Spring 2007 CDEPP Administrator Survey Results

Kathleen Paget, PhD
Heather Smith Googe, MEd
Fred Greer, PhD
DD Manning, Research Assistant
University of South Carolina

This report summarizes the results of a survey distributed in the spring of 2007 to CDEPP administrators employed in private and public settings. The purpose of the survey was to elicit input from the administrators regarding the implementation process of the CDEPP. The survey consisted of nine sections: (1) Demographics (of the respondents), (2) Administrative procedures, (3) Child Screening and Enrollment, (4) Funding Sources and Funds, (5) Implementation, (6) School Facility, Physical Environment, and Transportation, (7) Opportunities for Professional Development, (8) Parent Education and Related Child and Family Services, and (9) Child and Program Evaluation.

Forty (40) surveys were mailed to administrators in private programs. Of these, 18 were returned, yielding a response rate of 45%. To administrators in public school programs, 99 surveys were mailed. Of these, 77 were completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 85%. All survey results must be interpreted within the context of this significant difference in the actual number of surveys returned and the response rates across the private and public programs.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Question 1: Administrators' Current Positions

Tables 1a and 1b present information about the positions held by the CDEPP administrators who responded to the surveys from both private and public programs. From the private centers, approximately 78% of administrator respondents identified themselves as private center directors, and approximately 17% identified themselves as regional coordinators. From the public school programs, approximately 66% of administrator respondents identified themselves as public school principals, and approximately 21% as early childhood coordinators. Approximately 3% identified themselves as both public school principal and early childhood coordinator.

Table 1a. Position Held: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Position	Number	Percent
Private Center Director	14	77.8
Regional Coordinator	3	16.7
Other: First Steps Director of program monitoring and compliance	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

Table 1b. Position Held: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Position	Number	Percent
Public School Principal	50	65.8
Early Childhood Coordinator	16	21.1
Other:	5	6.6
• 4K teacher • Assistant Principal and CDEPP Director • Assistant Superintendent • Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction • ECC; plus new teacher program; after school; elementary and Even Start • Teacher/CDEPP director		
Public School Principal & Early Childhood Coordinator	2	2.6
Early Childhood Coordinator & Other	2	2.6
Total	75	100.0

Question 2: Administrators' Number of Years of Teaching Experience

Tables 2a and 2b present the number of years of teaching experience reported by the CDEPP administrators who responded to the survey from both public and private programs. Private center administrators reported an average of slightly more than12 years of teaching experience with a standard deviation of approximately 11 years. These private center administrators reported a wide range of years of teaching experience with a minimum of 0 years to a maximum of 38 years. Public school administrators reported an average of slightly more than 16 years of teaching experience with a standard deviation of about 9 years. These public school administrators also reported a wide range of years of teaching experience with a minimum of 3 years to a maximum of 38 years.

Table 2a. Number of Years Teaching Experience: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Years of Experience	18	12.81	11.23	14.5	0	38

Table 2b. Number of Years Teaching Experience: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Years of Experience	77	16.75	8.77	15	3	38

Question 3: Administrators' Number of Years of Administrative Experience

Tables 3a and 3b present information about the number of years of administrative experience held by the CDEPP administrators from private and public programs. Private center administrators reported an average of about 14 years of administrative experience with a standard deviation of close to 8 years. These private center administrators reported a wide range of experience, from a minimum of 5 years to a maximum of 31 years. Administrators from the public school programs reported an average of just over 12 years of administrative experience with a standard deviation of just over 8 years. Again, a wide range of administrative experience was reported, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 39 years.

Table 3a. Number of Years Administrative Experience: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Years of Experience	18	14.47	7.63	12	5	31

Table 3b. Number of Years Administrative Experience: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Years of Experience	77	12.37	8.38	11	0	39

Question 4: Administrators' Gender

Tables 4a and 4b present information about the gender of respondent CDEPP administrators from both private and public programs. 100% of administrators from private centers were female. Approximately 79% of the responding administrators from public school programs were female; just over 17% were male; and 4% did not respond to this particular item.

Table 4a. Gender: Private Centers Administrator Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	18	100.0
Total	18	100.0

Table 4b. Gender: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	59	78.7
Male	13	17.3
Did not respond	3	4.0
Total	75	100.0

Question 5: Administrators' Ethnicity

Tables 5a and 5b present information about the ethnicity of respondent CDEPP administrators from both private and public programs. As indicated in Table 4a, 61%of the responding private center administrators were Black or African American, 28% were white, 5% were Black/American Indian/White and 6% were Black/American

Indian/Hispanic. As indicated in Table 5b, 57% of the responding public school administrators were White, and 43% were Black or African American.

Table 5a. Ethnicity (based on US Census categories): Private Center Administrator Respondents

Ethnicity	Number	Percent
White	5	28.0
Black or African American	11	61.0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0
Asian	0	0.0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0
Black/American Indian/White	1	5.5
Black/American Indian/Hispanic	1	5.5
Total	18	100.0

Table 5b. Ethnicity (based on US Census categories): Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Ethnicity	Number	Percent
White	44	57.1
Black or African-American	33	42.9
Asian	0	-
Hispanic or Latino	0	-
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	-
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	-
Other	0	-
Total	77	100.0

Question 6: Administrators' Membership in Professional Organizations

Tables 6a and 6b describe the types of professional organizations private center and public school program administrator respondents belong to. Of the private center administrator respondents, 50% reported membership in the National Association for the Education of Young Children, while 33% reported no membership in a professional organization. Of public school program administrator respondents, approximately 22% reported membership in the South Carolina Early Childhood Association and approximately 17% reported membership in the National Education Association. Approximately 17% of public school program administrator respondents reported no membership in a professional organization.

Table 6a. Professional Organizations to Which CDEPP Administrators Belong: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Organization Name	Number	Percent (N=18)
National Association for the Education of Young Children	9	50.0
None	6	33.3
South Carolina Association for the Education of Young Children	4	22.2
South Carolina Early Childhood Association	3	1.7
South Carolina Child Care Association	3	1.7
Southern Early Childhood Association	2	11.1
International Reading Association	1	5.6
American Counseling Association	1	5.6
Pee Dee Child Care Association	1	5.6
Region IV Head Start Association	1	5.6
National Head Start Association	1	5.6
Palmetto State Teachers' Association	1	5.6
National Education Association	1	5.6
South Carolina Education Association	1	5.6

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were able to list more than one organization

Table 6b. Professional Organizations to Which CDEPP Administrators Belong: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Organization Name	Number	Percent (N=77)
South Carolina Early Childhood Association	17	22.1
National Education Association	13	16.9
None	13	16.9
South Carolina Education Association	12	15.6
National Association for the Education of Young Children	8	10.4
South Carolina Association for the Education of Young Children	8	10.4
International Reading Association	5	6.5
South Carolina International Reading Association	5	6.5
National Association of Elementary School Principals	5	6.5
South Carolina Alliance of Black School Educators	4	5.2
South Carolina Association of Black Educators	3	3.9
Delta Kappa Gamma	3	3.9
South Carolina Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development	3	3.9
Southern Early Childhood Association	2	2.6
South Carolina Science Council	2	2.6
National Council of Teachers of English	2	2.6
National Reading Association	2	2.6
Edisto Reading Association/Council	2	2.6
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics	2	2.6
Palmetto State Teachers' Association	1	1.3

Montessori Educational Programs International	1	1.3
American Montessori Society	1	1.3
North American Montessori Teachers' Association	1	1.3
South Carolina Association of Black Administrators	1	1.3
South Carolina Council for Mathematics	1	1.3
National Association of Mathematics	1	1.3
Berkeley Reading Council	1	1.3
South Carolina Council of Teachers of Mathematics	1	1.3
National Staff Development Council	1	1.3
South Carolina Middle School Association	1	1.3
Council for Exceptional Children	1	1.3
International Society for Technology in Education	1	1.3
International Montessori Council	1	1.3

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were able to list more than one organization

Question 7: Administrators' Highest Education Level and Area of Study

Tables 7a and 7b present information about the education level and areas of study of respondent administrators from private and public CDEP programs. The majority of teachers from private centers reported holding a Bachelor's degree in various areas of study. Eight of the responding administrators reported having an associate's or bachelor's degree, and nine reported having a master's degree or above. One respondent held the doctorate degree. These degrees were in a range of discipline areas, including early childhood development, education, guidance, counseling, social work, and business administration. Table 7b shows that respondent administrators from the public school programs held degrees from the bachelor's level to the doctorate level, with the highest concentration having a master's degree, master's degree plus 30, or an education specialist degree. These degrees were in a wide range of discipline areas.

Table 7a. Highest Education Level and Area of Study: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Highest Education Level	Number	Areas of Study
Master's degree	7	Education
		Guidance
		Early Childhood Education
		Counseling
		Social Work
Associate's degree	4	Early Childhood/Development
Bachelor's degree	4	Early Childhood
		Business Administration
		Education
Master's degree +30	1	Special Education
Doctorate degree	1	Early Childhood
Education Specialist degree	0	
Other	0	

Table 7b. Highest Education Level and Area of Study: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Highest Education Level	Number	Areas of Study
Master's degree +30	38	Administration
		Administration & Supervision
		Agriculture Education; Administration
		Early Childhood
		Early Childhood, Elem. Ed., Principal Cert.
		Early Childhood, Elem. Ed.,, &Masters of Technology
		Early Childhood, Leadership & Supervision
		Early Childhood/Special Education
		Elem Ed.
		ElemEd/Administration
		Elementary/LD spec ed/Admin
		M Ed. And Educational Administration
		Natural Science/Administration
		PE, Elem. Ed
		School Administration
		Special Ed. Early Childhood, Elem, Guidance
Master's degree	14	Administration & Supervision
		Early Childhood
		Education
		Educational Administration
		Elementary Education
		Elementary Administration & Supervision
		K-12 leadership
		Masters of Education
Doctorate degree	12	Educational Leadership & Administration
		Curriculum Instruction
		Early Childhood
Education Specialist degree	11	Administration – Superintendent
		Administration
		Administration & Supervision
		Educational Administration
Bachelor's degree	5	Early Childhood/Elem. Education
		History
		Music Ed.
		Psychology
		Social Studies
Other	1	National Board Certified – Early Childhood Generalist

Question 8: Administrators' Areas of Certification

Tables 8a and 8b present information about the type of state certifications held by CDEPP administrator respondents from private and public programs. Approximately 35% of responding administrators from private centers indicated they were not certified; 29% reported certification in early childhood education, and 18% reported having

certification as a child development associate (CDA). Table 8b shows that the vast majority of responding administrators from the public school settings (82%) reported being were certified as administrators; 60% reported being certified in elementary education, 30% in secondary education, and 34% in early childhood education.

Table 8a. Type of State Certification: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type of Certification	Number	Percent
Not certified	6	35
Early Childhood Education	5	29
Child Development Associate (CDA)	3	18
Administrator	1	6
Elementary Education	1	6
Other: Working on associates with child care disability special needs.	1	6
Early Childhood Education (add on)	0	-
Special Education	0	-
Secondary Education	0	-
Have submitted application	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all categories that applied to them.

Table 8b. Type of State Certification: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Type of Certification	Number	Percent
Administrator (specify)	63	81.8
• Admin./Supervision		
• Administrator		
• Early Childhood Coordinator		
• Educational Leadership		
• Ed. Leadership K-12		
• Elem/Secondary Prin.		
• Elem/Secondary Supervisor		
• Superintendent		
• Leadership & Supervision		
Elementary Education	46	59.7
Early Childhood Education	26	33.8
Secondary Education	20	30.0
Other	19	24.7
• Choral Music		
• Elem/Secondary Guidance		
• Fitness & Health		
• General Science and Mid-level Science		
• Gifted		
• Commerce		
• LD/TMD		
• Middle Level Math		
• Middle School Language Arts		
• PE; K-12		
• Social Studies		

• Reading		
• leadership		
Special Education	6	7.8
Have submitted application	2	2.6
Early Childhood Education (add on)	1	1.3
Not certified	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all categories that applied to them.

Question 9: Accreditations, licensures, certifications, approvals, and other formal credentials granted by external entities attained by CDEP programs.

Tables 9a and 9b show the types of accreditations, licensures, certification, approvals, and other formal credentials attained by private center and public school programs have attained from external entities, according to private center and public school administrator respondents. Two of the 18 private center administrator respondents reported having ABC enhanced certification for their CDEPP. Of public school program respondents, 50 reported having DSS licensure for their CDEPP, while 20 reported having Southern Association of Colleges and School (SACS) accreditation for their school.

Table 9a: Accreditations, Licensures, Certifications, Approvals and Other Formal Credentials Granted by External Entities: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type of accreditation, licensure, certification, approval, or formal credential	Frequency (N=18)
DSS licensure	2
ABC enhanced	2
Certified child care trainer-center for child development	1
ECER-R 5 start rating	1
NAEYC accreditation	1
DHEC	1
ABC	1
Department of Defense	1

Table 9b: Accreditations, Licensures, Certifications, Approvals and Other Formal Credentials Granted by External Entities: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Type of accreditation, licensure, certification, approval, or formal credential	Frequency (N=76)
DSS licensure	50
SACS Accreditation	20
SDE Accreditation	11
CDEPP	4
DHEC certification	3
CCCD license	2
ECERS	1
Certified child care trainer-center for child development	1
ABC	1

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Question 10: Satisfaction with the program application and approval processes for CDEPP participation

The tables associated with question #10 provide information regarding satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the program application and approval processes for participation in CDEPP from both the private and public administrator respondents. As indicated in Table 10a, 83% of the administrators in private centers were satisfied with the program application and approval processes implemented by the Office of First Steps (OFS); 11% reported not being satisfied, and 6% did not respond to this particular item. Reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction are listed in Table 10.1a. Interestingly, one respondent stated the need for "higher standards for initial approval" and that the agency needed to tighten requirements and not allow exceptions.

Table 10b shows that 80% of the responding administrators in public school settings reported being satisfied with the application and approval processes implemented by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE), and 20% reported not being satisfied. Reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction are given in Table 10.1b. Predominating reasons for dissatisfaction included the requirements from the South Carolina Department of Social Services (DSS) (i.e., that it is very difficult to get the State Fire Marshal to visit the schools, that public schools should be exempt from the DSS regulations, and that the SCDE should work more closely with DSS to avoid duplicate forms). Other frequent comments pertained to having too much paperwork and "too much credential work," such as fingerprints and South Carolina Law Enforcement Division SLED checks.

Table 10a. Satisfaction with the Program Application and Approval Processes Implemented by the OFS: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Number	Percent
Yes	15	83.3
No	2	11.1
No response	1	5.6
Total	18	100

Table 10.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with application and approval processes	Reasons for dissatisfaction with application and approval processes
- Everything is done in an organized fashion. - It is a simple process that is straight to the point. - Process is clear, specific and not too long. - Streamline and efficient process	- I'd like to see higher standards for initial approval. Right now a simple checklist of minimum requirements equates with approval. The agency needs to tighten requirements and not allow for exceptions. - There are other children who are in need of child care services but do not meet the income guidelines set forth by the First Steps application and approval process.

Table 10b. Satisfaction with the Program Application and Approval Processes Implemented by the SCDE: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Number	Percent
Yes	60	80
No	14	20
Total	74	100

Table 10.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with application and approval processes	Reasons for dissatisfaction with application and approval processes
• The approval process was clear and precise. • Application not lengthy, specific approval time quick. • All requirements are clearly delineated. • Application process was fairly easy - looking forward to on-line application this year. • District level support made it a "breeze" • District office actually did all of this • Everything went smoothly • Good support system in place - our Regional Coordinator - Dr. D. Willis provided exceptional support, advice, & resources. • Sufficient information regarding the program and regional coach very knowledgeable regarding the program. • The CDEPP application and approval Processes force a school site to give a serious self-study of its own program. • There is not a lot of wait time between completing the application and the approval process	• Because of regulations on public school 4K programs, public schools should not be required to meet DSS guidelines. Those should be requirements for private centers only. We should be exempt. • Didn't like application or process too much paperwork! • DSS requirements; very difficult to get State Fire Marshall to visit schools. The process is unnecessary. • Too much credential work to be considered, for example; fingerprints, SLED check, first aid, reference letters • It appears that the SDE should work more closely with DSS. We are constantly completing duplicate forms. The SDE has their forms, and DSS has their forms. Time is precious to waste duplicating forms. • Too much paperwork as required by law. The program should be available to all children. The SDE and schools should not be required to follow DSS guidelines. We are accredited by the SDE and SACS. This places a burden on the schools and districts, and it also creates a further disconnect between the early childhood program and the elementary program. • Too much paperwork, inconsistent requirements, presented in an overwhelming manner, lack of consideration for teachers, not enough time to prepare for new programs.

Question 11: Agreement with educational attainment requirements for CDEPP lead teachers

The tables associated with question #11 present information related to the degree to which CDEPP administrators agree with the educational requirements for CDEPP lead teachers. As can be seen in Table 11a, about 65% of the private center CDEPP administrators reported that they agree with the educational requirements, while 35% stated that they did not agree with the requirements. Reasons for their dissatisfaction were that hands-on experience should count for more, that lead teachers should have a two-year degree and be working on a bachelor's degree or master's degree, that there are teachers with degrees who are poorer teachers than some experienced teachers who are working toward their associate's degree, and that it is very difficult to find teachers with bachelor's degrees who want to work in private centers.

Table 11b reveals that 88% of the responding administrators from public school CDEP programs agreed with the educational attainment requirements for CDEPP lead teachers, while 12% disagreed. Table 11.1b shows that the administrators provided constructive feedback about the requirements that included questions about why extra hours were required by DSS for teachers who already were certified by the SCDE at the bachelor's degree level, that teachers are out of the classroom too much for additional training, and that administrators do not have time to complete the professional development requirements.

Table 11a. Agreement with the Educational Attainment Requirements for CDEPP Lead Teachers: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	64.7
No	6	35.3
Total	17	100.0

Table 11.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with educational attainment requirements for lead teachers	Reasons for dissatisfaction with educational attainment requirements for lead teachers
• Allows teacher to move to a professional level, gain knowledge of early childhood and understand the growth and development process. • Currently, H/S requires teachers have at least an AA in area or related field with six courses in ECE. The requirement may be going towards a BS/BA by 2010. Our agency requires the same. • I agree with the requirements of CDEP because this process ensures to have and choose the best person for the position. It helps to choose quality workers. • It gives an opportunity for different ones to reach a goal in a teaching	• I don't think any four year degree with six hours of E.C.E. is sufficient. All 4k teachers in any setting should have coursework and guided experience in educational settings for young children. • I personally believe hands-on experience over 10 years should qualify for/and to meet requirements • Lead teachers should have a two year degree working on bachelor's degree or masters to also become a lead teacher. We have teachers that can do the service well. • Lead teachers do not have to have higher level degrees

- setting.
- it helps to ensure all teachers are qualified as early childhood professionals
- It makes it mandatory for the lead teachers to have the proper training they need to teach the children
- Lead teachers must be prepared to get these children prepared for first grade.
- qualified teachers yield qualified students
- The requirements give you a better teacher.
- The requirements provide opportunities for lead teacher to become certified in Early Childhood Education.
- They must be working toward or have four year degree in E.C.E.
- Yes, I do agree with the educational requirements of the lead teachers, because a teacher can enter the program and go back to school to attain requirement to become certified.

