.1	114
More than 5 years	28.2	642	29.7	659
Contract Coverage				
Yes	38.9	890	37.0	834
No	61.1	1400	63.0	1419

Tables 6 and 7 contain compensation information for lead and associate teachers. Lead teachers, on average, make approximately \$7.50 more per hour than associate teachers, and salaried positions pay approximately \$21,000 more per year. However, at least one lead teacher makes over \$107,000 a year and at least one associate teacher makes \$68,000 a year. On average, teachers work between 35.6 and 38.2 hours per week, 38 weeks per year. Teachers also receive some additional benefits (mean total for lead teachers is 5.1 and for associate teachers 4.0). However at least one lead teacher receives only 1 additional benefit and at least one associate teacher receives no additional

benefits while others receive 10 additional benefits. Table 8 (on the following page) shows the prevalence of the types of benefits staff receive.

Table 6: Lead Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	N	Mean	S.D.	Minimum	Maximum
Hourly salary	920	19.9	5.89	8.8	64.6
Annual salary	1353	41,001	13,530	3,429	107,829
Hours worked per week	2290	37.3	4.43	10	52
Weeks worked per year	2290	38.2	4.26	9	52
Total number of benefits received	2290	5.1	2.16	1	10

Table 7: Associate Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	N	Mean	S.D.	Minimum	Maximum
Hourly salary	1944	12.3	2.15	8.0	33.6
Annual salary	284	20,607	7,744	6,950	68,172
Hours worked per week	2247	35.6	5.12	1	48
Weeks worked per year	2247	37.7	4.41	12	52
Total number of benefits received	2290	4.0	2.36	0	10

Table 8: Teacher Benefits

Benefits Received	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	N	%	N
Health insurance				
Yes	77.0	1,763	50.3	1,247
No	23.0	527	49.7	1043
Dental insurance				
Yes	71.4	1,635	47.8	1,094
No	28.6	655	52.2	1196
Vision insurance				
Yes	66.8	1,529	45.7	1,046
No	33.2	761	54.3	1244
Disability insurance				
Yes	41.8	957	29.1	666
No	58.2	1,333	70.9	1,624
Vacation days				
Yes	47.3	1,084	39.6	907
No	52.7	1,206	60.4	1,383
Sick days				
Yes	87.4	2,002	80.1	1,835
No	12.6	288	19.9	455
Retirement				
Yes	67.9	1,555	56.0	1,282
No	32.1	735	44.0	1008
Tax annuity				
Yes	18.5	423	12.4	284
No	81.5	1,867	87.6	2,006
Dependent care				
Yes	8.9	204	5.9	136
No	91.1	2,086	94.1	2,154
Cafeteria benefits				
Yes	11.0	252	9.0	206
No	89.0	2,038	91.0	2,084
Other benefits				
Yes	9.0	205	9.0	205
No	91.0	2,085	91.0	2,085