



Wilder's Child Development Center

Evaluation Results from the 2014-15 School Year

D E C E M B E R 2 0 1 5

Prepared by:
Monica Idzelis Rothe

Contents

Background.....	1
Evaluation methodology.....	1
Description of children.....	4
Results.....	5
Overall developmental gains.....	5
Program satisfaction.....	16
An assessment of ‘hope’.....	16
Conclusions and next steps.....	18
Appendix.....	19

Figures

1. Child demographics.....	4
2. TS GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): All classrooms.....	6
3. Teaching Strategies GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): Dolphin classroom (age 4-5 years).....	8
4. Teaching Strategies GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): Butterfly classroom (age 3 ½ - 4 ½ years).....	10
5. Teaching Strategies GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): Penguin classroom (age 33 months - 3 ½ years).....	12
7. IGDI results (Fall to Spring): Dolphin classroom (age 4-5 years).....	14
8. IGDI results (Fall to Spring): Butterfly classroom (age 3 ½ - 4 ½ years).....	15
9. NAEYC program satisfaction survey results by domain.....	16

Acknowledgments

The information provided for this report is due to the efforts of the Wilder Child Development Center staff, especially Judy Ohm, the Director of the Child Development Center, Angela Clair, Teacher Coordinator, and the many teachers who regularly complete many assessments for each of the children in their classrooms. We also wish to thank the parents of the students at the Center for taking the time to provide their input.

The following Wilder Research staff members contributed to this report:

Jenny Bohlke

Heather Johnson

Kerry Walsh

Background

The Wilder Child Development Center is a full-day child care and early childhood education program for children age 16 months to kindergarten. It is accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Through the development of a combination of partnerships and with financial support from the Wilder Foundation, the Center is able to offer a high-quality early learning environment. It has attained the highest Parent Aware rating, a Minnesota child and early education rating tool.

The program serves about 70 children at a given time. Many of the children live in the Frogtown neighborhood where the Center is located; others are bused by the Center from the east side of Saint Paul. The program welcomes families from all ethnic, economic, and education backgrounds.

Set in a nurturing environment, the program works to ensure children are fully prepared for learning success. This is accomplished by: employing highly qualified, stable staff and having low child-teacher ratios; utilizing a standardized early learning curriculum and age-appropriate learning activities, equipment, and materials; incorporating the evidence-based Incredible Years curriculum which teaches social skills and promotes emotional competence; providing children with nutritious home-cooked meals and snacks; and involving families in programming through family events, field trips, athletic events, and creative arts programs.

Evaluation methodology

The aim of the 2014-15 evaluation was to provide a snapshot of the program's effectiveness in preparing children for school success by summarizing key outcome measures as well as parents' satisfaction with the program and their hopefulness for their children's future success in school.

To this end, the evaluation relied upon the following data sources:

Teaching Strategies GOLD™

Teaching Strategies GOLD™ (TS GOLD) is a research-based, ongoing observational system for assessing children from birth through kindergarten. It is based on 38 objectives for development and learning that include predictors of school success and are based on school readiness standards. The objectives are aligned with the Common Core State Standards, state early learning guidelines, and the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework. Ten areas of development and learning are assessed through

TS GOLD, including: social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, mathematics, science and technology, social studies, the arts, and English language acquisition.

Teachers at Wilder’s Child Development Center assess all children in these ten areas of development at three points in time during the school year: fall, spring, and summer. This report includes results from two points: fall and spring (summer results were not yet available). In addition, four of the areas assessed (science and technology, social studies, the arts, and English language acquisition) are not available through TS GOLD yet. Based upon teacher observations, children receive a score at each assessment period that falls into one of three categories: below expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations. The categories indicate where children are relative to most children of the same age or class/grade.

Preschool Individual Growth & Development Indicators (IGDIs)

The Individual Growth & Development Indicators (IGDIs) are a set of preschool assessments for monitoring the growth and development of children on the pathway to kindergarten. The IGDIs identify developmental gains as well as children experiencing difficulties acquiring the skills necessary for academic success. They are predictive of school-readiness and later academic success. The Child Development Center uses the tool to assess early literacy in the following skill areas: picture naming (oral language), rhyming (phonological awareness), alliteration (phonological awareness), and letter naming (alphabet knowledge). Print and word awareness and name writing are assessed via the Phonological Awareness and Literacy Screening (PALS PreK), but are grouped with the IGDI results in this report given the related focus of these tools.

