2014–2015 Great Start Readiness Program
Program Quality Assessment
Statewide Data Report

December 2015

Updated January 2016

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 2014-2015 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, LLC, HighScope's technology partner for OnlinePQA on September 21, 2015. 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 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 2014-15 program year, compared to those for the 2013-14 year. These scores show that GSRP programs, on average,

---

[1] HighScope Educational Research Foundation & Red-e Set Grow. (2012). *OnlinePQA* [Computerized assessment system]. Ypsilanti, MI: HighScope Press. Online at Online PQA Website.

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 (4.54 and 4.55, respectively). Compared to last year, at the classroom level (Form A), there was a slight increase in the mean score for curriculum planning and assessment (a 1.11 percent positive change) and a decrease of 0.94 percent in the mean score for adult-child interaction. At the center level (Form B) all areas measured showed positive changes in mean scores from last year and overall a 2.08 percent positive change from last year.

Table 1: PQA Mean Scores and Change (2013-14 vs. 2014-15)

PQA Scale	2013-14 Mean Score	2014-15 Mean Score	Change	% Change
Classroom Level (Form A)	*N*=1537	*N*=2034		
Total Score for Form A	**4.29**	**4.30**	**0.01**	**0.23**
I. Learning environment	4.20	4.23	0.03	0.71
II. Daily routine	4.31	4.33	0.02	0.46
III. Adult-child interaction	4.27	4.23	- 0.04	- 0.94
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	4.49	4.54	0.05	1.11
Center Level (Form B)	*N*=333	*N*=480		
Total Score for Form B	**4.32**	**4.41**	**0.09**	**2.08**
V. Parent involvement and family services	4.38	4.48	0.10	2.28
VI. Staff qualifications and development	4.07	4.18	0.11	2.70
VII. Program management	4.48	4.55	0.07	1.56

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 (50.5 percent) fell within the fourth quality level and 93 percent of the classrooms had overall scores within the two highest levels (a score of 3.5 or higher). For Form B, more than 97 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 2014-15					
	Level of Quality (%)				
PQA Scale	**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**	**0.1**	**6.9**	**50.5**	**42.5**
I. Learning environment	0.0	0.3	11.6	50.1	38.0
II. Daily routine	0.0	0.4	7.8	42.5	49.3
III. Adult-child interaction	0.0	0.5	11.2	46.0	42.3
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	0.1	0.3	3.6	32.8	63.2
Center Level (Form B)					
Total Score for Form B	**0.0**	**0.0**	**2.7**	**46.9**	**50.4**
V. Parent involvement and family services	0.0	0.2	3.5	36.1	60.2
VI. Staff qualifications and development	0.0	0.4	12.3	54.5	32.8
VII. Program management	0.0	0.0	1.9	36.4	61.7

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	6.2	5.1	88.7
B. Defined interest areas	1.4	16.1	82.5
C. Logically located interest areas	1.2	15.2	83.6
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	7.3	4.7	87.9
E. Organization and labeling of materials	1.7	**26.8**	71.5
F. Varied and open-ended materials	2.5	18.6	79.0
G. Plentiful materials	2.3	13.5	84.2
H. Diversity-related materials	3.9	**43.1**	53.0
I. Displays of child initiated work	4.9	**27.5**	67.6
II. Daily Routine			
A. Consistent daily routine	1.6	14.2	84.2
B. Parts of the day	0.5	3.3	96.2
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	2.3	18.6	79.1
D. Time for child planning	3.8	23.2	73.0
E. Time for child-initiated activities	0.1	8.0	91.9
F. Time for child recall	4.8	22.2	73.0
G. Small-group time	**11.7**	3.7	84.7
H. Large-group time	8.3	19.8	71.9
I. Choices during transition times	8.1	**27.4**	64.6
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	1.6	11.0	87.4
K. Snack or mealtime	3.3	8.8	87.9
L. Outside time	4.6	10.5	84.9
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs	3.6	2.5	93.9
B. Handling separation from home	0.9	8.0	91.1
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	1.4	7.0	91.6
D. Support for child communication	2.1	**26.4**	71.5
E. Support for non-English speakers	1.3	19.9	78.8
F. Adults as partners in play	1.7	**32.2**	66.1
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	1.1	21.2	77.7
H. Support for child learning at group times	6.9	**28.3**	64.8
I. Opportunities for child exploration	2.3	24.4	73.4
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	7.0	23.5	69.5
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	1.2	21.8	77.0
L. Independent problem solving	1.5	12.5	86.1
M. Conflict resolution	**10.8**	**42.7**	46.5

