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~Executive Summary~

In Fiscal Year 2010, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts dedicated $8 million to Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK). The purpose of the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) UPK program is to “promote school readiness and positive outcomes for participating children and to inform the longer-term implementation of universally accessible, affordable, high quality early education.” ¹ Preschool programs serving at-risk and low-income children were prioritized during the pilot phase.

The purpose of the Universal Pre-Kindergarten Child Assessment Analysis project is three fold: (1) to analyze the FY 2010² UPK child assessment data, (2) to investigate what child assessment tools are currently being used in Massachusetts and (3) to investigate how other states are utilizing their child assessment data.

To accomplish these goals, Oldham Innovative Research:
1) analyzed the FY 2010 data,
2) spoke with public school preschool programs
3) interviewed ECE professionals representing Head Start, Family Child Care, Center-based Child Care, and ECE-related Higher Education
4) queried publishers of ECE child assessments,
5) interviewed state child care administrators in 9 states, and
6) conducted research on child assessment systems in 14 states outside of Massachusetts.

Analysis of Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) Grantee Data
The purpose of UPK assessment monitoring is to ensure that programs are using one of the four approved assessment systems to measure and track children’s development to inform program practice, individualize instruction for children and communicate with families on an on-going basis. The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) only monitors aggregated classroom-level reports to confirm that programs are assessing children in UPK-funded classrooms or homes. Individual child data is not collected by EEC nor is the information examined to determine the strengths and weaknesses of individual programs. The information collected is used to verify programs are assessing children, inform future planning and professional development opportunities.

Use of Child Assessment Data in Other States
A review of states that use early childhood assessment data in UPK and related programs was examined. Areas of exploration included: 1) legislative policies on UPK² child assessment data; 2) oversight and monitoring of UPK child assessment; 3) types of programs involved in collecting child assessment data; 4) types of training and technical assistance provided to programs; 5) and how data is used at the program and state level for program improvement.

² Data analyzed was based on fall FY 2010 data submitted (September 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009).
³ We use UPK as a term to indicate universal pre-kindergarten, pre-kindergarten and other similar programs.
Current Use of Early Childhood Assessment Tools Across the Commonwealth

Another goal of the project was to collect information from a variety of stakeholders on UPK assessment. UPK programs located within public school settings, professionals who work with early childhood professionals from across the Commonwealth, and the publishers of the early childhood assessment tools were contacted to glean further information of UPK child assessment systems and child outcomes.

Recommendations related to UPK Child Assessment Data

Recommendation 1: **Using web-based (or on-line) submissions as a way of collecting data should be a requirement of UPK grantees.** This allows for consistency in analysis and reporting resulting in more accurate results and recommendations. Older versions of the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire* do not support web-based data tracking, so grantees will need to switch to the latest version of the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire (ASQ-3)* in order to submit data via the web. This change may require additional training and resources (e.g., technology and subscription fees) for grantees using the ASQ-3. Use of web-based submissions also allows for periodic “spot checks” to check for data reliability and validity throughout the grant period.

**Evidence**
- 131 grantees (47.3%) submitted data using the on-line EEC licenses in FY 2010 and were the preferred method of those submitting data. 14 more programs used the on-line licenses in FY 2010 when compared to FY 2009.
- An electronic component is critical to the success of data collection and used in most states. Having an easily accessible data port streamlines the collection process at the program level, and allows program access to analyze the data on the classroom or program level, making the whole assessment process more valuable to educators and program administrators. Electronic collection also makes reporting easier and more timely and consistent, as long as sufficient professional development is provided.

Recommendation 2: **Department of Early Education and Care web-based licensees should indicate if they are a UPK grantee and specify the program’s UPK children.** By not carefully separating the UPK from the non-UPK grantees within the on-line license aggregate data runs the risk of being contaminated. Data analysis is also impeded by having to delineate the data before analysis can begin.

**Evidence**
- 64 programs utilizing the EEC on-line licenses were non-grantees compared to 131 of on-line licensees who were FY 2010 UPK grantees.

Recommendation 3: **While UPK grantees should be allowed to assess all of the children in their programs through the on-line license, they must delineate the children that are enrolled in UPK.** Again, this helps with accuracy in data analysis on this specific population.

**Evidence**
- There were instances (34.4% of cases) when programs reported data on more children than indicated they were serving in their UPK programs.
Recommendation 4: Increased and efficient communication with family child care grantees that belong to a family child care system needs to be systematically planned in order to raise submission rates. EEC may also want to consider working closely with family child care system representatives on ways to encourage timely data submissions.

Evidence
- Family child care grantees within a family child care system had the lowest rate of submissions (44.7% did not submit data).
- In all, 17 family child care systems are represent UPK grantees. Six out of the 17 systems had 100% submissions by family child care providers in their system. The same was true for systems that had no one submit data (6 out of 17 had 100% non-submissions). Five out of the 17 systems had a combination of providers who submitted data and those who did not submit data.

Recommendation 5: Domain completion rates could be increased with professional development.
Offering professional development on the various domains of child development and how to examine evidence of developmental milestone attainment is recommended. Training on how to utilize online systems may be related to domain completion rates and another area for professional development.

Evidence
- Domain completion rates were higher for paper copies than for on-line licenses. Completion rates by domain varied from tool to tool with no one domain being more complete than another. The Ages & Stages Questionnaire and the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Developmental Continuum had the best domain completion rates at 100% and 93% respectively. The Work Sampling System had the lowest domain completion rate at an average of 84%.

Recommendations related to Professional Development

Recommendation 6: Professional development on how best to utilize the web-based system of assessing children should be offered annually. Technical assistance should also be part of this type of professional development to help programs develop a systematic plan of data collection. With revised tools like the Ages & Stages Questionnaire-3 and Teaching Strategies GOLD now available, professional development will be necessary to help grantees become more familiar with the changes. Massachusetts may draw from the learnings from other states in this area, which are included in the Appendix of the full report.

Evidence
- Ages and Stages Questionnaire and the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Developmental Continuum now have revised tools, which are available via the web for tracking data efficiently and effectively.
- “Training is needed on online applications of the tool.” - Massachusetts ECE professional

Recommendation 7: To determine specific professional development needs for teachers as related to early childhood assessment, EEC will need to depend on director interviews, teacher interviews and/or focus groups or observation. The aggregate data did not reveal information useful in determining the professional development needs of teachers. Information about child performance is not directly related to the professional development needs of teachers (e.g., a highly trained teacher could be in a center that has a high percentage of low performing children). It would be more beneficial to consider the individual needs...
of programs by communicating with directors. For example, there could be training with program directors to help them use their data and interviews with teachers to determine professional development needs and then have the directors report back to EEC such that EEC can determine what is needed on a state-wide level. This type of information gathering could be incorporated into the annual UPK reporting.

Evidence
- Domain completion rates did not consistently point to one area of need over another. Many of the domains were completed at a similar rate.
- Looking at child results is not a reliable way of knowing what professional development teachers need (as indicated by other state experiences).
- If you were to use child knowledge gains in domain areas, it would require a detailed and time-intensive level of analysis. Since spring FY 2010 data was not due by grantees until June 30, 2010, data was not available to analyze progress for this report. Looking at gains in child knowledge to make any kind of determination (professional development or otherwise) is not common practice among other states and is not recommended.

Recommendation 8: Professional development coupled with technical assistance should be a systematic part of offering UPK grants and incentives. Training educators and offering technical assistance on successful use of tools is part of many states initiatives in assessing UPK children.

Evidence
- Arizona offers professional development through Arizona State University, regional mentoring, and a one-credit course on Progress Monitoring.
- Colorado provides training and technical assistance through an entity entitled, “Results Matter” that provides in-person training, meetings, and technical assistance.
- Pennsylvania has found that more one-on-one technical assistance (especially on the technology of progress monitoring) has been most effective. Webinars, one-on-one computer lab training, and individual training are all methods Pennsylvania uses to assist programs. On-line “refresher” trainings are also provided along with a help desk.

Recommendation 9: Provide professional development and technical assistance to UPK grantees on how they can use their aggregated child assessment data at the local level (i.e., with a local school district to show Pre-K growth and school readiness).

Evidence
- At the local level, child assessment data can be used effectively to help determine professional development needs for individual programs and classrooms, to help inform transition to Kindergarten initiatives, and to show district-wide progress in public Pre-K programs.
Recommendations related to Child Assessment Tools

Recommendation 10: Nationally, encouraging (and in some cases, requiring) early childhood programs to assess children using a reliable, scientifically-based early childhood assessment tool is a piece of improving outcomes for children prior to entering Kindergarten. **Massachusetts should continue its practice of encouraging UPK programs to assess children using evidence-based assessment tools through grants and incentives to track child outcomes.**

**Evidence**
- States we spoke with encourage or require early childhood programs that are providing UPK services to assess children using a systematic early childhood assessment tool.
- Eight states that currently have a Quality Rating and Improvement statewide system require a child assessment standard.

Recommendation 11: **The Commonwealth of Massachusetts should consider whether it wants to add additional tools to its approved list, or whether it would in fact be better to narrow the choices to one or two tools that are most often used.** The stated goal of using formative child assessment to inform program practices can help in determining whether EEC wants to add, reduce or maintain their current list of approved tools

**Evidence**
- States are adjusting their options for approved assessment tools due to budget cuts, issues with data compatibility, and concerns about the reliability of some tools. For example, Arizona has moved from a menu approach to one pre-approved tool, while New Jersey had moved away from its state-created tool to a menu approach. Among those states that offer a menu of tools for assessment, they typically narrow the list to a small number that are easily aligned.
- States vary widely in their approach to requiring the use of specific tools, but even those that do not require specific tools often use the *Work Sampling System* or *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* formats for collecting child assessment data.
- States have struggled with integrating and analyzing data from multiple tools at the state level, and with providing effective professional development when a number of tools are used by programs.

Recommendation 12: **Examine whether the High Scope COR Child Observation Record should remain one of the four EEC-approved child assessment tools due to low use.**

**Evidence**
- High Scope COR Child Observation Record was used by 9% of programs submitting data. The average preschool child data completion rate was lower than the *ASQ* and the *Work Sampling System* with a rate of 71.5%. The domain completion rate was at 91.6%.
- The child care professionals interviewed stated that Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum is the most commonly used tool in Massachusetts. High Scope COR was only mentioned by one out of nine professionals.
**Recommendation 13:** Investigate the new versions of the ASQ\(^4\) and the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum to determine what, if anything, grantees need to incorporate them into their data collection system. The Ages & Stages Questionnaire has recently gone through a revision that includes on-line component (called the ASQ-3). The Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum will have a new revision in the summer of 2010 entitled, Teaching Strategies GOLD. Both of these new revisions will be replacing the older versions of the EEC-approved tools.

**Evidence**
- According to Brookes Publishing, the ASQ-3 has two new age questionnaire (2 mo and 9mo), open ended questions to elicit information related to autism, more flexible age range for administration, refined Spanish translation, new cutoff scores with excellent sensitivity (.86) and specificity (.85), new monitoring zone (to say which kids need ongoing monitoring) and an online data management system.
- The publisher of Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum (Teaching Strategies) indicated that their newly revised tool, Teaching Strategies GOLD, is an entirely new assessment system with 38 new assessment areas, with two supporting English language acquisition. There are also Spanish acquisition objectives. Includes objectives to help teachers plan in science and technology, social studies and the arts. Extensively tested with children with developmental delays and disabilities, children who are advanced learners and children who are English-language learners. Includes “Assessment Opportunity Cards”, which present focused tasks for assessing selected predictors of school readiness in literacy and numeracy. EEC will need to negotiate with Teaching Strategies to ensure their data is translated seamlessly between the old and new system. Only the new system will be supported after the summer of 2011.

**Recommendation 14:** Consider whether ASQ should remain an approved tool.

**Evidence**
- ASQ is a screening tool, not an assessment tool. This is recognized in the community by an ECE professional, “I would not use Ages and Stages. It is not an assessment instrument – it is a screening tool and in my opinion it should not have been used for assessment purposes.”
- It is also recognized that it would be challenging for some programs to move away from ASQ. One ECE professional noted that “EEC has made it clear that they don’t like ASQ as an assessment tool, and there has been talk about eliminating it from the approved “four”. It is recognized as a screening tool, however, and we use it as such in both our center-based and family child care programs. We use it in our family child care systems as an assessment tool as well, and have invested time and resources in training our family child care providers in its use. We would hate to have to change and retrain our providers in the use of a different tool, never mind the expense.”

---

\(^4\) This is assuming that the ASQ remains an approved instrument.
**Recommendation 15:** If considering the approval of new tools, an in-depth examination of the *Brigance Early Childhood Complete System* and the *Galileo Pre-K* for use by UPK programs is warranted.