NAEYC program satisfaction questionnaire

Each year around February, the Child Development Center administers a program satisfaction questionnaire to the parents of students at the Center. The 50-item survey was developed by NAEYC (National Association for the Education of Young Children) and assesses parents’ satisfaction with: their relationship with program staff; the curriculum; the teaching style; the assessments conducted with children; their children’s health while at the Center; information provided to the family and the extent to which the family has input; relevant community services and events; and the program’s leadership and management.

Assessment of hope

This year, the program made its first attempt to assess the construct of “hope” among parents of students at the Center, as required by the Wilder Foundation. Two items were developed to assess parents’ hopefulness for their children’s future as a result of their

child's participation at the Child Development Center. Specifically, the items assessed the extent to which the parent was hopeful his/her child would be prepared for and successful in school. The brief two-item survey was administered by paper-and-pencil to parents at child pick-up and drop-off times in early March 2015.

CareLogic database

Descriptive information about the children at the Center was extracted from the Wilder Foundation's CareLogic database. Information was only included for children for whom assessment data (TS GOLD or IGDIs) were also available.

Other assessments

In addition to the methods described above, the Child Development Center utilizes numerous other tools to assess child development. These include:

- The Ages & Stages Questionnaires (ASQ)
- The Ages & Stages Questionnaires: Social-Emotional (ASQ:SE)
- The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)
- The Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy (TROLLS)
- The Phonological Awareness and Literacy Screening (PALS PreK)
- The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)
- The Numbers Works math literacy tool
- The Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation Tool (ELLCO)
- The Pyramid Infant Toddler Observational Tool (TPITOS)
- The Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool for Preschool Classrooms (TPOT)
- The Minneapolis Preschool Screening Instrument (MPSI)
- The BIRS (Behavior Incident Report)

This report highlights results from select key measures in order to provide a high-level summative picture of the program's effectiveness.

Description of children

The information provided below is based on the 52 children for whom matched TS GOLD and/or IGDI assessment data were available (i.e., data that were available at both time points examined here – fall 2014 and spring 2015). Most of these children were black/ African-American (81%), followed by white (13%), Asian (4%), and Native American (2%). Ages ranged from about 12 months to 58 months, with just over one-third (37%) in the 3-year old range and another third (33%) in the 4-year old range. There were slightly more girls (56%) than boys (44%). English was the primary language in all households (Figure 1).

1. Child demographics (N=52)

	N	%
Gender		
Female	29	56%
Male	23	44%
Age (as of 10/1/2014)		
12-23 months old (1 – 2 years)	3	6%
24-35 months old (2 – 3 years)	13	25%
36-47 months old (3 – 4 years)	19	37%
48-59 months old (4 – 5 years)	17	33%
Race/ethnicity		
Black	42	81%
White	7	13%
Asian	2	4%
Native American	1	2%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	1	2%
Primary language		
English	52	100%

Results

Overall developmental gains

Overall, most children showed gains over the course of the 2014-15 school year. In particular, the majority of pre-K children (i.e., children age 4-5 in the Dolphin classroom) were on track in all areas of development (including 100% of children who met expectations for literacy), with the exception of mathematics, rhyming, and alliteration. Overall, findings suggest that most pre-K children demonstrate general readiness for kindergarten and that other children are showing developmental gains.

The following summarizes findings from two developmental assessments, the TS GOLD and the IGDIs.

TS GOLD

A total of 44 children were assessed using TS GOLD in both fall 2014 and spring 2015.¹ Figure 2 illustrates results for children across all classrooms (Dolphins, Butterflies, Penguins, Toddle Bears, and Toddle Cubs). Overall, results indicate that at least three-quarters of all children were “meeting” or “exceeding” expectations in all domains by the time of the spring assessment. Furthermore, more children were meeting/exceeding expectations in the spring as compared to the fall, indicating growth across developmental domains during the school year.

In the spring, children were *most* likely to be meeting or exceeding expectations in terms of their literacy (95%), cognitive development (93%), language (91%), and physical development (91%). Some children (23-59%) showed significant enough improvement from fall to spring to move up a category (from “below” expectations to “meeting” expectations, or from “meeting” expectations to “exceeding” expectations). More children (81-95%), however, showed at least *some* improvement between assessment periods (even if they did not move up a full category) (Figure 2).