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	4.2	7.9	87.9
B. Team teaching	8.0	18.8	73.2
C. Comprehensive child records	0.7	1.3	97.9
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	4.2	13.3	82.5
E. Use of child observation measure	1.3	0.6	98.1
Form B			
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement	1.8	15.4	82.8
B. Parents on policy-making committees	**14.0**	20.3	65.8
C. Parent participation in child activities	0.0	3.7	96.3
D. Sharing of curriculum information	7.8	19.5	72.6
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	0.0	8.9	91.1
F. Extending learning at home	0.6	13.8	85.5
G. Formal meetings with parents	0.4	0.6	99.0
H. Diagnostic/special education services	0.8	3.3	95.9
I. Service referrals as needed	0.8	18.1	81.0
J. Transition to kindergarten	5.6	16.8	77.6
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	**33.8**	10.2	56.0
B. Instructional staff background	**16.0**	11.4	72.6
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	1.3	1.9	96.8
D. Ongoing professional development	2.5	5.4	92.1
E. In-service training content and methods	4.0	8.3	87.7
F. Observation and feedback	4.6	6.1	89.4
G. Professional organization affiliation	**30.5**	9.5	60.0
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed	0.2	0.6	99.2
B. Continuity in instructional staff	**16.1**	0.0	83.9
C. Program assessment	4.5	4.2	91.3
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	4.1	9.3	86.5
E. Operating policies and procedures	9.1	2.1	88.8
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	3.3	2.1	94.6
G. Adequacy of program funding	5.0	10.0	85.0

Characteristics of GSRP Teaching Staff

Information about teacher credentialing status for GSRP teaching staff was downloaded on September 29, 2015 from the Michigan Electronic Grants System and provided by the Michigan Department of Education. Additional information about LEA status was received on November 18, 2015. In this year's report, credentialing status is subdivided by program, those from a local education agency (LEA) and those from a non-LEA. As shown in Table 4, on average overall, 94.7 percent of lead teachers met their credential requirement (95.3 percent for LEA, 93.7 percent for non-LEA), and 85.5 percent of associate teachers met their credential requirement (83.8 percent for LEA and 88.4 percent for non-LEA). Compared to the 2013-14 program year, GSRP teachers meeting their credential requirement increased by 2.8 percentage points for lead teachers and remained nearly the same for associate teachers (a decrease of .8 percent).

Table 4: Teacher Credential Status

	Credential Status	LEA	Non-LEA	Total
Lead	**Total *N***	**1509**	**847**	**2356**
	***N* meeting qualification[a]**	**1438**	**794**	**2232**
	% meeting qualification	**95.3%**	**93.7%**	**94.7%**
	***N* with compliance plan[b]**	**71**	**53**	**124**
	Teaching certificate with ZA/ZS	<u>1264</u>	<u>364</u>	
	Teaching certificate with CDA	<u>13</u>	<u>18</u>	
	BA (ECE/CD) with prekindergarten training	<u>161</u>	<u>412</u>	
	Teaching certificate with approval	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
	Teaching certificate within 1-2 courses of ZA	71	53	
Associate	**Total *N***	**1461**	**823**	**2284**
	***N* meeting qualification[c]**	**1225**	**728**	**1953**
	% meeting qualification	**83.8%**	**88.4%**	**85.5%**
	***N* with compliance plan[d]**	**236**	**95**	**331**
	AA	<u>625</u>	<u>407</u>	
	CDA	<u>463</u>	<u>315</u>	
	120 hours approval from MDE	<u>137</u>	<u>6</u>	
	Minimal qualification with compliance plan	236	95	

