2013–2014 Great Start Readiness Program
Program Quality Assessment
Statewide Data Report

October 2014

Prepared by

Center for Early Education Evaluation at HighScope

Prepared for

Michigan Department of Education

Introduction

The following report summarizes Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) classroom quality data collected during the 2013–2014 program year. The data was reported and scored using the preschool version of HighScope's OnlinePQA[1] (Program Quality Assessment) system. The data was received from Red-e Set Grow on August 30, 2014. For Form A reports, this data was collected by individuals other than classroom teachers (e.g., early childhood specialists). For Form B reports, the data was collected by administrators (e.g., program directors). This report covers only the 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 percent for each of ten sections, and an overall reliability score of 80 percent. 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 2013–14 program year, compared to those for the 2012–13 year These scores show that GSRP programs on average fell within the fourth quality level for all sections. Compared to last year, there was notable increase this year in the mean score

---

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

for daily routine (3.86 percent), and curriculum planning and assessment (2.75 percent). However, there was a 2.67 percent decrease in the mean score for parent involvement and family services.

PQA Scale	2012–13 Mean Score	2013–14 Mean Score	Change	% Change
Classroom Level (Form A)	*N*=1042	*N*=1537		
Total Score for Form A	**4.20**	**4.29**	**0.09**	**2.14**
I. Learning environment	4.15	4.20	0.05	1.20
II. Daily routine	4.15	4.31	0.16	3.86
III. Adult-child interaction	4.23	4.27	0.04	0.95
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	4.37	4.49	0.12	2.75
Center Level (Form B)	*N*=392	*N*=333		
Total Score for Form B	**4.35**	**4.32**	**-0.03**	**-0.69**
V. Parent involvement and family services	4.50	4.38	-0.12	-2.67
VI. Staff qualifications and development	4.02	4.07	0.05	1.24
VII. Program management	4.47	4.48	0.01	.22

Table 1: PQA Mean Scores and Change (2012–13 vs. 2013–14)

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. On Form A, most classrooms (54.1 percent) fell within the fourth quality level and 94 percent of the classrooms had overall scores within the two highest levels (a score of 3.5 or higher). For Form B, more than 96 percent of classrooms scored within the two highest ranges. On both Form A and B, fewer than 1 percent of classrooms fell within the two lowest levels across all sections.

Table 2: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Scale

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**
Classroom Level (Form A)					
Total Score for Form A	**0.0**	**0.3**	**5.9**	**54.1**	**39.7**
I. Learning environment	0.1	0.3	9.9	56.9	32.8
II. Daily routine	0.0	0.7	7.3	45.7	46.4
III. Adult-child interaction	0.1	0.5	10.2	45.0	44.3
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	0.0	0.2	3.8	37.0	59.0
Center Level (Form B)					
Total Score for Form B	**0.0**	**0.0**	**3.6**	**54.7**	**41.7**
V. Parent involvement and family services	0.0	0.0	6.3	38.1	55.6
VI. Staff qualifications and development	0.0	0.9	16.6	57.1	25.4
VII. Program management	0.0	0.0	2.4	42.6	55.0

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 percent or greater at the unacceptable level and 25 percent 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	3.7	4.8	91.5
B. Defined interest areas	1.2	17.9	81.0
C. Logically located interest areas	1.5	17.4	81.1
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	6.0	4.6	89.4
E. Organization and labeling of materials	1.6	**28.9**	69.5
F. Varied and open-ended materials	2.8	19.7	77.5
G. Plentiful materials	2.0	12.3	85.7
H. Diversity-related materials	4.8	**43.3**	51.9
I. Displays of child initiated work	5.8	**30.3**	63.9
II. Daily Routine			
A. Consistent daily routine	1.7	13.9	84.4
B. Parts of the day	0.8	4.8	94.3
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	1.8	17.7	80.6
D. Time for child planning	3.5	**25.8**	70.7
E. Time for child-initiated activities	0.7	9.7	89.6
F. Time for child recall	6.6	23.4	69.9
G. Small-group time	**13.7**	4.4	81.9
H. Large-group time	7.2	19.9	72.9
I. Choices during transition times	7.9	**27.0**	65.1
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	1.4	9.3	89.3
K. Snack or mealtime	3.7	6.9	89.4
L. Outside time	7.6	12.4	79.9
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs	3.3	2.1	94.6
B. Handling separation from home	0.9	7.4	91.7
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	1.4	5.2	93.4
D. Support for child communication	2.7	23.4	73.8
E. Support for non-English speakers	2.3	13.9	83.9
F. Adults as partners in play	1.8	**28.8**	69.4
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	1.4	19.3	79.3
H. Support for child learning at group times	5.7	**28.5**	65.8
I. Opportunities for child exploration	2.6	**23.4**	73.9
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	7.0	**25.5**	67.5
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	1.4	18.0	80.6
L. Independent problem solving	0.9	11.4	87.7
M. Conflict resolution	9.1	**41.1**	49.8