¹ More children had assessments completed in the fall only, or the spring only. These scores are excluded from this report because matched assessment data (fall *and* spring) were not available for these children.

2. TS GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): All classrooms (N=44)

Domain	Percentage of children whose TS GOLD score...			
	Met or exceeded expectations		Improved from fall to spring	Moved child up a level from fall to spring ^a
	Fall	Spring		
Social-emotional	43%	73%	84%	43%
Physical	75%	91%	95%	23%
Language	50%	91%	91%	48%
Cognitive	43%	93%	93%	59%
Literacy (N=43)	81%	95%	81%	40%
Mathematics	50%	84%	93%	48%

Note: TS GOLD scores fall into the following categories: below expectations, meet expectations, and exceed expectations. The assessment of the remaining TS GOLD domains (science and technology, social studies, the arts, and English language acquisition) is conducted using a different rating system and the results are not currently available from TS GOLD.

Mean scores are not presented because the range of scores for below/meet/exceed expectations varies from classroom to classroom so means cannot accurately represent more than one classroom.

^a Those whose scores “moved up a level” include either a change from below to meeting or exceeding expectations, or meeting to exceeding expectations.

An additional 26 children (37% of all children) received a one-time assessment during the fall, winter, or spring of the 2014-15 school year due to the child entering or leaving the Center mid-year. Children without matched pre/post assessments had been in the program for varying lengths of time at the time of their first assessment, ranging from a few weeks to a few months. This mix of children includes those who would be considered “highly mobile” and do not have consistent child care assistance based on a number of circumstances. The following summarizes the proportion of these children who were meeting or exceeding expectations in each domain assessed by the TS Gold at the time of their single assessment: social-emotional (42%), physical (88%), language (65%), cognitive (65%), literacy (81%), and math (50%).

TS GOLD: Dolphin classroom (age 4-5 years)

The majority of pre-K children (79-100%) were meeting or exceeding expectations by the spring assessment across all domains. Of particular note is the fact that *all* children were meeting/exceeding expectations in the areas of language, cognitive development, and literacy. Nearly all children (93%) were doing so in the areas of social-emotional and physical development. Furthermore, across all domains, more children were meeting/

exceeding expectations in the spring than in the fall, suggesting general improvement over time.

At least half of children moved up a full category from fall to spring in the domains of social-emotional development, literacy, and cognitive development. Additionally, all or almost all of the pre-K children (93-100%) showed at least *some* improvement between assessment periods in their physical development, literacy, language, cognitive development, and math (Figure 3).

3. Teaching Strategies GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): Dolphin classroom (age 4-5 years) (N=14)

Domain	Range of scores for “meeting expectations”	TS GOLD scores			Percentage of children whose TS GOLD score...			
		Mean score		Mean number of points score increased by from fall to spring ^a	Met or exceeded expectations		Improved from fall to spring	Moved child up a level from fall to spring ^b
		Fall	Spring		Fall	Spring		
Social-emotional	589-690	579	668	90	50%	93%	86%	71%
Physical	578-698	576	630	54	57%	93%	100%	36%
Language	580-721	613	666	53	71%	100%	100%	36%
Cognitive	591-738	606	676	70	57%	100%	93%	57%
Literacy	572-705	638	689	51	86%	100%	100%	64%
Mathematics	615-712	608	644	36	50%	79%	93%	29%

Note: TS GOLD scores fall into the following categories: below expectations, meet expectations, and exceed expectations. The assessment of the remaining TS GOLD domains (science and technology, social studies, the arts, and English language acquisition) is conducted using a different rating system and the results are not currently available from TS GOLD.

^a Of those whose score increased from fall to spring (scores that remained flat or decreased were excluded from this calculation)

^b Those whose scores “moved up a level” include either a change from below to meeting or exceeding expectations, or meeting to exceeding expectations.

TS GOLD: Butterfly classroom (age 3 ½ - 4 ½ years)

By the spring assessment, all children in the Butterfly classroom were meeting or exceeding expectations in all six domains of development assessed by TS GOLD. Furthermore, similar to the Dolphin classroom, more children were meeting/exceeding expectations in the spring than in the fall (with the exception of literacy, where 100% of children were already doing so at both points). This pattern of results suggests general improvement for children over time (Figure 4).