- Some degreed teachers are poor teachers- some experienced people working toward their associates are better: stronger in classroom management. The lead teacher should have a 4 year degree in early childhood or child development, or elementary education with 6-9 hours of early childhood courses.
- We have experienced great difficulty finding bachelor degreed teachers

Table 11b. Agreement with the Educational Attainment Requirements for CDEPP Lead Teachers: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	68	88.3
No	9	11.7
Total	77	100.0

Table 11.1b.

Reasons for satisfaction with educational attainment requirements for lead teachers	Reasons for dissatisfaction with educational attainment requirements for lead teachers
- A bachelor's degree and certification in early childhood are crucial. - A professional with the appropriate expertise should be in place to make the CDEPP effective. - Agree that teacher should have initial and on-going training in developmentally appropriate research based practices curriculum.	- Do not agree w/ CCCCD requirements for Public school certified teachers. - DSS requires less than required by SDE - NCLB. - If we have teachers already SDE certified/bachelors degrees & many years of experience - why the extra hours for DSS? Teachers have to have so many hours for recert. every five years anyway - why isn't

- All are experienced and ECE certified.
- All lead teachers are experienced and certified.
- All lead teachers were experienced and highly qualified
- All lead teachers will have the same educational level to start a good foundation
- All of our lead teachers are certified and experienced
- All teachers must be measured by a yardstick. There must be no shortcuts when certifying teachers - regardless of the level!
- All teachers should be certified.
- All trainings and workshops prepared the teachers for instructing K4 students through best teaching practices and assessment.
- Certified teachers are required to provide quality programs for pre-school children.
- Certified teachers could still benefit from the training sessions
- Closely connects with State Department requirements.
- Credentials necessary for teaching
- degree in ECE
- Early childhood professionals better understand developmentally appropriate practices.
- Early Childhood teachers should all be certified in early childhood
- High quality teachers are essential to delivering a high quality education.
- Highly qualified and trained teachers enable students to receive excellent foundational information that promotes continuous learning for lifelong learning.
- Highly qualified staff are required by NCLB.
- I agree that all teachers in Early Childhood programs should be Early Childhood certified.
- I agree with this requirement because it ensures that highly

- this enough?
- It is my opinion that all child development teachers should be certified.
- Lead teachers need to have teaching certificates & be in school setting.
- Many administrators don't have time to complete.
- Teachers are certified in Early Childhood programs yet more requirements are necessary to meet CDEPP requirements.
- The information given at meetings was beneficial, but the same information was duplicated over and over again. The teachers were out of the classrooms entirely too much.
- Too many hours are required; too much time is spent away from school

qualified staff with be hired.

- I believe that more training and experience one gains only benefit them and the program.
- I believe that these teachers must be certified and receive the latest training to successfully work with the students in the CDEPP.
- I do agree but I think district should be able to do Professional Development
- I firmly believe the teacher should have a bachelor's degree and certification in early childhood.
- IDEA - Highly Qualified obtainable goals.
- In order for lead teachers to be effective they must be certified in early childhood. They need to know the research behind the programs (Creative Curriculum, etc.) in order to make sure all the students are given the best education possible. All teachers need to be aware and abreast to all research in regards to age appropriate, grade appropriate, and developmentally appropriate instruction.
- It assures continuous awareness of training in early childhood development and practices.
- It assures that highly qualified teachers are placed in the classroom
- Lead teachers should be highly qualified in the area of Early Childhood/Elementary education. I also agree that there should be an option for those not certified.
- Lead teachers should be HQ.
- Lead teachers should have a good understanding of child growth and development and appropriate development practices for early learners.
- Meets NCLB requirements for EC.
- obtainable goals and objectives; on task
- Our district/state requires early childhood certification for teaching

child development.

- Professional Development and Highly Qualified
- Professional development and training for teachers is always beneficial, but it is very different to allow teachers out during school year.
- Professional teachers tend to make more reflective instructional decisions than paraprofessionals.
- Teachers must be highly qualified and have experience with working with young children.
- Teachers need to keep abreast of the changing practices in Early Childhood Education
- Teachers should be knowledgeable about student's growth & development as well as academic needs.
- Teachers should be properly trained to be effective in the classroom
- The educational requirements for CDEP teachers were very informative. New as well as veteran teachers were provided with necessary tools to meet the needs of all learners.
- The program needs to have qualified teachers.
- The requirement by CDEPP are appropriate
- The requirements assure that teachers receive professional development in the area of Early Childhood. It also assures that teachers are appropriately certified in Early Childhood.
- These teachers must understand how children grow, develop, and learn to provide the appropriate experiences for the students.
- These teachers have such an important influence on these young students
- These will mean that the lead teachers will be up to date on current issues and trends.

- They must be qualified in Early Childhood Education in order to have a successful program.
- They must be qualified.
- They need this to adequately serve children
- They should have qualifications as highly qualified teachers.
- To maintain highly qualified, competent teachers w/ up to date practices.
- We follow NCLB
- We need to have the best teacher. I am happy to report that we have a great teacher.
- We require EC HQ anyway

Question 12: Agreement with educational attainment requirements for CDEPP assistant teachers

The tables associated with question #12 present information related to the degree to which CDEPP administrators agree with the educational requirements for CDEPP assistant teachers. As can be seen in Table 12a, about 83% of the private center CDEPP administrators reported that they agree with the educational requirements, while 17% stated that they did not agree with the requirements. Reasons for their dissatisfaction were that assistant teachers should have an associate's degree in early care and education and that the requirements do not take into account those teachers with "a multitude of hands-on experience."

Table 12b reveals that 92% of the responding administrators from public school CDEP programs agreed with the educational attainment requirements for CDEPP assistant teachers, while 8% disagreed. Reasons for their dissatisfaction, as listed in Table 12.1b, are that assistant teachers are not paid enough to be asked to attend training without pay, that they are asked to spend too much time out of the classroom, and that additional training should be recommended but not required.

Table 12a. Agreement with the Educational Attainment Requirements for CDEPP Assistant Teachers: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	83.3
No	3	16.7
Total	18	100.0

Table 12.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with educational attainment requirements for assistant teachers	Reasons for dissatisfaction with educational attainment requirements for assistant teachers
- Allows assistant to have some idea of what is expected of someone in the profession and what is best practice when working with young children - Appropriate educational requirements - Assistant teacher need an introduction to Early Childhood Education. - Assistants must be able to help lead teachers prepare these children. - Because they can work with the certification of ECD 101. Giving them the opportunity to continue their education as a lead teacher. - Exceeds the states requirements for assistant teachers - I believe the assistants should have a plan for attaining a BS degree as well - I know that the program assistant must meet requirements. For assistants to enhance the growth of young children, they must understand the development levels of children, how they learn. - It makes it mandatory for the assistant teachers to obtain the proper education. - More educated teachers in learning center - The requirement ensures a commitment to early childhood education - Yes, because this encourages people who enter the program to go back and get the certificate needed for the job. - Yes, I agree with the requirements for the teacher assistant because it helps us to select the teacher assistant that is most qualified for the program.	- I feel the requirements should require the assistants to have an associate's degree in early care and education. - The requirements do not take into account those teachers with a multitude of hands on experience

Table 12b. Agreement with the Educational Attainment Requirements for CDEPP Assistant Teachers: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	70	92.1
No	6	7.9
Total	76	100.0

Table 12.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with educational attainment requirements for assistant teachers	Reasons for dissatisfaction with educational attainment requirements for assistant teachers
- A professional with the appropriate expertise should be in place to make the CDEPP effective. - All persons in the classroom must be highly qualified to teach. - Assistant teachers must be as knowledgeable about children's growth and development as teachers. - Assistant teachers need to know most - all of what teachers know works with students. - Assistants need to be abreast of the changing practices in Early Childhood Education - Assistants should be HQ - Assistants should be trained to work with these students because they are resources for the teacher. - Better trained teacher provide better care. - CDA courses do not establish quality for assistants. Requiring EDC 101 or degrees is "a good thing." - Children do not care who is teacher or assistant; both need to be qualified. - Closely connects with State Department requirements - Early childhood training for assistants is most needed. - ECD 101 - ECD 101 was taken - Even though these teachers have already gone through their own local training, these requirements (local training) probably do not address in	- Always has been important - Don't like CCCCD for these folks either. - DSS requires less than required by the SDE & NCLB. - I don't believe a four-year degree is an appropriate requirement for a teaching assistant. - I feel that being a certified parpro is enough - Too little pay to be asked to attend training without pay - Too much time out of classroom & too much put on this person - We already have highly qualified assistants. While the course is great, it should be recommended but not required.

- depth needs of very young children.
- Further educational requirements/attainments
- Highly trained assistants positively impact the program.
- I agree that the assistants should have training in early childhood.
- I agree with this requirement. I even feel that CDEPP assistant should be required to not only take ECD 101, but should be enrolled in the TEACH program.
- I think all paraprofessionals need educational assistance (e.g.,, staff development, course work) because they are not fully certified.
- IDEA - Highly Qualified obtainable goals.
- It assures that quality assistants are placed in the classrooms
- It is very beneficial for the assistants to take the ESE 101 Course.
- It maintains high standards for all employees.
- Knowledge of Early Childhood issues - growth and development is crucial. They also need training for children w/ developmental delays.
- Meets NCLB requirements; Require ECD 101.
- Minimum requirements are needed to ensure that teaching assistants have some basic understanding of what is appropriate for children. They spend at least 7.5 hours in the classrooms.
- My assistants enjoyed the ED 101 course.
- Professional Development and Highly Qualified
- required courses; highly qualified
- Requirements are within reason.
- Same as above
- Some assistant would not advance if it was not a requirement
- TAs need training in teaching developmentally appropriate skills to children at the same or similar to teachers. They spend the same or

- more time in the classrooms - school environment as teachers.
- Teacher assistants must be highly qualified and meet the requirements of the State Board of Education
- Teaching assistants need a thorough understanding of child development
- The aides need to understand Early Childhood programs which they were able to get through ECD 101.
- The assistants must be highly qualified and knowledgeable of Early Childhood. CDEPP provide assistants with training opportunities to broaden their knowledge of professional development needs.
- The assistant teacher needs to be trained to become an effective leader.
- The assistants are almost as important to instruction as the teachers.
- The assistants must be highly qualified and knowledgeable of Early Childhood. CDEPP provide assistants with training opportunities to broaden their knowledge and professional development needs.
- The classes offered to assistants are good.
- The courses and requirements keep the assistants abreast of the latest research and give them training to be more effective in the classroom.
- The educational requirements for assistants require formal training for all. It assures that the assistants are able/equip to better serve students and offers background knowledge to assistants who otherwise might not have any in childhood development.
- The professional's development will ensure that the assistant competently executes his/her job. Some assistants do have any background knowledge and the training will greatly benefit them!
- The requirements see that assistant teachers also receive training

- The training provided by the Office of Early Childhood and EOC 101 course has helped them grow as educators. The only problem is the lack of funding to support the requirements.
- These persons also carry heavy impact on attitudes and sensitivity to learning for our youngsters
- They need to have knowledge of ECE.
- They really need the training and have truly grown as educators
- They should also be qualified/experienced in Early Childhood education in order to successfully assist the classroom teachers.
- To assist with instructional efforts.
- To ensure professionalism and a broad knowledge of early childhood & general education practices.
- Trained teacher assistants provide additional opportunities for students to receive an excellent education at the beginning of their lives.
- Training is needed at this level
- We follow NCLB plus additional requirements
- We had highly qualified assistants already, due to Title I.
- We have been very pleased with ECD 101 and its direct effect on the classroom. Many of our assistants are planning to take ECD 102 in the fall.
- We need to have a highly qualified assistant teacher. We have a great person.

Question 13: Satisfaction with the DSS requirements for approval, certification, and licensure.

Tables 13a and 13.1a provide information on private center administrator satisfaction and dissatisfaction with DSS requirements for approval, certification, and licensure. Private center administrators conveyed a high satisfaction of 89% for DSS requirements. Reasons cited included were requirements enhanced child health and safety and helped to ensure quality of care. Private center administrators responded with 11% dissatisfaction toward DSS requirements noting evaluator differences and suggesting equal monitoring of programs.

Tables 13b and 13.1b present information on public school administrator satisfaction and dissatisfaction with DSS requirements for approval, certification, and licensure. Public school administrators expressed 47% satisfaction for DSS requirements. Reasons mentioned were requirements enhanced child health and safety and helped to ensure child appropriate environments. Public school administrators indicated 53% dissatisfaction toward DSS requirements pointing to repetition of paperwork (e.g.; fire marshals, DHEC, SACS and DSS) and costs involved.

Table 13a. Satisfaction with DSS requirements: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	88.9
No	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

Table 13.1.a

Reasons for satisfaction with DSS requirements	Reasons for dissatisfaction with DSS requirements
- All centers are currently licensed under the DSS guidelines - All of the centers participating in First Steps 4K programs were licensed or registered by DSS. - All the regulations are necessary to operate a successful business - Department of Social Services (DSS) has laws and requirements that must be reinforced to keep children safe and healthy. - DSS should monitor all centers and schools should be involved to ensure quality service from all centers. To make sure that all rules and regulations are in order. - efficient process - It allows you to meet the proper standards necessary for well equipped establishment. - Makes a safe environment - Requirements are outside of first step's domain. Requirements and guidelines have improved in the last five years- especially ratios. - These children and all children deserve quality service in order to achieve - They meet the basic requirement - Yes, I agree because with all of the requirements, of DSS it helps to	- I feel if any program is serving children all must be monitored equally and have same license requirements. - Some centers are judged harsher than others. All centers are not made to meet the same requirements. Centers are hassled on minor issues that will not make a difference either way. Different evaluators- their interpretations are different resulting in excess fees.

ensure that all providers are
providing a safe and educational
program for all of the children.

Table 13b. Satisfaction with DSS requirements: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	35	47.3
No	39	52.7
Total	74	100.0

Table 13.1b.

Reasons for satisfaction DSS requirements	Reasons for dissatisfaction with DSS requirements
• Ample space; safety of children. • clear goals • Concerned that it is costly, a long process, time consuming, & confusing. • DSS has some overly difficult requirements, but it is in the best interest of children (Now that we have completed the process.) • DSS requirements will ensure a safe environment. • DSS works well with principal; DSS keeps principal informed • general • I agree with the DSS requirement to ensure quality, health, and safety in sound early childhood programs. • I am very pleased that DSS requirements insure that each center is adequately supplied with appropriate equipment and space, personnel are adequately suitable to work with young children, and that safety is a priority. • I believe there should be strict standards for a child care program. • I can understand the importance of some of the classroom requirements and regulations- They are good! • I feel that all of the DSS requirements are necessary in order to make sure the teachers, assistants, and directors are certified, responsible, and	• A school district has enough quality control in place without the oversight of DSS. • As I stated before, too many extra items needed to be completed as well as duplicated items. Items such as finger printing, first aid, etc. • As part of a school, the pre-K is licensed by fire marshals and DHEC as well as by SACS, all of which is a strenuous process. Our teachers are all highly qualified and two have master's degrees. The hours required for DSS require our teachers to spend more time out of the classroom and worry about hours that they are already certified in. The DSS process required more licensing that does not need to be done due to our other licensing requirements as a public institution. • Complex; added paperwork; expensive facility costs; managing records; massive paperwork • Consideration needs to be taken for age of building and classroom. • Don't see why DSS licensing is necessary. Ultimately we are an educational agency, not a child care agency. When our classroom was built and arranged all safety and age appropriate issues were addressed. • DSS contact was very friendly and easy to work with, but it was very

- trustworthy. These requirements for the buildings, etc. are necessary to make sure the center is up to code and provides a safe and secure learning environment for all students.
- I have no complaints about their requirements
- It is time consuming and appears troublesome but overall produces an environment that is safe and conductive for teaching young children.
- It is very lengthy - but worth it.
- Precautions are in place to ensure that the best candidates and safest classrooms house the 4K students.
- Program should be left to State Department regulations if in a public school.
- safety of children
- Some of it is tough, but we guess truly needed
- Standards for child care programs must be in place.
- The DSS guidelines for approval certification and licensure make for a reputable, viable program.
- The DSS requirements do meet the needs for private daycares, but I don't feel that they are necessary for schools. My district had to install an $80,000 fire alarm system and the cost was not covered by CDEPP.
- The licensure procedures of DSS ensure the safety of children under the providers care.
- The process went smoothly except for the duplication of forms with CDEPP.
- The requirements are necessary so that the CDEPP meets certain guidelines and standards to make sure that the classroom, facilities, etc. are safe and appropriate.
- This eliminates undesirables and molesters from coming in contact with students!
- We need to provide the best

- complex, added paperwork, and expensive.
- DSS was hard to work with. Materials were not sent on time and communication was not clear.
- DSS was very difficult to work with. They did not return phone calls and send materials in a timely manner. They also did not clarify the process clearly.
- duplication of paperwork; additional expense
- Duplication of requirements by SDE. Teacher and assistant certification are highly qualified, but they must obtain additional hours for DSS credit. (DSS teachers and assistants do not have a teaching degree - hence the requirement for all the hours!)
- For a CDEPP class in a public school… I don't think teachers should have to go through the FBI SLED and all the extra stuff. They have been checked out before hired.
- However, I believe the requirements for the initial license and the request for license renewal should not be the same. Fewer requirements should be made for renewal licenses.
- I also feel that public schools are already in compliance with state department regulations and public schools should not have to comply with 2 sets of rules. The DSS requirements are expensive and many times redundant to what districts have already done. (i.e. SLED checks)
- I don't believe DSS licensure is necessary for the successful implementation of the Pilot Program.
- I have difficulty understanding why all of their forms, procedures are necessary for an accredited public school. It the facility is good enough for 5 year olds it should be good

climate and environment for our students	enough for 4's.
	• I think it is too stringent.
	• If a student attends a school that operates by the codes of South Carolina, then that should be all that is required. If 5-K is approved, so should 4-K programs.
	• It took a lot of work to obtain a DSS license.
	• Much too much duplication of paperwork.
	• Only because of duplication of much of paperwork.
	• Public schools are under federal guidelines and should not have to be subject to DSS guidelines for a child care center.
	• Regulations are too much for public school with everything else we have to do.
	• Same response as # 10
	• Schools shouldn't have to get licensure.
	• The cost of SLED checks, fingerprinting, etc., was a burden to the district. Our licensing was held up due to a lack of documentation from the State Fire Marshall's office. Lori Moody from the upstate office is very helpful.
	• The DSS people were helpful, but the procedure was too time- and cost-consuming given the fact that the state already allows us to have children in our facilities.
	• There are several conflicts/additional requirements for DSS and CDEP approval. Since we have to comply with all regulations of a public school, it is very difficult to complete the additional DSS requirements. The separate fees and forms required create a problem since many are different from CDEP.
	• This is a public school.
	• Too many duplicate requirements; Too many additional requirements beyond state regulations.
	• Too many restrictions: 1. school, 2.

