

**2016–2017 Great Start Readiness Program
Program Quality Assessment
Statewide Data Report**

September 2017

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 2016-2017 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 August 21st, 2017. For Form A and Form B reports, the data was collected by Early Childhood Specialists (ECS) 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 2016-17 program year, compared to those for the 2015-16 year. These scores show that GSRP programs, on average, were assessed at the fourth or fifth quality level for all sections; daily routine, curriculum planning and assessment, parent

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

involvement and family services, and program management fell in the highest quality level (4.54, 4.71, 4.63 and 4.64, respectively). Overall, GSRP programs, on average, were assessed at the highest quality level on both Form A and Form B. Compared to last year, at the classroom level (Form A), there was a small positive increase in the mean score for all sections, ranging from 2.54% to 3.73%. At the center level (Form B) all areas measured also showed small positive change, ranging from 0.75% to 2.99% in mean scores from last year to this year.

Table 1: PQA Mean Scores and Change (2015-16 vs. 2016-17)

PQA Scale	2015-16	2016-17	Change	% Change
	Mean Score	Mean Score		
Classroom Level (Form A)	N=2245	N=2250	n/a	n/a
Total Score for Form A	4.35	4.52	0.17	3.81
I. Learning environment	4.28	4.43	0.15	3.26
II. Daily routine	4.37	4.54	0.17	3.73
III. Adult-child interaction	4.27	4.41	0.14	3.11
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	4.59	4.71	0.12	2.54
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Center Level (Form B)	N=659	N=620	n/a	n/a
Total Score for Form B	4.43	4.51	0.08	1.72
V. Parent involvement and family services	4.49	4.63	0.14	2.99
VI. Staff qualifications and development	4.24	4.27	0.03	0.75
VII. Program management	4.55	4.64	0.09	1.85

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, over half of the classrooms (56.6%) fell within the fifth 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 94% 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 2016-17

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>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Score for Form A	0.0	0.1	4.1	39.2	56.6
I. Learning environment	0.0	0.0	5.1	47.1	47.8
II. Daily routine	0.0	0.1	2.9	39.9	57.1
III. Adult-child interaction	0.0	0.2	7.1	44.0	48.7
IV. Curriculum planning and assessment	0.0	0.1	1.2	25.9	72.8
<u>Center Level (Form B)</u>					
Total Score for Form B	0.0	0.3	4.8	38.3	56.6
V. Parent involvement and family services	0.0	0.7	4.4	26.6	68.4
VI. Staff qualifications and development	0.0	0.8	8.9	55.5	35.7
VII. Program management	0.0	0.2	1.3	32.9	65.7

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% or greater at the unacceptable level and 25% or greater at the acceptable level.

Table 3: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Item 2016-2017

PQA Item	Level of Quality (%)		
	Level 1 & 2	Level 3	Level 4 & 5
Form A			
I. Learning Environment			
A. Safe and healthy environment	4.0	4.5	91.5
B. Defined interest areas	0.5	11.2	88.4
C. Logically located interest areas	0.5	10.7	88.8
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	7.5	3.3	89.2
E. Organization and labeling of materials	0.8	20.6	78.6
F. Varied and open-ended materials	0.8	14.4	84.9
G. Plentiful materials	1.1	9.3	89.6
H. Diversity-related materials	1.7	33.3	65.0
I. Displays of child initiated work	3.5	18.9	77.6
II. Daily Routine	0.7	12.0	87.3
A. Consistent daily routine	0.1	2.2	97.7
B. Parts of the day	1.6	17.7	80.7
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	1.8	18.6	79.6
D. Time for child planning	0.2	4.8	95.1
E. Time for child-initiated activities	4.0	16.4	79.6
F. Time for child recall	7.9	2.6	89.5
G. Small-group time	3.7	16.2	80.1
H. Large-group time	5.2	25.5	69.2
I. Choices during transition times	0.7	8.2	91.1
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	1.3	6.4	92.2
K. Snack or mealtime	3.1	7.7	89.2
L. Outside time			
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs	3.9	1.8	94.3
B. Handling separation from home	0.8	6.2	93.0
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	1.2	4.5	94.4
D. Support for child communication	1.8	21.0	77.2
E. Support for non-English speakers	0.3	12.7	86.0
F. Adults as partners in play	1.0	27.9	71.2
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	0.4	16.1	83.5
H. Support for child learning at group times	3.6	24.2	72.2
I. Opportunities for child exploration	1.6	19.1	79.3
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	3.6	18.4	78.0
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	0.5	15.7	83.7
L. Independent problem solving	0.5	10.4	89.1
M. Conflict resolution	9.8	44.0	46.2

