

## Spring 2007 CDEPP Teacher Survey Results

Kathleen Paget, PhD  
Heather Smith Gooze, 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 teachers employed in private and public settings. The purpose of the survey was to elicit input from the teachers regarding the implementation process of the CDEPP. The survey consisted of six major sections: (1) Demographics (of the responding teachers), (2) Administrative Procedures, (3) School Facility, Physical Environment, and Transportation, (4) Opportunities for Professional Development, (5) Parent Education and Related Child and Family Services, and (6) Public Awareness and Child Find.

Forty one (41) surveys were mailed to teachers in public programs. Of these, 16 were completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 39%. To teachers in public school programs, 170 surveys were mailed. Of these, 126 were completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 74%. 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: Teachers' Current Positions*

Tables 1a and 1b present information about the positions held by the CDEPP teachers who responded to the surveys from both private and public programs. From the private centers, approximately 94% of teacher respondents identified themselves as CDEPP lead teachers, and approximately 6% identified themselves as directors. From the public school programs, approximately 95% of teacher respondents identified themselves as CDEPP lead teachers, and the remaining 5% identified themselves as teachers, Montessori teachers, or education coordinators.

*Table 1a. Position Held: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

Private	Number	Percent
CDEPP lead teacher	15	93.8
Other: Director	1	6.2
Total	16	100.0

*Table 1b. Position Held: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

Public	Number	Percent
CDEPP lead teacher	120	95.2
Teachers	3	2.4
Montessori Teachers	2	1.6
Education Coordinators	1	.8
Total	126	100.0

### **Question 2: Teachers' Number of Years of Experience**

Tables 2a and 2b present the number of years of teaching experience reported by the CDEPP teachers who responded to the survey from both public and private programs. Private center teachers reported an average of slightly more than 12 years of teaching experience with a standard deviation of approximately 9 years. These private center teachers reported a wide range of years of teaching experience with a minimum of 0 years to a maximum of 34 years. Public school teachers reported an average of slightly more than 14 years of teaching experience with a standard deviation of 10 years. These public school teachers also reported a wide range of years of teaching experience with a minimum of 0 years to a maximum of 33 years.

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

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Years of Experience	16	12.25	8.98	11	0	34

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

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Years of Experience	125	14.26	10.31	15	0	33

### **Question 3: Teachers' Gender**

Table 3a and 3b present information about the gender of respondent CDEPP teachers from both private and public programs. 100% of teachers from private centers were female. Approximately 95% of teachers from public school programs were female, about 2 % were male, and 3% did not respond to this item.

*Table 3a. Gender: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	16	100.0
Total	16	100.0

*Table 3b. Gender: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female	120	95.2
Male	2	1.6
Did not respond	4	3.2
Total	126	100.0

### **Question 4: Teachers' Ethnicity**

Tables 4a and 4b present information about the ethnicity of respondent teachers from both private and public programs. As indicated in Table 4a, the majority of private center teachers were Black or African American (approximately 81%). As indicated in Table 4b, the majority of public school program teachers were White (approximately 65%).

*Table 4a. Ethnicity (based on US Census categories): Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Black or African American	13	81.2
White	2	12.5
Missing	1	6.3
Hispanic or Latino	0	-
Asian	0	-
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	-
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	-
Total	16	100%

**Table 4b.** *Ethnicity (based on US Census categories): Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
White	82	65.1
Black/African American	39	31.0
Hispanic or Latino	4	3.1
Asian	1	0.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	-
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	-
Missing	0	-
Total	126	100%

**Question 5: Teachers' Membership in Professional Organizations**

Tables 5a and 5b describe the types of professional organizations private center and public school program teacher respondents belong to. Of the private center respondents, 25% reported no membership in a professional organization. Of public school program teacher respondents, approximately 46% reported membership in the National Association for the Education of Young Children and approximately 37% reported membership in the South Carolina Association for the Education of Young Children. Approximately 23% of public school program teacher respondents reported no membership in a professional organization.

*Table 5a. Professional Organizations to Which CDEPP Lead Teachers Belong: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Organization Name</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
None	4	25.0
National Association for the Education of Young Children	1	6.2
South Carolina Association for the Education of Young Children	1	6.2
Palmetto State Teachers' Association	1	6.2
National Education Association	1	6.2
South Carolina Education Association	1	6.2
Sigma Tau Delta National English Society	1	6.2
South Carolina Child Care Center Association	1	6.2

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

*Table 5a. Professional Organizations to Which CDEPP Lead Teachers Belong: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Organization Name</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
National Association for the Education of Young Children	58	46.0
South Carolina Early Childhood Association	47	37.3
None	29	23.0
South Carolina Association for the Education of Young Children	16	12.7
South Carolina Education Association	16	12.7
Southern Early Childhood Association	14	11.1
National Education Association	10	7.9
Palmetto State Teachers' Association	7	5.6
South Carolina International Reading Association	5	4.0
South Carolina Reading Association	3	2.4
Montessori Educational Programs International	3	2.4
American Montessori Society	2	1.6
Early Childhood Association	1	0.7
International Reading Association	1	0.7
South Carolina Science Council	1	0.7
National Reading Council	1	0.7
National Technical Association	1	0.7
South Carolina Association of Colleges and Employers	1	0.7
National Council of Teachers of English	1	0.7
Kappa Delta Pi	1	0.7
Reading Recovery Council of North America	1	0.7
National Education Association	1	0.7
South Carolina Education Association	1	0.7
Sigma Tau Delta National English Society	1	0.7

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

#### **Question 6: Teachers' Highest Education Level and Area of Study**

Tables 6a and 6b present information about the education level and areas of study of respondent CDEPP teachers from private and public programs. None of the teachers from private centers or public school programs reported holding less than an Associate's degree. The majority of teachers from private centers reported holding a Bachelor's degree in various areas of study. A total of 64 teachers from public school programs reported holding a Bachelor's degree in various areas of study. In addition, a total of 61 teachers from public school programs reported either holding an advanced degree or working toward an advanced degree (i.e., Master's degree, Master's degree +30, Education Specialist degree, Doctorate degree).

*Table 6a. Highest Education Level and Area of Study: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

Highest Level of Education	Number	Areas of Study
Less than high school	0	NA
High school diploma or GED	0	NA
Associate's degree	6	Early Childhood
Bachelor's degree	9	Nutrition services Childhood Development Early Childhood English Elem Ed.
Master's degree	1	Creative Arts & learning (Education)
Master's degree +30	0	
Education Specialist degree	0	
Doctorate degree	0	

*Table 6b. Highest Education Level and Area of Study: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

Highest Level of Education	Number	Areas of Study
High School Diploma or GED	0	
Associate's degree	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Childhood</li> <li>• Elem. Ed. K-5, Early Childhood Endorse.</li> </ul>
Bachelor's degree	64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animal Biology, 27 hours Ed Business Administration</li> <li>• Early Childhood Education</li> <li>• Early Childhood &amp; Elementary Education</li> <li>• Early Childhood + 18 hrs</li> <li>• Early Childhood and Montessori Certified</li> <li>• Elementary Education</li> <li>• FCS-Child development</li> <li>• Home Economics</li> <li>• Physical Education</li> <li>• Psychology/ Counseling</li> <li>• Psychology/Early childhood</li> <li>• Sociology</li> <li>• Special Ed</li> </ul>
Master's degree	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creative Arts in Education</li> <li>• Early Childhood-Elementary</li> <li>• Early Childhood</li> <li>• Early Childhood Special Ed.</li> <li>• Elementary Ed</li> <li>• Elementary Reading</li> <li>• General education</li> <li>• HR development</li> <li>• Instructional Accommodation</li> <li>• Learning Disabilities</li> </ul>

Master's degree + 30	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master of Arts in Teaching</li> <li>• Early Childhood education</li> <li>• ECE/Individual/Family Dev.</li> <li>• Elementary Education</li> </ul>
Education Specialist degree	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computing Technology in Education</li> <li>• Early Childhood</li> <li>• Educational administration</li> <li>• Educational Leadership</li> </ul>
Doctorate degree	1	
	(in progress)	
Other	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Childhood add-on</li> <li>• Montessori</li> <li>• National Board Certified</li> </ul>

#### *Question 7: Teachers' Areas of Certification*

Tables 7a and 7b present information about the type of state certifications held by teacher respondents from private and public programs. Approximately 31% of teachers from private centers, and approximately 79% of teachers from public school programs reported holding state certification in the area of Early Childhood Education.

*Table 7a. Type of State Certification: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Type of Certification</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Early Childhood Education	5	31.3
Other (specify)	5	31.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Art Education</li> <li>• EDC 101</li> <li>• Psychology/sociology</li> <li>• Education</li> </ul>		
Child Development Associate (CDA)	4	25
Elementary Education	1	6.3
Early Childhood Education (add on)	0	-
Special Education	0	-
Administrator (specify)	0	-
Secondary Education	0	-
Have submitted application	0	-
Not certified	0	-

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

*Table 7b. Type of State Certification: Public School Program Respondent Teachers*

<b>Type of Certification</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
Early Childhood Education	99	78.6
Elementary Education	36	28.6
Early Childhood Education Add on	17	13.5
Other (specify)	13	10.3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBPTS candidate</li> <li>• Early Childhood Literacy</li> <li>• Elementary Guidance</li> <li>• Expired certificate</li> <li>• In process-going to Coker College majoring in Early Childhood</li> <li>• Learning Disabled</li> <li>• Montessori</li> <li>• NBCT-2001</li> <li>• Physical Education</li> <li>• Physically handicapped</li> <li>• Reading K-12</li> </ul>		
Administrator: Elementary Principal	3	2.4
Special Education	2	1.6
Not Certified	1	0.8
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.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES**

### ***Question 8: Awareness of at-risk four-year-olds in your community who are not attending full-day educational program***

Tables 8a and 8b describe how CDEPP teachers from private centers and public school 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?” The majority of teachers from both private centers (approx. 38%) and public school programs (approx. 70%) indicated that they were not aware of other at-risk four-year-olds in the community who were not attending a full-day educational program.