SCDC, 3. DSS, 4. District; Too many requirements (e.g. fingerprints by SLED & FBI, TB Tests, and letters of reference.
- Too much paperwork!
- Too much red tape & paperwork resigned especially when we are already certified by the state.
- Too much red tape; too much paperwork; & Fire Marshall checks us regularly.
- Too rigid and stringent. There is no need for the Administrator to be EC certified. Our assistants & teachers are HQ and follow the SCSDE requirements.
- Too tedious, time-consuming
- Tow sets of rules/regulations (SDE/DSS) are hard to implement.
- Unrealistic requirements of school administrators & teachers. We are already approved/cleared by the SDE to teach or to be an administrator - the DSS component is insulting & too time consuming.
- We already do SLED checks. That's enough some districts had to spend money they had planned to spend in order to meet DSS requirements.
- We are already meeting State Department expectations.

Question 14: Additional expenses incurred to meet DSS requirements for approval, certification, or licensure

Tables 14a and 14.1a present information on additional expenses incurred to meet DSS requirements provided by private center administrator respondents. Approximately 73% of private center administrators reported their center had no additional expenses associated with DSS requirements. Approximately 27% of private center administrator respondents indicated their centers incurred additional expenses associated with DSS requirements. A description of costs associated with meeting DSS requirements is listed in Table 14.1a.

Tables 14b and 14.1b show information regarding additional expenses incurred to meet DSS requirements provided by public school administrator respondents. Approximately 22% of public school administrators indicated their schools had no additional expenses associated with DSS requirements. Approximately 78% of public school administrator respondents indicated their schools incurred additional expenses associated with DSS requirements.

Table 14a. Additional expenses incurred to meet DSS requirements: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	26.7
No	11	73.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 14.1a. Description of Costs Associated with Meeting DSS Requirements: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Description	Cost
Sinks in a room that already had bathrooms with sink and had to add a hand sink in a kitchen with three sinks already individual hot water tank for two of the sinks	$3500
Fence	$2000
Sand	$300
Fire inspection- extra charge at licensing	$180
Central registry check on staff	Not reported
Fingerprints/SLED check	Not reported

Table 14b. Additional expenses incurred to meet DSS requirements: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	59	77.6
No	17	22.4
Total	76	100.0

Table 14.1b. Description of Costs Associated with Meeting DSS Requirements: Public School Program Respondents

Description of materials purchased to meet DSS requirements	No.	Examples of materials	Average Costs	Range
Fire Safety Enhancements	8	Complete fire alarm systems, fire alarm pull stations, fire inspection	$26,220	$60-$80,000
Classroom Facility and Components	30	Furniture, additional bathrooms, mobile classrooms, appliances, paint, hot water heaters, etc.	$7384.4	$8-$87,400
Other	1	Notification to classrooms/schools	$1000	-
State and Federal Background Checks and Associated Fees	36	SLED checks, FBI background checks, fingerprinting	$305	$7-$1652
Faculty and Staff Health Requirements	7	TB tests, annual health assessments,	$234	$40-$650
First Aid Training	8	CPR training, first aid training	$204	$50-$585
Program Fees	6	DHEC fee, DSS fee, CDEPP fee, SCOSS regulatory fee	$135	$50-$400
Inspection Fees	7	DHEC inspection, inspections,	$101	$60-$200
Application Fees	4	Application, various DSS applications, DSS application	$79	$60-$100
Licensing Fees	10	Licensing fee, DSS licensing fee, child care licensing fee	$74	$15-$200

Question 15: Classrooms in which CDEPP children are enrolled are currently approved, certified, or licensed by DSS, if not, reasons are stated for the lack of DSS approval, certification, or licensure.

Tables 15a and 15b describe how administrators from private centers and public schools responded to inquiries on approval, certification, and licensing by DSS for their individual CDEPP. All private centers are currently approved, certified or licensed. Table 15b reveals that 84% of the administrator respondents in public school settings stated their program was approved, certified, or licensed through DSS, whereas 16% of the public school administrator respondents indicated their program was not currently approved, certified or licensed.

Table 15.1b offers a breakdown of the 16% public school administrator respondents who noted their programs were not approved, certified and licensed. Of the 16% administrator respondents within the public school system who indicated their program was not currently approved, certified and licensed, 21% noted they had already applied

with DSS and had begun the three-fold process. Reasons stated by the respondents still involved in the process noted fire safety additions and delays in getting necessary inspections by DSS and fire marshals.

Table 15a. CDEPP Classrooms Approved, Certified, or Licensed by DSS: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	17	100
No	0	0
Total	17	100.0

Note: All of the private center administrator respondents were from programs that are currently approved, certified, or licensed and therefore did not answer the follow up question of: If not, has your program applied for DSS approval, certification, or licensure?

Table 15b. CDEPP Classrooms Approved, Certified, or Licensed by DSS: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	61	83.6
No	12	16.4
Total	73	100.0

Table 15.1b. Program has applied for DSS approval, certification, or licensure: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	21.1
No	60	78.9
Total	76	100.0

Reasons classrooms have not yet been approved, certified, or licensed

- Because the smoke alarm had to be installed which was out of the school's control.
- Classroom is not connected to school fire alarm system.
- Completion of personnel requirements
- Currently made corrections as directed by the fire marshal. We are currently waiting for corrective response.
- Had to have fire alarms installed in every classroom.
- inspected, paper not yet received for full licensure (only provisional thru 4-16)
- outdoor equipment, basic classroom needs (outlet covers, loose baseboards)
- Outdoor playground equipment did not meet the DSS guidelines. Basic classroom needs (loose baseboards, outlet covers.)
- Provisional: There are a few FBI reports that have not been approved, but they have all been sent in. There are a few teachers/assistants that need to make up DSS hours from 2005 & 2006.
- Should be approved as of today.
- The program has not been certified because DSS has not completed the process. We are waiting on them to complete the visit and we have been waiting since September, 2006.
- Waiting for DSS visits.

- Waiting for provisional approval, then 90 days to submit teacher info.
- Waiting on SLED check for teacher, it continues to be returned.
- We are finishing our first year of getting certified.
- We have a provisional license because the FBI fingerprint reports are not back. It seems as if the SLED report was insufficient.

CHILD SCREENING AND ENROLLMENT

Question 16: Satisfaction with parent application forms for CDEPP participation

Tables 16a and 16.1a show the responses of private center administrators' satisfaction with the parent application forms provided by the OFS for CDEPP Participation. Private center administrator respondents conveyed a strong approval of 88% satisfaction with the parent application forms. Reasons cited were the simplicity yet thoroughness of the information obtained to serve at-risk children and a clear presentation of parent or family history and expectations. Private center administrators who indicated dissatisfaction with the parent application forms were 12% and expressed concerns on the length of the application and making the program available to three-year-olds. Additional reasons are listed in Table 16.1a.

Tables 16b and 16.1b present the responses of public school administrators' satisfaction with the parent application forms provided by the SCDE for CDEPP Participation. Public school administrator respondents indicated 67% satisfaction with the parent application forms. Some reasons noted for satisfaction included the simplicity yet thoroughness of the information requested and a parent friendly format. Correspondently public school administrator respondents indicated 33% dissatisfaction with the parent application forms. Reasons cited for dissatisfaction were the duplication of paperwork and the language barrier. Recommendations suggested were making the applications available in Spanish, enlisting a universal design to accommodate the three-application criteria (i.e.; CDEPP, DSS, and SASI) and appending the application to include street address.

Table 16a. Satisfaction with the Parent Application Forms Provided by the OFS for CDEPP Participation: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	87.5
No	2	12.5
Total	16	100.0

Table 16.1a.

Reasons for satisfaction with parent application forms	Reasons for dissatisfaction with parent application forms
- appears to be easy for parents - Application is simple and direct. Not to personal to make parents uncomfortable. - Easy to understand and all the required information. - Everything is included in the application - Give basic information and enough	- I feel it needs to be open to three year olds and a little higher income. - The applications are too long and they ask for unnecessary information.

- data to improve system for at-risk children.
- Necessary information is asked on the application. It allows you to have an opportunity to be knowledgeable of what the parents expect.
- Questions easily presented
- The applications are self-explanatory and easy for parents to understand what they need to do.
- The applications require us to ask or request just enough information required from parents.
- The OFS made it easier by explaining how and what was on the application and what information to collect. What to send them, what to keep in file.
- They need all that information to make decisions
- They were designed to assure parents' knowledge of program requirements and supply data for EDC- only change I'd make is to allow Medicaid card as proof of income- no other proof required.
- We currently require the same set of information for our overall program.
- Yes, I'm satisfied with the application forms provided by the OFS because the application has a lot of family history as well as personal information for the student.

Table 16b. Satisfaction with the Parent Application Forms Provided by the SCDE for CDEPP Participation: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	49	67.1
No	24	32.9
Total	73	100.0

Table 16.1b.

Reasons for satisfaction with parent application forms	Reasons for dissatisfaction with parent application forms
• *We also need them in Spanish. There is only one discrepancy that I have noticed. It doesn't ask for a mailing address - only the street address. In our county they will not deliver mail to their street address if they have a P.O. Box. • Allow for information that is significant for understanding some of what the young child is about; Also helps in making determination of eligibility • Because of form is very thorough. • Detailed information is required by parents. • District, CDEP, & DSS need to have 1 form. • Excessive paperwork for parents • Forms provide parents with opportunities for involvement and feedback. • Forms are thorough and in compliance with federal requirements. • Has all information needed. • I am not familiar with the application forms. • In depth without being too invasive of privacy • Includes needed information. • It's designed for parents of all education levels. • It's fine. • No complaints. • No problems noted. • Precise; easy to read • SDE forms work well. • simple • Simple and accommodating • The application forms provide all information needed for enrollment. In my opinion, they also hold the parents accountable for making sure their children attend the program 180 days. • The application provides valuable	• All forms need to be in Spanish also, so they can be dispensed in a more timely fashion. (We have to have all current forms translated.) • Did not need this one; School's application should suffice. • Everything needs to come with a Spanish version • If DSS licensure is required, it would be more practical to have a registration form that is accepted by both CDEPP & DSS. • Information that is required for SASI is not included. We have to give parents 3 applications to get the necessary info. SDE application (required); DSS application (required); and District application - for other info that is not on the SDE and DSS application that is needed in the SASI program. • It's the fact that we have to duplicate basically the same information on DSS forms- That is a huge waste of time. • It is exactly the same as the DSS form except for the number at the bottom of the page. Parents have to complete both. Schools have to collect both. This is a duplication of effort. • Ours was already sufficient. • Parent forms and DSS forms should coincide so the parents don't have to complete the same forms twice. • Parents are having to complete CDEPP registration forms and district registration forms. • Parents are overwhelmed with "too many" forms: SDE, DSS, Local school/district forms. • Questions on the forms were too personal and not questions parents would want to answer. • The amount of duplication in parent forms is excessive. I think one

- information that is necessary, but one form would have been easier.
- The applications can be easily understood by the parents and insure that children with the greatest needs are served.
- The form is designed in such a way that it is easy for parents to understand.
- The forms provided by the SDE are parent friendly and easy for parents to complete.
- The forms request only relevant information.
- The forms used by CDEP are "parent friendly".
- The parent application is inclusive of a tremendous amount of information that is useful for many programs.
- The parent applications are reader friendly and provide essential information.
- The SDE forms are fine
- They appear to fix the needs as approved by The State Department
- They are not complicated.
- They are thorough.
- They are very simple and clear to understand. They ask for valuable information.
- They could be combined with other forms.
- They provide the information that is needed. They are easy to fill out.

- sheet could be affixed to the required DSS form to fulfill requirements. Excessive paperwork for parents is burdensome and disrespectful.
- The forms ask questions that many parents find intrusive. The screening forms ask many questions parents do not want to answer.
- The problem is that DSS requires separate forms. With the SDE forms, DSS forms and local district forms we exhaust parents with forms to fill out.
- The repetitive-same data required too many places (DSS-district-CDEPP)
- The State Department and DSS need to combine the information needed for enrollment. This year, it was embarrassing to ask parents to fill out approximately over & over again. (Please look at this!)
- There is an overlap of information required information on forms for the State Dept. and for DSS. Our school district enrollment forms cover all required information and the other forms are not necessary. Otherwise, the State Dept. has done an adequate job of providing forms if you do not already have them.
- There needs to be a place for parent education. Why can't CDEPP and DSS applications be combined so parents only fill out one?
- Too many pages of the application. Application should be no more than 1 page.
- We got the application forms after we had enrolled students. Next year will be fine.
- We had to adjust the form to meet the needs of our district.
- We have an application that ask for the same information
- You are discriminating against the

white, middle-class based on
income status.

Question 17: Awareness of other at-risk four-year-olds in the district not attending a full-day educational program

Tables 17a and 17b describe how administrators from private centers and public school CDEP programs responded to the following question: "Are you aware of other at-risk four-year-olds (i.e., Medicaid eligible or eligible for free- or reduced- price lunch) in your school district who are not attending a full-day educational program?" Table 17a shows that 53% of the respondent administrators from private centers answered 'yes" to this question, and 47% answered "no." Table 17b reveals that 35% of the respondent administrators in public school settings answered "yes" to this question, and 65% said "no" to the question.

If the responding administrators answered yes to question 17, they were then asked to indicate reasons the children did not attend a full-day educational program. These results are presented in tables 17.1a and 17.1b. The top three reasons selected by private center administrators were that the family chooses to keep the child at home or in a family setting (63%), transportation was not available (50%), and the family needs longer hours of service (50%). The top three reasons public school administrators selected were that classroom space was unavailable (73%); the family chooses to keep the child at home or in a family setting (46%); and other reasons (27%), such as the child attends other programs (GLEAMS, Head Start, a private center) or the parent's work schedule does not accommodate the child's participation.

Table 17a. Awareness of At-Risk* Four-Year-Olds in the Community who are not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Number	**Percent**
Yes	8	53.3
No	7	46.7
Total	15	100

*at-risk = Medicaid eligible or eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch

Table 17.1a: Reason for at-risk children in the community not attending a full-day educational program: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Reasons for Children Not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program	**Number**	**Percent (N=8)**
The family chooses to keep the child at home or in a family setting	5	62.5
No transportation available for the child	4	50.0
The family needs longer hours of service	4	50.0
Classroom space unavailable	2	25.0
The parent(s) did not complete application	2	25.0
Public awareness activities are lacking or inadequate	1	12.5
Shortage of qualified personnel	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all reasons that apply.

Table 17b. Awareness of At-Risk* Four-Year-Olds in the Community who are not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Number	Percent
Yes	26	35.1
No	48	64.7
Total	74	100%

*at-risk = Medicaid eligible or eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch

Table 17.1b. Reason for at-risk children in the community not attending a full-day educational program: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Reasons for Children Not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program	Number	Percent (N=26)
Classroom space unavailable	19	73.1
The family chooses to keep the child at home or in a family setting	12	46.2
Other reason	7	26.9
• Attend GLEAMS		
• Attend Head Start		
• Attend private center		
• Parent work schedule/location		
The parent(s) did not complete application	4	15.4
Public awareness activities are lacking or inadequate	3	11.5
Shortage of qualified personnel	2	7.7
No transportation available for the child	1	3.8
The family needs before-school services that are not available	1	3.8
The family needs after-school services that are not available	1	3.8

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all reasons that apply.

Question 18: Waiting list maintained for enrollment into CDEPP

Tables 18a and 18b present information on the maintenance of waiting lists for enrollment into CDEPP in private center and public school programs from the perspective of administrator respondents. Interestingly, about 69% of the respondents indicated they do not maintain a waiting list, while close to 31% indicated the existence of a waiting list. Table 18b shows that 61% of the CDEPP administrator respondents from the public schools reported that they do have a waiting list, while 39% reported not having a waiting list.

If a waiting list was maintained, administrators were then asked to indicate how many children were on the waiting list. Of the private center administrator respondents, two reported numbers of children on the list. One program reported 10 children and the other reported 15 children. Given the limited number of responses we were unable to calculate descriptive statistical information. Of the 76 public school administrators indicating the existence of a waiting list, 72 provided the number of children on the waiting list. The average number of children on the public school waiting lists was approximately 2 children with a standard deviation of approximately 4 children. According to these administrators, the number of children on the public school waiting lists ranged from 1 to 27. (See Table 18.1b.)

Table 18a. Center Maintains a Waiting List for Enrollment into the CDEPP: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	4	30.8
No	9	69.2
Total	13	100.0

Table 18b. School maintains a Waiting List for Enrollment into the CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	46	60.5
No	30	39.4
Total	76	100.0

Table 18.1b: Average Number of Children on the Waiting List for the CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median**	**Min**	**Max**
Average number of children on waiting list	72	1.9	4.4	0	0	20

Tables 19a and 19b indicate the reasons given by private center and public school program administrator respondents for their programs not being able to serve the children on their waiting lists. The unavailability of classroom space was the reason given by 50% of the respondents from private centers; other reasons (e.g., income too high, parents preferring for child to ride the bus to school) were given by an additional 50% of the respondents, and the unavailability of transportation was given by 25% of the private center respondents. Close to 67% of the public school administrators reported that the shortage of qualified personnel was the reason these children were not served; the unavailability of classroom space was stated by 47% as the reason.

Table 19a. Reasons the Program was Unable to Serve Children on the Waiting List: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Reason	**Number**	**Percent (N=4)**
Classroom space unavailable	2	50.0
Other (specify)	2	50.0
Income too high		
Parents prefer child to ride bus to school		
No transportation available for the child.	1	25.0
Shortage of qualified personnel	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all reasons that apply.

Table 19b. Reasons the Program was Unable to Serve Children on the Waiting List:
Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Reason	Number	Percent (N=45)
Classroom space unavailable	21	46.7
Other (specify)	5	11.1
Class is full		
Enrollment quota		
Not enough on waiting list to start another		
Did not have adequate time to find 2 more teachers and 2 more assistants.		
We did not have enough extra materials on hand until their orders would have come through.		
Shortage of qualified personnel	3	66.7
No transportation available for the child.	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to
select all reasons that apply.

FUNDING SOURCES AND FUNDS

*Question 20: Satisfaction with the $3077 amount per child provided by the CDEPP in the
2006-2007 school year.*

The tables associated with question #20 provide information about the degree of
satisfaction felt by CDEPP administrators in private and public settings with the $3077
amount per child. According to Table 20a, close to 67% of the private center
administrator respondents were not satisfied with this dollar amount; 33% were satisfied.
Reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction are given in Table 20.1a. Some of the
reasons stated for dissatisfaction included that it was not sufficient to provide for
qualified teachers, adequately meet the need to provide service, or cover the expense of
the requirement to participate in the CDEPP (lower ratios, extra planning time). See
Table 20.1a for more specific information related to these reasons.

Table 20b shows that about 60% of the public school administrator respondents
were not satisfied with the $3077 amount per child. Approximately 40% of these
administrators were satisfied with the dollar amount. Reasons for satisfaction or
dissatisfaction are listed in Table 20.1b. Reasons for dissatisfaction included that it does
not cover salaries/fringe/FICA of employees and the cost of materials and supplies. In
addition, respondents indicated that additional funds would allow for improved teacher
recruitment, additional materials and supplies, and more educational field trips.