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	0.6	4.2	95.2
B. Team teaching	6.0	14.1	79.9
C. Comprehensive child records	0.3	0.5	99.2
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	3.3	9.5	87.2
E. Use of child observation measure	0.2	0.4	99.5
Form B			
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement	1.0	14.7	84.4
B. Parents on policy-making committees	12.3	19.5	68.2
C. Parent participation in child activities	0.2	3.9	96.0
D. Sharing of curriculum information	6.3	15.8	77.9
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	0.6	9.4	90.0
F. Extending learning at home	1.3	10.5	88.2
G. Formal meetings with parents	1.1	1.3	97.6
H. Diagnostic/special education services	1.8	4.4	93.9
I. Service referrals as needed	1.8	15.6	82.6
J. Transition to kindergarten	3.9	12.3	83.9
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	34.4	8.9	56.8
B. Instructional staff background	15.8	13.5	70.6
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	2.3	3.2	94.5
D. Ongoing professional development	2.4	4.7	92.9
E. In-service training content and methods	2.3	6.9	90.8
F. Observation and feedback	2.7	3.7	93.5
G. Professional organization affiliation	19.8	11.9	68.2
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed	0.3	1.3	98.4
B. Continuity in instructional staff	19.8	0.8	79.4
C. Program assessment	3.1	5.8	91.1
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	2.1	7.7	90.2
E. Operating policies and procedures	4.8	0.6	94.5
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	3.9	2.9	93.2
G. Adequacy of program funding	5.2	9.0	85.8

Characteristics of GSRP Teaching Staff

Information about teacher credentialing status for GSRP teaching staff was provided by the Michigan Department of Education on September 11th, 2017. Additional information about Local Education Agencies (LEA) and Community Based Organizations (CBO) was received on September 20th, 2017. In this year's report, credentialing status is subdivided by program, those from a LEA and those from a Community Based Organizations (CBO). As shown in Table 4, on average overall, 95.5% of lead teachers met their credential requirement (96.3% for LEA and 94.4% for CBO), and 87.6% of associate teachers met their credential requirement (87.3% for LEA and 88.1% for CBO). Compared to the 2015-16 program year, GSRP teachers meeting their credential requirement remained nearly the same for lead teachers (a slight increase of 1.6%) and increased by 6.3% for associate teachers.

Table 4: Teacher Credential Status

Credential Status		LEA	CBO	Total
Lead	Total N	1,323	967	2,290
	N meeting qualification^a	1,274	913	2,187
	% meeting qualification	96.3%	94.4%	95.5%
	N with compliance plan^b	49	54	103
	Teaching certificate with ZA/ZS	<u>925</u>	<u>389</u>	
	Teaching certificate with CDA	<u>11</u>	<u>14</u>	
	BA (ECE/CD) with specialization in preschool teaching	<u>304</u>	<u>488</u>	
	Teaching certificate with approval	<u>34</u>	<u>22</u>	
	Teaching certificate within 1-2 courses of ZA	49	54	
	Associate	Total N	1,172	863
N meeting qualification^c		1,023	760	1,783
% meeting qualification		87.3%	88.1%	87.6%
N with compliance plan^d		149	103	252
AA		<u>412</u>	<u>263</u>	
CDA		<u>537</u>	<u>426</u>	
120 hours approval from MDE		<u>74</u>	<u>71</u>	
Minimal qualification with compliance plan		149	103	