**Evidence**
- The *Brigance Early Childhood Complete System* was mentioned by Commonwealth public school UPK programs and ECE professionals as a well-researched, high quality system.
- The new Brigance early childhood complete system was mentioned by the UPK programs offered in public school settings as an up-and-coming tool that may be commonly used in the future. ECE professionals noted that the publishers of Brigance have produced very high quality products in the past and this is likely a very well-researched product (it is a research-based tool). “Curriculum Associates has come out with an online tool for early childhood programs. Given their reputation, this one (Brigance Early Childhood Complete System) should be looked at closely.” It should be noted that research and evidence from interviews showed that these tools are expensive.
- The *Galileo Pre-K* was mentioned by other states as a comprehensive, online child assessment system. However, there was only one public school UPK program that mentioned this tool being used in the Commonwealth. (“I got asked about Galileo by a program while at EEC as a possible alternative.” – Corey Zimmerman) Thus, we would recommend a greater emphasis on the Brigance tools.

**Recommendation 16:** Continue to provide clear explanations and delineations between child assessment systems and child screenings and discuss rationale for approved systems. Professional development on the difference between child assessment systems and child screenings would be beneficial.
- There was not a clear distinction between assessment and screening tools among school personnel and many “assessment” tools mentioned were actually screening tools
- Many schools (9 out of 11) have a full battery of assessments due to the complexity of assessing children in all domains, special and general education requirements and to meet the specific needs of all children
- Schools are interested in future prekindergarten standards and whether they will include guidance on child assessment; and
- Schools are constantly re-evaluating their use of assessment tools with a number of schools mentioned that they review tools each year, some with teachers.

**Recommendations related to the Strategic Use of Child Assessment Data**

**Recommendation 17:** If aggregate child assessment data is going to be used by the Commonwealth to inform policy at the state level, develop a strategic plan that clearly indicates how the child assessment data will be used. Communicate the strategic plan through training and technical assistance to UPK grantees.

**Evidence**
- States are only beginning to use child assessment data to inform policy at the state level and are hesitant to do so because of ambivalence about the role of child level assessment data in program accountability. Some states, however, have effectively used child assessment as one component of a multi-faceted program improvement and data system.
- When combined with program assessment, quality improvement systems, professional development, quality enhancement dollars, and longitudinal child outcome research (separate from child assessment), state level aggregated child assessment data can help tell the story of the success and quality of the system.
Chapter 1.
Analysis of FY 2010 Spring UPK Assessment Data

Introduction and Methodology

Each year the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) awards UPK funds to center-based programs (which include Head Start), family child care systems, independent family child care providers, public school systems, and private school systems to serve children enrolled in Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) programs. One of the requirements of being a UPK grantee is to submit semi-annual child assessment data based on one of the four EEC-approved child assessment systems. The four approved assessment systems include: the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, Work Sampling System, Ages and Stages Questionnaire, and High Scope COR Child Observation Record. At the minimum, grantees must assess the children during the fall and spring of each year with “fall” being any time between September 1 and December 31 and “spring” being any time between “January 1 and June 30”.

The purpose of UPK assessment monitoring is to ensure that programs are using one of the four assessment systems to measure and track children’s development to inform program practice on an on-going basis. EEC only monitors aggregated classroom-level reports to confirm that programs are assessing children in UPK-funded classrooms or homes. Individual child data is not collected by EEC nor is the information examined to determine the strengths and weaknesses of individual programs. The information collected is used to verify programs are completing child assessments, inform future planning and professional development opportunities. Tool-specific instructions regarding the monitoring process are provided to grantees.

Child assessment data was required from 277 FY 2010 UPK programs. FY 2010 grantees who submitted data were located in child care centers, family child care systems, independent family child care homes, private schools and public schools. Grantees could submit data through mailing in a paper version of aggregate classroom/home report, e-mailing a copy of aggregate classroom/home reports, or through the on-line licenses established with the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, Work Sampling System, or High Scope COR Child Observation Record where aggregate classroom/home reports can be downloaded through the web.

In order to best determine completion rates by grantee, program, classroom, children and developmental domains it was necessary to look at submissions by tool individually because each tool has specific monitoring instructions and its own way of identifying aggregate reports. A description of the methodology by tool is captured below.

*The Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum*

For grantees that submitted an e-mail version of their aggregate report, a “snapshot report” was sent. The data examined within this snapshot report included the number of children included within the report, the number of classes, and the number of programs. Developmental domain completion rates were also noted. This same process was followed using the on-line license, where individual “snapshot reports” could be downloaded offering information on program, classroom, child and developmental domain completion. For System-affiliated family child care providers are the grantees in this case. The funding is dispersed through Family Child Care Systems.
those submitting reports by paper, “individual child profiles” were mailed in (both in English and in Spanish) where completion could be determined by family child care home, child, and developmental domain.

**Work Sampling System**

Grantees that were part of the on-line license, individual program reports could be downloaded to examine completion rates by classroom, children, and developmental domains (called “Teacher Assessment Status Reports”). For those that submitted an e-mailed report (called “2009/2010 Outcome Report”) data examined included completion rate by program, classrooms, children, and developmental domains.

**High Scope COR**

For those utilizing the on-line license of High Scope COR, the following data sets were explored (from the “Child Status Report”) to determine those submitting reports by program and the active number of preschool children. Completion rates by domain were only available using the on-line license in an aggregate format using the “Outcome Report” function under “reports” and could not be determined by program or classroom level. For those submitting paper reports, the “Child Information and Developmental Summary” were used to determine completion rate by program, classroom, child, and developmental domain. E-mailed reports, entitled “Class Portrait for UPK”, were examined to determine the number of children in which domain data was collected and completed by program.

**Ages and Stages Questionnaire**

The ASQ options for submitting data was only monitored by paper or e-mailed reports. An on-line license for ASQ is unavailable to grantees. The process for submitting data came in formats that varied (Individual Child Summaries by Age, Program-Wide Tracking Forms, ASQ-3 Screening Results) but rendered results based on program, children screened, and domains completed. All children that were 30 months or older were counted as UPK-age eligible in the data analyzed.

**Key Findings**

While there were many findings based on assessment tools, completion rates, and developmental domains (see details under “Findings” below), some of the key findings that emerged from the data analysis process included:

1.) Completion rates were higher in FY 2009\(^6\) by assessment tool, submission type (paper, on-line, e-mail), and by program type when compared to the data analyzed in FY 2010\(^7\).
2.) On-line license use grew from FY 2009 to FY 2010 and appears to be the overall preferred method for capturing child assessment data.
3.) The *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* remains the overall favored child assessment tool used by UPK grantees (46.2%).
4.) Of those programs that did submit a report using the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire*, completion rates by developmental domains were 100% completed.

---

\(^6\) FY 09 data referenced is based on summaries from data collected for the spring data collection period (January 1-June 30, 2009).

\(^7\) FY 10 data referenced is based on summaries from data collected for the fall data collection period (September 1-December 31, 2009)
5.) Data submitted by e-mail and paper were more complete than those downloaded off the on-line license.
6.) Independent family child care providers and private schools had the highest rates of data submission. Family Child Care Systems had more non-submissions that any other program type.

**Research Questions**

As part of the data collection from UPK grantees involves a careful analysis of the types of tools being used by specific categories of programs to include both on-line and paper-based assessments; the completion rates by developmental domains; and data submission by numbers of programs, classrooms/homes, and children. The analysis will include the following overall research questions:

a.) What are the submission rates of UPK grantees by program, method of submission, and assessment tool types?

b.) How complete is the data that is submitted in terms of the numbers of preschool children in UPK programs and by assessment tool developmental domains?

c.) Is there a change in the data that was collected in FY 2009 compared to FY 2010? If so, where do those changes exist?
Findings

*What is the total number of UPK grantees funded in 2010 and expected to contribute child assessment data?*

In all, 277 programs were honored UPK funds and therefore were expected to submit child assessment data. Almost half (49.8%) of those required to submit data were child care centers followed by family child care providers in a family child care system (41.1%).

![Graph 1: Number of FY 2010 UPK Grantees](image)

*What is the number of grantees contributing data?*

With the exception of family child care systems, more than three-fourths of programs submitted data. 100% of private schools (only one required to submit data) and independent family child care providers submitted data followed by 83.3% of public schools. The average rate of programs submitting data was 74.7%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th># Submitting Data</th>
<th>% Submitting Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>119/138</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC System</td>
<td>66/114</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Independent</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programs/Providers</strong></td>
<td><strong>207/277</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is the number of grantees using each EEC-approved child assessment tool?*

Almost half (48.7%) of FY 2010 grantees indicated that they were using the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* for a child assessment tool. Over a quarter (28.5%) of grantees reported that they would be utilizing the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire*. Center-based programs and independent Family Child Care providers were likely to use the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum*. Family Child Care Systems were more inclined to use the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire*. Public schools were more likely to use the *Work Sampling System*. Even though one private school was a grantee, the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* was the child assessment choice.
Table 2: Number of FY 2010 Using EEC-Approved Assessment Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</th>
<th>High Scope COR</th>
<th>Work Sampling System</th>
<th>Ages &amp; Stages</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Systems</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Independent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135 (48.7%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 (9.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>38 (13.7%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>79 (28.5%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What type of grantee submitted data using an EEC-approved child assessment tool?
The rate of FY 2010 grantees submitting data overall was 74.7%. Those using the Work Sampling System were more likely to submit data at a rate of 92.1%. Just over half (53.2%) of grantees using the Ages & Stages Questionnaire submitted data.

Table 3: FY 2010 Grantees Submitting Data by Program and Assessment Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</th>
<th>High Scope COR</th>
<th>Work Sampling System</th>
<th>Ages &amp; Stages</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Systems</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Independent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111/135 (82.2%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>19/25 (76.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>35/38 (92.1%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42/79 (53.2%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>207/277 (74.7%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are grantees submitting their data?
In FY 2010, almost half of (48.4%) grantees were likely to submit their data through the on-line license. Over a quarter of grantees (26.7%) did not submit data.

Table 4: FY 2010 Grantee Submitting Data by Submission and Assessment Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</th>
<th>High Scope COR</th>
<th>Work Sampling System</th>
<th>Ages &amp; Stages</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online License</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131/277 (47.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Submission</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28/277 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Submission</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44/277 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Submission</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74/277 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What is the difference in the grantees utilizing paper vs. on-line methodology for submitting data?**

All programs were most likely to submit their data using the on-line license with the exception of those in a family child care system. Those in Family Child Care Systems seem to prefer submitting data by paper although this was hard to definitely determine due to missing data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>On-Line License</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>No Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC System</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Independent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: FY 2010 Grantees Submitting Data by Program and Submission Type**

**What is the number of grantees contributing 100% complete data by assessment type?**

Those using the *Work Sampling System* were more likely to complete child assessments on all preschoolers in their programs. Programs using the *Work Sampling System* were more likely to have 100% completion rates for assessing all UPK children. The average completion rates by preschool children in UPK were also higher for those using the *Work Sampling System*. Overall, completion rates for the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* were the lowest.

**Table 6: Assessment Tool Completion Rates by Preschool Children in UPK (100% Completion and Average Completion)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Average Completion Rate (by Preschool Children in UPK)</th>
<th>Programs with 100% Completion Rate (by Preschool Children in UPK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASQ</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>High Scope COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>123.3%</td>
<td>ASQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scope COR</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>WSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Of the programs that completed child assessments using the *Work Sampling System*, 17 out of 38 programs assessed more preschoolers than originally intended resulting in percentages of children assessed over 100%.
What is the number of grantees contributing 100% complete data by methodology (on-line vs. paper)?
Those programs submitting reports by e-mail and paper had a higher rate of assessing 100% of their UPK children than through the use of the on-line license. However, it should be noted that less than half of those submitting had such a completion rate.

**Table 7: 100% Completion Rates (by Preschool Children in UPK) by Submission Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>100% Completion by Preschool Children in UPK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line License</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was the completion rate by developmental domain for each assessment tool?
All of the assessment systems have specific domains to assess children. These domains typically include components related to social/emotional development, physical development, cognitive development, language and literacy development and approaches to learning. Rates of domain completion are noted in Table 8 below (please note that each assessment system has unique domains).

**Table 8: Completion Rate by Assessment Tool Developmental Domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains by Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Average Completion Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Emotional</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Development Gross Motor</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Development Fine Motor</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literacy Development</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Sampling System</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Social Development</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Thinking</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Thinking</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Development &amp; Health</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Scope COR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Representation</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music &amp; Movement</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What was the completion rate for the entire population of children?

In all 277 programs, 464 classrooms/family child care homes, and 6434 UPK children were supposed to be reflected in the data submitted from FY 2010 grantees. In Table 9, the actual number of programs, classrooms/homes, and children are indicated by assessment type.