Table 20a. Satisfaction with the $3077 amount per child: Private Center Administrator
Respondents

	Number	Percent
Yes	6	33.3
No	12	66.7
Total	18	100.0

Table 20.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with $3077 amount per child	Reasons for dissatisfaction with $3077 amount per child
- It is a reasonable fee. - Something is better than nothing. It was beneficial. - That's plenty of money per child.	- Amount was insufficient to provide for qualified teachers or sufficient resources and staff to meet all guidelines. Many centers in Laurens, Abbeville, and McCormick did not apply because of inadequate funding. - Does not adequately meet the need to provide service - Doesn't cover the expense of the requirement to participate in CDEP. (lower ratios, extra planning time) - Funding is not enough to cover the lead teacher's salary. Centers with two or three eligible children lose money re: salary for teachers. There are no funds to assist providers (private) with teacher's salaries. They need to have at least 6-8 children (eligible) to cover the cost of the lead teacher. Private providers don't offer benefits to teachers. - No, I was not satisfied with the 3,077 amount per child because with the cost of living being as high as it is, I found it very difficult to do what I needed to do. We did what was asked, but it wasn't very much extras we could give them. - Not adequate to provide a quality program and pay qualified teachers. - These funds only scratch the surface of what is needed when providing quality services to children and families. Schools are the referring entity but do not have the capacity to serve children. These funds in no way can be used to provide additional services to children. - To maintain a certified teacher-cost is more than received with 10 children. More money is needed

Table 20b. Satisfaction with the $3077 amount per child: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Number	Percent
Yes	29	39.7
No	44	60.2
Total	73	100

Table 20.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with $3077 amount per child	Reasons for dissatisfaction with $3077 amount per child
- Adequate money to run the program - Gives teachers / schools the opportunity to provide quality instruction to each child. - However, with the different ability leveled children coming into the program there is a need for additional resources in order to differentiate instruction. - It increased for 07-08 - It was an adequate beginning amount. - More funds are available for supplies. - More than what we had! - Our needs were met. - Sufficient to provide qualified staff for the class. - The $3077 allocated amount for the most part is adequate when grant funds are added. However, other - These funds provide the school with adequate materials and supplies for each child. - This amount is adequate, but we could always use more.	$3077 per child does not cover salaries/fringe/FICA of employees. - CDEP requires more materials & supplies than this amount can cover. - Additional funds could allow for educational field trips that the parents cannot afford. - Funding at a higher cost per student could allow for improved teacher recruitment and additional materials and supplies which could ultimately lead to improved classrooms.

Question 21: Use of local, federal, or private funds to supplement CDEPP funds.

The tables associated with question #21 present information related to whether local, federal, or private funds were used to supplement CDEPP funds. As indicated in Table 21a, approximately 67% of the private center administrator respondents responded "yes" to this question, while 33% replied "no." Table 21.1a lists the specific supplemental sources used. As seen in the table, 50% of the respondents reported using personal funds, private funds, or US Navy funds to supplement CDEPP funds; 33% reported using tuition dollars or Head Start funds; and about 25% reported using DSS funds, state special education funds, or IDEA funds.

According to Table 21b, about 91% of the administrators from public school programs said "yes" to the question, while about 9% said "no." Specific supplemental funding sources used were district funds (81%), Title 1 (35%), EIA (18%), other local funds (11%), and state special education and IDEA funds (16%).

Table 21a. Use of Local, Federal, or Private Funds to Supplement CDEPP Funds:
Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	8	66.7
No	4	33.3
Total	12	100.0

Table 21.1a Funding Sources Used to Supplement CDEPP: Private Center
Administrator Respondents

Funding Source	Frequency	Percent (N=12)
Other: • My personal funds • Private • US Navy	4	50.3
Tuition	2	16.7
Head Start funds	2	16.7
DSS (specify)	1	8.3
State special education funds	1	8.3
IDEA (Part B federal special education funds)	1	8.3
United Way	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were able to
select more than one supplemental funding sources.

Table 21b. Use of Local, Federal, or Private Funds to Supplement CDEPP Funds: Public
School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	67	90.5
No	7	9.5
Total	74	100.0

Table 21.1b Funding Sources Used to Supplement CDEPP: Public School Program
Administrator Respondents

Funding Source	Frequency	Percent (N=74)
District funds	60	81.1
Title 1	26	35.1
EIA	13	17.6
Other local funds: • District • First Steps • general funds • public activity accounts • pupil activity • Student activity	8	10.8
State special education	6	8.1

funds

IDEA (Part B federal special education funds)	6	8.1
DSS (specify)	0	-
United Way	0	-
Tuition	0	-
Head Start funds	0	-

Note: each specified source above was cited by one respondent. Two persons endorsing the "Other local funds" item did not specify the source.
Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were able to select more than one supplemental funding sources.

Question 22: Satisfaction with the $185 amount per child provided by the CDEPP for transportation in the 2006-2007 school year.

The tables associated with question #22 report the degree of satisfaction among CDEPP administrators with the $185 amount per child. According to Table 22a, 20% of the private center administrators reported being satisfied, while 80% reported not being satisfied. The predominant reason given for their dissatisfaction, as presented in Table 22.1a, was that it did not cover transportation expenses (e.g., the cost of gas or the salary of the bus driver).

According to Table 22b, 70% of the public school administrators reported being satisfied with the dollar amount, while 30% reported not being satisfied. No reasons were given for dissatisfaction.

Table 22a. Satisfaction with the $185 Amount per Child Provided by the CDEPP for Transportation: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	3	20
No	12	80
Total	15	100.0

Table 22.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with transportation funds	**Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation funds**
• Gas costs! • Something is better than nothing. • Yes, we are satisfied because it takes a lot to transport child to the center daily.	• Again this is not enough money to cover the cost of gas or salary for a bus driver. • Amount did not begin to cover transportation costs. There were eligible children who were in both Abbeville and Saluda County because of lack of transportation. • As the gas price rising, we need more funding, even though our center does not have transportation as of yet. • Does not meet the need to furnish transportation • Gas is $3.00 per gallon and rising

- It is not an adequate amount due to excessive gas prices
- No we could use more money for transportation because the cost of gas and insurance on a bus is very high and if you're not careful you overspend.
- No, I believe this is not enough money for transportation.
- Not near enough for gas price
- The buses should be provided along with insurance and a stipend for gas.
- The price could be increased per child
- The price of gas, bus up keep
- Transportation cost more than 3 times this amount. Fuel alone cost more than this. IT cost approximately $1,000 per child for a whole year.

Table 22b. Satisfaction with the $185 Amount per Child Provided by the CDEPP for Transportation: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	50	70.4
No	21	29.6
Total	71	100.0

Table 22.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with transportation funds	Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation funds
• adequate • Adequate • adequate, reasonable • All needs were met • All students rode a bus with other students. • Buses already on routes. • Ensures that student goes to school. • Funding seemed adequate this year, but because of rising cost of gas, we need an increase. • Funds are appropriate. • Haven't been aware of transportation $ problems. • Helps defrag the cost for field trips.	

- If only a little more could be added to include field trips.
- It ensures that students will be transported to school in a timely, safe manner.
- It is adequate
- It is adequate for our needs - However if the cost of furl continues to climb - we will need additional funds.
- It is adequate for the service.
- It is sufficient for transporting students to our CDEPP
- More children are able to get involved in program
- No problems noted.
- Not really sure how this affects buses - we haven't had any yet.
- Students are on established routes
- Supports regular bus fund.
- The amount adequately meets the needs of the students.
- The children can come to school free
- The funds provided will allow for the transporting of students to and from school.
- The money was handled by the district.
- The students in the program are transported to school and from school by the school bus.
- These funds are allocated for transporting students (to and from school.)
- This does help with the transportation of these students.
- This extra money helped alleviate the "crunch" we've experienced in the past with fuel.
- This is sufficient for to/from school transportation. We would like to see additional funds for field trips.
- We are a small geographic area and utilize the same buses.
- We didn't see any of that money anyway. It went straight to the district.
- We don't know yet. We haven't

received any money.
• We provided transportation before.
• Yes, but with the price of gas now, for next year it should be increased.

Tables 23a and 23b show the degree to which administrators reported having sufficient resources to meet the school readiness needs of CDEPP students. Approximately 77% of the private center respondents stated they had sufficient resources, while 23% indicated the need for additional resources. Some of the needed resources listed are more materials and more training. Of the public school administrators, approximately 69% reported having adequate resources while 31% reported not having sufficient resources. Specific resources needed included books and manipulatives, age-appropriate furniture, training on instructional programs, computers and printers, gross motor equipment, other playground equipment, and field trip funds.

Table 23a. Sufficiency of Resources to Meet School Readiness Needs of CDEPP Students: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	13	76.5	• More books and manipulatives
No	4	23.5	• More materials for areas.
Total	17	100.0	• Most of the classrooms served this year have used all funding to actually set up class with materials. Additional training resource materials are needed.
			• We are not in a position to replace materials and supplies as needed.

Table 23b. Sufficiency of Resources to Meet School Readiness Needs of CDEPP Students: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	50	68.5	• Additional funds to meet program requirements for materials, equipment, etc.
No	23	31.5	
Total	73	100.0	• Additional resources are needed to ensure that all students are provided all materials necessary for learning. Classrooms need additional furniture that is age appropriate for 4-K. The playground is in need of additional equipment in order for children in 4-K to experience appropriate functional activities for their age level. Classroom needs supplies/materials to complete the play and learning center for all students.

- Additional training on instructional programs (High Scope) supplies and equipment are needed to further enhance the CDEPP at my school.
- But can always use more (i.e. playground stuff, storage, etc.)
- Computers, printers, a sufficient playground with playground equipment, direct access to playground, storage, child-sized equipment.
- Consumable supplies, materials, & outside playground equipment.
- Equipment, supplies, materials, gross motor equipment, field trip funds
- Facilities requirements need to be address when providing money for materials and supplies and program implementation. Luckily, our school facility was equipped to handle DSS licensing requirements (35 sq ft/child, hot water, etc.) Next year we will displace K-5 classes to accommodate these requirements.
- Field trip funds; gross motor equipment; supplies/materials/equipment
- In a few locations space is an issue. Playground equipment is lacking in some schools. Money for additional shelves, manipulatives, and sets of books (English/Spanish) are needed. Paying salaries above the CDEPP allocation is a problem.
- In most cases, the supplies/materials funding was sufficient to adequately supplement existing classrooms. For brand new classrooms, $10,000 was not enough to sufficiently supply the classroom.
- It takes a tremendous amount of supplies to meet all the requirements of CDEP.
- Materials and supplies are required to meet many CDEPP guidelines.
- More money for consumables
- My salary was paid by Even Start Grant. I spent most of my year addressing CDEPP needs. There

	needs to be some line item for administrator.
	• New playground equipment
	• Outdoor play areas.
	• Playground equipment (additional). Classroom libraries and other literacy materials need to be expanded.
	• Playground equipment; more reading/literacy materials.
	• Still working on space; manipulatives; playground materials; books-both English and Spanish; still need multicultural materials
	• Supplies/materials; gross motor equipment; field trip funds.
	• We always need more.
	• We need additional funds for consumable materials.
	• We need new facilities or additional supplies and equipment.
	• We started up 6 new classrooms with only $10,000 per classroom. $15,000 is required totally fund a new classroom at a minimal level.

Question 24: Satisfaction with the reimbursement schedule and accounting procedures for the CDEPP.

The tables associated with question #24 report the satisfaction among administrator respondents with the reimbursement schedule and accounting procedures for the CDEPP. According to Table 24a, about 67% of the private center responding administrators reported being satisfied, while 20% said they were not satisfied, and about 13% stated that they did not know. The reasons for dissatisfaction, as listed in Table 24.1a, all pertained to the long turn-around time, especially for supplies and materials.

Table 24b reveals that about 53% of the public school administrator respondents reported being satisfied, while 23% reported not being satisfied and 24% said they did not know. Reasons for their dissatisfaction, as listed in Table 24.1b were that the procedures were too complicated, that they did not understand why CDEP classrooms and EIA classrooms are not allowed at the same school, that turn-around time (especially for travel) was too long, and that the cost of hotels if not fully covered.

Table 24a. Satisfaction with the Reimbursement Schedule and Accounting Procedures for the CDEPP: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	10	66.7
No	3	20
Don't Know	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 24.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with reimbursement and accounting procedures	Reasons for dissatisfaction with reimbursement and accounting procedures
- Everything is done in an organized way. - Have not had any problems so far. - It's not a long process. Receiving payment is also quick. - It's set up for period of every 15 days and that will ensure teachers pay on time. - Payment is consistent and on time. - Prompt and efficient - Reimbursement turn around is pretty quick, but if funds were already allocated it would be easier for receiving materials and/or any additionals that may be needed within the guidelines. - The provision of funding through the First Steps county partnerships enables the providers (private) to be paid at least twice a month to generate funding for paying salaries for teachers. Funding is track by supplies/materials, tuition and transportation. 4k coordinators verify enrollment and attendance of children. - Yes, I'm satisfied with the reimbursement schedule because it ties in with our pay periods. - Yes, we are satisfied with reimbursement schedules because our checks are sent most times on a regular basis.	- I have been reimbursed once for salary. The money for supplies and materials took two months. - Time insufficient - Turn around time is too long - Turn around time too slow

Table 24b. Satisfaction with the Reimbursement Schedule and Accounting Procedures for the CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	40	53.3
No	17	22.7
Don't Know	18	24
Total	75	100.0

Table 24.1b.

Reasons for satisfaction with reimbursement and accounting procedures	Reasons for dissatisfaction with reimbursement and accounting procedures
- All reimbursement has been timely and accurate for the district. - Appears to be timely after 1st reimbursement. - Completed quickly - District handles so I'm not aware of any problems - efficient - Funds arrived timely. - It ensures that students are transported in a timely and safe manner. - It is done in a timely manner. - It takes too long for teachers to be reimbursed for attending meetings and conferences. The manner in which the monies are disbursed to the district causes the process to lengthen. - It works fine. - Length of time before reimbursement is received. - No complaints from district financial office. - Perhaps it should have been more clearly explained initially. Questions were politely, quickly, and adequately handled. - Personally, I haven't dealt w/ this. - Reimbursement has taken place in a timely manner. - Reimbursement is done in a timely fashion. - Reimbursement wait time is very short and the accounting procedures are not burdensome. - Reimbursements were received in a timely manner. - Seemed adequate. - Seemed timely - The $ comes in monthly with our other state allocations. - The procedures are easy to follow. I have found that the communication at the school level may create	- District reimbursed because $ was so long in coming! - EIA - funded and CDEPP -funded classes at the same school. Districts can have both at different sites. We only have one school in the district that serves Pre K. We should be able to operate both programs. - I am dissatisfied with the accounting procedures and reimbursement schedule because they need to be simplified and procedures need to be clarified and stated. - I don't like that we are not allowed to have EIA funded classes and CDEPP funded classes at the same school. Districts are allowed to have both, but they must be at different schools. We are the only school in our district that serves pre-K. It doesn't seem fair that we can't operate both programs. - It often is a very lengthy period for reimbursement of expenses. A more efficient method should be developed. - Money is slow to come to the district. On several occasions the district has reimbursed teachers for travel before money has been sent to the district. - My dissatisfaction is on the part of my district. Once I returned from a conference I had to fill out more paperwork to get reimbursed. Often times I don't remember the figures I gave the SDE in terms of the amount of money for meals, etc. It may be helpful to have a carbon copy of this information we fill out for the SDE. - Reimbursement takes too long. - Slow to come back! Several of us still have outstanding

some problem concerning proper procedures.	reimbursements
• The reimbursement process is too long. Some teachers haven't received funds from September. Another process should be considered for reimbursing CDEPP participants.	• The cost of hotels for our teachers is not covered fully by CDEP. For required meetings for the CDEPP it would be better for more money to be allocated for traveling costs.
• The reimbursement schedule and accounting procedures are simple and they responded to us in a timely manner.	• The form is misleading
	• The process takes too long for reimbursements.
• timely	• Too much paperwork
• Timely and accurate.	• Too much turn around time especially for travel.
• We have received monthly payments	

IMPLEMENTATION

Question 25: Total number of lead teachers of classrooms in which CDEPP children are enrolled.

The tables associated with question #25 provide information about the total number of lead teachers of classrooms in which CDEPP children are enrolled and the total number of lead teachers in programs. According to Table 25a, private center administrator respondents indicated an average of about one lead teacher in CDEPP classrooms. Table 25.1a shows the number of lead teachers per CDEPP, according to private center respondents. According to these respondents, close to 85% of the programs had one lead teacher per program; 15% of the programs had two teachers.

Table 25b shows that public school administrators reported the average number of lead teachers per classroom to be about three, with a standard deviation of three. In terms of the number of lead teachers per CDEPP, 25% of the programs have two teachers, 24% have three teachers, and 20% have 1 lead teacher. The remaining programs have between four and 13 teachers, according to the public school administrators.

Table 25a. Total Number of Lead Teachers in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of lead teachers	18	1.15	.38	1	1	2

Table 25.1a. Number of Lead Teachers per CDEPP: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Number of teachers per program	Number of programs	Percent
1	11	84.6
2	2	15.4
Total	13	100

Table 25b. Total Number of Lead Teachers in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of lead teachers	77	3.32	3	2.46		

Table 25.1a. Number of Lead Teachers per CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Number of teachers per program	Number of programs	Percent
1.00	15	20.0
2.00	19	25.3
3.00	18	24.0
4.00	6	8.0
5.00	8	10.7
6.00	2	2.7
7.00	2	2.7
8.00	1	1.3
9.00	1	1.3
11.00	2	2.7
13.00	1	1.3
Total	15	100.0

Question 26: Total number of assistant teachers of classrooms in which CDEPP children are enrolled.

The tables associated with question #26 provide information about the number of assistant teachers in CDEPP classrooms and programs in both private and public settings. According to table 26a, private center administrator respondents reported an average of about one assistant teacher per CDEPP classroom, with 77% of the programs having one assistant teacher and 23% having no assistant teachers. (See Table 26.1a).

Table 26b shows that public school administrator respondents reported an average of about three assistant teachers per CDEPP classroom, with about 19% of the programs having one assistant teacher, 27% having two assistant teachers, and 25% having three assistant teachers. The remaining programs employed from four to 13 assistant teachers.

Table 26a. Total Number of Assistant Teachers in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of lead teachers	18	0.77	.44	1	0	1

Table 26.1a. Number of Assistant Teachers per CDEPP: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Number of teachers per program	Number of programs	Percent
0	3	23.1
1	10	76.9
Total	13	100.0

Table 26b. Total Number of Assistant Teachers in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of lead teachers	77	3.29	2.48	3.00		

Table 26.1a. Number of Assistant Teachers per CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Number of teachers per program	Number of programs	Percent
1	14	18.7
2.00	20	26.7
3.00	19	25.3
4.00	9	12.0
5.00	5	6.7
7.00	2	2.7
8.00	1	1.3
9.00	2	2.7
11.00	2	2.7
13.00	1	1.3
Total	75	100.0

Question 27: Salary range of CDEPP lead teachers

Tables 27a and 27b provide information on the salary ranges of CDEPP lead teachers in private center and public school CDEP programs, according to administrators from CDEP programs. As displayed in Table 27a, the minimum annual salary for CDEPP lead teachers in private centers was $5,040 and the maximum salary reported was $35,000. According to Table 27b, minimum salaries for the lead teachers in public school CDEP programs averaged $33,904, and their maximum salaries averaged $47,066.