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 provided by the Michigan Department of Education on September 11th, 2017. Table 5 shows that approximately 92% of teachers (93.2% for lead teachers and 90.9% 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 (66.8% and 60.6%, respectively). Less than half of the teachers have union contract coverage (37.5% for lead teachers and 34.8% 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	6.8	154	9.1	199
1-2 years	30.2	683	39.1	855
3-4 years	23.9	540	18.8	411
4-5 years	14.4	325	10.7	233
More than 5 years	24.8	560	22.4	490
Additional Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	33.2	751	39.4	862
1-2 years	19.4	438	17.3	378
3-4 years	11.3	256	9.1	199
4-5 years	6.7	152	5.4	118
More than 5 years	29.4	665	28.8	631
Contract Coverage				
Yes	37.5	857	34.8	788
No	62.5	1,430	65.2	1,474

Tables 6 and 7 contain compensation information for lead and associate teachers. Lead teachers, on average, make approximately \$8.10 more per hour than associate teachers, and salaried positions pay approximately \$20,000 more per year. At least one lead teacher makes over \$88,000 a year and at least one associate teacher almost \$60,000 a year. However, the median income suggest that such numbers are uncommon, with at least half of all teachers earn salaries below the mean (\$37,557 for lead teachers and \$19,796 for associate teachers). On average, teachers work between 35.6 and 37.4 hours per week, 38 weeks per year. Teachers also receive some additional benefits (mean total for lead teachers is 5.3 and for associate teachers 4.3). However at least one lead teacher receives only 1 additional benefit and at least one associate teacher receives no additional benefits

while others receive 11 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.	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Hourly salary	1,026	20.9	6.0	19.84	9.7	63.3
Annual salary	1,409	40,788	13,008	37,557	1,350	88,699
Hours worked per week	2,287	37.4	4.3	--	6	98
Weeks worked per year	2,287	38.1	5.3	--	15	52
Total number of benefits received	2,287	5.3	2.2	--	1	10

Table 7: Associate Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	N	Mean	S.D.	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Hourly salary	1,982	12.8	2.4	12.4	3	60.02
Annual salary	404	20,609	6,677	19,796	1,000	59,183
Hours worked per week	2,262	35.6	5.5	--	0	80
Weeks worked per year	2,262	37.2	5.9	--	0	52
Total number of benefits received	2,287	4.3	2.5	--	0	11

Table 8: Teacher Benefits

Benefits Received	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	N	%	N
Health insurance				
Yes	79.9	1,829	50.3	1,343
No	20.0	458	49.7	944
Dental insurance				
Yes	72.7	1,665	52.4	1,200
No	27.2	622	47.5	1,087
Vision insurance				
Yes	70.6	1,617	51.8	1,187
No	29.3	670	48.0	1,100
Disability insurance				
Yes	43.5	997	33.7	771
No	56.3	1,290	66.2	1,516
Vacation days				
Yes	46.6	1,066	42.7	977
No	53.3	1,221	57.2	1,310
Sick days				
Yes	89.4	2,048	82.7	1,894
No	10.4	239	17.2	393
Retirement				
Yes	69.9	1,600	58.1	1,331
No	30.0	687	41.7	956
Tax annuity				
Yes	15.7	360	11.4	262
No	84.1	1,927	88.4	2,025
Dependent care				
Yes	14.3	328	12.5	287
No	85.5	1,959	87.3	2,000
Cafeteria benefits				
Yes	12.8	293	11.6	265
No	87.1	1,994	88.3	2,022
Other benefits				
Yes	8.1	186	7.9	180
No	91.7	2,101	92.0	2,107