Table 9: Programs, Classrooms/Homes, and Children Submitted by Assessment Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
<th>Number of Classrooms/Homes</th>
<th>Number of UPK Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Curriculum</td>
<td>111/277 (40.0%)</td>
<td>217/464 (46.8%)</td>
<td>3476/6434 (54.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Continuum</td>
<td>2/464 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages &amp; Stages</td>
<td>42/277 (15.2%)</td>
<td>65/464 (14.0%)</td>
<td>373/6434 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scope COR</td>
<td>19/277 (6.9%)</td>
<td>33/464 (7.1%)</td>
<td>445/6434 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sampling System</td>
<td>35/277 (12.6%)</td>
<td>81/464 (17.4%)</td>
<td>1140/6434 (17.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207/277 (74.7%)</td>
<td>396/464 (85.3%)</td>
<td>5434/6434 (84.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did data submission change between 2009 and 2010?
Submission of data rates for FY 09 was 203 out of 2119 (96%) and in FY 10 they were 207 out of 277 (74.7%). In FY 09, those submitting Ages & Stages Questionnaire data has the overall highest submission rates whereas in FY 10, those submitting Work Sampling System data had the highest submission rates. Private schools (with only one reporting in both FY 2009 and 2010) and independent family child care providers had a 100% submission rates in both FY 09 and FY 10.

9 Only those funded in FY07 and FY08 were required to submit data. Those newly funded in FY09 were not required to submit data in FY09 but were in FY10. In FY10, which had no new grantees, all programs were required to submit data.
Table 10: A Comparison of Program Submission Rate by Assessment Tool Type for FY 2009 and FY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</th>
<th>High Scope COR</th>
<th>Work Sampling System</th>
<th>Ages &amp; Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>FY 2010 Data</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009 Data</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC System</td>
<td>FY 2010 Data</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC Independent</td>
<td>FY 2010 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>FY 2010 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>FY 2010 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009 Data</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programs/Providers FY 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>90.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2009 Data</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum submission rates decreased from FY 2009 to FY 2010 with private and public schools as well as independent family child care providers remaining the same. Family Child Care Systems decreased the most dramatically.

Graph 2: Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Submissions

![Graph showing submission rates for different program types for FY 2009 and FY 2010.](image)
High Scope COR submissions were only applicable to centers and Family Child Care Systems (in FY 2010 only). Center submissions dropped from FY 2009 to FY 2010. FY 2010 saw Family Child Care Systems using High Scope COR for the first time.

Those using the Work Sampling System for an assessment tool were more likely to submit data in FY 2009 compared to FY 2010 with the exception of independent Family Child Care providers and center-based programs who submitted data each year.
In FY 2009, more Family Child Care System programs using the *Ages & Stages Questionnaire* submitted data than in FY 2010. Center-based programs submitted *Ages & Stages Questionnaire* for the first time in FY 2010.

The number of programs submitting data from FY 2009 to FY 2010 was not all that dramatically different. However, there were more grantees that were supposed to submit data in FY 10 compared to FY 09.
The number of classrooms and homes represented by the data was slightly greater in FY 2010 with the exception of High Scope COR.

Overall, more children were served by child assessment systems in FY 2010 (a difference of 304 children)
Overall Pertinent Findings:

Assessment Tool Findings:
- In both FY 2009 and FY 2010, programs and providers preferred using the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* as an assessment system in their Pre-K settings.
- FY 2009 had more programs and providers that were using the *Ages and Stages Questionnaire* submitting data than any other tool.
- FY 2010 had more programs and providers that were using the *Work Sampling System* submitted data than any other tool.
- Center-based programs (in both years) preferred using the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* and the *Work Sampling System* more so than the other tools.
- Family Child Care providers in a system preferred using the *Ages and Stages Questionnaire* tool (in both 2009 and 2010) but independent Family Child Care providers were more likely to use the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* as an assessment tool.
- Public School Pre-K programs preferred using the *Work Sampling System* in both FY 2009 and FY 2010.
- There was one program that was a private school grantee in both FY 2009 and FY 2010 and their preference was the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum*.

Completion Rate Findings:
- While the *Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum* was a preferred assessment tool, it had the lowest rate of completion by preschool children enrolled in UPK. This could be in part due to the length of the assessment tool and process involved.
- The tool that had the best completion rate by preschool children enrolled in UPK was the *Work Sampling System*. Part of the reason for this was that many programs used this assessment on more children than those first anticipated.
- 4 more programs submitted data in FY2010 as compared to FY 2009, which meant an increase of 40 classrooms or homes and an increase of data on 237 children.\(^{10}\)
- Using the on-line license was the preferred methods for programs to submit child data. In fact, those programs submitting data through the on-line license rose by 14 programs from FY 2009 to FY 2010.

Developmental Domain Findings:
- Domain completion rates were better for copies submitted by paper or e-mail vs. those completed through the on-line license.
- *Ages and Stages Questionnaire* domains were completed by all programs submitting data at a rate of 100%. Paper and e-mail submissions typically had higher domain completion rates and preschool children in UPK completion rates of programs using *Ages and Stages Questionnaire* was higher as well. The *Ages and Stages Questionnaire* is a system based on checklists and is typically less time-consuming to use per child.
- Completion rates by domain components varied from tool to tool with no one domain being more complete than another.
- *Work Sampling System* had the lowest rates of domain component completion.

\(^{10}\) Only those funded in FY07 and FY08 were required to submit data. Those newly funded in FY09 were not required to submit data in FY09 but were in FY10. In FY10, which had no new grantees, all programs were required to submit data.
Caveats and Considerations:
While conducting the data analysis of the reports generated for FY 2010 grantees, some complications were encountered. These are noted in Table 11 below with potential ways in which to remedy problems noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caveats</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There are instances when the number of children reported on exceeds the number of UPK children grantees indicated were enrolled. The assessment tool reports do not necessarily delineate the UPK children from the preschool population and more than likely some of the children counted include non-UPK enrollees. | - Encouraging grantees to delineate UPK children when completing their on-line licensing profile and to only submit reports on UPK designated children.  
- Ask grantees to update their UPK enrollment numbers in January each year. |
| Running “Snapshot Reports” through Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum’s on-line license is cumbersome and time-consuming. “Snapshot Reports” give detailed information that is program specific with indications as to the level of completion of the developmental domains. | - Encouraging that any written or e-mailed reports include a “Snapshot Report”.  
- Working with Teaching Strategies on a user-friendly manner in which to download the “Snapshot Reports” without multiple layers of steps.  
- Delineating the non-UPK grantees from the UPK grantees to promote easier access to obtaining reports. |
| There were occasions when UPK grantees switched the child assessment tool they were using and often it was difficult to determine which tool was legitimate when the name of a program showed up on two different on-line licenses or a paper version of a different tool than was noted was sent to EEC. | - Implement a formal process for communication when there is a change in assessment tools, which should also include notification to the Publisher to then omit the program from the on-line license.  
- Note changes within UPK grantees document (i.e. Excel spreadsheet of grantees). |
| Some grantees had duplicate submissions (e.g., e-mailed a report and was an on-line licensee) making it difficult to determine which report should be used in the data analysis. | - Remind grantees through their contracts of the manner in which they determined they will be reporting their data and encourage grantees to only submit data in the agreed upon format. |
| Completion rates do not appear as high for those using an on-line license as those submitting paper versions. However, that does not indicate which is more accurate. Accuracy is difficult to determine in a once a year submission. | - Collecting a random sample of program reports throughout the year (recommended twice) would determine accuracy and highlight potential areas of difficulty to be addressed through professional development. |
| It is hard to determine why certain domains are not complete or why not all preschool children are included as there are not specific places for anecdotal reporting within the reports generated. | - Include an additional form for grantees to record any anecdotal notes/discrepancies that may affect the way in which data is reported (i.e., children move in and out of programs throughout the year). |
Chapter 2.

Use of Child Assessment Data in Other States

Introduction

A review of states that use early childhood assessment data in UPK and related programs is examined in Chapter 2. Areas of exploration included legislative policies on UPK11 child assessment data, oversight and monitoring of UPK child assessment, types of programs involved in collecting child assessment data, types of training and technical assistance provided to programs, and how data is used at the program and state level for program improvement.

Key Findings

The key lessons learned from states with active assessment and data reporting systems are:

1. States are adjusting their options for approved assessment tools due to budget cuts, issues with data compatibility, and concerns about the reliability of some tools. For example, Arizona has moved from a menu approach to one pre-approved tool, while New Jersey had moved away from its state-created tool to a menu approach. Among those states that offer a menu of tools for assessment, they typically narrow the list to a small number that are easily aligned. Massachusetts should consider carefully whether to add more options to its menu of approved assessment tools, and may even want to consider narrowing the list to fewer options. It is worth noting that most programs responding to 2009 Boston EQUIP survey (62% of center-based respondents) said they used Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum’s tool for assessment, and a very small percentage used Work Sampling System Systems. As stated in Chapter One of this report, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum is also the overall favored child assessment tool statewide, used by 46.2% of UPK grantees.

2. An electronic component is critical to the success of data collection and use in most states. Having an easily accessible data port streamlines the collection process at the program level, and allows program access to analyze the data on the classroom or program level, making the whole assessment process more valuable to educators and program administrators. Electronic collection also makes reporting easier and more timely and consistent, as long as sufficient professional development is provided.

3. Most states have not taken major steps in analyzing data at the state level or analyzing or using the data in any kind of aggregated way, other than federally required reporting for special education programs. Some states hope that with some improvements in their collection and data systems they will be able to use the data at the state level for policy and program improvements. However, some states remain committed to using assessment data strictly as a tool for improving instruction and have no plans to use the data to show progress at the state level.

Overall states do not appear to be aggregating data on the statewide level. They do sometimes ask that programs using different tools for collecting data report them to the state in a common format (either the format of one of the tools, as in Pennsylvania, or one created by the state as in Arizona and New Jersey.) The most common use of aggregated data is on the program or classroom level.

---

11 We use UPK as a term to indicate universal pre-kindergarten, pre-kindergarten and other similar programs.
Programs are most often using the on-line systems of their chosen tools to generate those aggregated reports, even if they may be reporting data to the state using a different format. For the purposes of OSEP reporting, some states combine assessment data from different tools. For example, Colorado has special instructions for providers reporting data using different on-line tools that allow students to be flagged for inclusion in OSEP reporting.

4. Although many of the states interviewed have some form of a Quality Rating System (QRS) in place, most have not made assessment part of their QRS standards. In PA, level three and four programs are required to report assessment data, but in most states resistance to tying child assessment results to accountability or program quality determinations has led to an overall reluctance to include the reporting of assessment data as a program requirement. In fact, among the QRS reviewed by ACF’s Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation (OPRE), only 11 have standards related to assessment, and among those four actually refer specifically to developmental screening (not child progress assessment). A table of those requirements can be found in Appendix B.

Methodology

To evaluate state use of child assessment data in Pre-Kindergarten programs and other early education and care programs, we collected data from a total of fourteen states. In nine of those states, we conducted some internet research, followed by interviews with state administrators using the list of questions in Appendix A. As Table 1 shows, in three states (Arkansas, Georgia and Colorado), we conducted only internet-based research. In South Carolina and Tennessee we received no substantive response from state administrators, nor were we able to locate information about the child assessment system on line. The summary of all of our findings can be found in Appendix C. The narrative that follows summarizes those findings, and provides more in-depth information about the practices in the states that were most fully developed in this area: Arizona, Colorado, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Table 1. Contacts with States Regarding Child Assessment Policies and Use of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Contact Results</th>
<th>Assessment Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements/Profiled Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Internet Research Only</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Internet Research Only</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements/Profiled Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>Limited Assessment Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>No Significant Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>No Significant Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Internet Research Only</td>
<td>No Reporting Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>No Significant Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements at K Level Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements/Profiled Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>Limited Assessment Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Interview/Internet Research</td>
<td>Assessment Requirements/Profiled Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Lessons from States with Well-Developed Child Assessment Collection and Reporting Systems

Arizona

Although Arizona does not have a state-funded Pre-Kindergarten, it has developed policies and practices around child assessment in preschool programs that are informative to the use of data in Pre-K states. Like many states, however, its policies have shifted and downsized in recent years due to reductions in available resources.

Assessment Policies

When EEC consultants talked with Arizona officials in 2007, the state was requiring child assessment in any school district receiving Early Childhood Special Education (IDEA Part B, Section 619), Early Childhood Block Grant Preschool (A.R.S. 15-1521), or Title 1 Even Start Program (NCLB, Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)/State Family Literacy Program (A.R.S. 15-191.01). With cuts in state discretionary funds the Early Childhood Block Grant preschool program and State Family Literacy Program have both been cut, leaving the assessment requirement only in IDEA and Title 1 funded programs, including private and non-profit programs that partner with Arizona school districts.