This pattern of improvement is also supported by the fact that most children's scores generally increased from fall to spring, especially in the areas of social-emotional development (93%), physical development (87%), cognitive development (87%), and mathematics (87%). A smaller proportion of children moved up a level in any domain (7-47%) (Figure 4).

4. Teaching Strategies GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): Butterfly classroom (age 3 ½ - 4 ½ years) (N=15)

Domain	Range of scores for “meeting expectations”	TS GOLD scores			Percentage of children whose TS GOLD score...			
		Mean score		Mean number of points score increased by from fall to spring ^a	Met or exceeded expectations		Improved from fall to spring	Moved child up a level from fall to spring ^b
		Fall	Spring		Fall	Spring		
Social-emotional	516-614	524	570	46	60%	100%	93%	47%
Physical	512-617	568	596	25	93%	100%	87%	7%
Language	524-639	557	590	33	67%	100%	73%	40%
Cognitive	519-634	568	618	50	73%	100%	87%	40%
Literacy	530-610	622	628	7	100%	100%	47%	7%
Mathematics	545-621	585	631	46	93%	100%	87%	47%

Note: TS GOLD scores fall into the following categories: below expectations, meet expectations, and exceed expectations. The assessment of the remaining TS GOLD domains (science and technology, social studies, the arts, and English language acquisition) is conducted using a different rating system and the results are not currently available from TS GOLD.

Four children were in the Penguin classroom in the fall but in the Butterfly classroom by the spring and are included in the table above. The range of scores that “meet expectations” for each domain are the same for the Penguin and Butterfly classrooms.

^a Of those whose score increased from fall to spring (scores that remained flat or decreased were excluded from this calculation)

^b Those whose scores “moved up a level” include either a change from below to meeting or exceeding expectations, or meeting to exceeding expectations.

TS GOLD: Penguin classroom (age 33 months – 3 ½ years)

The vast majority of children in the Penguin classroom were meeting or exceeding expectations in the spring across 5 of the 6 developmental domains assessed. In particular, all children were meeting/exceeding expectations in the areas of physical development and literacy. Almost all children (92%) were doing so in terms of language development and mathematics. One-third (33%) were meeting/exceeding expectations in their social-emotional development by the spring assessment (Figure 5). Additionally, all children's scores improved from fall to spring across all domains except social-emotional development.

Overall, the proportion meeting/exceeding expectations was higher in the spring than in the fall across all domains, indicating that in general, children demonstrated growth over time. There were significant increases in the rate of children meeting/exceeding expectations between fall and spring in the areas of language development (17% to 92%) and mathematics (8% to 92%).

5. Teaching Strategies GOLD scores by developmental domain (Fall to Spring): Penguin classroom (age 33 months - 3 ½ years) (N=12)

Domain	Range of scores for “meeting expectations”	TS GOLD scores			Percentage of children whose TS GOLD score...			
		Mean score		Mean number of points score increased by from fall to spring ^a	Met or exceeded expectations		Improved from fall to spring	Moved child up a level from fall to spring ^b
		Fall	Spring		Fall	Spring		
Social-emotional	516-614	465	491	25	25%	33%	67%	17%
Physical	512-617	505	593	88	92%	100%	100%	33%
Language	524-639	444	570	126	17%	92%	100%	83%
Cognitive ^c	519-634	424	n/a	n/a	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Literacy	530-610	497	611	114	73%	100%	100%	64%
Mathematics	545-621	478	588	109	8%	92%	100%	83%

Note: TS GOLD scores fall into the following categories: below expectations, meet expectations, and exceed expectations. The assessment of the remaining TS GOLD domains (science and technology, social studies, the arts, and English language acquisition) is conducted using a different rating system and the results are not currently available from TS GOLD.

Three children were in the Toddle Bears classroom in the Fall but in the Penguins classroom by the Spring and are included in the table above.

^a Of those whose score increased from fall to spring (scores that remained flat or decreased were excluded from this calculation).

^b Those whose scores “moved up a level” include either a change from below to meeting or exceeding expectations, or meeting to exceeding expectations.

^c Insufficient spring data was available for students in the Penguin classroom on the cognitive domain so those results are omitted here.