If teacher respondents answered yes to question 8, they were then asked to indicate reasons the children did not attend a full-day educational program. These results are presented in table 8.1a and 8.1b. The top three reasons private center teacher respondents selected were that the parent(s) did not complete the application (83%), classroom space was unavailable (67%), and the family needed longer hours of service (67%). The top two reasons public school program teacher respondents selected were that classroom space was unavailable (55%), and the family chose to keep the child at home or in a family setting (45%). Lack of transportation was cited as a reason by 16% of public school teacher respondents.

*Table 8a. Awareness of At-Risk\* Four-Year-Olds in the Community who are not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	Number	Percent
Yes	6	37.5
No	9	56.3
No response	1	6.3
Total	16	100.0

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

*Table 8b. Awareness of At-Risk\* Four-Year-Olds in the Community who are not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program.: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	Number	Percent
Yes	38	30.2
No	88	69.8
No response	0	
Total	126	100%

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

*Table 8.1a: Reason for At-Risk Children in the Community not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

Reason	Number	Percent (N=6)
The parent(s) did not complete application	5	83.3
Classroom space unavailable	4	66.6
The family needs longer hours of service	4	66.6
No transportation available for the child	2	33.3
Other: School district only half day	1	16.6
Shortage of qualified personnel	0	-
Child find and program awareness activities are inadequate	0	-

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

*Table 8.1b. Reason for At-Risk Children in the Community not Attending a Full-Day Educational Program: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

Reason	Number	Percent (N=38)
Classroom space unavailable	21	55.3
The family chooses to keep the child home or in a family setting	17	44.7
Other reasons:	10	26.3
Parent prefers Home schooling		
Private day care/Head Start		
No transportation available for the child	6	15.8
The family needs after school services that are not available	4	10.5
The family needs before school services that are not available	3	7.9
Shortage of qualified personnel	2	5.3
Child find and program awareness activities are inadequate	1	2.6

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

**Question 9: Waiting list for enrollment in CDEPP**

Tables 9a and 9b present information on the maintenance of waiting lists for CEPP enrollment into private center and public school programs from the perspective of teacher respondents. 56% of private center teacher respondents indicated that their CDEPP maintained a waiting list. 62% of public school teacher respondents indicated that their CDEPP maintained a waiting list.

If a waiting list was maintained, teachers were then asked to indicate how many children were on the waiting list. Of the 9 private center teachers indicating the existence of a waiting list, none of the teachers reported the number of children on the list. Of the 78 public school teachers indicating the existence of a waiting list, 23 provided the number of children on the waiting list. The average number of children on the public school waiting lists was approximately 7 children with a standard deviation of approximately 8 children (see table 9.1b). The number of children on the waiting lists ranged from 1 to 27.

Table 9a. School Maintains a Waiting List for Enrollment into the CDEPP: Private Center Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	56.3
No	7	43.8
Total	16	100.0

Note: Private center teacher respondents did not indicate how many children were on the waiting list.

Table 9b. School maintains a Waiting List for Enrollment into the CDEPP: Public School Program Teacher Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	78	61.9
No	44	34.9
No response	4	3.2
Total	126	100.0

Table 9.1b: Average Number of Children on the Waiting List for the CDEPP: Public School Teacher Respondents

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Average number of children on waiting list	23	7.39	7.69	5	1	27

**Question 10: Reasons program not able to serve children on waiting list**

Tables 10a and 10b indicate the reasons given by private center and public school program teacher respondents for their programs not being able to serve the children on their waiting lists. The unavailability of classroom space was the top reason given by both private center (approx. 78%) and public school teachers (approx. 68%) for not being able to serve children on their waiting lists.

*Table 10a. Reasons the Program was Unable to Serve Children on the Waiting List: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=9)</b>
Classroom space unavailable	7	77.8
No transportation available for the child.	1	11.1
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 10b. Reasons the Program was Unable to Serve Children on the Waiting List: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=78)</b>
Classroom space unavailable	53	67.9
Other reasons:	13	16.7
• Chose private day cares or Head Start		
• Full Enrollment		
• Not enough children in area		
• Out of district		
• Parents choose other options		
• Private daycares/Head Start		
• Serving everyone		
Shortage of qualified personnel	6	7.7
No transportation available	3	3.8

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

**Question 11: Sufficient resources to meet children's school readiness needs**

Tables 11a and 11b show the degree to which teacher respondents report having sufficient resources to meet the school readiness needs of CDEPP students. Approximately 69% of the private center respondents stated they had sufficient resources, while 31% percent indicated the need for additional resources. Some of the needed resources are listed in table 11a. Of the public school teacher respondents 79% reported they had sufficient resources, while 21% stated the need for additional resources. Some of these resources are listed in table 11b.

*Table 11a. Sufficient Resources to Meet School Readiness Needs of CDEPP Students: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	11	68.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional materials are needed such as books, science, math, literacy building materials</li> </ul>
No	5	31.2	
Total	16	100.0	

*Table 11b. Sufficient Resources to Meet School Readiness Needs of CDEPP Students: Public School Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	98	79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A building is needed that does not leak when it rains.</li> <li>• All classroom supplies: Musical instruments, art supplies, multicultural dramatic play costumes, food, books, doll clothes, tricycles and other outdoor equipment.</li> <li>• Classroom space is not adequate.</li> <li>• Funds for field trips, funds for snacks/cooking activities</li> <li>• Larger classroom, library services, extra classrooms</li> <li>• Appropriate materials and supplies to maintain Creative Curriculum Parent workshops on how to raise children</li> <li>• Playground equipment (needs updated to meet DSS regulations)</li> <li>• Translator</li> </ul>
No	26	21	
Total	124	100.0	

**Question 12: Ability to serve children for whom English is a second language**

Table 12a presents information about the ability of private centers to serve children for whom English is a second language, according to private center teacher respondents. Slightly more than 81% reported they had the ability to serve these children, while approximately 19% reported not being able to serve these children. Listed in table 12a are some of the additional resources needed by private center teachers in order to serve English language learners. Table 12.1a indicates the number of children for whom English is a second language reported by private teacher respondents. The average number of CDEPP children in these private center programs who are English language learners was approximately 2 children with a standard deviation of about 6 children.

Table 12.b shows information about the ability of public school programs to serve children for whom English is a second language, according to public school teacher respondents. Approximately 84% indicated the ability to serve these students, while approximately 16% indicated they were not able to serve these students. Listed in table 12b are some of the additional resources needed by public school teachers in order to serve English language learners. The average number of CDEPP children in these public school programs who are English language learners was approximately 5 children with a standard deviation of approximately 9 children.

*Table 12a. Ability to Serve Children for whom English is a Second Language: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	13	81.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spanish teacher</li> <li>• Translator</li> <li>• Courses in conversational Spanish</li> </ul>
No	3	18.7	
Total	16	100.0	

*Table 12.1a. Number of Children for whom English is a Second Language: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
ESL students	16	2.06	5.74	0	0	23

*Table 12b. Ability to Serve Children for whom English is a Second Language: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	103	84.4	• ESOL teacher
No	19	15.6	• Language training
Total	122	100.0	• Materials with Spanish language • Multicultural dolls, books, dress-up clothes etc • Translator and/or computer program for documents that are sent home

*Table 12.1b Number of Children for whom English is a Second Language: Public School Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
ESL students	51	5.27	8.54	2	1	40

**Question 13: Ability to include children with identified developmental delays**

Table 13a presents information about the ability of private center programs to include children with identified developmental delays, according to private center teacher respondents. Approximately 94% indicated the ability to include these children. From the responses received private center teachers 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.

Table 13b presents information about the ability of public school programs to include children with identified developmental delays, according to public school program teachers. Approximately 95% indicated the ability to include these children. Table 13.1b reveals that an average of approximately 3 children with speech only IEPs and approximately 3 children with IEPs for other developmental delays are included in their district programs.

*Table 13a. Ability to Include Children with Identified Developmental Delays: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	15	93.8	• IEP team
No	1	6.2	
Total	16	100.0	

*Table 13.1a. Number of Students with Identified Developmental Delays: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Speech only IEP	16	.75	1.0	0	0	3
IEP for developmental delays	15	.27	.46	0	0	1

*Table 13b. Ability to include children with identified developmental delays: Public School Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	118	95.2	• Another classroom
No	6	4.8	• Speech therapist
Total	124	100.0	

*Table 13.1b. Number of Students with Identified Developmental Delays: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Speech only IEP	99	3.34	2.15	3	1	10
IEP for developmental delays	27	3.30	3.94	2	1	20

## **SCHOOL FACILITY, PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORTATION**

### ***Question 14: Adequacy of classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment***

Tables 14a and 14b present information about the adequacy of classroom and outdoor play facilities according to private center and public school program teacher respondents. Of the private center teacher respondents, 75% indicated they had adequate classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment. The remaining private center teachers indicated that these facilities were inadequate and listed some needed additional resources. Of the public school program teachers, approximately 57% indicated they had adequate classroom and outdoor play facilities and equipment. The remaining public school teachers (approx. 43%) indicated these facilities were inadequate and listed some needed additional resources.