In the fourth year of a five-year procurement cycle, Arizona has allowed programs to choose among a menu of four assessment tools: Work Sampling System, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, High Scope COR COR, Galileo PLUS. It is the state’s intent, however, to select one tool from among respondents to an RFP that closed in April 2010. The agency is currently reviewing submissions. The RFP specified that the newly selected single assessment tool will be used in conjunction with ongoing collaborative systems work, and therefore must meet the assessment needs of programs serving children birth through kindergarten. While preschool programs currently meeting assessment requirements may continue to use their current assessment tools for one more fiscal year, by FY2012 they will all be expected to have switched over from their current tool to the newly selected statewide tool. With statewide adoption, agency staff hope that data collection will become more streamlined. The RFP stipulated that the selected vendor must have an electronic format and online data collection system, a feature that has been advocated for by providers because it would eliminate the need to aggregate data at the program level before reporting it to the state, and will give directors and teachers more options for analyzing and using the data at the program level. Having one tool will also make state level analysis more straightforward and will allow the state to focus professional development around assessment to one tool.

As the new tool is adopted, the state expects to change some of its related requirements. For example, in the past programs have been required to report data twice a year - six weeks after entry and at the end of June. The lag time in making initial assessments, however, meant that good baseline data for student growth often wasn’t available, often meaning that data showed less progress than students actually made from the beginning of the year. With the adoption of the new assessment, programs will be required to assess immediately upon entry, and then conduct ongoing assessment through the end of the school year, as required by the tool. The state will pull the data for analysis by the end of September for baseline information, and at the end of the school year as they have in the past. The AZ Department of Education is also in dialogue with a broader scope of programs serving children, in hopes of getting broader adoption of assessment policies, and therefore a fuller picture of children who are served by
state programs. The Department is currently in dialogue with early intervention, First Things First (a statewide network of local child development initiatives), and the administrators of Arizona’s Early Childhood Quality Improvement Program, the state’s quality rating and improvement system. Some stakeholders have agreed to participate in statewide training when the new assessment tool is adopted. Finally, the Department plans to reach out to public school Kindergarten teachers in an effort to familiarize them with the data collected through the new tool and its potential use in transitioning children to Kindergarten.

Collection

Arizona collects child level aggregate data from providers using a paper format that allows programs to combine multiple indicators into one number for reporting purposes. Because programs can select different tools, even by child, each of those forms is different, and combining data from the multiple forms for reporting purposes is difficult. Programs are encouraged to use the child level data for their programs for program planning, curriculum and pedagogical planning, and in relation to their participation in ECQUIP, the state’s quality improvement system. Individual scores are aggregated to program level by the state to verify that programs are meeting specific state grant requirements. According to administrators, a good amount of data is not accepted for various reasons related to the misuse of forms or other errors on the part of reporting programs. In addition, administrators must manually check whether individual programs have completed and submitted data. These issues have been part of the administration’s motivations for adopting a single tool and data reporting system.

To help providers meet data collection and reporting requirements, the AZ Department of Education has in the past provided professional development training around the approved assessment tools. In 2007, the state was funding regional training through Arizona State University, and were preparing to create regional teams of experienced providers to provide mentoring to those new to assessment. That mentoring was provided for one year, but most professional development now happens through conferences and other means. The state agency is in dialogue with community colleges and other higher education institutions to increase the number of available “progress monitoring” course (one-credit courses). The state is also expecting the new vendor selected through the current RFP to do annual initial training, plus regional trainings statewide. In the future, the state may offer on-line training in progress monitoring through an existing partnership with ASU. Finally, the preschool manual, available on-line, provides programs with guidance and expectations around assessment.

According to Arizona administrators, the most valuable lesson learned in the area of child assessment has been to select and commit to a single tool as early as possible. In its roll-out of assessment requirements many programs “wanted to be told” which one to use, but instead were encouraged to choose from the menu of approved tools. Now that the state is moving to a single tool to streamline professional development, reporting and data analysis at the state level, administrators fear that some programs will be reluctant to change from the tool they’ve now used for four at least four years. In an attempt to give programs more options early on, the state may have inadvertently created a higher level of challenge and stress at the program level.

State Use of Data

Arizona uses collected child assessment data at the state level for very limited purposes, including to meet requirements under IDEA for reporting data on outcome indicators related to preschool children
receiving special education services. Currently, the state can aggregate individual child scores to the program level to use to verify that programs are meeting specific grant requirements, and they can also aggregate data from different districts or programs for a single child, but do not use this analysis widely. Primarily, programs are encouraged to use the child level data for their programs for program planning, curriculum and pedagogical planning, and in relation to its participation in ECQUIP, the state’s quality improvement system.

Future Direction/Next Steps

The biggest upcoming change in Arizona’s assessment work is the imminent change to a single approved assessment tool. In addition, the state hopes to expand assessment requirements to include a broader array of funded programs.

Colorado

Assessment Policies

Like most states, Colorado requires the collection and reporting of child assessment to meet OSEP reporting requirements. In addition, however, all Colorado Preschool Program, Head Start, Early Intervention and special education students are assessed through a statewide data initiative called “Results Matter,” which is serving as Colorado’s early childhood assessment and accountability system. Results Matter, which incorporates all of the state’s early childhood education programs, includes professional development, quality measures, family outcomes, and long term research, in addition to "authentic assessment."

Collection

Child assessment is ongoing according to the requirements of the tools used, but programs are required to submit data to the state three times per year (October, February, May). Programs are required to use an assessment tool from a pre-approved menu that includes: Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, High Scope COR, Work Sampling System System/Ounce Scale, and Assessment Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) (Part C only), and they submit their data using an on-line data collection system. Program implementation guidelines, expectations and requirements are available to programs on the Results Matter web site. Through Results Matter, Colorado provides training and professional development in assessment tools and on using assessment data. Training includes approved in-person trainings, some of which are funded through Results Matter, and ongoing regional meetings where technical assistance is provided. In addition, Results Matter has a series of training and TA videos available on-line.

State Use of Data

Results Matter data is shared with both the CO Department of Human Services and the CO Department of Education to inform policy and program decisions. Data is aggregated at the school district level and publicly released.

12More information available at http://www.cde.state.co.us/resultsmatter
Future Direction/Next Steps

Colorado’s Race to the Top application included a proposal to link data from Results Matter to its broader student assessment database for the purposes of transition to K and school-readiness. The Results Matter initiative was in part created to use child assessment and family data to inform state policy and program decisions.

New Jersey

The New Jersey Department of Education launched its set of child assessment policies in a very targeted way – with a limited number of programs required to collect and report data (the Abbott Districts) and the creation of a single required assessment tool, the New Jersey Early Learning Assessment (ELA). Since that time the state has struggled with the desire and momentum to expand assessment requirements, followed by a contraction in available funds and a decision to move away from the state-created tool, due to questions about reliability from the federal DOE. This roller coaster ride has left New Jersey in a situation similar to several other states – requiring a limited number of state funded programs to assess, and offering them a menu of tools to use to do those assessments.

Assessment Policies

Assessment is currently required in 35 districts that receive full preschool funding (the 31 Abbott Districts plus four that were later added because they had high concentrations of low-income children). An additional 110 districts get some state funding, and are encouraged but not required to use assessment systems. Those districts required to assess must screen each child upon entry, flag any potential developmental issues, conduct regular performance based assessments, and complete regular classroom assessments (Environmental Rating Scale).

The state developed ELA which was initially used by funded preschool programs was discontinued for a number of reasons, including concerns about its reliability and validity. Instead programs can now choose from a menu of tools to conduct assessments, including High Scope COR, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, and Work Sampling System. The State has recently begun to collect aggregate data from these tools from participating programs, information about how programs are using the data for classroom improvements and child instruction, samples of the evidence they are collecting, and information about how they’re using the data to plan professional development and train staff to use the tools reliably.

Collection

Although the DOE previously required that the ELA be completed three times per year for each child, there are no current requirements around frequency, other than meeting the recommendations of the specific tools programs are using. Beginning this year, programs will be asked to submit aggregated data once per year, averaging assessments over the course of the year and also submitting information on the percentage “growth” or change.
**State Use of Data**

New Jersey has district coaches who help conduct statewide professional development on the regional level. Administrators have found that program staff are weakest in the area of using assessment to inform instruction, so that is an area where more professional development is planned.

**Future Direction/Next Steps**

New Jersey DOE currently has no plans to aggregate data beyond the classroom level or to use it for reporting or policy development purposes. Officials predict that assessment will at some point become part of a longitudinal data system, currently being built. Because children in the system have already been given unique identifier numbers, they may be able to track individual assessment data to later outcomes data in the K-12 education system or beyond.

**Pennsylvania**

**Assessment Policies**

Currently in Pennsylvania, state funded programs including Pennsylvania Pre-K Counts, Head Start Supplemental programs, and center-based programs that are at Levels 3 and 4 of the Keystone Stars (QRIS) program are required to collect and report assessment data three times each year. Early Intervention programs are also required to assess, but are only required to report annually. School run Pre-K programs are required to use a child assessment and asked to report data if they receiving state quality funding, but they are not required to report data and are less consistent in doing so.

Pennsylvania administrators expect to ultimately require all state funded programs to report data, but are phasing in this requirement. Pennsylvania’s new initiative for infants, Keystone Babies (connected to Early Head Start grantees), and family child care programs with three or four stars under Keystone Stars report their first required round of assessment data in Fall 2010. Most infant and toddler programs are also required to conduct screenings, using Ages and Stages.

**Collection**

All Pennsylvania programs are required to report assessment outcomes using the Ounce Scale or Work Sampling System Systems format, and with these systems Pennsylvania is able to access and use data through its Early Learning Networks database. If a program conducts assessments using a different tool, it must use one that is standardized, norm referenced and aligned with the state’s learning standards. Pennsylvania provides information on-line about alignment for various tools. The most frequently used alternative tool is Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, and a small and decreasing number of programs use High Scope COR. Programs are moving toward using Work Sampling System or Ounce if they are required to report data, probably because the cost to access to on-line reporting is covered by the state using these formats.

To support teachers in using assessment tools, Pennsylvania has rolled out content information across regions on Work Sampling System and the Ounce Scale, including technical assistance on how to use them in classrooms and how to use their on-line systems. Technical assistance on data reporting has been made available in two stages. Before accessing WSS or Ounce on-line, programs are first required to learn how to enter accurate demographic information on their students, and to do that successfully.
That support is provided statewide, including webinars, and one-on-one computer labs, which have been more successful than "paper trainings." In general, administrators have found that in-person individual trainings are extremely helpful in making educators more comfortable with on-line collection systems. On-line trainings are also available for WSS data entry, and in-person "refresher" trainings are also available for Pelican (demographics) and WSS. Pennsylvania has also found it helpful to have a help desk within the agency so users can access help immediately on line or by phone.

According to administrators, a check of the data in February 2010 showed that most programs had met reporting deadlines, but they have not yet assessed the accuracy of that data. Directors have the ability to check for accuracy and completion at the program level.

Pennsylvania administrators recommend easing into collection requirements, giving programs time to learn and become comfortable with the systems, and also giving administrators time to trouble-shoot and provide the necessary technical support. As programs become comfortable with the tools, they can be ambassadors of the system to other programs to ease the roll-out of requirements.

To help minimize problems with data collection, Pennsylvania had a user group that worked with the contractor in the early stages of implementation. They also have an institutionalized advisory board that meets about the broader Early Learning Network data system, and a trouble shooting focus group (a combination of advisory board members, users, and others who've been vocal about the system) that meets monthly.

State Use of Data

Pennsylvania has found it valuable to start its data use and analysis at the program level. By making the system useable and valuable to programs, they have built support for the data collection system across the field. Programs report child level data, and teachers and administrators have access to classroom level reports. The state aggregates data to program level. The state aggregates that data for analysis and reporting purposes.

Future Direction/Next Steps

Although Pennsylvania doesn't currently have a formal system of reporting preschool assessment data to Kindergarten as part of a school readiness initiative, it is beginning to move in that direction. It is currently part of a study to assess how closely Work Sampling System aligns with the kindergarten assessment currently used, and how well preschool assessments predict the student's level at Kindergarten entry.