TS GOLD: Toddle Bears and Toddle Cubs classrooms (age 16-33 months)

Matched data between any two time points (fall to winter or fall to spring) were available for too few children (n=2) to be analyzed or included in the report. Some children who were in the Toddle Bears classroom in the fall had moved to the Penguins (preschool) classroom by spring so their scores are included with the Penguins classroom. It should be noted that the toddler classrooms (Toddle Bears and Toddle Cubs) include the most mobile group of students in the Center. It is also mandated that at 33 months of age, students must move up to the preschool classroom, unlike in other classrooms where children can remain in their classroom to finish out the year before moving up.

Preschool IGDIs

Dolphin classroom

By the spring assessment, almost all children in the pre-K Dolphin classroom (94%) were at or above the target in name writing. At least 70 percent were at or above target in the areas of letter naming (lower case) (76%), print and word awareness (75%), letter naming (upper case) (71%), and picture naming (71%). Fewer children's scores (29%) met the target by spring in rhyming and alliteration. More than half of children's scores increased from fall to spring across all domains except alliteration. Many also moved up a "level" (from "far from the target" to either "close to the target" or "at or above the target," or from "close to the target" to "at or above the target") from fall to spring. This was particularly true for picture naming (94%), followed by name writing (65%) (Figure 7).

7. IGI results (Fall to Spring): Dolphin classroom (age 4-5 years) (N=16-17)

Domain	Target score	Mean fall score	Mean spring score	Percentage at or above target by spring	Percentage whose score increased any amount by spring	Percentage who moved up a level ^a by spring
Picture naming	26	15.3	27.8	71%	100%	94%
Rhyming	12	5.8	9.2	29%	53%	47%
Alliteration	8	3.1	4.1	29%	29%	29%
Letter naming (upper)	14	14.7	18.4	71%	82%	6%
Letter naming (lower)	11	10.7	15.6	76%	88%	41%
Print & word	7	5.6	7.8	75%	75%	44%
Name writing	6	4.9	6.7	94%	94%	65%

Note: Scores fall into one of three categories: "far from the target," "close to the target," and "at or above the target."

IGDIs were assessed for most children at three points in time: fall, winter, and spring. Fall and spring scores are reported here. When fall scores were not available, winter scores were used in its place. Children for whom spring scores were not available were excluded from the results.

^a Those whose scores "moved up a level" include: either a change from "far from" to "close to" or "at or above the target," or from "close to" to "at or above the target."

Butterfly classroom

By the spring, all children in the Butterfly classroom were at or above target in picture naming, and at least half were at or above target in name writing (61%), print and word awareness (61%), letter naming (upper case) (56%), and letter naming (lower case) (50%). Similar to the Dolphin classroom, fewer children's scores met the target in rhyming (37%) and alliteration (41%). Nevertheless, more than half of children's scores increased from fall to spring across all domains except rhyming. Additionally, two-thirds moved up a "level" by spring in print and word (67%). Less than half moved up a "level" in the other domains by spring (Figure 8).

8. IGD results (Fall to Spring): Butterfly classroom (age 3 ½ - 4 ½ years) (N=17-19)

Domain	Target score ^a	Mean fall score	Mean spring score	Percentage at or above target by spring	Percentage whose score increased any amount by spring	Percentage who moved up a level ^b by spring
Picture naming	18 (26)	16.7	23.8	100%	61%	39%
Rhyming	7 (12)	3.3	7.0	37%	42%	32%
Alliteration	5 (8)	2.4	4.4	41%	59%	41%
Letter naming (upper)	14	9.8	15.3	56%	78%	33%
Letter naming (lower)	11	8.7	12.6	50%	83%	28%
Print & word	7	4.4	7.4	61%	89%	67%
Name writing	6	4.3	5.6	61%	61%	39%

Note: Scores fall into one of three categories: "far from the target," "close to the target," and "at or above the target."

IGDIs were assessed for most children at three points in time: fall, winter, and spring. Fall and spring scores are reported here. When fall scores were not available, winter scores were used in its place. Children for whom spring scores were not available were excluded from the results.

^a There are two sets of target scores for select domains in the Butterfly classroom, based on the child's age. The lower target score is for children age 3 by September 1 of the school year, while the higher target score is for children who are age 4 by September 1.

^b Those whose scores "moved up a level" include: either a change from "far from" to "close to" or "at or above the target," or from "close to" to "at or above the target."