Table 27a. Salary Range of CDEPP Lead Teachers: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type	Min	Max	N
Salary (per year)	$5040	$35,000	6
Wage (per hour)	$7.26	$30.00	4

Note: Given the limited number of private center administrator responses we were unable to calculate descriptive statistical information related to the salary ranges for private center lead teachers

Table 27b. Salary Range of CDEPP Lead Teachers: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median**	**Min**	**Max**
Lead Teachers Minimum salary	55	$33904	$7232	$31687	21000	57026

	N	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median**	**Min**	**Max**
Lead Teachers Maximum salary	55	$47066	$6656	$46725	$30000	$63007

Question 28: Salary range of CDEPP assistant teachers.

Tables 28a and 28b display information related to the minimum and maximum salaries of CDEPP assistant teachers in private center and public school programs, according to the respondent administrators. As displayed in Table 28a, the minimum annual salary of assistant teachers in private centers was $5,616, and the maximum salary reported was $28,000. According to Table 28b, the minimum salaries for public school assistant teachers averaged 12,676, and their maximum salaries averaged $15, 810.

Table 28a. Salary Range of CDEPP Assistant Teachers: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type	**Min**	**Max**	**N**
Salary (per year)	$5616	$28,000	4
Wage (per hour)	Not reported	$6.50	1

Note: Given the limited number of private center administrator responses we were unable to calculate descriptive statistical information related to the salary ranges for private center assistant teachers

Table 28b. Salary Range of CDEPP Assistant Teachers: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median**	**Min**	**Max**
Assistant Teachers Minimum Salary	50	$12676	$2507	$12384	$7423	$20000

	N	**Mean**	**SD**	**Median**	**Min**	**Max**
Assistant Teachers Maximum Salary	50	$15810	$3359	$14927	$10000	$30000

Question 29: Number of four-year-old kindergarten classes offered in the 2006-2007 and in the 2005-2006 school years.

The tables associated with question #29 provide information about the number of kindergarten classes for four-year-olds offered in the 2006-2007 and 2005-2006 school years. According to Table 29a, the average number of full-day classes in private centers was .78 in the 2006-2007 year, and the average number of classes was .41 in 2005-2006. According to Table 29.1a, the number of half-day classes in private centers averaged .06 in 2006-2007 and .06 in 2005-2006.

Table 29b reveals that the public school responding administrators reported an average of 3.3 full-day classes in public school programs in 2006-2007 and an average of 1.8 classes in 2005-2006. According to Table 29.1b, the average number of half-day classes in 2006-2007 was .45 and the average number of half-day classes in 2005-2006 was one.

Table 29a. Number of full-day classes: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
2006-2007	18	.78	.55	1	0	2
2005-2006	17	.41	.51	0	0	1

Table 29.1a. Number of half-day classes: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
2006-2007	18	.06	.24	0	0	1
2005-2006	18	.06	.24	0	0	1

Table 29b. Number of full-day classes: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
2006-2007	75	3.3	2.7	3	0	14
2005-2006	75	1.8	1.8	1	0	8

Table 29.1b. Number of half-day classes: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
2006-2007	75	.45	2.33	0	0	19
2005-2006	75	1.0	2.0	0	0	9

Question 30: Number of four-year-old, pre-kindergarten children enrolled in the 2006-2007 school year and in the 2005-2006 school year.

The tables associated with question #30 provide information about the number of four-year-old, pre-kindergarten children enrolled in the 2006-2007 school year and in the 2005-2006 school year. According to Table 30a, private center administrator respondents reported an average of about ten children enrolled in 2006-2007 compared to an average of about five children enrolled in 2005-2006. Table 30b shows that public school administrators reported an average of 75 children enrolled in 2006-2007, compared to about 60 enrolled in 2005-2006.

Table 30a. Number of Children Enrolled in Four-Year-Old, Pre-Kindergarten Program: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
2006-2007	18	9.6	8.5	9.5	0	27
2005-2006	18	5.2	7.3	0	0	20

Table 30b. Number of Children Enrolled in Four-Year-Old, Pre-Kindergarten Program: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
2006-2007	75	74.96	86.95	53	0	600
2005-2006	75	59.71	56.23	40	0	353

Question 31: Ability to serve children for whom English is a second language

Table 31a presents information about the ability of private centers to serve children for whom English is a second language, according to private center administrator respondents. Approximately 93% reported they had the ability to serve these children, while approximately 7% reported not being able to serve these children. According to these administrators, an average of about two children for whom English is a second language attend their centers. According to Table 31b, 88% of the public school administrators reported they had the ability to serve these children, while about 12% said they could not serve these children. Public school administrators reported having about three children for whom English is a second language in their programs.

Table 31a. Ability to Serve Children for whom English is a Second Language: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	13	92.9	
No	1	7.1	
Total	14	100.0	

Table 31.1a. Number of Children for whom English is a second Language: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
ESL students	13	1.62	4.09	0	0	15

Table 31b. Ability to Serve Children for whom English is a Second Language: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	68	88.3	
No	9	11.7	
Total	77	100.0	

Table 31.1b Number of Children for whom English is a second Language: Public School Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
ESL students	77	3.1	7.6	1	0	40

Table 32a presents information about the ability of private center CDEP programs to include children with identified developmental delays, according to private center administrator respondents. Approximately 72% indicated the ability to include these children, while 28% of the respondents reported not being able to serve these children. From the responses received from private center administrators regarding the numbers of children with identified developmental delays served, it appears that children with speech-only IEPs are included at a higher rate than children with other developmental delays. (See Table 32.1a.).

Table 32b presents information about the ability of public school programs to include children with identified developmental delays, according to public school program administrators. Approximately 96% indicated the ability to include these children. Table 32.1b reveals that an average of approximately seven children with speech-only IEPs and approximately two children with IEPs for other developmental delays are included in public school programs.

Table 32a. Ability to include children with identified developmental delays: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	13	72.2	
No	5	27.8	
Total	18	100.0	

Table 32.1a. Number of students with identified developmental delays being served in CDEPP: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Speech-only IEP	13	1.58	2.065	0.5	0	6
IEP for developmental delays	13	0.38	0.961	0	0	3

Table 32b. Ability to include children with identified developmental delays: Public School Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	73	96.1	
No	3	3.9	
Total	76	100.0	

Table 32.1b. Number of students with identified developmental delays being served in CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Speech-only IEP	76	6.9	8.6	4	0	39
IEP for developmental delays	76	1.7	4.9	0	0	36

SCHOOL FACILITY, PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, AND TRANSPORTATION

Question 33: Adequacy of classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment

Tables 33a and 33b present information about the adequacy of classroom and outdoor play facilities according to private center and public school program administrator respondents. Of the private center administrator respondents, approximately 79% indicated they had adequate classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment. The remaining private center administrators indicated that these facilities were inadequate and listed some needed additional resources. Of the public school program administrators, approximately 50% indicated they had adequate classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment. The remaining public school administrators (approx. 50%) indicated these facilities were inadequate and listed some needed additional resources. Inadequate outdoor equipment was noted by both private and public administrator respondents.

Table 33a. Adequacy of classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	11	78.6	• Both centers I supervised had inadequate outdoor facilities. The $10,000 materials grant barely covered needed classroom materials. Additional funding is need in both counties to equip an outdoor environment that is in any way similar to public schools.
No	3	21.4	
Total	14	100.0	
			• outdoor equipment
			• outdoor equipment is needed

Table 33b. Adequacy of classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	If no, what additional resources are needed?
Yes	38	50	• Playground and Outdoor Equipment (27 respondents, 58.7%)
No	38	50	
Total	76	100.0	• More classroom space (10 respondents, 21.4%)
			• Indoor equipment (e.g. Mobile cubbies, video camera, child-sized equipment, mobile equipment, direct access to and from playground, TV/VCR/DVD) (2 respondents, 4.3%)
			• No bathrooms in classroom; no running water in classroom; (2 respondents, 4.3%)
			• Additional classrooms (5 respondents, 10.9%)

The tables associated with question #34 provide information about the administrators' satisfaction with the classroom and materials grant/award application and approval processes. Table 34a reveals that 76.5% of private center administrator respondents were satisfied with the process established by the OFS, and 23.5% were dissatisfied. Table 34.1a lists the reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction and shows that more than twice as many respondents detailed reasons for satisfaction than dissatisfaction.

Table 34.2a lists the materials purchased with CDEPP funds, as reported by the private center administrators. Table 34.3a shows the average cost of CDEPP materials purchased by the private centers to be $9255, with a standard deviation of $2798.44.

Table 34b provides information about the satisfaction of administrators in public school programs with the grant/award application and approval process established by the SCDE. Of the responding administrators, almost 90% said they were satisfied, though nearly 11% said they were not satisfied. Table 34.1b lists the reasons for their satisfaction and dissatisfaction and shows almost seven-times as many reasons for satisfaction as dissatisfaction.

Table 34.2b gives a description of materials purchased with CDEPP funds, as reported by public school administrators. Table 34.3b shows the average cost of CDEPP materials purchased by public school programs to be $28,828, with a standard deviation of $24,037.20.

Table 34a. Satisfaction with the classroom and materials grant/award application and approval process: Private Center Teacher Respondents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	13	76.5
No	4	23.5
Total	17	100

Table 34.1a.

Reasons for satisfaction with the grant/award process	**Reasons for dissatisfaction with the grant/award process**
• All materials meet standards for program • Classroom grant/award was adequate for the program. • Everything in great shape • Great process working with regional coordinator • I am so happy to receive the materials grant award. It made the educational process much easier. However, I had to spend more to get the materials needed. • I had an opportunity to select many materials that I needed. I know what kinds of materials my children need.	• Funding payment policy implemented mid year allowed for abuse of funds. Because centers received money and then paid supplies, many supplies were not paid. OFS is changing policy for 2007-2008 so that county offices pay supplies. We must be diligent in safeguarding state tax payer money. • Materials ordered were not necessarily what the center was in need of. Minimum input came from the center on materials ordered. • School year 06-07, SCFS sent funding to child care centers to pay

- It enhances our facility, children were excited, staff motivated to do more with more.
- The whole outline and process was completed smoothly
- Was able to assist with appropriate purchases.
- Yes, I'm satisfied with the classroom and materials grant/award application and the approval process because we had a lot of help from our executive director and all of our equipment was delivered on time and in good condition.

supplies/material invoices. This funding should be paid directly to the supplier and not sent to the private provider. This procedure was revised for 07-08 school year.
- The materials were excellent, there was just not enough to sufficiently provide for each child or classroom set up.

Table 34.2a. Description of Materials Purchased with CDEPP funds: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Description of materials purchased with CDEPP funds	No.	Examples of materials purchased	Average Costs
Complete Classroom	4	Learning centers furnishings, academic materials, manipulatives, etc.	10624
Classroom materials	14	Reading, science and math materials	1223
Playground Equipment	3	Trikes, storage buildings	3166
Technology	1	Computer	1800
Classroom Furnishings	3	Furniture, art easels	1373

Table 34.3a. Average cost spent on CDEPP materials: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max.
Cost of CDEPP materials purchased	8	9255	2798.44	10000	2450	11500

Table 34b. Satisfaction with the classroom and materials grant/award application and approval process: Public School Teacher Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	69	89.6
No	8	10.4
Total	77	100.0

Table 34.1b.

Reasons for satisfaction with the grant/award process	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the grant/award process
- adequate materials in the classroom - All supplies were provided as needed!	- Classroom materials need to be upgraded yearly. - It was not enough to meet all requirements

- Allowed us to purchaser needed supplies
- application process was easy to follow (but needed more money)
- Approval was granted in a timely fashion.
- Correct, easy to understand guidelines were given.
- Easy for completing
- Easy process
- Easy to use
- Grant process was easy.
- Grant was easy to write and funds flowed quickly in the district.
- Grants were specific to needs and justifications. Approval process was simple.
- Help to improve quality of program implementation and help to satisfy requirement of item #33.
- Help us cover or meet the requirements established by State Board of Education and our District.
- However, I do not believe the "established classrooms" should be limited to an additional $2,500 in the second year.
- However, it would be great if there was additional money awarded to help upgrade the playground to meet the needs of the students both physically and emotionally.
- It's okay - I'm not sure why it is necessary to write a narrative about why materials are needed - These are certified teachers making the request - and principals sign the P.O.S.
- It is easy to complete. The awards were made quickly.
- It is fair and adequate
- It provided beneficial resources to assist four year olds- intellectually, physically, and socially.
- It provides much needed consumable and non-consumable items.
- It was easy to fill out. The grant/awards application and

- Refrigerators, classroom furniture, supplies, materials, blocks, outdoor picnic areas, covered play areas, cameras, books, listening materials, science equipment, puppets, big books, dress up clothes, gross motor play materials, activity carpets.
- Second year drop puts immediate halt to outdoor improvements.
- Should be renewable each year; Not enough funds to meet requirements.
- The list of supplies and materials were developed in line with the teacher's perception of classroom needs. However, the final approval process by the SDE was somewhat subjective.
- Too much time was spent adjusting equipment to fit $10,000 grant.
- While the money was great, it was not enough to make all the changes needed to comply with the program.

approval process was very fast. It did not take long to hear back.

- Literacy print rich materials for the classes were purchased and utilized.
- Lots of it.
- More time is needed and materials are needed to address diversity.
- OK
- Our goal is to complete the application as required and obtain funding for our students.
- Our teachers were able to get supplies that they might not have normally received.
- Process was simple and response was quick.
- reasonable, adequate
- simple
- Simple to complete, fast turn around
- The 10,000 helped us to provide literacy rich materials for our classes.
- The amount of money per class was great and the application process was not hard
- The amount of new supplies and materials enabled us to implement Creative Curriculum.
- The amount was sufficient & turn-around time expedient in disbursing funds.
- The application was easy to complete and teacher friendly.
- The application was easy to fill out and didn't require a lot of time.
- The assistance that it provided my school was a great help and much appreciated. However, we are in need of more than $2,500.00 for existing classes next year.
- The grant gave us the opportunity to purchase shelving and furniture that was much needed in the classroom center areas. It also provided for manipulatives and materials to help implement our curriculum - Creative Curriculum.

- The grant provided much needed supplies and equipment.
- The grant seemed easy enough for teachers & we were able to get materials we needed.
- The money was needed to equip the classrooms as needed.
- The only complaint I would have is that it was very late in the year before teachers received the materials.
- The process had funds available to secure the necessary instructional materials that were needed to meet the needs of the students.
- The process was relatively easy, and we received the materials grant quickly.
- The process was simple and easy to follow
- The teacher was awarded the entire amount requested.
- The turn around time between submission and application approval is minimal.
- We got lots of great stuff!
- We were able to upgrade materials and supplies. We were able to set up a new classroom to meet the needs of our growing population.
- We worked together on the grant and it was a good experience generating lots of conversation and collaboration.
- Yes, but we could use additional funds to enhance science and technology centers.

Table 34.2b. Description of Materials Purchased with CDEPP Funds: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Description of materials purchased with CDEPP funds	No.	Examples of materials purchased	Average Costs
Complete Classroom	23	Instant Classroom	29313
Classroom materials	50	Hands on materials, consumable goods (art, writing, paint, etc.)	11052
Playground Equipment	25	Playground equipment and supplies, storage building	13094
Classroom Furnishings	10	Furniture, developmentally appropriate materials	7200
Technology	5	technology supplies and equipment (computer, software, smartboards, brainchild)	6639
Undesignated Purchases	1	Unknown	17,000

Table 34.3b. Average Cost Spent on CDEPP Materials: Public School Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Cost of CDEPP materials purchased	55	28,828	24,037.20	2000	130,000

Note: The administrator respondents consisted of both district early childhood coordinators and public school principals, therefore these numbers could reflect the amount spent on materials for multiple classrooms.

Question 35: Transportation provided to participating children

The tables associated with question #35 present information about transportation services for CDEPP children in the private and public settings. Table 35a reveals that about 43% of private center administrator respondents indicated that transportation services are provided to CDEPP children, while 57% reported that such services were not provided. Table 35.1a shows information about private center administrators' satisfaction with transportation services, with 50% indicating satisfaction and 50% reporting dissatisfaction. Reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction are listed in table 35.2a. One of the salient reasons for dissatisfaction was the rising price of insurance and gasoline.

Table 35b indicates whether transportation services are provided to CDEPP children in public school settings. Of the administrators responding, 97% reported that transportation services are provided by their public school programs, whereas about 3% offered no response. According to Table 35.1b, 79% of the responding administrators reported satisfaction with these transportation services, while close to 8% reported dissatisfaction, and 13% had no response. Reasons for their satisfaction are listed in Table 35.2b and included convenience and reliability. Reasons for dissatisfaction included concern that such young children were riding the bus with older children, that adequate supervision is not provided on the bus, and that no safety measures are in place to transport smaller 4-K students.

Table 35a. Transportation Services Provided to CDEPP Children: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	42.9
No	8	57.1
Total	14	100.0

Table 35.1a. Satisfaction with Transportation Services: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	50
No	3	50
Total	6	100.0

Table 35.2a.

Reasons for satisfaction with transportation services	Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation services
- It is convenient for the parents - Something is better than nothing. We look forward to any increase in the future. - We provided transportation through our current system. Children were added to current routes.	- Cost was not adequate - No, I was not satisfied with the transportation services because the cost to transport the children was very high due to the high cost of insurance, gas, and other expenses, it was very difficult to do, but we did it.

Table 35b. Transportation Services Provided to CDEPP Children: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	75	97.4
No	0	0
No Response	2	2.6
Total	77	100.0

Table 35.1b. Satisfaction with Transportation Services: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	61	79.2
No	6	7.8
No response	10	13
Total	77	100.0

Table 35.2b.

Reasons for satisfaction with transportation services	Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation services
It works well within our regular	4-K students have to ride with 5-K-

program
- The children are able to arrive on time.
- Takes the transportation responsibility of the parents and ensure student attendance.
- The additional dollars help with security.
- Students arrive to school on time and ride on buses with certified drivers.
- Students ride along with other children and are well supervised. We had no transportation problems this year.
- Our district is wide-spread meaning that it covers a large area. Many of our students would not have a way to school if transportation was not provided.
- We are able to run a route for some that just have 4 year old children on the bus.
- Higher participation due to transportation.
- I am satisfied because it ensures that students get to school in a prompt and safe manner.
- Increases attendance
- It allows students who would not be able to attend due to transportation to be able to attend.
- It takes the responsibility off the parents and ensures students attendance.
- More students are able to get involved in the program.

12 grade students; 4K students have to walk from central stops unattended; 4K students get to school early (7:00am) and get home late (5:00pm); 4K students within 1.5 miles of school do not receive services
- 4K students have to ride with older students and have to walk from central stops unattended (students not serviced within 1.5 miles of school); many arrive early and get home late
- As part of a school which educates children pre-k through 8th grade busing is a problem. There are not enough buses for the students to leave at the same time. We have to run multiple routes. Very young children have to ride with other grade levels including middles school. Our buses are very old and many need to be replaced.
- Students ride the same local school buses as the other students who attend this school.
- Supervision on bus doesn't meet guidelines and funding doesn't exist to close gap. Our rural school transports 4K with 12th graders and everything in between. Only adult on the bus is the driver.
- We need new buses!