In the future, Pennsylvania state administrators plan to analyze assessment data at the regional and state level, and to develop a system of longitudinal data linked to the K-12 data system and eventually to higher education. In addition, they may conduct analysis on the county or regional level, however different programs required to submit data have different regions (e.g. Early Intervention has different regions that Pre-K Counts) so that may not be the best unit for analysis. Pennsylvania expects to complete some county-level analysis for some programs (e.g. Pre-K Counts) by the end of this year.
Next Steps for Massachusetts

The states profiled above are the ones researched that have had or currently have the most developed child assessment policies and data systems. Although all states have some requirements around child assessment tied to children with special needs, most do not have comprehensive child assessment plans or policies, and very few have considered at all what to do, if anything, with child assessment data at the state level. Furthermore these questions are couched in the ongoing debate and discussion in the early childhood education field about appropriate assessment of young children and the use of child assessment data for program accountability. As the state administrator from Connecticut said, “Nobody really has a clear answer.”

Based on the experiences and learning of other states collecting and using child assessment data, there are several directions Massachusetts may consider.

- All states clearly see a value in encouraging and/or requiring as many programs as possible to assess children using a reliable tool, and in training educators to use those tools effectively to improve instruction at the classroom level. Massachusetts should not back away from assessment requirements and should continue to provide systematic technical assistance to ensure all teachers are equipped to use child assessment data to improve learning.

- States vary widely in their approach to requiring the use of specific tools, but even those that do not require specific tools often use the Work Sampling System System or Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum formats for collecting child assessment data. Furthermore, states have struggled with integrating and analyzing data from multiple tools at the state level, and with providing effective professional development when a number of tools are used by programs. With that in mind, Massachusetts should seriously consider whether it wants to add additional tools to its approved list, or whether it would in fact be better to narrow the choices to the one or two tools that are most often used.

- States are only beginning to use child assessment data to inform policy at the state level, and as stated above are hesitant to do so because of ambivalence about the role of child level assessment data in program accountability. Some states, however, have effectively used child assessment as one component of a multi-faceted program improvement and data system. When combined with program assessment, quality improvement systems, professional development, quality enhancement dollars, and longitudinal child outcome research (separate from child assessment), state level aggregated child assessment data can help tell the story of the success and quality of the system.

- At the local level, child assessment data can be used effectively to help determine professional development needs for individual programs and classrooms, to help inform transition to Kindergarten initiatives, and to show district-wide progress in public Pre-K programs.
Chapter 3.

Current Use of Early Childhood Assessment Tools Across the Commonwealth

Introduction

One goal of the project was to collect information from program, people and publishers within the Commonwealth that would reflect current program use of child assessment data. A related goal was to determine whether there were any commonly used or up-and-coming assessments that may need to be considered for approval by EEC for the UPK child assessment requirement. This chapter addresses that goal.

Key Findings

There are three tools EEC should consideration for approval within their UPK system.

1. Brigance Early Childhood Complete System
2. Galileo Pre-K
3. Teaching Strategies GOLD

Methodology

Currently, there are four child assessment tools that are approved by the Department of Early Education and Care: (1) Ages and Stages Questionnaire13, (2) Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, (3) High Scope COR, and (4) Work Sampling System.

Our methodological approach was to contact public preschools, professionals in the field that interact with programs and have inside knowledge about trends in assessment and publishers of commonly used tools to determine what new tools are coming out and characteristics of commonly used tools to determine if they are a candidate for approval by EEC.

Public Preschools

Because this project was of short duration (6 weeks with 3 weeks to gather data), we focused our time on contacting public schools with a preschool program. Previous studies that have gathered data about child assessment use have focused more on center-based care and family child care and have not collected as much information about the use of assessments in public preschools. We contacted 22 schools (see Appendix D). These schools were chosen by region such that we contacted at least one school from each county in Massachusetts. Contact information was obtained from http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/ and the school website. When information was not clear on who to contact regarding assessment at the PreK and Kindergarten level, the school secretary was contacted. Schools were all called 2-3 times. In some cases, it took multiple times to get to the correct person that would be able to answer our questions. In the end, we received responses from 11 schools (50% response rate). The school personnel were asked the following questions:

1. What child assessment tools are currently being used in Pre-K and in Kindergarten?
2. Why were these tools chosen?

13 ASQ is a screening tool, not an assessment tool.
3. How long have these tools been used?
4. What are your plans for the future in terms of child assessments for Pre-K and Kindergarten?
5. Do you know of other child assessment tools that, in your opinion, should be approved by the Dept. of Early Education and Care for use in Pre-K programs?

Publishers

We contacted the publishers of the four approved tools and three additional publishers which were responsible for the development and marketing of tools that were identified as commonly used in Massachusetts schools. Internet research was also conducted to profile each child assessment tool of interest.

Questions that were asked of the publishers included:

1. Have there been any new revisions to the child assessment tools that you currently have available to early childhood programs (like Pre-K)? If so, what have the revisions entailed?
2. Are there any new childhood assessment products that your company is currently publishing that will be made available to early childhood programs? If so, is there a fact sheet or profile of the tool that you could send to me or direct me to on your website?
3. (For tools that we were profiling) Can you describe to me how the child assessment tool is implemented? How is observation used? Is it on-going or a one-time assessment? Are there ways to involve the parents and forms for parents?

Professional Organizations

Eleven individuals at professional organizations in Massachusetts were contacted to get their perspective on early childhood assessment. These individual and professional organizations were contacted by email and phone.

We asked the following questions. We gave people the option of filling out a Survey Monkey link or responding by phone or email.

1. Do you know of any new trends in using child assessments in preschool programs?
2. What child assessment tools are early childhood preschool programs typically using in their programs (in your opinion)?
3. What new or different child assessment tools are you aware of that could be potential EEC-approved tools for preschool programs to consider?
4. What types of requests do you receive for coursework, training, or technical assistance that are related to early childhood assessments?

Characteristics of Child Assessment Tools

We completed a brief profile on child assessment tools that were brought up by our key informants. Child Assessment tools that are being suggested to EEC for further investigation and possible approval are profiled in more detail.
Findings

1. Public Preschools

In all, 11 successful contacts were secured through phone interviews or by e-mail (a 50% response rate). The schools where contact was made included: Integrated Preschool Program of Harvard Public Schools, School Union #38 (Conway, Sunderland and Whately Schools in Franklin County), Pathways Preschool of the Nantucket Elementary School, Springfield Public Schools, The Green Meadows Elementary School in Hampden, Burell Elementary School in Foxborough, Pioneer Valley Regional School District in Northfield, Early Childhood Center of Bentley School in Salem, East Cambridge Preschool, Lowell Public Schools and Belchertown Public Schools.

We detail the findings from the 11 schools in Table 1.

Table 1: Assessment Tools Utilized by Various School Systems throughout MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>School Systems Using Tool</th>
<th>Why Chosen?</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDI-2</td>
<td>Belchertown Public Schools, ECC of Bentley School is using Indicator 7</td>
<td>&quot;For use as a global assessment to address all developmental areas&quot;.</td>
<td>Useful for special education progress reporting. &quot;It is an ongoing assessment and progress can be determined.&quot; One school reported using the BDI-2 as an &quot;arena&quot; evaluation where parent, teacher, therapists all evaluate the children together using the BDI-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken: Preschool Scale of Intelligence</td>
<td>Belchertown Public Schools</td>
<td>&quot;To look at cognitive needs of students&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigance Inventory of Early Development II</td>
<td>Burell Elementary School (IEDII), Harvard Public Schools, Integrated Preschool Program (Inventory of Early Development), Springfield Public Schools (Inventory of Early Development), Green Meadows Elementary School (IEDII)</td>
<td>For special education purposes.</td>
<td>Useful for special education. &quot;It is expensive&quot; (according to school personnel). Information specific to age level and good for IEP development. Gives &quot;useful general knowledge and readiness skills of the child&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>Springfield Public Schools</td>
<td>For special education purposes.</td>
<td>It contributes to IEP development; documents progress. It is developmental (not tied to age) and useful for special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</td>
<td>Burell Elementary School, Springfield Public Schools, Lowell Public Schools</td>
<td>&quot;It was an approved assessment tool from the Department of EEC&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC)</td>
<td>Pathways Preschool in Nantucket, ECC of Bentley School in Salem</td>
<td>&quot;It is user-friendly and thorough&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux Early Childhood</td>
<td>Springfield Public Schools, Lowell Public Schools, School</td>
<td>For special education purposes.</td>
<td>DECA is being administered for the social-emotional domain in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Tool</td>
<td>School Systems Using Tool</td>
<td>Why Chosen?</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (DECA)</td>
<td>Union #38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-K and Kindergarten. One can obtain percentiles and see where a child falls on the behavior chart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAL-3</td>
<td>School Union #38</td>
<td>Easy to administer screening tool for children.</td>
<td>One school noted that “results are broken down into categories and gives more information than the ESI screening tool.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>Lowell Public Schools, School Union #38, Harvard Public Schools Integrated Preschool Program, Pioneer Valley Regional School District in Northfield</td>
<td>“The district will require the DIBELS in the future”</td>
<td>DIBELS is typically used as a screening tool. Can be used at multiple times throughout the year; frequency of assessment may be related to providing intervention services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESI-R</td>
<td>ECC of Bentley School in Salem, Burell Elementary School, Lowell Public Schools, Green Meadows Elementary School, School Union #38</td>
<td>Easy to administer screening tool for children.</td>
<td>Used as “screening tool for children with special needs”. Used to determine “entrance into EEC program”. Can be used in PreK and K. Can also be used with younger children (age 3). It is “quicker and easier than DIAL-3”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontas and Pinnell Benchmark</td>
<td>Springfield Public Schools, Lowell Public Schools, Harvard Public Schools Integrated Preschool Program, School Union #38</td>
<td>“It can be given from kindergarten through the higher grades”.</td>
<td>Only Kindergarten and higher. Specific to Literacy. Done at specific times throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALS</td>
<td>School Union #38 (1 school is currently using PALS, looking to expand to all preschools in the district)</td>
<td>As a screening tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Evaluation Scale</td>
<td>Pathways Preschool of the Nantucket Elementary School Harvard Public Schools Integrated Preschool Program</td>
<td>“It is thorough and effective”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sampling System System</td>
<td>Pioneer Valley Regional School District in Northfield, East Cambridge Preschool, School Union #38</td>
<td>“It is EEC approved and can be used through Kindergarten”. “It is an authentic assessment and includes child portfolios”.</td>
<td>One school reported that “teachers love it”. The portfolios, writings and drawings can be scanned into the system. “The manuals break down and explain the domains in a straightforward, simple way”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCAT</td>
<td>ECC of Bentley School, Burell Elementary School</td>
<td>“It provides information on general knowledge and readiness skills”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment within Special Education

Public schools are the providers of IDEA, Part B services. Thus, although we were inquiring about child assessment within their prekindergarten programs, many schools routed us to their special education department (as special education is strongly associated with the word “assessment”). As a by-product, we documented that multiple and a large number of child assessments are used within special education to document progress among children receiving services. There are no standard assessments used across schools. Instead each school determines what assessments they use to comply with all regulations they need to meet and to meet the needs of the children. (Some schools use so many different tools that respondents couldn’t remember the whole list!).

School Developed Tools

Five schools have developed and are administering their own assessments. Some of these assessments have been thought through and carefully developed while others are informal assessments. One school administers their own assessments based on the standards and expectations of the Department of EEC that included preschool basic concepts, listening and literacy, preschool math, science and social skills checklist (they previously used the Brigance and Battelle assessments). One school stated they informally administer letter and sound recognition inventories. One school mentioned they perform ongoing, informal assessments. One school has a Pre-K checklist developed by the teacher, as well as several published assessments, and uses ongoing informal evaluation.

Notable Trends Among Schools

- There was not a clear distinction between assessment and screening tools among school personnel. Many “assessment” tools mentioned were actually screening tools.
- It was challenging to get the correct person to speak to as staff play multiple roles and there are many different “assessments” being used within the school.
- Schools are constantly re-evaluating their use of assessment tools. A number of schools mentioned that they review tools each year, some with teachers. One school is applying for a grant to evaluate their assessment system.
- Schools are interested in future prekindergarten standards and whether they will include guidance on child assessment.
- Many schools (9 out of 11) have a full battery of assessments due to the complexity of assessing children in all domains, special and general education requirements and to meet the specific needs of all children.
- A good number of schools (5 out of 11) have developed their own assessment tools.
- A couple schools mentioned staying current on child assessment through “research and professional development, as well as networking”.

Profile of a School’s Child Assessment System

Schools develop a whole battery of assessments that they need to use to meet different purposes. For example, one school stated the following.

“The screening tool for the 3 year olds in Pre-K is the ESI. We use the DIAL-3 for the 4 year old and Kindergarten children. The assessment for Pre-K children is Work Sampling System. The assessments used in Kindergarten are the DIBELS and the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessment. For special education, we use the Brigance and the Learning Accomplishment Profile in Pre-K and Kindergarten. The DECA is used for the social emotional domain. In one particular preschool, they decided to use the PALS.”
Some schools noted high training costs as a barrier towards using certain assessments (e.g. the Brigance). One school mentioned using a parent-completed questionnaire within their assessment system (we didn't ask about this specifically).