*Table 14a. Adequate Classroom and Outdoor Play Facilities and Equipment: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	12	75	• Need more materials-tricycles and balls
No	4	25	• Swings, sitting areas, see - saw, bikes (riding equipment), play houses
Total	16	100.0	• Tricycle trail added to our current playground, as well as more tricycles.
			• Balance beam for the playground.

*Table 14b. Adequate Classroom and Outdoor Play Facilities and Equipment: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>If no, what additional resources are needed?</b>
Yes	72	57.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The playground is shared with four kindergarten classes. Several classes are out at the same time. This causes the playground to be crowded at times.</li> <li>• Larger classrooms with ample storage space.</li> <li>• Playground equipment, especially climbing apparati and obstacle course materials, arts and crafts materials, picture books, beginning readers.</li> <li>• Outdoor equipment such as swing set/play center, wagons, tricycles, scooters, paved riding area, and equipment for outside centers.</li> <li>• Toys, equipment, and more space.</li> <li>• We have some materials that will need replacing (balls, sand toys, etc.) for outside play.</li> <li>• We need new classrooms-two 4K classes split one portable unit. With all the learning centers, equipment and materials needed for "at-risk" students, there is no space to work freely without bumping into something, which is frequently what we all do.</li> <li>• We need outside playground equipment: swings, space for playing ball, equipment for seasonal ball sports. We have access to a gym but we need indoor equipment appropriate for children.</li> </ul>
No	54	42.9	
Total	126	100.0	

**Question 15: Satisfaction with classroom and materials grant/award application and approval processes**

The tables associated with question #15 provide information about the teachers' satisfaction with the classroom and materials grant/award application and approval processes established by the South Carolina Office of First Steps (OFS). Table 15a reveals that approximately 81% of private center teacher respondents were satisfied with the process, none of them were dissatisfied, and 19% gave a "don't know" response. Table 15.1a lists the reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction and shows more reasons for satisfaction than dissatisfaction. Because some reasons for dissatisfaction were actually given, we conclude that some of the teachers who responded "don't know" may have been the respondents who gave reasons for being dissatisfied. The two reasons given suggest the need to review the process of ordering, delivery, and payment and the turn-around time.

Table 15.2a lists the materials purchased with CDEPP funds, as reported by the private center teacher respondents. Table 15.3a shows the average cost of CDEPP materials purchased by the private centers to be \$2,406, with a standard deviation of \$4,184.

Table 15b provides information about the satisfaction of teachers in public school programs with the grant/award application and approval process established by the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE). Of the responding teachers, almost 75% said they were satisfied, 11% said they were not satisfied, and about 14% said they did not know. Table 15.1b

lists the reasons for their satisfaction and dissatisfaction and shows close to the same number of reasons in both columns.

Table 15.2b gives a description of materials purchased with CDEPP funds, as reported by public school teacher respondents. Table 15.3b shows the average cost of CDEPP materials purchased by public school programs to be \$4,041, with a standard deviation of \$5,885.

*Table 15a. Satisfaction with Classroom and Materials Grant/Award Application and Approval Process Developed by the OFS: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	13	81.3
No	0	0
Don't know	3	18.7
Total	16	100.0

*Table 15.1a.*

Reasons for satisfaction with the grant/award process	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the grant/award process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Steps gave us the supplies, materials and training needed to implement this program</li> <li>• Teaching much more easy when you have the equipment to work with children are</li> <li>• Children in the center were excited to have a new classroom.</li> <li>• Everything was handled in an organized fashion: a) We received approval for grant/award b) Our First Steps coordinator and local office help decided what was needed and placed the order c) In a matter of weeks (2-3) we received our supplies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application and approval process is efficient, but once received the process of ordering, delivery, payment and the amount of materials needs review. \$10,000.00 does not touch a complete classroom set-up.</li> <li>• Long turn around process</li> </ul>

*Table 15.2a. Description of Materials Purchased with CDEPP funds: Private Center Respondents*

Description of materials purchased with CDEPP funds	No.	Examples of materials purchased	Average Costs	Standard Deviation
Classroom materials	6	puzzles, science manipulatives, outdoors equipment, crayons, bingo, markers, tables, books, chairs, paper, kitchen materials, blocks	2800	4701
Furniture	1	couch, chairs, tables Dividers, cubbies	9500	--
New class	1	Insta-class	3000	-
Technology	1	Computer & hutch	3000	-

*Table 15.3a. Average Cost Spent on CDEPP Materials: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max.</b>
Cost of CDEPP materials purchased	16	2406	4184	1	10000

*Table 15b. Satisfaction with Classroom and Materials Grant/Award Application and Approval Process Developed by the SCDE: Public School Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	93	74.4
No	14	11.2
Don't know	18	14.4
Total	125	100.0

*Table 15.1b.*

<b>Reasons for satisfaction with the grant/award process</b>	<b>Reasons for dissatisfaction with the grant/award process</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A \$10,000 grant per class room was a blessing! CDEP classrooms need to continue to receive this same amount every year. Our program quality would improve immensely.</li> <li>• Ability to give students more materials &amp; equipment to work with</li> <li>• Allowed us to add a classroom and go from half-day to full-day.</li> <li>• Funding allowed me to replace old and tattered materials and the opportunity to purchase additional developmentally appropriate ones.</li> <li>• I am receiving quality goods and resources of which I had absolutely no access to last year.</li> <li>• I am satisfied because it allowed me to select and receive furniture, book, and other developmentally appropriate materials for my classroom.</li> <li>• I am very proud and appreciate the materials I have this year to work with the children. I have never had this support before.</li> <li>• I am very satisfied with the classroom materials. I think the materials are very nice, educational, and appropriate for the student's age, comprehension skills, and height.</li> <li>• Money was adequate to equip classroom although more will be needed annually for consumables.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application and approval process is efficient, but once received the process of ordering, delivery, payment and the amount of materials needs review. \$10,000.00 does not touch a complete classroom set-up.</li> <li>• Long turn around process</li> <li>• Why should it be in the format of a grant? Why can't we just request materials, supplies, or equipment that we need? Why can't we use funds for educational field trips?</li> <li>• A lot of changes needed to be done for a CDEPP classroom and not enough money to meet the needs.</li> <li>• Amount of grant did not cover all items needed.</li> <li>• As a classroom teacher, I would like to participate in educational field trips to correlate with my lesson plans, to directly purchase my own materials, and to use it for parenting skills.</li> <li>• Guidelines need to be more specific as to what we can order.</li> <li>• I think we should have been allowed to purchase what we feel that we need for children. We are the ones with them daily and know exactly what they need in order to succeed.</li> <li>• Not enough money per child.</li> <li>• The application/approval process was a little confusing. We needed to have</li> </ul>

- Received money in a timely manner suggestions were given during instructional review for materials needed
  - Requirements for grants were clear and concise. Materials were ordered and delivered promptly. There were not any hassles or aggravating circumstances involved.
  - The State Department was quick with its approval of the grant. They also were quick with the money getting to our school district to the teachers for materials for our classrooms.
- more specific guidelines on what would be allowed and what would not be allowed to order.
  - We also had classrooms that were starting from scratch and needed everything. That was somewhat overwhelming for those teachers to sit down and make up that order from the catalog. It took a lot of time.
  - We need additional classroom space (come and see for yourself), even though DSS measured and said space was adequate.

*Table 15.2b. Description of Materials Purchased with CDEPP Funds: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

Description of materials purchased with CDEPP funds	No.	Examples of materials purchased	Average Costs	SD
Classroom materials	45	Blocks, folders, glue & art supplies Math, ELA, science, social studies, manipulatives & games, books, multicultural dolls	3842	4190
Playground equipment	19	Tricycles, sand table, storage shed, playground equipment	7164	5838
Furniture	18	Couch, chairs, tables	4437	4706
Technology	10	Computers, cameras, printers	7582	13507
New Classroom	5	Set up a new classroom	8000	4472
Library Need	3	Books, language & literacy materials	2432	2382

*Table 15.3b. Average Cost Spent on CDEPP Materials: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Cost of CDEPP materials purchased	124	4041	5885	0	43000

#### **Question 16: Transportation provided to participating children**

The tables associated with question #16 present information about transportation services for children in the private and public programs. Table 16a reveals that 75% of private center teacher respondents indicated that transportation services are provided to CDEPP children, while 25% reported that such services were not provided. Table 16.1a shows information about private center teachers' satisfaction with transportation services, with 75 % indicating satisfaction and 25% reporting dissatisfaction. Reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction are listed in table 16.2a. One of the salient reasons for dissatisfaction was the rising price of gasoline.

Table 16b indicates whether transportation services are provided to CDEPP children in public school settings. Of the teachers responding, 95% reported that transportation services are provided by their public school programs, whereas about 5% indicated that such services are not provided. According to 16.1b, 80% of the responding teachers reported satisfaction with

these transportation services, while 10% reported dissatisfaction, and 10% had no response. Reasons for their dissatisfaction are listed in Table 16.2b. 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 16a. Transportation Services Provided to CDEPP Children: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	6	75
No	2	25
Total	8	100.0

*Table 16.1a. Satisfaction with Transportation Services: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	6	75
No	2	25
Total	8	100.0

*Table 16.2a.*

<b>Reasons for satisfaction with transportation services</b>	<b>Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation services</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have a bus. Our bus takes and brings the children to and from the school The children are always on time.</li> <li>Transportation services arrival time was in the appropriate time frame to begin my day.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Something is better than nothing at all. The amount we are currently receiving is a help but we're praying for more. The gas prices are unbearable.</li> <li>Need more funding</li> <li>Gas prices may cause this option to be unavailable this fall</li> </ul>

*Table 16b. Transportation Services Provided to CDEPP Children: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	120	95.2
No	6	4.8
Total	126	100.0

*Table 16.1b. Satisfaction with Transportation Services: Public School Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	101	80.2
No	12	9.5
No response	13	10.3
Total	126	100.0

Table 16.2b.