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question 36: Indication of the exact number, clock hours, and type of professional development or training activities related to Early Childhood Education in which administrators participated in before August 1, 2007.

Table 36a lists information about professional development or training activities attended by the private center administrator respondents. The information reveals a variety of activities listed, with the most number of events attended being state and national conferences followed by local and state workshops. Classes providing graduate credit accounted for about 64% of the professional development hours accumulated overall by private center administrator respondents. Table 36b provides similar information for the public school administrator respondents. The largest number of

events was in the category of school district in-services followed by local and state workshops. Local and state workshops accounted for about 63% of the professional development hours accumulated overall by public school administrator respondents.

Table 36a. Participation in professional development (PD) or training activities related to Early Childhood Education (by August 1, 2007): Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type of Professional Development or Training Activity for CDEPP teachers	Number of Respondents	Total number of events attended	Average Clock hours of Professional Development (rounded to nearest ½ hr)	Minimum Clock hours	Maximum Clock hours
State and National conferences	18	28	16	0	150
Local and state workshops	18	21	12	0	64
School district in-services	18	13	2	0	20
Classes or workshops providing re-certification credit	18	2	4	0	40
Classes providing graduate credit	18	13	32	0	576
Release time to observe other classrooms and teachers	18	1	0	0	6
Other (specify): CPR	18	13	6	0	40

Table 36b. Participation in professional development (PD) or training activities related to Early Childhood Education (by August 1, 2007): Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Type of Professional Development or Training Activity for CDEPP teachers	Number of Respondents	Total number of events attended	Average Clock hours of Professional Development (rounded to nearest ½ hour)	Minimum Clock hours	Maximum Clock hours
State and National conferences	77	8	14.5	0	284
Local and state workshops	76	32	31.5	0	1031
School district in-services	76	52	9.0	0	70
Classes or workshops providing re-certification credit	77	14	5.5	0	108
Classes providing graduate credit	77	3	7.0	0	120
Release time to observe other classrooms and teachers	77	15	1.0	0	30
Other (specify): -EC Coordinator Meetings -First Steps Meetings -Local EC Conference -Meetings with regional coordinator -Teaching EC course -Blood borne pathogens	6	6	6.0		

Question 37: Satisfaction with the professional development and training activities provided by the OFS and the SCDE for CDEPP staff

Table 37a reveals that about 88% of the private center administrator respondents reported being satisfied with professional development and training activities provided by the OFS. (Note, however, that the number of administrators responding to this particular question was 17, not the 18 total number of private center administrator respondents.) Specific reasons for their satisfaction are listed in Table 37.1a.

Table 37b reveals that about 79% of public school administrator respondents reported being satisfied with the professional development and training activities provided by the SCDE, while about 16% reported not being satisfied. Public school administrator respondents who indicated they were both satisfied and not satisfied with the professional development and training activities provided were about 4%. Of the public school administrator respondents, about 1% offered no response at all. According to Table 37.1b, some of the reasons for dissatisfaction noted some of the training required too much time away from the CDEPP classroom and that the training was not well organized.

Table 37a. Satisfaction with the Professional Development and Training Activities Provided by the OFS for CDEPP Staff: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	88.2
No	2	11.8
Total	17	100

Table 37.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with professional development opportunities	Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation services
- A variety of training options are available. Specific to their teacher needs. - Creative training was held in Columbia for 4k centers and public school 4k. It amazed me to see how much a child could learn by using this program as the study for each subject that will be presented to each child for many ongoing weeks. - Ms. Barbara Black takes time to help us and monitor for professional development. She tries to provide the training and assistance we need. Thank you - Yes, I was very much satisfied with the training and activities for staff because we were introduced to a lot of conferences and workshops that we didn't know about and got a lot of good information which is being utilized in the program now.	- As a regional coordinator, I saw need for training that went beyond that required by proviso. It is my hope that in 2007-2008, OFS can provide training separate from SDE. Private centers have needs that public centers do not- some specifics include: guidance and discipline for 4-5 year olds, lesson planning, developing portfolios, children with special needs- referral process. - Workshops are uninteresting and need improvement

Table 37b. Satisfaction with the Professional Development and Training Activities Provided by the SCDE for CDEPP Staff: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	61	79.2
No	12	15.6
Yes and No	3	3.9
No response	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0

Table 37.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with professional development opportunities	Reasons for dissatisfaction with professional development opportunities
- Availability of free curriculum training; 2. Availability of free Work Sampling and Work Sampling on-line training; 3. Payment for subs for teachers and assistants! - All in-services, workshops and trainings have been relevant, did not require a great deal of travel and involved knowledgeable presenters. - Ample opportunities offered throughout the school year for staff development. Good variety of conferences and speakers. - Because of the relevance to EC and teacher needs. - Conference in January gave us LOTS to think about & do…We should be with other teachers & parents and we are STILL sharing ideas with them that the conference generated! - Creative Curriculum was new to us & we needed an appropriate 4K curriculum. - Early childhood conference gave my teachers wonderful ideas and helped them earn DSS required hours; Work sampling and Creative Curriculum training was very valuable and useful to the teachers. - Has allowed for training of staff that otherwise the district cannot provide due to unavailable resources. - I enjoyed the two conferences	- Too much time taken away from the students for conferences. The days that teachers are away from does not help our staff attendance ratings. For small rural districts such as ours, it is extremely hard to get substitute teachers. - Information kept changing; things were not clear. - Instructional assistants need to be trained also. - Often the trainings were unorganized; the location did not support the number of people in attendance. - All day meetings could have been 2 hours max., irrelevant information sent out in e-mails. Some training did not cover the information adequately, leaving the participants frustrated. (Work Sampling) - Recertification should have been available, not all training requirements were available (DSS hours. Requirements need to be clarified, stated and/or stipulated. - State dept. meetings were very unorganized, too crowded, not prepared, information was not relevant or useful - Teachers were pulled from the classroom too much at the beginning of the year. They were trying to establish routines and procedures and it was hard when they were constantly out.

(NAEYC/SCEA)

- Lots of good suggestions and information
- Professional development has been focused on developmentally appropriate instruction.
- State conference was excellent
- Substantial support has been provided for the teachers
- Teachers found Work Sampling and Creative Curriculum very helpful. The Early Childhood Conference provided teachers with useful techniques and required DSS hours.
- The activities are relevant to their classroom practices.
- The opportunities for professional development allowed me to gain a higher insight in the area of child development, curriculum, and assessment. It also allowed the CDEPP staff to participate in several conferences and workshops.
- The SDE provided staff development that was useful, timely and that addressed issues relevant to early childhood teachers and students. The staff development opportunities provided choice and therefore teachers attended sessions that they felt were useful to them.
- The State provided training for Creative Curriculum, Dial 3 training (portfolios), Work Sampling, Work Sampling on-line, and the SLEA State Conference.
- The teacher assistants attended 1 day of in-service and Class Ed 101 - great. Dr. Willis trained teachers and teacher assistants on early release day for 3 1/2 hours. Teachers received many professional opportunities: Dial 3 & Creative Curriculum.
- The teachers are given opportunities to learn necessary and appropriate curricula to

- The amount of time out of the classroom for training was way too much for our most at-risk children.
- The information that was given was not clear and often contradicted what was previously said.
- The workshops are executed well and are informative; however, certified highly qualified teachers were required to attend too many training sessions to meet DSS guidelines.
- There is a difficulty with how the Center for Child Care Career Development counts training hours by the calendar.
- Too much time out of classroom. Give money to district to train teachers
- Very displeased with limits of High Scope curriculum for children of poverty.
- Workshops, training and other in-services that are required need to be closer to our district. The same in-service and trainings should be offered multiple times to ensure training for assistant teachers as well. It is impossible for teachers and their assistants to attend training simultaneously.

- improve instruction in their classrooms.
- The training for the program (High Scope) used in the district has been informative and extensive. It involved training teachers and paraprofessional which was most helpful. It allowed both groups to have access to the process of how children should be educated.
- The training has been extremely helpful. However, during the 07-08 school year, curriculum training & Work Sampling training should be provided much earlier than during 06-07.
- The training was wonderful, and the teachers learned a lot. It did take them away from their students for many days. Is summer training a possibility?
- The Work Sampling and Creative Curriculum classes, in-services, etc. have been very informative and applicable to the needs and the philosophy of the program.
- These workshops provided educational activities to make me a better teacher and administrator.
- They are catered to the needs of the early childhood teacher.
- They are learning best practices for the early learners.
- They are relevant to the needs of Early Childhood Education and teacher needs.
- They provided relevant information.
- They were very informative. They were also relevant to CDEPP and helpful as the program was implemented.
- Very well organized
- Will get the opportunity to learn the ins and outs of the CDEPP.
- Workshops, in-services have provided me with opportunities to become more knowledgeable.

Question 38: Technical assistance received for CDEPP personnel

The tables associated with question #38 provide information about the technical assistance received by CDEPP personnel in both private and public settings. According to Table 38a, 93% of private center administrator respondents reported receiving technical assistance, while 7% stated they had not received technical assistance. Table 38.1a shows the mode, location, source, and focus of the technical assistance received: 86% of the technical assistance was face-to-face, 83% was by telephone, 57% was in group meetings, and 42% was online or through e-mail; 64% was either at state or regional meetings, 64% was classroom-based or center-based; 14% was district-wide and 7% was school-based. In terms of the source or the provider of the technical assistance, the responding administrators reported that 93% were First Steps regional coordinators, 42% were DSS personnel, 14% were private consultants, and 7% were either university personnel, personnel from the national technical assistance center, or the First Steps local coordinator. The focus of the technical assistance was 86% about the classroom environment, 83% about child development, 57% on curricular issues, and 36% on child behavior issues.

Tables 38b and 38.1b provide information about the technical assistance received by public school CDEPP personnel and the mode, location, source, and focus of the technical assistance. The tables reveal that 92% of the responding public school CDEPP administrators reported receiving technical assistance, while 8% reported not receiving technical assistance. In terms of the mode through which the technical assistance was delivered, 78% of the respondents reported that it was face-to-face, 76% stated it was online or through e-mail, 74% was in group meetings, 60% was through telephone, and 1% was in some other kind of manner. The responding administrators reported that 77% of the technical assistance was through state and regional meetings, 69% was school-based, 63% was classroom-based, and 51% was district-wide. The source or provider of the technical assistance was from state agency personnel (88%), school-district personnel (73%), private consultants (15%), university personnel (12%), and about 3% through the national technical assistance center.

Table 38a. Received Technical Assistance: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	13	92.9
No	1	7.1
Total	14	100.0

Table 38.1a. Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Received: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Mode	Frequency	Percent (N=14)
Face-to-face	12	85.7
Telephone	10	83.3
Group meeting	8	57.1
Internet/email	6	42.3

Location	Frequency	Percent (N=14)
State or regional meeting	9	64.3
Classroom-based	9	64.3
Center-based	9	64.3
District-wide	2	14.3
School-based	1	7.1

Source/Provider	Frequency	Percent (N=14)
First Steps regional coordinator	13	92.9
DSS personnel	6	42.3
Private consultant	2	14.3
University personnel	1	7.1
National Technical Assistance Center	1	7.1
Other: First Steps local coordinator	1	7.1

Focus	Frequency	Percent (N=14)
Classroom environment	12	85.7
Child Development	10	83.3
Curricular issues	8	57.1
Child behavior issues	5	35.7

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 because respondents were able to select more than one item for each category.

Table 38b. Received Technical Assistance: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	68	91.9
No	6	8.1
Total	74	100.0

Table 38.1b Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Received: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Mode	Frequency	Percent (N=74)
Face-to-face	58	78.4
Internet/email	56	75.7
Group meeting	55	74.3
Telephone	44	59.5
Other	1	1.4

Location	Frequency	Percent (N=74)
State or regional meeting	57	77.0
School-based	51	68.9
Classroom-based	47	63.5
District-wide	38	51.4

Source/Provider	Frequency	Percent (N=74)
State agency personnel	65	87.8
School district personnel	54	72.9
Private consultant	11	14.9
University personnel	9	12.2
Other:	5	6.8
• Pee Dee Ed. Center		
National Technical Assistance Center	2	2.7

Focus	Frequency	Percent (N=74)
Classroom environment	64	86.5
Curricular issues	62	83.8
Child Development	50	67.6
Child behavior issues	36	48.6
Other:	3	4.1
• CDEPP requirements		
• Creative Curriculum		
• Work Sampling entries		

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 because respondents were able to select more than one item for each category.

Question 39: *Technical assistance preferred for CDEPP personnel.*

The tables associated with question #39 display information about the technical assistance that is preferred for CDEPP personnel, according to CDEPP administrators from both private and public settings. Tables 39a shows that 61% of the private center respondents prefer face-to-face technical assistance, 33% prefer group meetings, 39% prefer telephone, and 28% prefer online or e-mail. In terms of location, 39% prefer it to be classroom-based, 39% prefer it to be center-based, 33% prefer state or regional meetings, and about 6% preferred it to be school-based and 6% district-wide. The preferred source/provider of the technical assistance was the First Steps regional coordinator (56%), DSS personnel (22%), 17% university personnel, 17% private consultant, and 6% either "other," SCDE personnel, school district personnel, or through the national technical assistance center. The preferred focus was about the classroom environment (44%), child behavior issues (44%), child development (39%), and curricular issues (33%).

Table 39b shows the preferred mode, location, source, and focus of technical assistance, according to public school CDEPP administrators. As indicated by numbers in the table, about 69% of the public school respondents prefer face-to-face technical assistance, 56% prefer online or electronic mail, 56% prefer group meetings, and 34% prefer telephone. In terms of location, 64% prefer it to be at state or regional meetings, 61% prefer it to be school-based, 51% prefer it to be classroom-based, and 44% prefer it to be district-wide. The preferred source/provider of the technical assistance, according to the public school CDEPP administrators, was state agency personnel (82%), school district personnel (53%), university personnel (16%), private consultant (12%), "Other" (12%), and the national technical assistance center (7%). The preferred content focus was curricular issues (82%), the classroom environment (77%), child development (61%), child behavior issues (60%), and 3% "Other."

Table 39a. Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Preferred: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Mode	Frequency	Percent (N=18)
Face-to-face	11	61.1
Group meeting	6	33.3
Telephone	7	38.9
Internet/email	5	27.8

Location	Frequency	Percent (N=18)
Classroom-based	7	38.9
Center-based	7	38.9
State or regional meeting	6	33.3
School-based	1	5.6
District-wide	1	5.6

Source/Provider	Frequency	Percent (N=18)
First Steps regional coordinator	10	55.6
DSS personnel	4	22.2
University personnel	3	16.7
Private consultant	3	16.7
Other:	1	5.6
State Department of Education personnel	1	5.6
School district personnel	1	5.6
National Technical Assistance Center	1	5.6

Focus	Frequency	Percent (N=18)
Classroom environment	8	44.4
Child behavior issues	8	44.4
Child Development	7	38.9
Curricular issues	6	33.3

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 because respondents were able to select more than one item for each category.

Table 39b. Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Preferred: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Mode	Frequency	Percent (N=77)
Face-to-face	53	68.9
Internet/email	43	55.8
Group meeting	43	55.8
Telephone	26	33.8

Location	Frequency	Percent (N=77)
State or regional meeting	49	63.6
School-based	47	61.0
Classroom-based	39	50.6
District-wide	34	44.2

Source/Provider	Frequency	Percent (N=77)
State agency personnel	63	81.8
School district personnel	41	53.2
University personnel	12	15.6
Private consultant	9	11.7
Other:	9	11.7
• Early Childhood Regional Coordinator		
• Pee Dee Ed Center Specialist		
National Technical Assistance Center	5	6.5

Focus	Frequency	Percent (N=77)
Curricular issues	63	81.8
Classroom environment	59	76.6
Child Development	47	61.0
Child behavior issues	46	59.7
Other:	2	2.6
• Creative Curriculum		
• Work Sampling		
• DIAL-3		
• Management Issues		

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 because respondents were able to select more than one item for each category.

PARENT EDUCATION AND RELATED CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Question 40: Number of parent/teacher conferences for each CDEPP child per year.

Tables 40a and 40b provide information about the number and location of parent/teacher conferences for each CDEPP child per year, according to administrator respondents from private center and public school programs. Private center administrator respondents reported their teachers conducted an average of four parent/teacher conferences per child per year with a standard deviation of approximately three conferences. Public school program administrator respondents reported conducting an average of approximately five parent/teacher conferences per child per year with a standard deviation of approximately three conferences.

Table 40a. Number of Parent/Teacher Conferences for Each CDEPP Child per Year: Private Center Administrators Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Parent/Teacher Conferences Per Year	17	4	2.76	4	0	8

Table 40b. Number of Parent/Teacher Conferences for Each CDEPP Child per Year: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Parent/Teacher Conferences Per Year	74	5.05	2.65	4	0	17

Question 41: Home visits typically conducted by teachers for each CDEPP child per year.

The tables associated with question #41 present information related to the home visits conducted for CDEPP children in private center and public school programs, according to private center and public school administrator respondents. Of the private center administrators, approximately 79% reported conducting home visits for their CDEPP children and 21% reported not conducting home visits. The average number of home visits for students enrolled in these private center program classrooms was reported to be two with a standard deviation of 0.63. Of the public school program administrators, approximately 99% reported conducting home visits for their CDEPP children. The average number of home visits for students enrolled in these public school program classrooms was reported to be three with a standard deviation of 3.1.

Table 41a. Home Visits Conducted for CDEPP Children: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	78.6
No	3	21.4
Total	14	100.0

Table 41.1a. Number of Home Visits for Each CDEPP Child per year: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of home visits per child per year	10	2.0	.63	2.0	1	3

Table 41b. Home Visits Conducted for CDEPP Children: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	73	98.6
No	1	1.4
Total	74	100.0

Table 41.1b. Number of Home Visits for Each CDEPP Child per year: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of home visits per child per year	62	3.2	6.8	2.0	1	40

Question 42: Type of involvement in CDEPP by parents or adult family members of enrolled children.

Table 42a provides information about the type of onsite involvement in CDEPP for parents or adult family members in private center settings. The private center administrator respondents reported a wide range of ways that parents or other adult family members are involved. Approximately 78% of the respondents reported that parents assisted on field trips; 67% reported that parents assist in the classroom, and 67% reported that parents assist in special events at the center. About 50% reported that parents participate in parent education programs. The public school program administrator respondents also reported a wide range of ways that parents or adult family members are involved. Approximately 86% reported that parents participate in family learning activities and another 86% reported that parents assist with field trips; 81% of the respondents reported that parents participate in parent education activities, while 79% indicated that parents assist in special events at the center.