Program satisfaction

Overall, participants expressed a high level of satisfaction with all aspects of the program. At least 9 out of 10 parents felt positively about each element of the program, with the exception of community relationships, which was slightly lower (81%) because a relatively low number of parents said they worked with staff on community projects. The areas with the highest level of endorsement by parents were health (97%) and leadership and management (97%), followed by teaching (94%) and families (94%) (Figure 9). See the Appendix for the results for each individual item within each domain.

9. NAEYC program satisfaction survey results by domain (N=44-65)*

Program element	Percentage who rated items positively (Average across items)	Percentage who rated items negatively (Average across items)
Relationships (6 items)	93%	7%
Curriculum (2 items)	90%	10%
Teaching (2 items)	94%	6%
Assessments (8 items)	93%	7%
Health (3 items)	97%	3%
Families (20 items)	94%	6%
Community relationships (3 items)	81%	19%
Leadership and management (6 items)	97%	3%

Note: The scale for each item was as follows: “yes,” or “yes but,” (positive ratings) and “no,” or “no but,” (negative ratings). Respondents could provide more information about their response if they selected “yes but,” or “no but.” That information is not available for this report.

* Select items within several domains (relationships, health, families, and community relationships) were answered by a smaller set of respondents (N=9-25) as these were only relevant to these parents. Percentages for each item were calculated based on the total number of valid respondents.

An assessment of ‘hope’

In addition to assessing program effectiveness and satisfaction, this evaluation aimed to gather preliminary data about parents’ hopefulness for their children’s future as a result of their child’s participation at the Wilder Child Development Center. Specifically, parents were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the following statements:

- Because of my child’s experience at the Wilder Child Development Center, I feel hopeful that my child will be prepared when he/she goes to school.

- Because of my child’s experience at the Wilder Child Development Center, I feel hopeful that my child will be successful when he/she goes to school.

All 43 parents who participated in the assessment said they either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that their child would be both prepared for school and successful when they attended school because their child attended the Wilder Child Development Center. The vast majority “strongly agreed” with these statements (84% “strongly agreed” their child would be prepared for school, while 86% “strongly agreed” their child would be successful in school).

The findings suggest that parents are extremely hopeful about their children’s future schooling as a result of their time at the Child Development Center, based on these preliminary results. However, these results may reflect a response bias on the part of parents who want to project a “hopeful,” positive outlook, or survey items that do not fully or adequately measure the construct of “hope.” Future evaluations will re-examine the assessment of “hope” with this population.

Conclusions and next steps

Results from the 2014-15 evaluation of Wilder’s Child Development Center suggest that most children are making developmental gains. The findings indicate that the majority of children (especially older children) are generally on track in the domains of development assessed by the TS GOLD and IGDIs. Importantly, most children are also showing positive gains between assessment periods, even those children who may not be meeting expectations in some areas of development.

Parents expressed high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the program. They also reported feeling very hopeful that their child would be prepared for and successful in school.

To enhance the evaluation and the value of the results in the future:

- Ensure ratings are entered at each assessment period for all children to maximize the number of children for whom matching data are available.
- Continue to summarize findings at the end of an academic year when all assessment data are available in order to have a full picture of the gains that occurred over the year.
- Consider whether other data/assessments might be incorporated into future reports to provide additional information about children’s development.
- Identify additional methods for assessing the construct of “hope” that better discern the potential variability in responses.

Appendix

A1. NAEYC program satisfaction survey results

Program element	N	Percentage who said “yes” or “yes but”	Percentage who said “no” or “no but”
Relationships (mean of following 6 items)		93%	7%
I feel that I have regular contact and communication with my child’s teacher and that we value and use each other’s input about the care of my child.	65	97%	3%
My child’s teacher talks to me regularly about the interests and needs of my child both at home and at school.	64	97%	3%
I know the rules and expectations for my child’s classroom.	65	97%	3%
My child’s teacher asks me about my family background and my beliefs.	63	70%	30%
The program staff help me and my child move smoothly between home and school.	60	97%	3%
<i>For families with children with special needs only:</i> The program staff works with me to develop plans to support my child’s full inclusion.	9	100%	0%
Curriculum (mean of following 2 items)		90%	10%
The program staff use information about my family background and beliefs to make my child’s learning experiences more meaningful.	48	81%	19%
The program takes into account my child’s home language when working on literacy and provides my child opportunities to learn in a language they are comfortable with.	53	98%	2%
Teaching (mean of following 2 items)		94%	6%
I regularly have the opportunity to participate in classroom activities and events.	63	94%	6%
When I disagree with how a teacher works with my child, I feel that I can have a good conversation with him or her and develop mutually satisfying decisions.	60	95%	5%
Assessments (mean of following 8 items)		93%	7%
The program staff told me about the assessment process they use. I know about and understand the following :			
the instruments they use	61	90%	10%
the procedures	61	93%	7%
the use of the results	59	88%	12%
how they keep my child’s progress confidential	60	93%	7%