Reasons for satisfaction with transportation services	Reasons for dissatisfaction with transportation services
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 year olds are the last ones to get on the buses with middle school and high school students. I'd like for them to have assigned seats at the front of the bus. Some are on the buses at 6:30 am and not off until after 4:00.</li> <li>• The children are riding with older children (on some buses) up to the fifth grade (at least). I think a bus just for younger children would be safer.</li> <li>• The children ride the bus with the older students. There is not enough supervision for 4 &amp; 5 yr-olds.</li> <li>• There are no safety measures in place to transport smaller k4 students (less than 3 feet tall or 30 pounds.)</li> <li>• These students I feel need their own transportation. The students now ride the same buses the entire student body does.</li> </ul>

## OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

*Question 17: 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 17a lists information about professional development or training activities attended by the private center teacher respondents. The information reveals a variety of activities listed, with the most number of events attended being local and state workshops, followed by state and national conferences. Table 17b provides similar information for the public school teacher respondents. The largest number of events was in the category of school district in-services, followed by local and state workshops and state and national conferences.

*Table 17a. Participation in Professional Development (PD) or Training Activities Related to Early Childhood Education (by August 1, 2007): Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Type of Professional Development or Training Activity for CDEPP teachers</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Total number of events attended</b>	<b>Average Clock hours of Professional Development (rounded to nearest ½ hr)</b>	<b>Minimum Clock hours</b>	<b>Maximum Clock hours</b>
Local and state workshops	16	29	9.0	0	39
Other (specify): CPR	3	12	5.0	0	24
State and National conferences	16	10	6.5	0	48
School district in-services	16	5	1.0	0	16
Release time to observe other classrooms and teachers	16	4	1.5	0	12
Classes or workshops providing re-certification credit	16	2	0	0	0
Classes providing graduate credit	16	0	0	0	0

*Table 17b. Participation in Professional Development (PD) or Training Activities Related to Early Childhood Education (by August 1, 2007): Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Type of Professional Development or Training Activity for CDEPP teachers</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Total number of events attended</b>	<b>Average Clock hours of Professional Development (rounded to nearest ½ hour)</b>	<b>Minimum Clock hours</b>	<b>Maximum Clock hours</b>
School district in-services	126	527	19	0	112
Local and state workshops	126	400	15	0	120
State and National conferences	121	219	13	0	84
Classes or workshops providing re-certification credit	123	140	18	0	160
Classes providing graduate credit	126	111	8	0	120
Release time to observe other	126	37	1	0	16

classrooms and teachers					
Other	118	20	3.5	0	120

**Question 18: Satisfaction with the professional development and training activities for CDEPP staff**

Table 18a reveals that 100% of the private center teacher respondents reported being satisfied satisfaction with professional development and training activities provided by the OFS. (Note, however, that the number of teachers responding to this particular question was 14, not the 16 total number of private center teacher respondents.) Specific reasons for their satisfaction are listed in Table 18.1a.

Table 18b reveals that 76% of public school teacher respondents reported being satisfied with the professional development and training activities provided by the SCDE, while 24% reported not being satisfied. According to Table 18.1b, some of the reasons for dissatisfaction were that in-services need to be offered in more regions of the state (i.e., the Low Country), that more one-on-one consultation time is needed, that more time is needed on specific curricula, that some of the training was not well organized, and that some of the training required too much time away from the CDEPP classroom.

*Table 18a. Satisfaction with the Professional Development and Training Activities Provided by the OFS for CDEPP Staff: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	100
No	0	0
Total	14	100

*Table 18.1a*

Reasons for satisfaction with professional development opportunities	Reasons for dissatisfaction with professional development opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Steps gave us training in all areas of the program from implementing the curriculum to testing and observing the child's developmental progress</li> <li>• I have learned a lot from First Steps training activities, and now I am beginning to put them to use in the classroom.</li> <li>• This effort provides my center a structural outline for our "plan", "do" and "review" process when dealing with the total family network.</li> <li>• Many ideas and other information were shared during training, which helped a lot once it was used in my own classroom.</li> <li>• The training activities given by First Steps are great learning tools. The workshops help broaden your train of</li> </ul>	

thought in ways you could not even think of. First Steps work shops are A+ in my book.

- I learned a lot from the professional development training activities provided by First Steps. I was able to network with other lead teachers and receive graduate and DSS credit hours.
- I have learned a lot and was given great ideas to implement in my classroom
- They informed us of a lot of ways to help children learn.

*Table 18b. Satisfaction with the Professional Development and Training Activities Provided by the SCDE for CDEPP Staff: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	89	76.1
No	28	23.9
Total	117	100

*Table 18.1b*

Reasons for satisfaction with professional development opportunities	Reasons for dissatisfaction with professional development opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educated/informative information; examples on implementing ideas; support from staff.</li> <li>• Excellent organization, excellent instruction, excellent discussion, excellent leadership.</li> <li>• Hands-on learning on how to collect documentation and "how to" access and work on-line with work sampling information.</li> <li>• High Scope training was the most rewarding &amp; informative class I've ever had! Thank you!</li> <li>• I am satisfied with the State Department of Education professional development activities because they were all relevant to Early Childhood education and the information helped me to implement my program.</li> <li>• I received very valuable information about the CDEPP and innovative ideas/suggestions that I can implement in my classroom.</li> <li>• The in-services provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching assistants should be trained. Some workshops were not organized.</li> <li>• I do not feel that it adequately prepared me for the work I need to do in my classroom.</li> <li>• In-services need to be held in the low country as well as the upstate.</li> <li>• Need more one-on-one time with consultations.</li> <li>• Our teaching assistants should have attended as well. It is vital that both teacher and assistant be knowledgeable of the curriculum.</li> <li>• Repeated same information over and over. Needed more hands-on, less theory.</li> </ul> <p>Curriculum Specific</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional in-depth training on Work Sampling</li> <li>• Assistants need training in Creative Curriculum, Work Sampling; Need additional Work Sampling training</li> <li>• High Scope training caused me to be out of my classroom 4 weeks; That was</li> </ul>

developmentally appropriate practice for four year-olds.	too much lost instructional time. This defeated the purpose of the program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State Department had a variety of speakers for the conferences. Also, there were many topics to which to choose from to attend.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dial 3 training was not organized, instructors were not prepared. Most of the time instructors were confused trying to work video equipment.</li> </ul>

**Question 19: Technical assistance received for CDEPP classrooms**

The tables associated with question #19 present information related to technical assistance received, as reported by private center and public school program teacher respondents. According to Table 19a, 79% of the private center respondents reported receiving technical assistance; 21% reported that they had not received technical assistance. According to Table 19.1a, 57% of the respondents reported receiving face-to-face technical assistance, 43% in group meetings, 14% online or through e-mail, and 64% by telephone. In terms of location of the technical assistance, 43% reported that it was at state or regional meetings, 14% reported that it was school-based, 50% said it was classroom-based, and 14% said it was district-wide. With respect to source/provider of the assistance, 72% reported that it was a First Steps regional coordinator, 7% reported it was SCDE personnel, 21% said it was DSS personnel, 7% reported it was school district personnel, and 7% reported receiving the assistance from university personnel. The focus of the technical assistance was curricular issues (50%), classroom environment (64%), child development (64%), child behavior issues (36%) and other (parent information) (7%).

Table 19b indicates that, of the public school CDEPP teachers responding, 84% reported having received technical assistance, while 16% reported that they had not. Table 19.1b presents information about the mode, location, source/provider and focus of the technical assistance received. In terms of the mode, 57% reported receiving face-to-face assistance, 56% reported receiving the assistance in group meetings, 48% reported receiving the assistance online or through e-mail, and 26% reported receiving it via telephone. The locations of the technical assistance were state or regional meetings (58%), school-based (46%), classroom-based (46%), and district-wide (40%). The source/provider of the assistance was state agency personnel (68%), school district personnel (44%), private consultants (15%), university personnel (9%), and the national technical assistance center (3%). The focus of the assistance was curricular issues (59%), the classroom environment (56%), child development (41%), child behavior issues (29%), and Other (9%).