Table 42a. Type of Onsite Involvement for Parents or Adult Family Members of CDEPP Children: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type of involvement	Frequency	Percent (N=18)
Assisting on field trips	14	77.8
Assisting in the classroom	12	66.7
Assisting in special events at center	12	66.7
Participating in parent education	9	50.0
Making or providing classroom materials at home	8	44.4
Participating in family learning activities	7	38.9
Making or providing classroom materials at center	4	22.2
Participating in lending library for parents	4	22.2
Assisting by working in the center outside of the classroom	2	11.1
Participating in Even Start or other family literacy programs	2	11.1
Other (specify): Birthday Parties	1	5.6

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all methods that apply.

Table 42b. Type of Onsite Involvement for Parents or Adult Family Members of CDEPP Children: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Type of involvement	Frequency	Percent (N=77)
Participating in family learning activities	66	85.7
Assisting on field trips	66	85.7
Participating in parent education	62	80.5
Assisting in special events at center	61	79.2
Assisting in the classroom	53	68.8
Participating in lending library for parents	43	55.8
Making or providing classroom materials at center	37	48.1
Participating in Even Start or other family literacy programs	34	44.2
Making or providing classroom materials at home	30	39.0
Assisting by working in the center outside of the classroom	25	32.5
Other (specify): • Family Nights/PTO • other school wide projects • parent conferences • Parent orientations/meetings • Volunteering at school through DSS.	6	7.8

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all methods that apply.

*Question 43: Program provides or refers CDEPP participating **children** for supplemental health and social services*

The CDEPP administrators were asked to provide information about supplemental health and social services for participating children. As displayed in Table 43a, approximately 88% of the private center respondents reported that they provided these services directly or referred children to other agencies for the services. Of these respondents, about 81% of them reported that they refer children for speech and hearing screenings and services; 63% reported referring children to a counselor or social worker, and 50% reported referring children for consultation on individual children's behavior and social-emotional development. (See Table 43.1a.)

Of the responding administrators from public school programs, 93% reported that they provided these services directly or referred children for supplemental services (Table 43b); 84% stated that they provide direct vision screenings and services, and 80% reported providing direct services from a counselor or social worker. The most frequently reported referrals out to other agencies were consultation on individual children's behavior and social-emotional development (56%), dental screening and services (49%), and occupational and physical therapy (44%). (See Table 43.1b)

Table 43a. Program Provides or Refers for Supplemental Health and Social Services for CDEPP Participating Children: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	87.5
No	2	12.5
Total	16	100.0

Table 43.1a. Types of Services to CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=18)	Frequency	Percent (N=18)
Speech and hearing screenings and services	2	12.5	13	81.3
Dental screenings and services	1	6.3	7	43.8
Vision screenings and services	1	6.3	5	31.3
Counselor or social worker	0	-	10	62.5
Consultation on individual children's behavior and social-emotional development	1	6.3	8	50.0
Occupational Therapy/Physical Therapy and other related screenings and services	0	-	6	37.5

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Table 43b. Program Provides or Refers for Supplemental Health and Social Services for CDEPP Participating Children: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	70	93.3
No	5	6.7
Total	75	100.0

Table 43.1b. Types of Services to CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=75)	Frequency	Percent (N=75)
Speech and hearing screenings and services	69	92.0	23	30.7
Dental screenings and services	41	54.7	37	49.3
Vision screenings and services	63	84.0	25	33.3
Counselor or social worker	60	80.0	29	38.7
Consultation on individual children's behavior and social-emotional development	39	52.0	42	56.0
Occupational Therapy/Physical Therapy and other related screenings and services	37	49.3	33	44.0
Other: Medical care	3	4.0	0	-

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all that apply.

*Question 44: Program provides or refers **families** of CDEPP participating children for supplemental health, education, social, and support services*

The tables associated with question #44 provide information about the provision and referral for supplemental health, education, social, and support services to families of CDEPP participating children, according to private center and public school program administrator respondents. Approximately 38% of private center administrator respondents reported providing or referring for supplemental health and social services for the families of their CDEPP participating children. Respondents were asked to indicate the type of service and whether the service was provided directly to the family by the private center or the private center program referred to another entity to access the service for the family (see table 44.1a). Approximately 86% of public school program administrator respondents reported providing or referring for supplemental health and social services for families of their CDEPP participating children. Table 44.1b shows the types of services either provided or referred for by these public school CDEP programs.

Table 44a. Programs Provide or Refer for Supplemental Health and Social Services for Families of CDEPP Participating Children: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	37.5
No	3	18.8
Total	16	100

Table 44.1a. Types of Services to Families CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=16)	Frequency	Percent (N=16)
Substance abuse services	0	-	4	33.3
Psychological/mental health services	0	-	4	33.3
Extended childcare hours	6	50.0	4	33.3
Health related services	1	8.3	8	66.7
Continuing education/GED/vocational education training	1	8.3	9	75.0
Family counseling	0	-	8	66.7

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Table 44b.Programs Provide or Refer for Supplemental Health and Social Services for Families of CDEPP Participating Children: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	55	85.9
No	9	14.1
Total	64	100.0

Table 44.1b. Types of Services to Families of CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=64)	Frequency	Percent (N=64)
Substance abuse services	2	3.1	36	56.3
Psychological/mental health services	12	18.8	47	73.4
Extended childcare hours	18	28.1	28	43.8
Health related services	19	29.7	46	71.9
Continuing education/GED/vocational education training	31	48.4	30	46.9
Family counseling	12	18.8	43	67.2
Other:	0	-	2	3.1
• DSS				
• Family literacy				
• ESL				

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents were asked to select all that apply.

CHILD AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

Question 45: Number of CDEPP classes receiving monitoring visits

Tables 45a and 45b present information regarding the number of CDEPP classrooms receiving monitoring visits, according to private center and public school program administrator respondents. Each private center administrator respondent provided the number of classrooms in their program receiving at least one monitoring visit from the OFS. Of the 14 respondents, the average number of classrooms per program was approximately one classroom. Each public school program administrator respondent provided the number of classrooms in their program receiving at least one monitoring visit from the SCDE. Of the 74 respondents, the average number of classrooms per program was approximately 3 classrooms.

Table 45a. Number of CDEPP Classes Receiving Monitoring Visits from the OFS: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of classes receiving monitoring visits	14	1.2	1.19	1	0	5

Table 45b. Number of CDEPP Classes Receiving Monitoring Visits from the SCDE: Public School Program Administrator Respondent

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of Classes receiving monitoring visits	74	2.97	2.13	3	0	11

Question 46: Number of CDEPP classes receiving more than one monitoring visit

Tables 46a and 46b show information regarding the number of CDEPP classrooms receiving more than one monitoring visit, according to private center and public school program administrator respondents. Each private center administrator respondent provided the number of classrooms in their program receiving more than one monitoring visit from the OFS. Of the 14 respondents, the average number of classrooms per program was approximately one classroom. Each public school program administrator respondent provided the number of classrooms in their program receiving more than one monitoring visit from the SCDE. Of the 75 respondents, the average number of classrooms per program was approximately two classrooms.

Table 46a. Number of CDEPP Classes Receiving More Than One Monitoring Visit from the OFS: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of classes receiving more than one monitoring visits	14	1.14	1.23	1	0	5

Table 46b. Number of CDEPP Classes Receiving More Than One Monitoring Visit from the SCDE: Public School Administrator Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Number of classes receiving more than one monitoring visits	75	2.35	2.25	2	0	11

Question 47: Satisfaction with the processes for assuring and monitoring quality of the CDEPP.

The tables associated with question 47 present information regarding the satisfaction of private center and public school program administrator respondents with the processes for assuring and monitoring the quality of the CDEPP. The OFS developed processes for assuring and monitoring the quality of private centers. Of the 15 private center administrator respondents, approximately 93% of them reported being satisfied with the processes established by the OFS. (See Table 47a.) Table 47.1a provides the specific reasons for their satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The SCDE developed processes for assuring and monitoring quality in public school programs. Of the 75 public school program respondents, 92% reported being satisfied with the processes established by the SCDE, while 8% reported being dissatisfied. Table 47.1b presents the reasons for satisfaction and dissatisfaction provided by public school program administrator respondents.

Table 47a. Satisfaction with the OFS Processes for Assuring and Monitoring the Quality of the CDEPP: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	93.3
No	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

Table 47.1a.

Reasons for satisfaction with the processes for assuring and monitoring the quality	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the processes for assuring and monitoring the quality
• Great relationship with regional coordinator. works with classroom teachers and offers appropriate	• Need to hire at least one 4k coordinator in 07-08 to serve growing number of providers in the

| | solution for classroom improvements | PeeDee area. |

- I saw each class in my approved programs at least every other week, in addition to phone calls, emails, and faxes. I provided on-site technical assistance, modeled classroom practices, assisted with lesson planning, etc. It was intensive monitoring and T.A.
- It lets us know someone is thinking about how and what we are doing with the children.
- Monitoring helps keep us on the right track.
- No problems with them.
- OFS visit often, they make phone calls and set up meeting and classes for teachers to attend.
- Our agency also monitors using the same tool. Therefore the first steps observation contributes to our programs establishment of
- The first step staffing has been excellent and has done their processing well. It was done in a professional matter.
- very helpful, students are able to be engaged in a lot of educational opportunities.
- Yes, because you are always treated with respect and you get positive feedback from anyone in the OFS.
- Yes, I'm satisfied with first steps process of assuring and monitoring the quality of our program because of coordination and our executive director was there for us they really went out of their way to make sure we knew what to do.

Table 47b. Satisfaction with the SCDE Processes for Assuring and Monitoring the Quality of the CDEPP: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	69	92
No	6	8
Total	75	100.0

Table 47.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with the processes for assuring and monitoring the quality	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the processes for assuring and monitoring the quality
- Adequate - Adequate - Age appropriate; research based; best practices - Allows fro immediate progress of the program quality of implementation. - Amy DeCola is the SDE associate who has worked with our school. She is very knowledgeable and will find the answer if needed. Additionally she has been reliable, honest, and helpful in her suggestions & assistance. - Amy DeCola was great. The teachers felt very comfortable with her. She provided valuable feedback and support. - Amy helps us do what is necessary - Conferences are not only held with the teacher and/or teacher assistant, but the curriculum coordinator and the principal are also kept abreast of the status of the program and concerns. Verbal feedback, along written feedback, are given. - Dr. Diane Willis has been so good to us. Because of her great leadership and knowledge she has truly helped us grow. - Dr. Willis has been very supportive. She established relationships before asking teachers to make changes. - Dr. Willis was very involved in the schools, and each classroom. (received visits in Montessori); Dr. Willis held 3 training workshops for teachers at the school level, and provided one district wide training for teacher associates. - Each classroom is visited by a consultant from the State Department of Education who provides meaningful assistance to	- Discrepancy in monitoring report. One person came for 2 hours & observed 2 classes during that time. - More transition time was needed to adjust to curriculum change and regulations. Teacher had a difficult year due to the many new regulations, requirements, and a new curriculum. - need to use the assessment forms provided by the curriculum model. - Teachers need a coach more than they need an observer. - Too much monitoring. - We did not receive enough support from The State Department in the early stages of CDEP to help us implement the new requirements.

- teachers in reference to the total classroom concept for 4-K students.
- Enough visits, but not so many as to feel "watched" constantly; Able to teach.
- Excellent advisors. (Especially Felecia)
- Fair; Give expectations ahead of time; Flexible in scheduling.
- Gives us a look at how the program is doing in terms of classroom management, environment, etc.
- Gives very helpful information.
- Good information is given that can be easily utilized.
- I don't believe this is a question I can adequately answer before the completion of the 1st year of this Pilot Program
- I have no data to make a comparison.
- I would like to commend the SDE staff on the quality of the monitoring of the program.
- Immediate feedback is provided as well as assist with corrective actions.
- It always helps to have another pair of eyes look at what we are doing and offer advice that will improve the program.
- It seems fair even though some of the guidelines are too rigid.
- It was a good way to determine strengths and weaknesses of the program.
- It was timely and informative. Technical assistance that was provided was excellent.
- Logics of the monitoring proves, such as training and workshops on what's to be expected and how to do it/comply, followed by the actual visit and immediate feedback to coordinators and principals to be discussed with teachers and then time for improvements to be made prior to follow up visit.
- Meetings and professional

development have assisted in implementation. However, there have been too many of them. Many of us wear more than one hat and it's difficult to attend all the meetings. Gayle Morris has been a wonderful support.

- Meets the developmental needs of all children.
- Monitoring keeps us on our toes
- Mrs. Jenerette is great!
- My regional coordinator is very knowledgeable of the processes involved and makes herself available. She makes visits when they are scheduled.
- No problems noted.
- On-site, professional, thorough
- On site visits followed by conferences
- Other than confusion accompanying a new program, things were o.k. Sometimes we felt "punched at," but when things become more familiar SDE will become more courteous & calm.
- Our monitor has been very helpful
- Our regional coordinator was not punctual with paperwork, visits, etc.
- Positive feedback
- Productive feedback is provided.
- Quality rating scale was developed.
- SDE provided a lot of support
- State Department personnel have provided very helpful suggestions especially in best arrangement and utilization of centers.
- The evaluator was helpful and knowledgeable
- The monitoring process ensures that we are within the appropriate guidelines.
- The process for monitoring is not a secret. The teachers and coordinator know exactly what types of things the monitor will be observing. Feedback is given about positive things observed as well as areas that need improvement.

- The SDE is very qualified to assure quality of EC programs
- The SDE processes have been great. We have filled out reports, have received numerous on-site visits, and have talked directly with personnel to ensure monitoring.
- The SDE provides immediate feedback and provides assistance with corrections.
- The SDE provides the appropriate monitoring of EC programs.
- The State Department of Education provides technical assistance and opportunities for professional development to the CDEPP staff.
- They follow the guidelines which they give you.
- They have been very patient and helpful.
- Very helpful; Seems many hours working to improve our program; assists in all aspects of environment and instruction
- Very informative, fair and helpful to teachers.
- Very thorough and reflective.
- Very thorough to cover a variety of areas.
- We just feel that we need more than one visit in order to make sure we are operating the program appropriately and following all state requirements.
- We received great feedback. The process seemed fair.
- We were given feedback and suggestions

Question 48: Satisfaction with approved curricula for use in CDEPP classrooms

The tables associated with question 48 present information regarding satisfaction with the approved curricula for use in CDEPP classrooms, according to the private center and public school program administrator respondents. Of the private center administrator respondents, approximately 94% reported being satisfied with the curricula approved by the OFS for use in CDEPP classrooms. Table 48.1a provides a list of reasons given for their satisfaction. There were no reasons explicitly stated by private center administrator respondents for dissatisfaction. Among public school program administrator respondents, approximately 91% reported satisfaction with curricula approved by the SCDE for use in CDEPP classrooms. Table 48.1b lists reasons given

by public school program administrator respondents for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the approved curricula.

Table 48a. Satisfaction with the Curricula Approved by the OFS for Use in the CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	17	94.4
No	1	5.6
Total	18	100.0

Table 48.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with approved curricula	Reasons for dissatisfaction with approved curricula
• Yes, I love the curriculum. We are using creative curriculum and it is very good for the children. I provide all of the necessary activities and arrangements for children to grow and learn. It stimulates them to want to learn. • All approved curriculums are developmentally appropriate that connect closely to our state content standards. • Both High Scope and Creative Curriculum were used in my counties-very appropriate curricula-tied to state standards. But-moderately trained teachers in private settings need stronger background n child development and curriculum models in order to implement these two models. Some providers did not attend required training and there were no consequences. High turnover in private settings hampered implementation of either curriculum. • Compatible with public schools curricula • The curriculum has been most effective. Teacher as well as students are enjoying it. • The curriculum is easy to use and teachers are offered training to make their job easier. • It allows students to make their individual choices • Creative curriculum is a program	No reasons for dissatisfaction were offered.

that we've adopted, learned, and implemented. We understand what we are doing and what's being taught.

Table 48b. Satisfaction with the Curricula Approved by the SCDE for Use in the CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	70	90.9
No	7	9.1
Total	77	100.0

Table 48.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with approved curricula	Reasons for dissatisfaction with approved curricula
• Age appropriate • All 4K/5K teachers were able to receive Creative Curriculum training. • Creative Curriculum's alignment with standards is a plus. The inclusive areas provide a comprehensive child-centered focus on curriculum. Creative Curriculum is a great program used to meet the needs of all our students. • Creative curriculum is a viable curriculum that meets the developmental needs of 4 year olds • Creative Curriculum research based. • Creative Curriculum training has helped our teachers move toward teaching the whole child. Montessori was already implemented; however the grant and Montessori Conference helped our teachers grow. • Creative curriculum works for our population. Teachers needed more transition time since the decision was made after school started. • High Scope is a great research based program. • High Scope was selected by our county and is approved by The State Department. High Scope is a	• High Scope: poor learning environment for academically starved students. • Need for direct instruction • No flexibility in choice. • No support is provided for Montessori classes. • Some teachers are not comfortable with developing their instructional materials. All require the teacher to develop the lesson. At other grade levels, the teachers have the option of using a prepared lesson (parts or all). Support instructional material was not allowed. • There is confusion from the teacher & her assistant. The High Scope training tells them one way & CDEP says to do it another. Needs consistency! • We had to participate in "Early Reading First" and adopted "balanced literacy'. Balanced Literacy seemed to work well with our children. We saw a lot of progress and growth.

- researched based curriculum that focuses on the needs of young children.
- I do not agree with the curricula. There is not a single on way of doing things,
- In- depth training is available for all curriculum choices for both teachers and assistants.
- It matches what is currently being done in kindergarten and EIA Cd programs.
- It prepares students for the next level (Kindergarten).
- Solid, age/developmentally appropriate curriculum; User friendly; Excellent training provided.
- The CDEPP has chosen 3 curriculums that are varied and research-based. All have specific advantages & qualities unique to the program.
- The curriculum is developmentally appropriate and districts (schools) were allowed the opportunity to select which curriculum they wanted to implement.
- The district uses High Scope as the basic foundational curricula because it fits the educational demands for the 4-K students in Bamberg Two.
- The growth of students in the program
- The school/district chooses the curriculum that best meets the needs of our students. The state department of education provides training and resources to support our chosen curriculum.
- The state gave choices as to the curriculum use.
- very much more focused and has more content that will help prepare our CD students for K class.
- We follow state standards and adapt activities to meet the needs of our children.
- We like Creative Curriculum. One school was already using it and the

other school changed to it this year. We are interested on Montessori as well.
- We needed a 4K curriculum.
- Yes and no. The curricula is fine, however, there needs to be a meshing of the approved curricula (High Scope) with the S.C. State Standards.
- Yes, it meets the needs of the children being served in the 4 year old program

Question 49: Satisfaction with approval process for curricula models

The tables associated with question #49 display information related to the satisfaction felt by CDEPP administrators with the approval process for curriculum models used in CDEPP classrooms. Table 49a shows that 100% of the private center responding administrators reported being satisfied with the approval process developed by the OFS. No reasons for dissatisfaction were stated. Table 49b reveals that 90% of the public school CDEPP administrators reported being satisfied with the approval process developed by the SCDE, while 10% reported not being satisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction (Table 49.1b) were that teachers should be allowed to use their own expertise in selecting a curriculum, the models chosen do not allow for direct instruction, and three curricula is not enough to choose from. One respondent stated that his/her district had not received the necessary training in the *Creative Curriculum* model.