A1. NAEYC program satisfaction survey results (continued)

Program element	N	Percentage who said “yes” or “yes but”	Percentage who said “no” or “no but”
Assessments (mean of following 8 items)		93%	7%
Program staff communicate with me about my child’s assessments in a language I understand and in a manner that is respectful to my cultural identity.	57	95%	5%
I was or will be included in developing the assessment plan for my child.	61	95%	5%
My child’s teacher talks with me regularly about how my child is doing at home and at school.	65	91%	9%
I receive written reports about my child at least twice a year.	51	96%	4%
Health (mean of following 3 items)		97%	3%
Program staff let me know when there are contagious diseases in the program.	60	97%	3%
<i>For families who send food to school only:</i> I am aware of the nutritional requirements for sending food along with my child to school.	21	95%	5%
<i>For families with children with allergies or special nutritional needs only:</i> Program staff is aware of my child’s special health needs and carefully provides for the	22	100%	0%
Families (mean of following 20 items)		94%	6%
I am provided with information about the following:			
the program philosophy and goals	61	98%	2%
program rules and expectations	65	97%	3%
program events	64	98%	2%
community activities	64	98%	2%
available community support	63	97%	3%
child assessment plans	60	93%	7%
I am provided written materials (including this survey) in a language I understand.	64	100%	0%
The program has the resources and ability to help me obtain the services I need for my child and family.	61	100%	0%
Information that I provide about my child’s skills, interests, and needs is incorporated into classroom interactions and activities.	60	97%	3%
The program gives me opportunities to work with other families.	61	92%	8%
I have the opportunity to help plan program events.	51	82%	18%
Program staff and I informally share information about my child on at least a weekly basis.	63	90%	10%

A1. NAEYC program satisfaction survey results (continued)

Program element	N	Percentage who said "yes" or "yes but"	Percentage who said "no" or "no but"
Families (mean of following 20 items)		94%	6%
The program staff helps me know about and use community resources.	60	87%	13%
I believe I have a good relationship with the staff at my child's program.	61	98%	2%
I am aware of many opportunities to volunteer at my child's program.	62	95%	5%
The program asks me for my input about the program in many different ways, both verbally and written.	60	92%	8%
I am encouraged by the program staff to take on leadership roles in the program.	54	83%	17%
<i>For families with ESL needs only:</i> The program provides a translator when needed.	25	100%	0%
When program staff have had a concern about my child and his or her development, they have communicated this concern to me with sensitivity and respect and in private. I have received this information in writing, with thorough explanations and suggestions about how to proceed.	49	96%	4%
If problems arise in my interactions with teaching staff, they are good about working to solve these problems and do so in language I understand.	44	98%	2%
Community relationships (mean of following 3 items)		81%	19%
<i>For families with children with special needs only:</i> Program staff have been able to provide me with special services for my child's special needs.	24	100%	0%
Staff are good about informing me about special events in the community that may be of interest to my family.	62	97%	3%
I work with program staff members on community projects.	63	48%	52%
Leadership and management (mean of following 6 items)		97%	3%
The program administrator seems to keep up to date in the field and provides competitive, high-quality services.	60	97%	3%
I generally feel respected by the program staff and that my contributions are valued.	64	98%	2%
I am familiar with the program's procedures for dropping off and picking up my child. Program staff and I use this time to communicate about my child.	65	98%	2%
I have been or will be included in a yearly program evaluation.	51	96%	4%
When a program evaluation is completed, I am given a final report of the findings.	45	98%	2%
I feel like I have a voice in planning for program improvement.	60	92%	8%

Note: The scale for each item was as follows: "yes," "yes but," "no," and "no but".