**Table 19a. Received Technical Assistance: Private Center Teacher Respondents**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	11	78.6
No	3	21.4
Total	14	100.0

**Table 19.1a. Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Received: Private Center Teacher Respondents**

<b>Mode</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=14)</b>
Face-to-face	8	57.1
Group meeting	6	42.8
Internet/email	2	14.3
Telephone	9	64.3

<b>Location</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=14)</b>
State or regional meeting	6	43.4
School-based	2	14.3
Classroom-based	7	50.0
District-wide	2	14.3

<b>Source/Provider</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=14)</b>
First Steps regional coordinator	10	72.4
SCDOE personnel	1	7.1
DSS personnel	3	21.4
School district personnel	1	7.1
Private consultant	0	0
University personnel	1	7.1
National Technical Assistance Center	0	0

<b>Focus</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=14)</b>
Curricular issues	7	50.0
Classroom environment	9	64.3
Child Development	9	64.3
Child behavior issues	5	35.7
Other:	1	7.1
• Parents		

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

*Table 19b. Received Technical Assistance: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	99	83.9
No	19	16.1
Total	118	100.0

*Table 19.1b Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Received: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Mode</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
Face-to-face	72	57.1
Group meeting	71	56.2
Internet/email	61	48.4
Telephone	33	26.2

<b>Location</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
State or regional meeting	73	57.9
School-based	58	46.0
Classroom-based	58	46.0
District-wide	50	39.7

Source/Provider	Frequency	Percent (N=126)
State agency personnel	85	67.5
School district personnel	55	43.7
Private consultant	19	15.1
University personnel	11	8.7
National Technical Assistance Center	4	3.2

Focus	Frequency	Percent (N=126)
Curricular issues	74	58.7
Classroom environment	70	55.6
Child Development	51	40.5
Child behavior issues	37	29.4
Other:		
• Assessment		
• PBIS	11	8.7
• Record keeping		
• Work Sampling		

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

#### **Question 20: *Technical assistance preferred for CDEPP classrooms.***

The tables associated with question #20 present information related to technical assistance that is preferred by private center and public school program teacher respondents. Table 20a presents information about the mode, location, source/provider and focus of the technical assistance preferred, according to private center teacher respondents. In terms of the mode, 62% reported a preference for face-to-face assistance, 50% for group meetings, 19% for telephone, and 6.3% for both online assistance and “other.” The locations of the technical assistance preferred by private center teacher respondents were classroom (50%), state or regional meetings (38%), school-based (19%), and district-wide (13%). The preferred sources/providers were First Steps regional coordinators (56%), university personnel (19%), DSS personnel (6%), and Other (such as Head Start staff) (6%). The preferred focus of the technical assistance was curricular issues (63%), classroom environment (50%), child behavior issues (44%), child development (19%), and information about parents (6%).

Table 20b presents information about the mode, location, source/provider, and focus preferred by public school CDEPP teacher respondents. Of those responding, 68% reported a preference for face-to-face technical assistance, 54% for online or e-mail information, 53% for group meetings, 17% for telephone assistance, and close to 1% for “Other” modes of assistance. The preferred locations of the technical assistance were school-based (61%), classroom-based (54%), district-wide (46%), and state or regional state or regional meetings (36%). The preferred sources/providers of the assistance for these respondents was state agency personnel (46%), school district personnel (49%), private consultants (30%), university personnel (16%), the national technical assistance center (11%), and Other (4%). The preferred focus of technical assistance was classroom environment (62%), curricular issues (59%), child behavior issues (56%), and child development (52%)..

*Table 20a. Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Preferred: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Mode</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Face-to-face	10	62.5
Group meeting	8	50.0
Telephone	3	18.8
Internet/email	1	6.3
Other	1	6.3
<b>Location</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Classroom-based	8	50.0
State or regional meeting	6	37.5
School-based	3	18.8
District-wide	2	12.5
<b>Source/Provider</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
First Steps regional coordinator	9	56.3
University personnel	3	18.8
DSS personnel	1	6.3
Other:	1	6.3
• Head Start staff		
State Department of Education personnel	0	-
School district personnel	0	-
Private consultant	0	-
National Technical Assistance Center	0	-
<b>Focus</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Curricular issues	10	62.5
Classroom environment	8	50.0
Child behavior issues	7	43.8
Child Development	3	18.8
Other:	1	6.3
• Parents		

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

*Table 20b. Mode, Location, Source, and Focus of Technical Assistance Preferred: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Mode</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
Face-to-face	85	67.5
Internet/email	68	54.0
Group meeting	67	53.2
Telephone	21	16.7
Other	1	0.7
<b>Location</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>

School-based	77	61.1
Classroom-based	68	54.0
District-wide	58	46.0
State or regional meeting	45	35.7

Source/Provider	Frequency	Percent (N=126)
State agency personnel	68	46.0
School district personnel	62	49.2
Private consultant	38	30.2
University personnel	20	15.9
National Technical Assistance Center	14	11.1
Other:		
• Doesn't matter	5	4.0
• ECE Regional Coordinator		

Focus	Frequency	Percent (N=126)
Classroom environment	78	61.9
Curricular issues	74	58.7
Child behavior issues	70	55.6
Child Development	67	52.2
Other:	1	0.7
• Assessment		

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 21: Type of involvement in CDEPP by parents or adult family members of enrolled children.*

Table 21a provides information about the type of onsite involvement for parents or adult family members in private center programs. The private center teacher respondents reported a wide range of ways that parents or other adult family members are involved. Approximately 63% of respondents reported that parents assisted in the classrooms. While approximately 56% reported that parents participated in parent education programs and/or family learning activities. The public school program teacher respondents also reported a wide range of ways that parents or adult family members are involved. Approximately 84% reported that parents assisted on field trips. While approximately 79% reported that parents assisted in special events for their program. Approximately 70% reported that parents participated in family learning opportunities.

*Table 21a. Type of Onsite Involvement for Parents or Adult Family Members of CDEPP Children: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Type of involvement</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Assisting in the classroom	10	62.5
Participating in parent education	9	56.3
Participating in family learning activities	9	56.3
Assisting on field trips	7	43.8
Assisting in special events at center	7	43.8
Making or providing classroom materials at center	5	31.3
Participating in Even Start or other family literacy programs	5	31.3
Assisting by working in the center outside of the classroom	4	25.0
Making or providing classroom materials at home	3	18.8
Participating in lending library for parents	2	12.5
Other (specify): Parent Committee meetings	1	6.3

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

*Table 21b. Type of Onsite Involvement for Parents or Adult Family Members of CDEPP Children: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Type of involvement</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
Assisting on field trips	106	84.1
Assisting in special events at center	100	79.4
Participating in family learning activities	88	69.8
Assisting in the classroom	81	64.3
Participating in parent education	75	59.5
Participating in lending library for parents	59	46.8
Making or providing classroom materials at center	56	44.4
Making or providing classroom materials at home	44	34.9
Participating in Even Start or other family literacy programs	43	34.1
Assisting by working in the center outside of the classroom	34	27.0
Other (specify): Community meetings held on Fridays	2	1.6

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

***Question 22: Supplemental health and social services provided or referred for by CDEP programs to CDEPP participating children.***

The tables associated with question 22 provide information about the provision and referral for supplemental health and social services for CDEPP participating children by CDEP programs, according to private center and public school program teacher respondents. Approximately 56% of private center teacher respondents reported providing or referring for supplemental health and social services for children participating in their CDEP programs. Table 22.1a shows the types of services either provided or referred for by these private center CDEP programs. Approximately 85% of public school program teacher respondents reported

providing or referring for supplemental health and social services for children participating in their CDEPP. Table 22.1b shows the types of services either provided or referred for by these public school CDEP programs.

*Table 22a. Program Provides or Refers for Supplemental Health and Social Services for CDEPP Participating Children: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	9	56.3
No	5	31.3
No response	2	12.5
Total	16	100

*Table 22.1a. Types of Services to CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Type of Service</b>	<b>Provided Service Directly</b>		<b>Provide Referral for Service</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Speech and hearing screenings and services	2	12.5	13	81.3
Dental screenings and services	3	18.8	9	56.3
Vision screenings and services	4	25.0	8	50.0
Counselor or social worker	2	12.5	7	43.8
Consultation on individual children's behavior and social-emotional development	1	6.3	7	43.8
Occupational Therapy/Physical Therapy and other related screenings and services	1	6.3	7	43.8

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

*Table 22b. Program Provides or Refers for Supplemental Health and Social Services for CDEPP Participating Children: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	107	84.9
No	12	9.5
No response	7	5.6
Total	126	100

*Table 22.1b. Types of Services to CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=126)	Frequency	Percent (N=126)
Speech and hearing screenings and services	100	79.4	48	38.1
Dental screenings and services	50	39.7	65	51.6
Vision screenings and services	87	69.0	46	36.5
Counselor or social worker	80	63.5	51	40.5
Consultation on individual children's behavior and social-emotional development	51	40.5	62	49.2
Occupational Therapy/Physical Therapy and other related screenings and services	56	44.4	52	41.3
Other: Medical Services				
Applied Behavior Therapy	1	0.8	1	0.8

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

*Question 23: Program provides or refers **families** of CDEPP participating children for supplemental health, education, social, and support services*

The tables associated with question 23 provide information about the provision and referral for supplemental health, education, social, and support services to families of CDEPP participating children by CDEP programs, according to private center and public school program teacher respondents. Approximately 38% of private center teacher 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 23.1a). Approximately 65% of public school program teacher respondents reported providing or referring for supplemental health and social services for families of their CDEPP participating children. Table 23.1b shows the types of services either provided or referred for by these public school CDEP programs.

*Table 23a. Programs Provide or Refer for Supplemental Health and Social Services for Families of CDEPP Participating Children: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	37.5
No	3	18.8
No response	7	43.8
Total	16	100

*Table 23.1a. Types of Services to CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=16)	Frequency	Percent (N=16)
Substance abuse services	1	6.3	6	37.5
Psychological/mental health services	5	31.3	8	50.0
Extended childcare hours	1	6.3	7	43.8
Health related services	6	37.5	7	43.8
Continuing education/GED/vocational education training	2	12.5	7	43.8
Family counseling	2	12.5	5	31.3

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

*Table 23b. Programs Provide or Refer for Supplemental Health and Social Services for Families of CDEPP Participating Children: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	82	65.1
No	27	21.4
No response	17	13.5
Total	126	100

*Table 23.1b. Types of Services to CDEPP Children Provided Directly by Program or Through Referral to Other Entities: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

Type of Service	Provided Service Directly		Provide Referral for Service	
	Frequency	Percent (N=126)	Frequency	Percent (N=126)
Substance abuse services	3	2.3	36	28.6
Psychological/mental health services	2	1.6	51	40.5
Extended childcare hours	33	26.2	34	26.9
Health related services	14	11.1	48	38.1
Continuing education/GED/vocational education training	27	21.4	48	38.1
Family counseling	16	12.7	52	41.3

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

**Question 24: Number and location of parent/teacher conferences for each CDEPP child per year.**

The tables associated with question 24 provide information about the number and location of parent/teacher conferences for each CDEPP child per year, according to teacher respondents from private center and public school programs. Private center teacher respondents reported conducting an average of approximately 2 parent/teacher conferences per child per year with a standard deviation of approximately 2 conferences. In response to the question: "where do these conferences typically occur?" private teacher respondents most frequently reported the location as being at the center (approx. 88%). However, in reviewing the

results from table 24.1a, it is possible that these teachers may have selected more than one answer to this question. Public school program teacher respondents reported conducting an average of 3.9 parent/teacher conferences per child per year with a standard deviation of approximately 2 conferences. The most frequently reported location for these conferences was the school (approx. 98%). However, it is possible that the public school teacher respondents also may have selected more than one answer to this question (see table 24.1b).