2. Publishers

We spoke with seven publishers. Publishers that were contacted include:

- Teaching Strategies (Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum and Teaching Strategies Gold)
- Pearson (Work Sampling System, ESI and DIAL)
- Brookes Publishing (ASQ)
- High Scope COR Educational Research Company (High Scope COR COR)
- Curriculum Associates (Brigance)
- Riverside Publishing Company (Battelle Developmental Inventory), and
- Assessment Technology Incorporated (Galileo).

We asked the publishers the following questions.

1. Have there been any new revisions to the child assessment tools that you currently have available to early childhood programs (like Pre-K)? If so, what have the revisions entailed?
2. Are there any new childhood assessment products that your company is currently publishing that will be made available to early childhood programs? If so, is there a fact sheet or profile of the tool that you could send to me or direct me to on your website?
3. (For tools that we were profiling) Can you describe to me how the child assessment tool is implemented? How is observation used? Is it on-going or a one-time assessment? Are there ways to involve the parents and forms for parents?

We discovered revisions to the ASQ (ASQ-3) and to Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum (Teaching Strategies GOLD). Revisions are reported in Table 2. Teaching Strategies GOLD will completely replace Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum in the summer of 2011. It is clearly a tool that many programs are considering and will likely move towards. If ASQ continues to be an approved tool, EEC may want to consider approving ASQ-3\textsuperscript{14}.

Table 2. Revisions to EEC approved tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEC Approved Tool</th>
<th>Revision?</th>
<th>Types of changes</th>
<th>Does it affect EEC’s approval?</th>
<th>Does it affect data submission?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages and Stages Questionnaire</td>
<td>Ages and Stages Questionnaires, Third Edition (ASQ-3)</td>
<td>Two new age questionnaire (2 mo and 9mo), open ended questions to elicit information related to autism, more flexible age range for administration, refined Spanish translation, new cutoff scores with excellent sensitivity (.86) and specificity</td>
<td>No. ASQ-3 remains a screening tool which should be considered in future EEC decisions.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} A number of UPK programs are already using ASQ-3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEC Approved Tool</th>
<th>Revision?</th>
<th>Types of changes</th>
<th>Does it affect EEC’s approval?</th>
<th>Does it affect data submission?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Entirely new assessment system. 38 new assessment areas, with two supporting English language acquisition. Includes objectives to help teachers plan in science and technology, social studies and the arts. Extensively tested with children with developmental delays and disabilities, children who are advanced learners and children who are English-language learners. Includes “Assessment Opportunity Cards”, which present focused tasks for assessing selected predictors of school readiness in literacy and numeracy.</td>
<td>No. Teaching Strategies GOLD remains an authentic, ongoing observation-based assessment. This version is likely to be very useful to programs.</td>
<td>Yes. EEC will need to negotiate with Teaching Strategies to ensure their data is translated seamlessly between the old and new system. Only the new system will be supported after the summer of 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scope COR-COR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sampling System</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Early Childhood Professionals and Organizations

Nine early child professionals representing a cross-section of organizations within the early childhood world were interviewed.\(^\text{15}\)

- Mary Ann Anthony, Catholic Charities
- Jennifer Brooks, Division of Child and Family Development, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, DHHS
- Carol Campbell at Associated Early Care and Education
- Marcia Farris, Massachusetts Association of Education of Young Children
- Jody Figuerido at the Institute for Education and Professional Development*
- Barbara Goodsen, Abt Associates
- MaryLu Love at University of Massachusetts Boston
- Kathy Modigliani, Family Child Care Expert
- Geetha Pai, United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley
- Stan Schwartz, Independent Assessment Consultant
- Nancy Topping-Tailby, Massachusetts Head Start Association
- Corey Zimmerman, United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley

Notable Trends from ECE Professionals

Many programs are already using one of the EEC approved tools.

“The most common tools are Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, High Scope COR's, Ages and Stages, and Work Sampling System.”

“Based on what I know about what is happening currently, a large proportion of those using tools are using Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum. The ASQ is also being used quite a bit, but I do think folks will adopt a “true” assessment tool as the folks at EEC promote the use of screening and assessment.”

“Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum or developmental checklists/progress reports (are most used) as required by EEC.”

“Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum seems to be the one that most folks use.”

“According to FACES 2006 data, Head Start programs are using the following tools. 36% are using Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, 15% High Scope COR, 3% ASQ, 5% Galileo, 7% LAP, 9% DRDP, 5% Work Sampling System, and 7% Brigance”

---

\(^{15}\) We also reached out to the Child Care Resource and Referral Network and another community college but were not able to contact them in time for the report.
A number of programs use their own assessment system.

“The majority are using their own systems. Of the commercial systems, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum is probably the most used.” – Higher Education Representative

There is an updated version of Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum that is likely to be widely used. One tool that is being considered by a number of programs is “Teaching Strategies Gold” – an updated version of the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum.

“Regarding Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, the transition to Gold is definitely on people’s radar screens as they move into the new tool by Teaching Strategies.”

“A small number of programs (from my perspective) are in the process of moving to Gold now, but most are waiting, especially if they are using the online version as Gold won’t be available online until July at the earliest. But, cc.net will transition to Gold by next summer.”

“Yes, Teaching Strategies GOLD seems worth looking into.”

There is an updated version of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire.

“Some agencies will begin using the new ASQ 3.”

There may be a trend away from Ages and Stages to the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum in Family Child Care.

“I have sensed a trend away from Ages and Stages and to the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum.”

“I do know of one agency that is dropping ASQ in favor of Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum.”

EEC should define better why it is using child assessment tools which would contribute to making informed decisions about the ASQ and other proposed assessment tools.

Reporting meaningful information on trends within the field around child assessment “really depends on whether EEC is looking for measures to increase provider knowledge of individual children or measures to provide state-wide data on developmental readiness at the end of preK. These two goals call for very different measures.”

Some programs would have a hard time moving away from Ages and Stages, even though they know it is a screening tool.

“EEC has made it clear that they don’t like ASQ as an assessment tool, and there has been talk about eliminating it from the approved “four”. It is recognized as a screening tool, however, and we use it as such in both our center-based and family child care programs. We use it in our family child care systems as an assessment tool as well, and have invested time and resources in training our family child care providers in its use. We would hate to have to change and retrain our providers in the use of a different tool, never mind the expense.”
ACF is currently conducting a review of ongoing assessment instruments (related to Head Start) that may be helpful to EEC.


The Brigance system should be investigated further.

“Curriculum Associates has come out with online tools [http://www.curriculumassociates.com/products/detail.asp?title=brigied2] for early childhood programs and given their reputation, this one should be looked at closely.”

There is a need for advanced assessment training.

“I also would like to see more training on how to review assessment information for making informed instructional decisions. I see providers mainly gathering assessment data for its own sake.”

“Training is needed on online applications of the tool.”

“Programs are very interested in getting training for assessments- the requests for training exceeded our capacity to provide training through the Assessment Grant.”

There are barriers to effectively training in Institutions of Higher Education.

“We have a required course as part of our major. The main request is that we actually be able to demonstrate USE of the electronic assessment tools recommended by the State, but they are prohibitively expensive to purchase and pay annual fees for demonstration purposes.”

There are mixed feelings about the electronic versions.

“I personally feel EEC made a mistake in pushing for the electronic versions of these assessment systems. They are complicated, expensive, and put the emphasis on filling in the information for record-keeping purposes rather than gathering useful information for informing instructional decisions.”

Schools reported that teachers loved the online versions.

There is a growing need for assessments that are appropriate for Dual Language Learners.

“The HS Act requires programs to use valid and reliable screening and assessment instruments for the population being served. I think this will be a very big issue in the coming months.”

Some felt that screenings should be added to the requirement for UPK programs.

“We should also consider, adding screenings Like DIAL and ESI, DECA.”
One researcher reported on a new screening tool.

“In terms of screening measures, another measure that is currently coming into greater use is PEDS. And the EDI has a strong national advocacy group among developmental pediatricians as a potential nationally-used measure at the end of Pre-K/start of kindergarten. Mike Lopez, from the LA First Five evaluation of their Pre-K initiatives, reported on what they were using to assess children’s development. All programs in CA use a lengthy teacher rating of children, but LA is also administering a sophisticated battery of standardized measures.”

4. Characteristics of Child Assessment Tools

Brief Profile of Child Assessment Tools

Table 3 presents a brief profile of child assessment tools that were mentioned in interviews with schools, with publishers or with other states. We developed the following criteria by which to determine if a tool should be investigated further.

1. It must be currently being used within Massachusetts or be an update of a tool that is currently being used.
2. It must have the characteristics of an authentic assessment tool in that it (a) is based on observation occurring in the natural environment, (b) is ongoing, happening throughout the school year, and (c) appears to focus on all developmental domains.

From this list, two tools were noted as appropriate for further investigation (see next section).

Table 3. Brief Profile of Suggested Assessment Tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Developmental Domains</th>
<th>Type of Administration</th>
<th>Potential for EEC approval?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASQ-3</td>
<td>1 mo – 5.5 years</td>
<td>Developmental and social-emotional screening for young children</td>
<td>Communication, gross motor, fine motor, problem solving, and personal-social.</td>
<td>In any environment. Observe children doing 30 activities.</td>
<td>ASQ already approved by EEC. No significant differences that would affect current approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battelle Developmental Inventory – II</td>
<td>Birth – 7.11 years</td>
<td>Screening, diagnosis, and evaluation of early development.</td>
<td>Personal-social, adaptive, motor, communication and cognitive ability</td>
<td>The examiner interacts with the child using toys, games and tasks. Observe the child’s ability to follow instructions, interact with others and perform tasks.</td>
<td>No. Based on observation but not in natural setting. Not an authentic assessment. Not clearly linked to instruction. Typically used with children with special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Developmental Domains</td>
<td>Type of Administration</td>
<td>Potential for EEC approval?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brigance Early Childhood Complete System</strong></td>
<td>Birth-7</td>
<td>Screening (early childhood screen II), developmental inventory (assessment), instructional activities and online management system. It is a &quot;developmentally sequenced criterion-referenced assessment&quot;.</td>
<td>Designed to align with state early learning standards: language development, literacy, math and science, social and emotional development and physical health and development.</td>
<td>Assessment based on observation in natural setting, interview with parent or caregiver, and/or child performance. Can be used for ongoing assessment, and to monitor progress towards early learning standards, instructional goals and/or IFSPs and IEPs.</td>
<td>Yes. Well researched tool. Very teacher friendly. Integrated instructional activities related to child's development level and progress. More directive than other approved assessments – not only based on observation. Online training available at no cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devereux Early Childhood Assessment (DECA)</strong></td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>Measure of Within-Child Protective Factors in Preschool Children</td>
<td>Based on 27 positive behaviors.</td>
<td>Parent, family child care and early childhood professionals complete questionnaire</td>
<td>No. Doesn't cover developmental domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Developmental Domains</td>
<td>Type of Administration</td>
<td>Potential for EEC approval?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo (Pre-K)</td>
<td>3-5 (Pre-K version; there is also a k-12 version)</td>
<td>Integrated system for &quot;Assessment for Learning&quot;. Entire system including curriculum, data management system, support for home and free technical support.</td>
<td>Early math, language and literacy, fine and gross motor development, physical health practices, approaches to learning, creative arts, social/emotional</td>
<td>Ongoing observation in natural environment. Integrate teacher observation, parent input and classroom projects into one integrated development profile. Establishes initial developmental profile</td>
<td>Maybe. It is a system meeting all criteria for an authentic assessment leading to individualized instruction. However, no one is Massachusetts mentioned it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Young Children’s Achievement Test (YCAT)</td>
<td>4 years-7 years, 11 months</td>
<td>Identifies young children who are at risk for school failure.</td>
<td>General information, reading, writing, mathematics, spoken language</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Wrong age group and more of a developmental assessment rather than an authentic assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Profile of Child Assessment Tools

Out of the list of “assessment” tools used with schools and within the states we spoke to, we determined that the following tools warranted further investigation.

1. **Brigance Early Childhood Complete System**
2. **Galileo Pre-K**
3. **Teaching Strategies GOLD**

**Brigance Early Childhood Complete System**

*Publisher:* Curriculum Associates. Massachusetts Representative: Tom Hughes (941-735-1819)

*Detailed Description:* The Brigance Early Childhood System is comprised of three Brigance products: (1) Brigance Early Childhood Screens, (2) Brigance Early Childhood Developmental Inventory and (3) Brigance Readiness Activities. All of these products are brought together through the online management system. There is also a product specifically for special education called the Brigance IED II.