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	2.2	10.6	87.2
B. Team teaching	8.6	22.7	68.8
C. Comprehensive child records	0.5	2.9	96.6
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	5.1	15.4	79.5
E. Use of child observation measure	1.1	1.2	97.7
Form B			
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement	4.2	20.2	75.6
B. Parents on policy-making committees	**17.6**	**21.5**	60.9
C. Parent participation in child activities	0.9	3.6	95.5
D. Sharing of curriculum information	**13.6**	**25.3**	61.1
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	0.3	10.9	88.8
F. Extending learning at home	1.8	17.9	80.3
G. Formal meetings with parents	0.6	1.5	97.9
H. Diagnostic/special education services	0.3	1.2	98.5
I. Service referrals as needed	1.2	**23.6**	75.2
J. Transition to kindergarten	2.1	24.2	73.6
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	**34.4**	10.6	55.0
B. Instructional staff background	**13.6**	10.6	75.8
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	2.4	3.3	94.2
D. Ongoing professional development	3.6	9.1	87.3
E. In-service training content and methods	5.1	10.6	84.3
F. Observation and feedback	2.7	9.4	87.9
G. Professional organization affiliation	**40.2**	8.8	51.1
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed	0.0	0.6	99.4
B. Continuity in instructional staff	**18.1**	0.3	81.6
C. Program assessment	5.2	5.8	89.0
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	5.1	12.4	82.5
E. Operating policies and procedures	7.9	1.5	90.6
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	3.9	1.2	94.9
G. Adequacy of program funding	7.3	15.1	77.6

Characteristics of GSRP Teaching Staff

Information on teacher credentialing status for GSRP teaching staff was downloaded on September 8, 2014 from the Michigan Electronic Grants System and provided by the Michigan Department of Education. In this year's report, credentialing status is subdivided by program from local education agency (LEA) and non-LEA given that competitive programs no longer exist. As shown in Table 4, overall, 91.9 percent of lead teachers met their credential requirement (90.5 percent for LEA, 97.3 percent for non-LEA), and 86.3 percent of associate teachers met their credential requirement (85.5 percent for LEA and 88.1 percent for non-LEA). Compared to the 2012-13 program year, GSRP teachers meeting credential requirement decreased by 3 percentage points for lead teachers and remained the same for associate teachers.

Table 4: Teacher Credential Status

	Credential Status	LEA	Non-LEA	Total
Lead	**Total N**	**1305**	**337**	**1642**
	N meeting qualification[a]	**1181**	**328**	**1509**
	% meeting qualification	**90.5%**	**97.3%**	**91.9**
	N with compliance plan[b]	**73**	**8**	**81**
	N without compliance plan[c]	**51**	**1**	**52**
	Teaching certificate with ZA/ZS	<u>1181</u>	<u>179</u>	
	Teaching certificate with CDA	13	<u>19</u>	
	BA (ECE/CD) with prekindergarten training	56	<u>128</u>	
	Teaching certificate with approval	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	
	Teaching certificate within 1-2 courses of ZA	55	9	
Associate	**Total N**	**1261**	**328**	**1589**
	N meeting qualification[d]	**1082**	**289**	**1371**
	% meeting qualification	**85.8%**	**88.1%**	**86.3**
	N with compliance plan[e]	**141**	**26**	**167**
	N without compliance plan[f]	**38**	**13**	**51**
	AA	<u>519</u>	<u>153</u>	
	CDA	<u>390</u>	<u>132</u>	
	120 hours approval from MDE	<u>173</u>	<u>4</u>	
	Minimal qualification with compliance plan	141	26	
	Minimal qualification without compliance plan	38	13	

Note. Underlined entries indicate the qualification was met.