*Table 24a. Number of Parent/Teacher Conferences for Each CDEPP Child per Year: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Parent/Teacher Conferences Per Year	16	2.1	1.8	2	0	8

*24.1a. Location of Parent/Teacher Conferences: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
At school/center	14	87.5
At home	12	75
Other community setting	4	25

*Table 24b. Number of Parent/Teacher Conferences for Each CDEPP Child per Year: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Parent/Teacher Conferences Per Year	126	3.9	1.9	4	0	15

*24.1b. Location of Parent/Teacher Conferences: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
At school/center	123	97.6
At home	87	69.0
Other community setting	1	0.8

**Question 25: Home visits conducted for CDEPP children.**

The tables associated with question 25 present information related to the home visits conducted for children enrolled in private center and public school CDEP programs, according to private center and public school program teacher respondents. Of the private center teachers, approximately 81% reported conducting home visits for their CDEPP children. The average number of home visits for students enrolled in these private center program classrooms was 2 with a standard deviation of 0.64. Of the public school program teachers, approximately 93% reported conducting home visits for their CDEPP children. The average number of home visits for students enrolled in these public school program classrooms is 2 with a standard deviation of 3.1.

*Table 25a. Home Visits Conducted for CDEPP Children: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	13	81.3
No	0	0
No response	3	18.8
Total	16	100

*Table 25.1a. Number of Home Visits for Each CDEPP Child per year: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Number of home visits per child per year	13	2	0.64	1.9	1	3

*Table 25b. Home Visits Conducted for CDEPP Children: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	117	92.9
No	9	7.1
No response	0	0
Total	126	100

*Table 25.1b. Number of Home Visits for Each CDEPP Child per year: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
Number of home visits per child per year	117	2.4	3.1	2	0	20

## **CHILD AND PROGRAM EVALUATION**

### ***Question 26: Satisfaction with curricula approved for use in CDEPP classrooms.***

Table 26a shows that 100% of private center teacher respondents reported being satisfied with the curriculum models approved for use in CDEPP classrooms by the OFS. Table 26.1a lists reasons for their satisfaction with the approved curriculum models. There were no reasons given for dissatisfaction.

Table 26b shows that approximately 93% of public school program teacher respondents reported being satisfied with the curriculum models approved for use in CDEPP classrooms by the SCDE, while 7% reported not being satisfied. Table 26.1b lists reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction given by the public school program teacher respondents. The reasons for satisfaction with the approved curriculum models are numerous, but these teacher respondents did articulate some reasons for dissatisfaction.

*Table 26a. Satisfaction with Curricula Approved by the OFS for use in CDEPP Classrooms:  
Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	14	100
No	0	0
Total	14	100.0

*Table 26. 1a.*

<b>Reasons for satisfaction with the approved curricula</b>	<b>Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approved curricula</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already using High Scope.</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum is a developmental curriculum. This curriculum meets the needs of children on all levels.</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum is a program that we had to adopt, learn and implement. I understand why we do what we do and I'm comfortable with it.</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum provides ample opportunities for learning.</li> <li>• I find the Creative Curricula to be creative and very educational at the same time. I like it because the children are playing and don't even know that they are learning through play</li> <li>• I was already familiar with this curriculum. It was a much easier adjustment for this reason.</li> <li>• Our program currently utilizes the High Scope curriculum in all our classrooms not just for 4-K expansion children.</li> <li>• Our program uses one of the curricula approved by the office of First Steps. I had prior training in the past.</li> <li>• This curriculum is aligned with South Carolina State standards, with a lesson plan format developed by Creative Curriculum. Also training showed us how to implement, plan, evaluate, and test by using DIAL 3.</li> <li>• We already use High Scope. We didn't have to change much</li> <li>• We are currently using High Scope curriculum and Hand Writing without Tears. We have been pleased with both at this time.</li> <li>• We use High Scope</li> <li>• We would like for CDEP to enforce what they say</li> </ul>	<p>No reasons given for dissatisfaction.</p>

- Whole-child learning
- Yes, because with the Creative Curriculum it is child centered and supports the active learning of young children,

*Table 26b. Satisfaction with Curricula Approved by the SCDE for use in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	112	93.3
No	8	6.7
Total	120	100.0

*Table 26.1b.*

Reasons for satisfaction with the approved curricula	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approved curricula
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child centered; standard based; age appropriate</li> <li>• Children are allowed opportunities to explore on their own.</li> <li>• Comprehensive</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum-It involves the student in a number of interesting creative activities. High Scope- Good curriculum because the students are involved and learning takes place.</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum focuses on interest areas</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum has helped me to set up my classroom in a more developmentally appropriate way and to also assess my students better.</li> <li>• Creative curriculum focuses on the whole child. It allows children to be who they are. They are looked at in a positive way.</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum is a developmentally appropriate curriculum</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum if we can implement to the fidelity of the model.</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum is a socialization development curriculum that is what a lot of children we serve needs to get started on becoming productive citizens</li> <li>• Creative Curriculum is a study based curriculum focus on the 4 main developmental stages of young</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't have enough time to do everything/I can't do it all.</li> <li>• Not enough rigors.</li> <li>• I like High / Scope curriculum, but there are too many things we are required to implement (high / Scope, Anderson 5, Work Sampling, South Carolina Standards) and most of them contradict each other.</li> <li>• I feel that some teachers have a difficult time planning dev. app. activities. I am not in favor of a curriculum that gives step by step directions, but feel that it might be beneficial for teachers who do not know how to plan.</li> <li>• Not enough time for planning.</li> <li>• Other curriculum has proven equally useful.</li> <li>• OWLS and Creative Curriculum provide adequate activities and skills.</li> <li>• Should have been trained first before trying to use it.</li> <li>• There is not one curriculum that is totally good in itself. A highly qualified, national board certified teacher should be able to use her expertise to combine the good from the different curricula.</li> <li>• Too many different curricula expected to be implemented that contradict each other. If training teachers in High</li> </ul>

---

children.

- Creative curriculum is a wonderful age and developmentally appropriate curriculum. I am greatly pleased with it.
- Creative curriculum is developmentally appropriate for 4k students
- Creative Curriculum is theoretically sound and developmentally appropriate.
- Creative Curriculum is wonderful for this age group. It allows for children's interests.
- Creative Curriculum meets the needs of the young child.
- Creative Curriculum provides developmentally appropriate activities that cover a variety of learning styles.
- Developmentally appropriate-creative curriculum.
- Developmentally appropriate; Creative curriculum; researched based
- Developmentally appropriate
- Easy to comprehend, gives students levels of growth, focus on the whole child.
- Good social interactions.
- Developmentally appropriate; user-friendly guide
- Good workshops about classroom management.
- High Scope is a developmentally appropriate curriculum and it is research-based. I believe in it!
- High Scope which is approved and researched based
- I'm satisfied because the district can choose the curriculum (creative curriculum, or high scope) that best fits the needs of our children. The curriculum allows for hands-on activities and student creativity. It builds on what the child already knows. It builds self confidence.
- I'm still learning the curriculum and have no complaints. It is very flexible to meet students' needs.
- I am a Montessori teacher. I would like to see the Montessori Curricula receive.

scope, allow us to implement it. We are being asked to implement high scope, work sampling, Anderson 5 and state standards. Allow us to implement one. Others may be used as a reference.

- We have not had any training on the curriculum we have chosen

- 
- I am enjoying using Creative Curriculum. And want to use it to the fullest
  - I am satisfied with the curricula because it allows the children to be creative on paper.
  - I am enjoying using the Creative Curriculum, if I can teach it to the fullest.
  - I am pleased with High Scope because it is developmentally appropriate for the students.
  - I am trained in the curricula the State Department of Education endorses.
  - I am satisfied with Creative Curriculum. All of the CC resource books given to me are very helpful. It is complete-giving many practical strategies for good teaching and caring for preschoolers.
  - I am satisfied with the curricula approved the state department because it meets the needs of the students and it is developmentally appropriate.
  - I believe in Montessori. It provides education for every child.
  - I believe that the Creative Curriculum approach has worked very well for my students' classrooms and for myself. It goes right along with how children learn best.
  - I can utilize the curriculum and appreciate the training
  - I enjoyed implementing Creative Curriculum but will enjoy it more when I can implement completely.
  - I had a great "Creative Curriculum" class and I love the Creative Curriculum!
  - I have nothing to compare it to since this is my first year of teaching.
  - I like Creative Curriculum; however, I wish I could make it a more prescribed curriculum with room to deviate according to children's development. I like the structure of the curriculum.
  - I have seen growth and development in my students throughout this school year is using Creative Curriculum.
-

- 
- I like High / Scope & I have been trained. In my classroom High / Scope has proven to work.
  - I like using a dev. appropriate research based curricula.
  - I like the curriculum approved because I feel like it is child centered and can lead them openly (when I want to) to certain areas I may want to discuss with them.
  - I love using the High/Scope Curriculum model.
  - I think that Creative Curriculum is good because it focuses on the whole child.
  - I think the high scope approach is wonderful. It is also correlated to state standards.
  - I was very impressed with the High Scope training. It has helped me see my classroom & students in a different way. I feel more confident in my teaching ability.
  - It creates and maintains a physical setting that encourages active learning experiences. It provides a consistent daily routine and is developmentally appropriate.
  - It gives children the opportunity to do hands-on activities, be in charge of their own learning, and be creative.
  - It is developmentally appropriate
  - It is developmentally appropriate for the children, but guidelines need to be more specific.
  - It is new to me and I like it.
  - It is the complete program that is good for the children.
  - It meets the developmental needs of my children; Instruction is based on interest of children
  - It promotes child-centered environments
  - It provides a great education for those children entering school. They receive the necessary skills in order to move on to the next level.
  - It provides developmentally appropriate activities that cover multiple areas.
  - It seems to meet their needs and
-

---

contributes to their development effectively.