*Brigance early childhood screens* identify developmental needs quickly and accurately. They allow teachers to identify potential learning delays and giftedness in language, motor, self-help, social-emotional and cognitive skills.

*Brigance early childhood developmental inventory* monitors progress towards early learning standards and identifies developmentally appropriate, individualized instruction. The product helps teachers identify a level of performance, set goals and measure progress towards goals (in compliance with IDEA as well).

*Brigance readiness activities* help teachers link assessment to instruction, build the home-school connection through family letters and take-home learning plans and activities and includes student activity pages for teachers to use.

The *Brigance early childhood online management system* gives teachers access to reports on screening and ongoing assessment data for individual children, the classroom and the whole program. The system can integrate cutoff scores to comply with programs specific needs or funding requirements. The online system automatically identifies ongoing assessment and readiness activities.

The assessment is based on observation in natural setting, interview with parent or caregiver, and/or child performance. The goal in developing a tool to integrate information from multiple sources is objective, collaborative assessment. The tool can be used for ongoing assessment, and to monitor progress towards early learning standards, instructional goals and/or IFSPs and IEPs.

No specialized training is required for the Brigance. The online training is provided for free which seems comprehensive. However, the cost of the system is substantial. The complete system cost $1199 for 20 children and $1899 for 40 children (this covers 3 years worth of materials). The online management system starts at $8 per child. Individual tools within the Brigance system cost about $150 - 250.
**Galileo Pre-K**

*Publisher: Assessment Technology, Inc. (ati-online.com)*

*Detailed Description:* The Galileo is another complete assessment system. Galileo is an integrated system for “Assessment for Learning”. The Galileo system includes assessment, curriculum, child/family services and online management. It includes (1) an evidence based early childhood curriculum designed to help teachers be efficient and resourceful when linking content, instruction and learning goals, (2) ongoing assessment in the child’s natural environment, (3) demographic and developmental profiles of children, (4) individualized reports for parents about child’s development and readiness for new skills, (5) lesson planning, (6) developmental screening and IEP development, and (7) program level online management. Assessment information is gathered by doing ongoing observation in the child’s natural environment.

Typically, most programs are doing monthly or bi-monthly assessments. It is intended to be an ongoing observational authentic assessment. Assessment information integrates teacher observation, parent input and classroom projects into one integrated development profile. The online program establishes initial developmental profile, progress report and identifies opportunities for scaffolding children’s skills.

The Galileo early childhood curriculum specifies an empirically-based scope and sequence, development and learning theory, interest areas and room preparation, and instructional content that includes the most current research on what and how children learn. The Galileo e-curriculum allows schools to build their own activities or use Galileo activities.

For parents, the Galileo system generates three individualized reports that tell parents about what a child has learned at preschool and about a child's readiness to learn new capabilities in a given developmental area.

There is onsite and online training available. The onsite training is two days. The online training is intended to do over five weeks. The online training has the same information as the onsite training.

The cost of Galileo Online is $260.00 per classroom (which covers 15-20 students). It is important to note that a computer is needed to use Galileo which may be a concern to particular programs. The reports provide the capacity for the English content to be translated into Spanish.
Teaching Strategies GOLD

Publisher: Teaching Strategies, Inc (teachingstrategies.com)

Detailed Description: Teaching Strategies GOLD is a complete assessment system integrating ongoing authentic assessment, curriculum, instructional planning, family involvement and an online management system. The program can choose a web-based or print-based system. The system is designed to track individual and group progress. That information is then used to generate detailed reports and make instructional and referral decisions.

The purpose of Teaching Strategies GOLD as stated by the publisher is to “(1) observe and document children’s development and learning over time, (2) support, guide and inform planning and instruction, (3) report and communicate with family members and others and (4) identify children who might benefit from special help or further evaluation.”

The system is designed around 38 objectives (see appendix E for objectives). The system also includes a research summary of why each objective is important and teaching strategies for each objective. To make assessment observations easier to collect for teachers, the authors developed “assessment opportunity cards” which give suggestions for integrated, play-based experiences for teachers to do focused observations on a particular objectives.

The new system contains ‘in-between” steps in each progression (related to each objective) to allow for emerging skills or to indicate if a child needs support to accomplish a skill or behavior which is relevant for assessment children with special needs.

The authors also developed an inter-rater reliability protocol so teachers can be rating children in the same manner. This should contribute significantly to more objective, reliable information for teachers about their children.

The new system has two objectives for English language acquisition as well as Spanish oral language and literacy objectives to support dual language learners. There is a Spanish version of all the tools and components. There is a dedicated online portal where families can access and contribute information about their child’s learning and development.

The cost of the online portion of the system is not yet advertised. The toolkit is $200 and other components of the system range from $6 (objectives poster) to $20 (observation recording tool) to $70 (objectives for development and learning).
Appendix A – Interview Questions for States

MA UPK - State Use of Assessment Data

Questions for Other States:

ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

➢ Do all of your Pre-K programs regularly collect formative child assessment data?

➢ Do you have a list of approved assessment tools and/or what are the most frequently used tools? What tools are commonly used? Are you considering approving any additional or new tools? Which ones?

➢ If you have a list of approved tools, do the options appear to meet the needs of the child care programs? Have they expressed concerns or suggested other tools for approval?

➢ What state policies are in place regarding the collection of assessment data in UPK programs?

➢ If use of child assessment tools is required, with what frequency?

➢ Do you require assessment for preschool only or are infants/toddlers also included in assessment requirements?

➢ Do you partner screening with assessment and if so, what screening tools are used?

➢ Do you use child assessment data as part of a kindergarten readiness plan, and if so, how?

➢ Are there specific types of Pre-K or other programs that are required to collect assessment data?

➢ If assessment is not required, what percentage of your programs collect such data voluntarily?

COLLECTION

➢ What training and technical assistance does the state provide to programs related to the collection of child assessment data?

➢ If your Pre-K program requires collection of child assessment data, how do you require programs to report that data? That is:

  o Do programs aggregate the data at a classroom or program level? If not, does that state aggregate the data after it's received?
  o How frequently are programs required to report the data?
  o Do you request the data in electronic form, paper, or either?
  o Do you provide a format for reporting the data (e.g. data base, standardized data collection form?)
To what extent are programs currently submitting this data accurately, completely and in a timely fashion (what are some of the lessons learned)

- If your state has approved use of multiple assessment tools, do you collect data in a common format? If not, how do you combine data collected with various assessment tools?

**STATE USE**

- Of the data collected at the program level, what assessment data do you require programs to report to the state level?

- Do you analyze assessment data at the state – regional – local – program -- classroom -- child level? How do you aggregate the data for the agency’s use? (Is there a report we can obtain or look at?)

- How do you use assessment data to inform your administrative or legislative policies related to UPK? (is there any documentation of this – can we see)

- How do you use assessment data to provide assistance (financial, technical assistance, other) to UPK programs?

- If your state has a QRIS, how do you use or analyze assessment data at the state level in conjunction with the QRIS standards, rating process, or in making adjustments to QRIS policy?

- In terms of using the data submitted by programs are there “lessons learned” to be aware of? (Is everything working according to plan? Any unexpected successes or problems?)
### Appendix B: Use of Child Assessment in State and Municipal Level QRIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Systems</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Requires use of assessment</td>
<td>Written plan for documenting progress in Level 2; Use of data for curriculum planning in Level 3; Use of data for individualization in Level 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Requires use of <em>screening</em> tools as part of transition to Kindergarten</td>
<td>Annual use of recommended screening instrument for points 4 and 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Requires the collection of evidence related to children’s development and its use in curriculum planning.</td>
<td>Required at Level 2, and more frequently at Level 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Use of approved tool</td>
<td>For points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Teacher training in assessment; use of assessment</td>
<td>Teacher training at Step 4; Regular use of assessment for all children at Step 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Director expertise to provide training to staff; use of observation to plan curriculum</td>
<td>Staff conducting observation at Level 3 and use of observation to plan curriculum at Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Developmental <em>screening</em> and referrals</td>
<td>Screening and referrals at steps 2 and 3; regular assessment shared with families and used in teaching at step 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Assessments conducted at least once a year; more frequently at higher levels, and shared with families at higher levels</td>
<td>Star 2 – Star 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Municipal Systems     |                                                                              |                                            |
|-----------------------|                                                                              |                                            |
| Los Angeles, CA       | Requires use of developmental *screening* tools                             | Complete and use screenings at level 3-5, more frequently at higher levels. |
| Miami-Dade, FL        | Requires annual use of *screening* tool and referral for 90% of children; guides planning | For 5 points. |
| Palm Beach, FL        | System of regular observation; minimum 3x/year; percentage of samples observed; shared with families | Level 5                                    |
## Appendix C – Policies and Practices in States Actively Collecting Assessment Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Amy Corriveau, Deputy Assoc. Superintendent</td>
<td>Jamie Morrison</td>
<td>Lori Goodwin Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Dept.</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Department of Education</td>
<td>Arkansas Better Chance Program Administrator</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number</strong></td>
<td>602-364-1530</td>
<td>501-683-0975</td>
<td>(303)866-6783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Amy.Corriveau@azed.gov">Amy.Corriveau@azed.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamie.morrison@arkansas.gov">jamie.morrison@arkansas.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bowers_l@cde.state.co.us">bowers_l@cde.state.co.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Work Sampling System, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, COR, and Galileo Plus</td>
<td>Work Sampling System, Ounce Scale</td>
<td>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, High Scope COR (COR), Work Sampling System/Ounce Scale, and Assessment Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) (Part C only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>AZ has been offering a menu of four tools, including Work Sampling System, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, COR, and Galileo Plus. Programs have a paper tool they can use to turn their assessment numbers from various tools into a small number of indicators they report. They currently have an open RFP for a single vendor/tool.</td>
<td>Arkansas Better Chance (ABC) has a program manual on-line, at its Child Outcome Planning and Assessment (COPA) site, that details child assessment data collection and reporting requirements. Access to WSS data reporting is available via a link on the COPA web site. ABC has three regional data specialists who advise programs on COPA. ABC programs are required to have all teachers, paraprofessional staff, and home visitors trained in Work Sampling System Systems. All classroom staff are required to</td>
<td>Assessment is ongoing, but programs are required to submit data three times per year (roughly Oct, Feb, May). Programs are required to use an assessment tool from a pre-approved menu that includes: Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, High Scope COR (COR), Work Sampling System System/Ounce Scale, and Assessment Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) (Part C only). CO uses an on-line data collection system. Program implementation guidelines, expectations and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which they will require programs to use. Programs have been required to submit data within six weeks of entry and at end of year. As of FY12 programs will be required to submit data immediately upon entry to make better baseline data available. Programs currently aggregate data at program level, then submit. State is seeking a new vendor that will allow programs to skip this step, submit directly on-line, and access aggregated data. With new vendor, state expects to require more programs to collect and submit data.</td>
<td>undergo the initial training, and teachers are required to participate in refresher courses every two years. One staff person must be trained in the COPA data collection system.</td>
<td>requirements are available on the Results Matter web site. Through Results Matter, CO provides training and professional development in assessment tools and on using assessment data. Training includes approved in-person trainings, some of which are funded through Results Matter, and ongoing regional meetings where TA is provided. In addition, Results Matter has a series of training and TA videos available on-line. (<a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/resultsmatter/RMVideoSeries.htm">http://www.cde.state.co.us/resultsmatter/RMVideoSeries.htm</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Use of Data**