[a]Lead teachers from local education agency (LEA) programs are coded as qualified if they had 1) a Michigan teaching certificate with an Early Childhood Education (ZA) endorsement; 2) an Early Childhood-General and Special Education (ZS) endorsement; or 3) a Michigan teaching certificate with PPI/Special Education Approval. Lead teachers from a non-LEA are coded as qualified if they met the requirements for one of the first four categories listed above.

[b]All lead teachers with a Michigan teaching certificate within 1–2 courses of a ZA are coded as having a compliance plan.

[c]Lead teachers who are neither qualified nor have a compliance plan are coded as having no compliance plan (e.g., teachers from an LEA program who had a teaching certificate with a Child Development Associate [CDA] credential or Bachelor's degree [BA] in Child Development).

[d]Associate teachers with one of the first three credentials are considered to be qualified.

[e]Associate 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.

[f]Associate teachers who met minimum qualifications without a compliance plan on file with their Early Childhood Specialist (ECS) are considered to have no compliance plan.

Information on teacher compensation and benefits was downloaded on September 5, 2014 from the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) and provided by the Michigan Department of Education. Table 5 shows that approximately 76 percent of teachers (77.6 percent for lead teachers and 75.8 percent for associate teachers) have one year or more of GSRP teaching experience and less than half of the teachers have union contract coverage (44 percent for lead teachers and 41.2 percent for associate teachers).

Table 5: Teacher Experience and Contract Coverage

Teacher Characteristics	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	N	%	N
GSRP Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	22.5	375	24.1	395
1−2 years	33.3	554	33.5	550
3−4 years	11.7	194	10.5	173
4−5 years	8.4	139	6.3	104
More than 5 years	24.2	402	25.5	418
Additional Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	38.7	645	44.3	726
1−2 years	20.4	339	14.3	234
3−4 years	8.9	148	6.7	109
4−5 years	6.1	102	5.6	91
More than 5 years	25.9	431	29.2	479
Contract Coverage				
Yes	44.0	735	41.2	680
No	56.0	937	58.8	969

Table 6 contains compensation information for lead and associate teachers. Lead teachers, on average, make approximately $7.45 more per hour than associate teachers, and salaried positions pay approximately $24,000 more per year. On average, teachers work between 34.5 and 36.5 hours per week, 38 weeks per year. Teachers also receive some additional benefits (mean total for lead teachers is 5.00 and for associate teachers 3.77). Table 7 (on the following page) shows the prevalence of the types of benefits staff receive.

Table 6: Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	Lead Teacher			Associate Teacher		
	Mean	S.D.	*N*	Mean	S.D.	*N*
Hourly salary	19.49	5.33	648	12.04	2.14	1439
Annual salary	42,155	14,674	1016	18,364	7,335	197
Hours worked per week	36.44	5.17	1659	34.48	5.70	1642
Weeks worked per year	37.64	4.43	1672	37.09	4.44	1645
Total number of benefits received	5.00	2.11	1672	3.77	2.42	1672

Table 7: Teacher Benefits

Benefits Received	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	*N*	%	*N*
Health insurance				
Yes	75.8	1268	49.5	828
No	24.2	404	50.5	844
Dental insurance				
Yes	70.0	1170	44.5	744
No	30.0	502	55.5	928
Vision insurance				
Yes	65.1	1089	43.9	734
No	34.9	583	56.1	938
Disability insurance				
Yes	38.0	635	26.0	434
No	62.0	1037	74.0	1238
Vacation days				
Yes	44.1	738	40.0	669
No	55.9	934	60.0	1003
Sick days				
Yes	90.3	1510	81.8	1367
No	9.7	162	18.2	305
Retirement				
Yes	72.1	1206	58.4	976
No	27.9	466	41.6	696
Tax annuity				
Yes	12.6	211	7.8	131
No	87.4	1461	92.2	1541
Dependent care				
Yes	7.6	127	6.2	104
No	92.4	1545	93.8	1568
Cafeteria benefits				
Yes	10.7	179	7.5	125
No	89.3	1493	92.5	1547
Other benefits				
Yes	11.5	193	11.2	187
No	88.5	1479	88.8	1485