- meets developmental needs of my children
  - Meets students' needs.
  - meets the developmental needs of all children
  - Meets the developmental needs of my children
  - Montessori was allowed to be kept on.
  - Montessori. I truly believe this is for every child! I love teaching it and I love to watch the students become independent learners.
  - My program is Montessori
  - Our school district has chosen to implement creative curriculum. We have not been trained yet. Therefore, I'm not sure whether I'll be satisfied or not.
  - Provides excellent experiences for the developing child.
  - Research-based.
  - Seems to cover all areas of development and meets the needs of the whole child.
  - The Creative Curriculum is a great curriculum for my classroom. It extends on children's learning as well as including students to help become good citizens in the classroom and at home.
  - You really get to know the students and identify their strengths and weaknesses. Plus it is also developmentally appropriate and meets each child's needs.
  - The Creative Curriculum is a wonderful curriculum for hands-on learning.
  - The creative curriculum is developmentally appropriate for four year olds.
  - The Creative Curriculum is very appropriate for our children
  - The curriculum allows the children to develop at their own rate and it is developmentally appropriate.
  - The creative curriculum provides developmental appropriate practices
-

---

for children

- The curriculum used in my classroom is Creative Curriculum. I am very pleased with the choice and have enjoyed implementing it into my classroom.
  - The curricula affords students many opportunities for exploration. It is also developmentally appropriate for early learners.
  - The curriculum is child centered and the focus is on the child and family.
  - The curriculum gives a complete outline, research, and activities that are age-appropriate.
  - The curriculum is researched based. It is age appropriate as well as developmentally appropriate for young children.
  - The curriculum is very flexible and it can be easily used along with our students needs.
  - The high scope curriculum is research and practice based and designed specifically for the young child's social, emotional, physical, and conceptual development.
  - The High Scope Curriculum helps to develop the whole child. It starts where the child is and continues to move the child upward. It works for all students.
  - The high scope curriculum is developmentally appropriate and it encourages the children to be independent in making choices.
  - The state allowed us to choose our own curriculum.
  - This curriculum allows for each child to learn at his/her own pace.
  - They meet the children's needs.
  - very child centered
  - We are using Creative curriculum. This allows the children to learn about topics they are interested.
  - Very easy to follow
  - We had a choice of which curriculum to use.
  - We have been using Creative Curriculum for a couple of years. We
-

- 
- are continually learning more about it.
  - We have not had training
  - We use High Scope and it is research-based.
  - We were used to the High Scope Model and the state department allowed us to keep it-it worked.
  - Would like more training to strengthen my skills in implementing the GSGS with HS
  - Yes I am satisfied with the curricula it has all of the components needed to implement an early childhood development program.
  - Yes, it gives the children more choices and more hands-on activities.
- 

**Question 27: Satisfaction with assessments approved for use in CDEPP classrooms.**

Table 27a reveals that approximately 93% of private center teacher respondents reported being satisfied with the assessments approved for use in CDEPP classrooms by the OFS. Table 27.1a lists reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the approved assessments. Only one respondent listed a reason for dissatisfaction with the approved assessments. This reason relates to the amount of time it takes to get assessment results back.

Table 27b shows that approximately 66% of public school program teacher respondents reported being satisfied with the assessments approved for use in CDEPP classrooms by the SCDE, while approximately 35% reported not being satisfied. Table 27.1b lists reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction given by the public school program teacher respondents. The most common reasons for dissatisfaction with the approved assessments are that the assessment processes are too time consuming, that the assessment information is not parent friendly, and that the training to use the assessment system was not provided until after school had already started.

*Table 27a. Satisfaction with the Assessments Approved by the OFS for use in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	93.3
No	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

*Table 27.1a.*

Reasons for satisfaction with the approved assessments	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approved assessments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because they are clear and easy to follow</li> <li>• Currently use Dial 3</li> <li>• good communication</li> <li>• It gives me an opportunity to briefly see what/where children need more exposure to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of assessments take a very long time to come back.</li> </ul>

---

- Like all assessments it's just a measuring tool that can be used to evaluate and make adjustments.
- Our program already utilizes the ECERS-R for classroom environment observations/assessment. We also use the ELLCO periodically along with annual self-assessment.
- Our program used the Dial 3. We had a representative from AGS foundation.
- The assessment approved by First Steps correlates with the assessment of the State Early Childhood Program
- Through training, I enjoyed the assessment process! I was able to use teacher observations, portfolios, checklists, progress reports, DIAL 3, and checking for understanding educational learning techniques.
- Use DIAL 3.
- We use Dial 3 already
- We use EKERS and EDERS assessments. We feel that these assessments provide insight into areas without our program that could use improvement and how to approach each area for success.

*Table 27b. Satisfaction with Assessments Approved by the SCDE for use in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	76	65.5
No	40	34.5
Total	116	100.0

*Table 27.1b*

Reasons for satisfaction with the approved assessments	Reasons for dissatisfaction with the approved assessments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• But, I wish I would have had work sampling training before school began in order to prepare for assessment</li> <li>• Comprehensive and developmentally appropriate</li> <li>• Continuous; authentic</li> <li>• Doesn't rely on one method</li> <li>• ERF Checklist provide information on the achievement of each student</li> <li>• Getting to know our children better.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much extra paperwork - writing and typing; too many extra classroom visits and evaluations; a lot of extra work; too many restraints.</li> <li>• Although we're watching the children, it takes away valuable learning time from the students.</li> <li>• Assignment tool is sufficient. We do not need to be doing double work.</li> <li>• Confusing to parents, not parent</li> </ul>

- 
- Helps with scaffolding (knowing where children are and taking them higher).
  - Helps you to really know your children
  - I am allowed to assess my children openly and with whatever type of assessment may fit the particular skill (checklist, oral discussions, pictures, etc.)
  - I am fortunate to have been to the FPG Child Development Institute for a short course in ECERS, which the CDEPP model is based on (3 days with intense training/instruction by the authors), as well as regional and state trainings.
  - I am satisfied because there is sufficient funds to improve my classroom. There are plenty of materials to work with and plenty computers and furniture
  - I am satisfied but I am still trying to implement it in my classroom.
  - I am satisfied with the assessment because it measures or covers every area of the child's ability to learn and the areas in the classroom (kitchen / housekeeping area, art area, etc.
  - I enjoy collecting student work to assess their growth
  - I have nothing to compare it to since this is my first year of teaching.
  - I like being able to show a child's growth through evidence. I'm also happy with the online work sampling assessment. (However, it is time-consuming!)
  - I really like the Work Sampling system because you can see what the students can do at what level they're at in order to move them upward.
  - Individualized, concise, comprehensive and developmentally appropriate.
  - It covers all the area of a well developed program.
  - It helps you to really know your children.
  - It involves the teacher and the assistant really getting to know the student. It is an in-depth assessment.
  - It is a continual assessment tool
- friendly, extremely vague, takes too much time to create reports because you have to cut and paste.
- I do not feel that the Work Sampling report gives the parents an accurate assessment.
  - I do not like having to put documentation on line. The check-list and summaries are fine, but documentation should be kept on-site. Too time consuming with the other programs in my room (TBS, Early Reading 1st).
  - I do not like Post Dial 3.
  - I do not think our training was adequate (Work Sampling for example).
  - I do not like the work sampling online. It's too general, not specific enough.
  - I feel that completing a report card on Integrate Pro gave the parents more information on their child's progress. Work Sampling does not let the parents know about letter recognition, number recognition, etc.... Work Sampling reports seem to be a bit vague.
  - I feel that creative curriculum assessments done on-line are sufficient. We do not need to back it up with work sampling. One assessment tool is sufficient. We do not need to be doing double work. Creative Curriculum, work sampling, and State Standards all align with one another.
  - I like checklist; notes on-line are time consuming.
  - I think the assessment used is very time consuming.
  - I think the Creative Curriculum assessments done on line are sufficient. We do not need to do work sampling with it.
  - It's time consuming. The assessment (work sampling) is too broad and not specific.
  - It is confusing to parents and extremely vague. It takes too much time to write narratives on each individual student.
  - It does not give the parents good/clear
-