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) a Michigan teaching certificate with an Early Childhood-General and Special Education (ZS) endorsement; 3) a Michigan teaching certificate with PPI/Early Childhood Special Education Approval; 4) a Michigan teaching certificate with a Child Development Associate (CDA); or a Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood Education/Child Development (ECE/CD) with prekindergarten training. Lead teachers from a LEA or non-LEA program 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]Associate teachers with one of the first three credentials are considered to be qualified.
[d]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.

Information about teacher compensation and benefits was downloaded on September 29, 2015 from the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) and provided by the Michigan Department of Education. Table 5 shows that approximately 81 percent of teachers (82.4 percent for lead teachers and 79.5 percent 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 (64% and 58.3%, respectively). Less than half of the teachers have union contract coverage (39.8 percent for lead teachers and 35.5 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	17.6	373	20.5	422
1-2 years	39.5	838	40.5	832
3-4 years	13.2	279	10.5	215
4-5 years	9.1	193	7.1	146
More than 5 years	20.6	438	21.4	440
Additional Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	36.0	764	41.7	855
1-2 years	19.5	413	15.4	317
3-4 years	9.2	196	7.3	151
4-5 years	7.4	157	6.0	124
More than 5 years	27.9	591	29.6	608
Contract Coverage				
Yes	39.8	846	35.5	744
No	60.2	1282	64.5	1354

Tables 6 and 7 contain compensation information for lead and associate teachers. Lead teachers, on average, make approximately $7 more per hour than associate teachers, and salaried positions pay approximately $21,000 more per year. However, at least one lead teacher makes $90, 000 a year and at least one associate teacher makes $60,000 a year. On average, teachers work between 35.4 and 37.1 hours per week, 38 weeks per year. Teachers also receive some additional benefits (mean total for lead teachers is 4.85 and for associate teachers 3.73). However some teachers both lead and associate receive 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	891	19.11	4.61	9.48	63.30
Annual salary	1220	41,560	13,556	8,231	90,127
Hours worked per week	2122	37.11	4.49	7.00	44.00
Weeks worked per year	2126	38.03	4.89	10.00	52.00
Total number of benefits received	2128	4.85	2.18	0	10

Table 7: Associate Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	N	Mean	S.D.	Minimum	Maximum
Hourly salary	1797	12.18	2.14	7.50	33.00
Annual salary	263	20,580	8,136	5,928	60,427
Hours worked per week	2073	35.40	5.22	10.00	42.00
Weeks worked per year	2076	37.28	4.72	4.00	52.00
Total number of benefits received	2128	3.73	2.44	0	10

Table 8: Teacher Benefits

Benefits Received	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	N	%	N
Health insurance				
Yes	73.7	1569	50.3	1070
No	26.3	559	49.7	1058
Dental insurance				
Yes	70.2	1494	47.1	1003
No	29.8	634	52.9	1125
Vision insurance				
Yes	66.6	1417	45.7	972
No	33.4	711	54.3	1156
Disability insurance				
Yes	37.6	801	26.9	572
No	62.4	1327	73.1	1556
Vacation days				
Yes	44.9	955	39.4	839
No	55.1	1173	60.6	1289
Sick days				
Yes	88.0	1873	77.8	1656
No	12.0	255	22.2	472
Retirement				
Yes	64.0	1361	53.6	1140
No	36.0	767	46.4	988
Tax annuity				
Yes	10.2	217	6.7	143
No	89.8	1911	93.3	1985
Dependent care				
Yes	7.8	167	6.3	134
No	92.2	1961	93.7	1994
Cafeteria benefits				
Yes	10.0	212	7.4	157
No	90.0	1916	92.6	1971
Other benefits				
Yes	11.6	246	11.6	246
No	88.4	1882	88.4	1882