Colorado’s Race to the Top application included a proposal to link data from Results Matter to its broader student assessment database for the purposes of transition to K and school-readiness. The Results Matter initiative was in part created to use child assessment and family data to inform state policy and program decisions. Results Matter data is shared with both the CO Department of Human Services and the CO Department of Education to inform policy and program decisions. Data is aggregated at the school district level and publicly released. Data reported using different tools can be used for OSEP reporting if providers follow special instructions for flagging students for inclusion in OSEP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
<th>Delaware</th>
<th>Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Deborah Adams</td>
<td>Verna Thompson</td>
<td>Shan Goff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Dept.</strong></td>
<td>CT State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>DE Early Childhood Education Resources Workgroup</td>
<td>FL Dept. of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number</strong></td>
<td>(860) 713-6756</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vthompson@DOE.K12.DE.US">vthompson@DOE.K12.DE.US</a></td>
<td>850-245-0445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Deborah.Adams@po.state.ct.us">Deborah.Adams@po.state.ct.us</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:shan.goff@fldoe.gov">shan.goff@fldoe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Connecticut state funded Pre-K grantees are required to do child assessment, but are not required to use a specific tool or to report the data.</td>
<td>Delaware does not have a universal Pre-K program. Programs are required to do assessment under federal OCEP regulations, and Delaware Early Childhood Assistance Programs follow Head Start performance standards, and use assessments accordingly.</td>
<td>Florida does not currently require assessment data collection in their VPK program. This was a negotiation with providers who were brought into the system after a constitutional amendment requiring access to Pre-K for all children. Hoping to include a pre/post assessment beginning next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tools Used</strong></td>
<td>No pre-approved list; must comply with CT Pre-K Frameworks.</td>
<td>Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, Carolina Curriculum, Desired Results (California)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>State grantees are required to do assessment, but no tool or frequency is specified. Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum seems to be the most commonly used tool, followed by High Scope COR/COR. One district used Pearson's OWLS, but has since stopped. State is focusing technical assistance on helping towns determine how to use data at the local and classroom level to inform instruction, and would like to provide more general technical assistance to improve reliability.</td>
<td>Delaware has been providing technical assistance to programs in a number of forms to improve their use of assessment tools, and to encourage the use of data to inform instruction and improve programs. This summer they will be moving to collection through Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Gold, and will be convening &quot;clusters,&quot; regional user groups to trouble-shoot and provide technical assistance. In Race to the Top Application, DE officials describe the development of a Pre-K through 12 data portal - Delaware Automated System for Education Reporting (DASER) - which will collect child-level data. Pre-K is already part of the statewide longitudinal data system.</td>
<td>All of the programs in public school systems collect assessment data. 98-99 percent collect standardized pre and post assessment data. About 15% of all programs are in the public school sector. An estimated 50% of &quot;more traditional higher end [private] programs&quot; collect ongoing or pre and post assessments, but it's all voluntary. Some TA is provided on request, but few requests come, especially from school-based programs. Programs use a variety of assessments, some of which are screening tools. The list includes Galileo, Peabody Picture, Battelle, Dial-3, LAP, LAP-D, Get It Got It Go! FL is Building a progress monitoring data collection system tied to VPK standards in four content areas. It will include an on-line reporting system. This is intended for use by classroom teachers and use at the program or school level. It is specifically focused on early math and early reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Use of Data</strong></td>
<td>Assessment is used at the K level, based on the Preschool frameworks, to give a snapshot of children's learning levels. They do not use the data to determine &quot;readiness&quot; or in any way related</td>
<td>Delaware does not currently use assessment data on the statewide level, but they are considering ways to move in that direction. Programs in the top tiers of its QRIS are required to use an evidence based assessment tool in their programs.</td>
<td>Currently, VPK is focused on alignment with K-12 literacy assessment, so efforts on Pre-K level assessment are focused in that areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecticut | Delaware | Florida
--- | --- | ---
To accountability. Connecticut is very clear that they do not want to use child assessment for accountability purposes, but that it’s appropriate use is to improve instruction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Indiana</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maryland</strong></th>
<th><strong>New Jersey</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Sally Reed Crawford</td>
<td>Janice Treakle</td>
<td>Ellen Wolock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Dept.</strong></td>
<td>Indiana Dept. of Education, ISTAR</td>
<td>Maryland Model for School Readiness, MD DOE</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number</strong></td>
<td>(317) 234-5596</td>
<td>410-767-0100</td>
<td>609-777-0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:scrawford@doe.in.gov">scrawford@doe.in.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jtreakle@msde.state.md.us">jtreakle@msde.state.md.us</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ellen.wolock@doe.state.nj.us">ellen.wolock@doe.state.nj.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Requirements</strong></td>
<td>ISTAR-K is a state standards-based instrument and is mandatory for all preschool children receiving special education (3 years through 5 years). It is also available to private community early childhood education programs at no cost. Data is collected to fulfill federal outcome reporting for the preschool special education population.</td>
<td>Maryland code requires that every district has to provide readiness data in the fall. Assessments are required at the K level, but not at the Pre-K level. State provides examplars at K, PK-4 and PK-3 levels, but assessment only required at K level. DOE also provides funding for some Model for Maryland School Readiness trainings for center and family child care providers, but there is no requirement.</td>
<td>Assessment is required in 35 fully funded districts (Abbott+4). 110 districts get some state funding, and those encouraged to use assessment systems which include screening upon entry, performance based assessment, and classroom assessment. Programs start with ECERS, and once they’ve reached a 5.0 can switch to curriculum based instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tools Used</strong></td>
<td>ISTAR-K</td>
<td>No requirement, but Work Sampling System System widely used.</td>
<td>Approved list includes WSS, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, and COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>No significant reporting requirements beyond requirements for federal reporting.</td>
<td>Most K's use WSS, but not required to use that system. Pre-K's have access to WSS but are not required. Some schools have integrated required indicators into report card to facilitate reporting. Each system applies for professional development grants, and use funds for ongoing training. State has 20 trainers deployed based on needs of each system. Hold regional trainings for new teachers. Year one training has four sessions, year two training has three sessions. Then content-specific trainings are available as needed.</td>
<td>Approved list of tools is in guidelines, and includes WSS, Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, and COR. Training is critical. NJ offered 20 hours on observation, and has a system with coaches in districts. The state has regular meetings with coaches, so they have a good way of getting information out to programs on how to use observations, collecting samples, interpreting development, etc. Teachers are weakest on using assessment to inform instruction. NJ is working with districts through professional learning communities, tapping into preschool programs to get people to use information to inform instruction. Collecting aggregate average scores by program for each of the domains for each of the collection periods (most people did three) using a state developed form. Also ask for growth score - percentage change from first collection to the last, and plan for how they will respond to scores through changes in classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Use of Data</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No link to Kindergarten readiness yet, but hopeful. State's response to early learning standards is Foundations, which is linked to the IN academic standards (from which ISTAR was derived). They've conducted a validation and alignment study over the past five years to revise ISTAR to become ISTAR-KR, using grant from office of special ed. Hope is to get part c or EI services to use it for kids that transition, and by beginning to educate private programs about it. They would like it to become a tool used by all providers that share children, but are just beginning that effort.</td>
<td>State publishes statewide K readiness report using the data collected, and sends data to districts aggregated at district and school level. Districts can use that for public release and for district/school improvement.</td>
<td>NJ doesn't use child assessment data in a &quot;high stakes way&quot; and only aggregates to classroom level for use by programs. The state may look at looking at screening data (early screening inventory) and how many had more comprehensive assessment. All data collected at the state level will at some point be part of longitudinal data system being built. They currently have identifiers for children when they enter program, but those are not tied to other programs at this point. They can follow students from district to district, and have some demographic data. They also have provider identifier numbers. They may tie assessment data to these eventually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Laurie Danahy</td>
<td>Susan Mitchell</td>
<td>Susan DeVenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Dept.</strong></td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Department of Education</td>
<td>SC First Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number</strong></td>
<td>(503) 947-6500</td>
<td>(717) 783-9783</td>
<td>(803) 734-1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Laurie.Danahy@state.or.us">Laurie.Danahy@state.or.us</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:susmitchel@state.pa.us">susmitchel@state.pa.us</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sdevenny@scfirststeps.org">sdevenny@scfirststeps.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Previously planned early childhood assessment data, based on Foundations (learning standards) was not implemented. Currently OR Pre-K and Head Start programs are required to assess. 31 Pre-K programs in total are required to do assessments.</td>
<td>State funded Pre-K Counts programs are required to collect and report assessment information, as are state-funded Head Start (supplemental), Early Intervention, and center-based Star 3 and Star 4 (under Keystone Stars/QRIS). Ultimate goal is for all state-funded ECE programs to collect and report assessment data. Infant/toddler programs will begin reporting assessment data in Fall 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Tools Used</strong></td>
<td>No pre-approved list, but Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum and Galileo widely used.</td>
<td>Required to report data in WSS or Ounce Scale format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection</strong></td>
<td>OR Pre-K has no pre-approved list of assessments. The most widely used tool is Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, followed by Galileo. OR has an umbrella agreement for Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, so portal for reporting data is available to those providers. Early Intervention and ECE programs not funded through pre-k are required to screen using AEPS I and AEPS II (or ASQ for some children). Professional Development for Pre-K: Many programs use training dollars from grants. Most is arranged individually at program level. OR tried statewide training for Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, but logistics got hairy. State is encouraging programs to bring</td>
<td>Programs required to collect data and report data on-line. School run Pre-K programs if receiving state quality funding, are asked to report assessment data, but are not as consistent. Infant and Toddler programs are required to use Ounce. All reported data will go into statewide Early Learning Network database. All programs report data using WSS or Ounce format. If they use a different tool it must be aligned, and the state provides alignment information for various tools on its web site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pennsylvania</strong></td>
<td><strong>South Carolina</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tennessee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training to their sites so they get in depth training for whole staff. Galileo (which only a few use) works directly with grantees and part of package when they buy the system is technical support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Use of Data</strong></td>
<td>EI/ECE assessment/screening data goes into the statewide database. The database aggregates data by county program, service area, and state-wide. Although the data hasn't been used for legislative work, etc. yet, they expect to do this within the next year. With its Pre-K assessment data, OR has had a researcher evaluate the population of Pre-K programs using Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum, and has found that it is representative of the state population of Pre-K providers, so can be instructive in policy decisions. OR just received a grant to add to early childhood database, and is hoping to use it to add Pre-K assessment data to the database that currently holds EI/ECE data.</td>
<td>Working on alignment between Pre-K assessments and K assessments. PA analyzes data at program level. Plans to analyze at county and state level, and would like to link to K-12 and higher education data to do longitudinal analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. List of Schools Contacted for Chapter 3

1) Sandwich Independent Day School in Sandwich, Barnstable
2) Sandwich Community School Sandwich, Barnstable
3) Harwich Elementary School, Harwich, Barnstable
4) Side by Side Preschool, Williamstown, Berkshire
5) Undermountain Elementary School, Sheffield, Berkshires
6) Early Childhood Center, Abington, Plymouth
7) Memorial Early Childhood Center, Middleboro, Plymouth
8) Union#38,(Conway,Deerfield,Sunderland,Whately) Franklin County
9) Pioneer Valley Regional School District,Northfield, Franklin
10) Pathways Preschool of Nantucket Elementary School, Nantucket
11) Belchertown Public Schools in Hampshire
12) Amherst Early Education Center, Amherst, Hampshire
13) Shawsheen Elementary School in Andover, Essex
14) Early Childhood Center of Bentley School in Salem, Essex
15) Lowell Public Schools, Middlesex
16) East Cambridge Preschool, Cambridge, Middlesex
17) Burell Elementary School in Foxborough, Norfolk
18) Olive Day School, Norfolk,Norfolk
20) John Silber Early Learning Center, Chelsea, Suffolk
21) Green Meadows Elementary School in Hampden, Hampden
22) Springfield Public Schools in Hampden
Appendix E. Teaching Strategies GOLD Domains

Social-Emotional Development
Objective 1. Regulates own emotions and behaviors
Objective 2. Establishes and sustains positive relationships
Objective 3. Participates cooperatively and constructively in group situations

Physical Development
Objective 4. Demonstrates traveling skills
Objective 5. Demonstrates balancing skills
Objective 6. Demonstrates gross-motor manipulative skills
Objective 7. Demonstrates fine-motor strength and coordination

Language Development
Objective 8. Listens to and understands increasingly complex language
Objective 9. Uses language to express thoughts and needs
Objective 10. Uses appropriate conversational and other communication skills

Cognitive Development
Objective 11. Demonstrates positive approaches to learning
Objective 12. Remembers and connects experiences
Objective 13. Uses classification skills
Objective 14. Uses symbols and images to represent something not present

Literacy
Objective 15. Demonstrates phonological awareness
Objective 16. Demonstrates knowledge of the alphabet
Objective 17. Demonstrates knowledge of print and its uses
Objective 18. Comprehends and responds to books and other texts
Objective 19. Demonstrates emergent writing skills

Mathematics
Objective 20. Uses number concepts and operations
Objective 21. Explores and describes spatial relationships and shapes
Objective 22. Compares and measures
Objective 23. Demonstrates knowledge of patterns

Science and Technology
Objective 24. Uses scientific inquiry skills
Objective 25. Demonstrates knowledge of the characteristics of living things
Objective 26. Demonstrates knowledge of the physical properties of objects and materials
Objective 27. Demonstrates knowledge of Earth’s environment
Objective 28. Uses tools and other technology to perform tasks

Social Studies
Objective 29. Demonstrates knowledge about self
Objective 30. Shows basic understanding of people and how they live
Objective 31. Explores change related to familiar people or places
Objective 32. Demonstrates simple geographic knowledge

The Arts
Objective 33. Explores the visual arts
Objective 34. Explores musical concepts and expression
Objective 35. Explores dance and movement concepts
Objective 36. Explores drama through actions and language

English Language Acquisition
Objective 37. Demonstrates progress in listening to and understanding English
Objective 38. Demonstrates progress in speaking English