Table 49a. Satisfaction with the Approval Process for Curriculum Models used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	16	100
No	0	0
Total	16	100.0

Table 49.1a.

Reasons for satisfaction with approval process for curriculum models	**Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approval process for curriculum models**
• Allows provider to choose between several different curricula. • I've had opportunities to work with models- provided many hands- on experiences • I guess the process is acceptable. We did not use a curriculum model different from those approved. • I have no problems • My students (4k) are learning and are happy doing it and that is what makes the difference. • The curriculum is easy to use and	

teachers have received a lot of training in this area.
- The process helps to ensure we are following closely with the curriculum recognized as developmentally appropriate
- We have a process in place for approving curricula other than the legislated approved curriculum e.g. CC, High Scope, etc.

Table 49b. Satisfaction with the Approval Process for Curriculum Models used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	66	90.4
No	7	9.6
Total	73	100.0

Table 49.1b.

Reasons for satisfaction with approval process for curriculum models	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approval process for curriculum models
3 choices with process in place for alternative choice. - Appears to word for us - Appropriate models were chosen. - At least it gives us something to sink our teeth into. - Creative Curriculum - Creative Curriculum is a researched based program developed to ensure that students receive developmentally appropriate instruction. - Curricula models are researched-based and proven effective. - Didn't need to use it. - Districts have the leverage to choose a curriculum which best fits the characteristics of the children being served. - Easy to use - I like the model we are using. - It appears that all the choices are solid, proven, and effective; Well-researched programs to choose from. - It is good, developmentally appropriate model.	- A teacher should be allowed to use her expertise in deciding curriculum for her students. It should not be limited to the 3 State-Department choices. - Model does not allow for direct instruction - No, we were given only 3 curricula models from which to choose. No other materials (instructional) could be considered. - Our district/school appealed the curriculum choice based on what was "proven" to be effective for our children. We were declined. - We have had no training in the Creative Curricula model which was adopted by my district.

- It promotes consistency across the state
- Models are age-appropriate
- More choices are available for program design
- No problems noted.
- No reason
- Not stressful
- Our district was already using an approved curriculum prior to CDEP, and therefore the application process was simple.
- Prior to the district becoming approved to be funded through CDEPP, the curricula model was in place. CDEPP made it possible for the district to retrain and train new staff members employed in the 4-K program.
- Research-based
- Research based models
- researched based
- Simple if using an approved research-based curriculum.
- The approve curricula models are age appropriate
- The programs the SDE selected were researched based. It was great that the SDE provided a choice of the best programs and that training was provided.
- This curricula, High Scope was already one of the approved curriculums by the SDE
- training forced us to choose.
- very thorough and relative
- We had the opportunity to choose one of 3 programs.
- We have the opportunity to choose.
- We mostly utilize High Scope.
- We were able to select the curriculum model that we felt our students would most benefit from.

Question 50: Satisfaction with assessments approved for use in CDEPP classrooms.

The tables associated with question #50 display information about the satisfaction felt by CDEPP administrators with the assessments approved for private and public programs. Table 50a shows that 94% of the private center responding administrators reported being satisfied, while 6% reported not being satisfied. One critical comment

was made about the evaluator as the reason given for dissatisfaction. Table 50b shows that 95% of the responding administrators from the public school programs reported being satisfied with the approved assessments, while 5% reported not being satisfied. Reasons given for dissatisfaction were related to the *DIAL-3* not being an assessment tool, the duplication of work, that there were too many assessments, and that the effort that goes into *Work Sampling* is wasted because it is not used at other grade levels.

Table 50a. Satisfaction with the Assessments Approved by the OFS for use CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	94.1
No	1	5.9
Total	17	100.0

Table 50.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with approved assessments	Reasons for dissatisfaction with approved assessments
• Assessments are appropriate and in line with research in young children. But, untrained teachers struggled with these during this first year. More training and in-center T.A. needed. • ECERS-R is currently one tool we use in assessing our program. • It allowed you to check the students progress • It helps determine what the child has or has not accomplish • It is precise and self explanatory • No problems • Proper training provided to ensure smooth implementation of assessments • Simple to perform • The assessments are user-friendly and easy to administer and is less time-consuming • The ECERS-R assessments help create a solid plan for what the coordinators, teachers, and directors, can use to improve the quality of the program. We understand Dial 3 and its purpose • yes, I am satisfied with ECERS rating scale. I've had training on how to assess classroom and staff. Dial III is very good for the students. • yes, I am very much satisfied with	• The evaluator did not know what they were doing

the assessments approved by the OFS because the assessments are reliable.

Table 50b. Satisfaction with the Assessments Approved by the SCDE for use CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	73	94.8
No	4	5.2
Total	77	100.0

Reasons for satisfaction with approved assessments	Reasons for dissatisfaction with approved assessments
- Again, work sampling is wonderful. It allows parents to see their individual child's growth over time. However, training, implementation, and data entry times had to be "squeezed" into the teacher's schedule. A lot for one year! - appropriate - Assessments are very informative. It identifies areas that need improvement. - detailed and specific - DIAL-3 and COR are both instruments that provide information that is helpful to the teacher. - DIAL-3 is a good instrument. - DIAL-3 is a great screening tool, to be used for screening. Work Sampling and WS on line are good indicators of student progress. - DIAL 3 and Work Sampling measures students' growth and ability levels. - Follows guidelines - Follows guidelines of Creative Curriculum - Follows guidelines of creative curriculum - Helps define weak areas or areas that need improvement. - I really liked what I was given to use and the design of the form. - It gives a general picture of all students where they are and what to do to get the next level. - It is fair and there are no hidden	(Tool) DIAL 3 is not an assessment tool - this was required by law. - DIAL-3 is not a pre/post test. - Lots of duplicate work - depending on curricula - WSS has problem with having to enter things more than once in different places - or we don't understand how to only enter it once and pull it up somewhere else. - Too many assessments. - Working sampling is not used in other grade levels other than pre-k in our school. Therefore, the amount of work put into selecting work samples and completing observations and checklists online is not utilized.

- surprises.
- It measures students' academic progress/growth over a period of time.
- It reflects appropriate practices for young children by requiring staff to maintain and update student portfolios.
- More training for on line portfolio training needed. Work Sampling is great!
- On line & portfolio in class correlates to SCRA.
- Plenty of feedback was given prior to Formal Assessment.
- Researched based; best practices
- Teacher is satisfied with classroom and initial assessments.
- Teachers needed work sampling training before year began.
- The assessment (Work Sampling) is appropriate, but the report is not parent friendly. The report needs to give information to parents that can be easily understood. The narrative takes the teachers a long time to complete because it is typed in a Word document & then posted on the report. This process is very time consuming.
- The assessments are formative, on-line and track the students' progress over time. I am pleased that multiple assessments have been approved by the State Department of Education.
- The assessments are helpful and provide tremendous insight for student progress. The student portfolios - DIAL-3 provides information that is helpful in several areas in order to determine student strengths in the early years.
- The design of the form was very friendly; however, some of the items were redundant.
- The instrument is reliable and specific.
- The only suggestion is to adjust some of the regulations

- The teachers are very happy with the on-line work sampling process; although I have heard comments that some prefer to use CORE with the High Scope curriculum.
- The teachers do seem to be overwhelmed with the paperwork.
- The Work Sampling system is aligned with the 4-K state standards.
- There was not change in assessment
- They are thorough and fair.
- They give us good information.
- They measure children's ability and growth.
- They use the PQA for High Scope. *However, there are a few conflicting issues between the CDEPP classroom review and the PQA.
- Thorough - covers all the facets; Work Sampling - time consuming, but provides substantial useful info/feedback - record of child's individual progress.
- Very comprehensive
- We feel that the work sampling/portfolio assessment helps us get to know our students in order to meet their individual needs and helps us move them forward.
- We were already using the assessment across the district. This gives the opportunity for uniformity across the state.
- We were using the assessments through ERF (Early Reading First).
- Work Sampling has been a huge shift for us. We were using skills checklists and had to change to work sampling. It was do-able but required many extra hours of work for 4 K teachers.
- Work Sampling has worked for this district.
- Work Sampling is an authentic assessment. It also provides the opportunity for data collection and comparisons on a district-wide as

well as state-wide basis.
- Work sampling is comprehensive and developmentally appropriate. It has provided great insight into our children.
- Works for us
- WSS program has been used here for a number of years. It is sensible and useful.
- You can really monitor students' growth

The tables associated with question #51 provide information about the satisfaction felt by CDEPP administrators from private and public centers with the approval process for assessments. Table 51a shows that 88% of the responding administrators in private centers indicated that they were satisfied with the process developed by the OFS, while 12% revealed that they were not. Reasons for dissatisfaction were that the *DIAL-3* is not an assessment, that it is a screening tool that should be administered one time a year and that the approval process takes too long.

Table 51b shows that 93% of the responding administrators from public school programs reported being satisfied with the approval process developed by the SCDE, while 7% reported not being satisfied. Reasons for dissatisfaction were that the assessments were not researched well enough and that training was not adequate, that the *DIAL-3* is not a pre-post tool, the need for more training in online *Work Sampling*, and that there is too much paperwork.

Table 51a. Satisfaction with the Approval Process for Assessments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	88.2
No	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Table 51.1a

Reasons for satisfaction with approval process for assessments	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approval process for assessments
• compatible with public school • Currently use DIAL 3 along with other Health Screening tools • it even helps us understand what we need to be teaching on. • It is an easy process that has potential not to fail. • no problems • Parent surveys, dial III, work sampling are great tools to assess children. I also had training in doing assessments for children.	• DIAL-3 is not an assessment. DIAL-3 is a screening tool that should be administered one time a year. • Takes too long

- Simple
- Yes, I'm satisfied with the approval process for the children's assessment because this process is very reliable and it measures what it's supposed to measure and it is consistent.

Table 51b. Satisfaction with the Approval Process for Assessments used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	62	92.5
No	5	7.5
Total	67	100.0

Table 51.1b

Reasons for satisfaction with approval process for assessments	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approval process for assessments
- All of our children qualified - Detailed training was provided for all assessment tools. - DIAL 3 is satisfactory. (However, it doesn't really show growth as a post test.) - Efficient - I'm not sure if there was a survey or teacher/administrator input in the selection or was it state mandated? - I liked on-line and classroom portfolio. - It is a valuable assessment - It just works for us. - It serves as a checklist to ensure that students are making the appropriate progress. - Multiple assessments used and assessments are formative - No problems. - OK - On line & classroom portfolio for convenience. - Our State Department of Education is doing an outstanding job - I couldn't ask for better preparation! - research-based. - Teachers can note observations that may explain a child's performance.	- An assessment for all children needs to be researched and teachers need to be trained on giving that assessment statewide. - DIAL-3 is a screening tool. It is not a pre and post test. - DIAL 3 is not assessment tool. - This has been one of our greatest challenges this year embracing portfolios and on-line Work Sampling. We desperately need more training in this area. - Too much paper work.

- The assessment allows the teachers to see growth over time. In addition it shows students areas that they need to focus on in the classroom.
- The assessment is meaningful, thorough, age appropriate, and user friendly. Teachers are able to administer the assessment to the students without stress on either the child or teacher.
- The assessments approved are ones of value when looking at student progress.
- The assessments are geared toward helping the teachers meet the needs of all students.
- They are the current assessments recommended.
- Tries to reach those most at-risk.
- Vague, but use of technology transmits data quickly
- variety
- Work Sampling is a research-based assessment for 4K/5K children.
- Work sampling is approved and is good for assessing our CDEPP students. Provides valuable information.
- work sampling; on-going assessments; research based
- Yes, I agree that the assessment tool must be valid, reliable, and culturally sensitive.
- Yes, I believe it is useful and helpful for our school
- Yes, it is a lot, but nice. I believe the portfolios helped tremendously.

Question 52: Child screening instruments used in CDEPP classrooms.

Tables 52a and 52b present information about the child screening instruments used by private center and public school program administrator respondents in CDEPP classrooms. Of the private center administrator respondents, 78% used the *DIAL-3* child screening instrument. Approximately 96% of public school program administrator respondents reported use of the *DIAL-R* child screening instrument.

Table 52a. Child Screening Instruments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Name of Screening Instrument	Number using Instrument	Percent (N=18)
Dial-3	14	77.8
Observation	2	11.1
Portfolio	2	11.1
work sampling	2	11.1
Speech	1	5.6
Hearing	1	5.6
ELAP	1	5.6
ECER-R	4	22.2

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one screening tool.

Table 52b. Child Screening Instruments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Name of Screening Instrument	Number using Instrument	Percent (N=77)
Dial-3	74	96.1
Observation	1	1.3
PPVT	3	3.9
work sampling	2	2.6
speech	4	5.2
Hearing	4	5.2
ELLCO	1	1.3
ELDA	1	1.3
RSL	1	1.3
ELSA	1	1.3
HAP-3	1	1.3
Get It, Got It, Go	1	1.3
PLS	1	1.3
Pals	1	1.3
IGDI	1	1.3
High Scope	1	1.3
COR	1	1.3

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one screening tool.

Question 53: Child assessments used in CDEPP classrooms for evaluating student progress

Tables 53a and 53b describe child assessments used by private center and public school program administrator respondents to evaluate the progress of students enrolled in their CDEPP classrooms. Private center administrator respondents reported use of the *DIAL-3* (approx. 33%), *Work Sampling* (approx. 33%), and portfolios (approx. 28%) to assess child progress in their CDEPP classrooms. The *Work Sampling System* was the most frequently used assessment among public school administrator respondents (approx. 77%) to assess child progress in their CDEPP classrooms.

Table 53a. Child Assessments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Name of Child Assessment	Number using instrument	Percent (N=18)
DIAL 3	6	33.3
Work sampling	6	33.3
portfolios	5	27.8
observations	4	22.2
anecdotal records	2	11.1
ECERS-R	1	5.6
ELAP	1	5.6
EOC	1	5.6
NRS	1	5.6
developmental checklists	1	5.6
parent survey	1	5.6

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one assessment tool.

Table 53b. Child Assessments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Name of Child Assessment	Number	Percent (N=77)
Work sampling	59	76.6
DIAL-3	22	28.6
portfolios	22	28.6
skills checklist	14	18.2
anecdotal records	13	16.9
observations	10	13.0
PPVT	3	3.9
ELDA	2	2.6
ELLCO	2	2.6
ELSA	2	2.6
ECERS	1	1.3

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one assessment tool.

Question 54: Curricula used in CDEPP classrooms.

Tables 54a and 54b present information about the curricula used by private center and public school program administrator respondents in their CDEPP classrooms. The most frequently used curricula among both private center (approx 60%) and public school program administrator respondents (74%) was the *Creative Curriculum*. The next most used curriculum among both private center (approx. 20%) and public school program administrator respondents (approx. 26%) was the *High/Scope Curriculum*.

Table 54a. Curricula Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Name of Curriculum	Number	Percent (N=15)
Creative Curriculum	9	60
High Scope	3	20
Montessori	1	6.7

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one curriculum.

Table 54b. Curricula Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Name of Curriculum	Number	Percent (N=74)
Creative Curriculum	55	74.3
High Scope	19	25.7
Montessori	4	5.4
Best practices	2	2.7
Doors to Discovery	3	4.1
Language for Learning	1	1.4
Balanced Literacy	1	1.4

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one curriculum.

Question 55: Methods used to assess program quality in CDEPP classrooms.

Tables 55a and 55b present information about the methods used to assess program quality in CDEPP classrooms, according to private center and public school program administrator respondents. Approximately 44% of private center administrators reported using the *ECERS-R* to assess program quality. Other methods used frequently by these private center administrators to assess program quality include self-assessment (approx. 28%), and parent satisfaction surveys (approx. 22%). Approximately 54% or public school program administrator respondents reported using self-assessment methods to assess program quality. Other frequently used methods to assess program quality among the public school program administrator respondents include *ECERS-R* (approx. 36%) and use of the parent surveys (approx. 34%).

Table 55a. Methods Used to Assess Program Quality in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Program Quality Assessment Method	Number using method	Percent (N=18)
ECERS-R	8	44.4
self-assessment	5	27.8
Parent satisfaction survey	4	22.2
NAEYC accreditation	3	16.7
work sampling	2	11.1
ITERS	1	5.6
Fed PRISM Review	1	5.6
annual unannounced navy headquarters inspection	1	5.6
DIAL-3	1	5.6

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one program quality assessment method.

Table 55b. Methods Used to Assess Program Quality in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Program Quality Assessment Method	Number using method	Percent (N=72)
self-assessment	39	54.2
ECERS-R	26	36.1
Parent satisfaction survey	25	34.2
SDE checklist	14	19.4
Creative Curriculum	9	12.5
PQA	6	8.3
SACS	4	5.5

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one program quality assessment method.

Question 56: Publicity of CDEPP to the community

Tables 56a and 56b present information about the methods used by private center and public school CDEP programs to publicize the availability of the CDEPP to parents, referral sources, and the general public. Approximately 84% of the private center administrator respondents cited contact with families of former students as a strategy. Open houses, newspaper ad, and brochures were each cited by 61% of the responding administrators as strategies. Contact with community service providers was cited by 44% of the private center respondents. Public school program administrators cited newspaper ads (94%), brochures (83%), open houses (79%), contact with families of former students (74%), contact with community groups such as churches (73%), and contact with community service providers (51%) as the major strategies used to publicize their CDEPP.

Table 56a. Methods Used to Publicize Availability of CDEPP to Parents, Referral Sources, and the General Public: Private Center Administrator Respondents

Method	Number	Percent (N=18)
Contact with families of former students	15	83.3
Brochures	11	61.1
Open house	11	61.1
Newspaper	11	61.1
Contact with community service providers such as doctors, social workers, and county health offices	8	44.4
Contact with community groups such as churches	8	44.4
Radio and TV	6	33.3
Speakers	5	27.8
Internet	4	22.2
Community health fair	3	16.7
Other (describe)		
• Passing out fliers	2	11.1

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one method.

Table 56b. Methods Used to Publicize Availability of CDEPP to Parents, Referral Sources, and the General Public: Public School Program Administrator Respondents

Method	Number	Percent
Newspaper	72	93.5
Brochures	64	83.1
Open house	61	79.2
Contact with families of former students	57	74.0
Contact with community groups such as churches	56	72.7
Internet	40	28.6
Contact with community service providers such as doctors, social workers, and county health offices	39	50.7
Radio and TV	26	33.8
Other (describe)	22	28.6
• banner out front by the rode		
• Banners for advertising/enrollment		
• flyers posted in school and sent home with students		
• Flyers sent home with students		
• Flyers sent home with students.		
• flyers via all students		
• Local stores		
• Marquee		
• marquee in front of the school		
• newsletters		
• newsletters, school marquee, word of mouth, and Parenting program		
• Phone calls to district students and		

businesses.
- Posters in Community
- PTO
- school bill board
- School bill boards
- School newsletters
- weekly newsletters, school marquee
- Word of mouth, advertise w/ gets, grocery stores, ESL classes, etc.

Speakers	15	19.5
Community health fair	9	11.7

Note: Percentages should not be expected to equal 100 as respondents may have listed more than one method.