- 
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a systematic and proven strategy for data collection that helps me assess where my students are and plan for instruction.</li> <li>• It is a very good checklist and easy to follow.</li> <li>• It is an assessment procedure based on observations of the children's interest, needs, and behaviors. The assessment is developmentally appropriate.</li> <li>• It is appropriate</li> <li>• It is new to me. I was a teacher's assistant before and the teacher I worked with did most of the assessments therefore, I really do not have anything to compare it to.</li> <li>• It will help me to see the growth in a child, and what I need to work on more.</li> <li>• Makes me aware of what I need to improve.</li> <li>• Meets students' needs</li> <li>• mostly easy to use</li> <li>• Portfolio assessment reflects appropriate practice for child development as well as assesses on individual needs.</li> <li>• Portfolio assessments document specific skills learned by students</li> <li>• Research based/but very time consuming</li> <li>• Provides me with an outlook of how to improve my classroom as well as myself and better serve my children.</li> <li>• Standards are the basis for our assessment. We see the checklist and know what we need to cover.</li> <li>• The assessments are a good tool to keep up with my students' progress and identify any problems or struggles my students may have. The assessments show my students strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• The assessments are age appropriate.</li> <li>• The assessments provide teachers an in-depth look at the students. It is a good diagnostic tool.</li> <li>• The checklist is thorough. It will take time to become comfortable using it.</li> </ul> | <p>insight on how their child is doing in class</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is very confusing to parents- many can not read, very vague report, time consuming to create report.</li> <li>• It is very time consuming; the on-line has had problems and could not be used - then we had to push to meet deadline.</li> <li>• It requires a great deal of writing.</li> <li>• Lack of time to fully use and scan stuff into</li> <li>• Needed training prior to school opening rather than mid-year.</li> <li>• Not given assessments to know what to improve.</li> <li>• Not parent-friendly and extremely vague. Time consuming when having to do student narratives, creating reports.</li> <li>• Observational notes are a pain.</li> <li>• They are very time-consuming (Portfolios and Anecdotal notes). I also feel the on-line Work Sampling is very broad.</li> <li>• Should not have to do district report card as well. Skills should be correlated and one method only used for state/district assessment</li> <li>• Time consuming - Documentation is hard to provide in all domains for all children.</li> <li>• The assessment is very long - shorter version of the assessment.</li> <li>• Time consuming; some documentation is hard to provide for the domains.</li> <li>• Time consuming; documentation is hard to provide for all domains for all children</li> <li>• Too much observation; time consuming.</li> <li>• Too much paperwork; Takes time away from teaching. Being regulated is not necessary for all CDEPP teachers. Some of us are professional enough to regulate.</li> <li>• Too paperwork and the time spent on completing and meeting the assessment requirements. Too much is</li> </ul> |
|--|---|
-

- 
- The checklist is thorough
  - The checklist is very thorough.
  - The portfolios and checklists are wonderful; work sampling is a great way to keep up with children's progress.
  - The results are child directed, and are never negative and can be observed.
  - The Work Sampling on-line assessment is a great tool for teachers. It helps teachers reach all their students throughout the year.
  - The standards are covered through the online checklist. Parents receive a copy.
  - The work sampling on line assessment is a good tool to track children's progress throughout the year.
  - The work sampling on-line made assessment more efficient.
  - There is no better assessment than the students work itself
  - These are the areas that are typical of excellent classrooms.
  - The work sampling online made assessment more efficient and easier.
  - They accurately measure current and potential development
  - Used assessments through ERF.
  - Very in-depth
  - Useful information is obtained.
  - We must have accountability.
  - We are allowed to utilize our (ERF) Early Reading First checklist to provide information on the achievement of each child
  - We use the Dial 3 as our assessment for the agency.
  - We use the work sampling which is based on the strengths of the child and allows teacher input.
  - Work sampling assessment is satisfactory
  - Work Sampling
  - Work Sampling is a thorough assessment. The parents like the information that is shared with them.
  - Work Sampling focuses on what children can rather than can't do. I wish
- on teacher's time.
  - Very open-ended, confusing to parents, extremely vague. Too time-consuming for teachers to create reports.
  - Too time consuming; too complex for assessing 4 year-olds. Teachers do not have enough time to enjoy and get to know the children because of all the paperwork. Too much documentation.
  - We've been told to be calm, but if you don't have everything or do everything that could mean your job. We were told that even if you're doing well, you weren't going to get a perfect score.
  - We still need a lot of training in work sampling. It is also very very time consuming.
  - Work Sampling has not been very appropriate for child-development assessments. Since High / Scope is our curriculum, I would like to use the CORE assessment from High / Scope. It goes in depth on each child about their developmental levels & offers more that parents will understand.
  - We did not receive an assessment piece for Creative Curriculum.
  - Work sampling is fine-I see the benefits for teachers and I feel it could be complied and have less repeated steps. I also feel that parents would prefer a more "cut and dry" report. Does not lend itself well to our community.
  - Work sampling is loaded with paper work and on-line work that takes a lot of time away from teaching. The on-line program has also had problems and could not be used-we had to do double time to catch up.
  - Work Sampling is a lengthy process that is time consuming. The information gained through observation is wonderful, however the other grade levels do not utilize Work Sampling so next year the information gained from this year will not be utilized
  - Work sampling is not the most appropriate assessment of child
-

- I had training before school began.
- Work Sampling is very informative for the parents. I have enjoyed using it and have found that it goes right along with state standards. Taking and recording notes have been less stressful and I am now able to use my results to better guide instruction.
  - Work sampling really looks at the growth a child makes over a period of time. This information is important to guiding instruction.
  - Work sampling too time-consuming.
  - Would like more training.
  - WSS gives the parents the info they need & helps the teacher to guide instruction.
  - Yes, because it shows the student strength and weakness.
  - Yes, but I needed training prior to school opening rather than mid-year

development. The high scope COR assessment is more in depth and gives where the child is developmental. Parents are more likely to talk to teachers about child's progress than to look on the computer if they have access.

- Work Sampling is too time consuming for the process not to be used in kindergarten on up.
- Work sampling is very frustrating to me because I haven't been trained appropriately and it is time consuming.
- Work sampling is very time consuming.
- Work Sampling is very time consuming; will not be used in their school careers later

**Question 28: Child screening instruments used in CDEPP classrooms.**

Tables 28a and 28b present information about the child screening instruments used by private center and public school program teacher respondents in CDEPP classrooms. Of the private center teacher respondents, 75% used the Dial-3 child screening instrument. Approximately 85% of public school teacher respondents reported use of the Dial-R child screening instrument.

*Table 28a. Child Screening Instruments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Name of Screening Instrument</b>	<b>Number using Instrument</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Dial 3	12	75
Eye and hearing screening	5	31.3
Documentations( Work Sampling System, observations & notes)	4	25.0
Speech language vision dental screener	3	18.8
Parent surveys	1	6.3
Preschool 4 Developmental Guidelines	1	6.3
Brigance rating scale	1	6.3
Peabody PPVT	1	6.3

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

*Table 28b. Child Screening Instruments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Name of Screening Instrument</b>	<b>Number using Instrument</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
DIAL-R;	107	84.9
Work sampling	9	7.1
checklists	4	3.2
anecdotal records	4	3.2
portfolio	4	3.2
free lunch applications	3	2.2
speech and health screening	3	2.2
Audiometer for hearing / Hear Kit	2	1.6
Individual Screening Card for Vision,	2	1.6
Observation note cards	3	2.2
PPVT	2	1.6
Snellen Picture / Symbol Chart	2	1.6
Dibbles	2	1.6
CDEPP Review	1	0.8
ELSA (Early Literacy Skill Assessment)	2	1.6
High Scope Core	1	0.8
LAP-3	1	0.8
Leap Frog Assessment	1	0.8

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

**Question 29: Child assessments used in CDEPP classrooms for evaluating student progress**

Tables 29a and 29b describe child assessments used by private center and public school program teacher respondents to evaluate the progress of students enrolled in their CDEPP classrooms. The Dial 3 was used most frequently among private center teacher respondents (approx. 71%). The Work Sampling System was the most frequently used assessment among public school teacher respondents (approx. 69%).

*Table 29a. Child Assessments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Name of Child Assessment</b>	<b>Number using instrument</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Dial 3	10	71.4
Work Sampling	4	28.6
Portfolios	4	28.6
National Reporting System (NRS)	3	21.4
Anecdotal notes	3	21.4
Observation	3	21.4
Parent interviews/interaction	2	14.3
Pupil progress cards	2	14.3
Developmental checklists, portfolios and summary reports	1	7.1

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

*Table 29b. Child Assessments Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Name of Child Assessment</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=124)</b>
Work Sampling	86	69.4
Teacher Checklist/observations	44	35.5
DIAL	26	20.6
Portfolio	32	25.8
Anecdotal records	35	28.2
Early Literacy Skill Assessment	4	3.2
DIBELS	1	0.8
SCRAPI assessment on line	8	6.5
Dominic	1	0.8
Get It, Got it, GO!	2	1.6
Creative Curriculum Assessments	3	2.4
Head Start Letter Naming Tool	3	2.4
High Scope	1	0.8
PPVT	2	1.6

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

**Question 30: Curricula used in CDEPP classrooms.**

Tables 30a and 30b present information about the curricula used by private center and public school program teacher respondents in their CDEPP classrooms. The most frequently used curricula among both private center (approx 62%) and public school program teacher respondents (71%) was the Creative Curriculum. The next most used curriculum among both private center (approx. 46%) and public school program teacher respondents (approx. 28%) was the High/Scope Curriculum.

*Table 30a. Curricula Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Name of Curriculum</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=13)</b>
Creative Curriculum,	8	61.5
High/Scope	6	46.2
Dental Health	4	30.8
Tickle My Appetite /Nutrition	3	23.1
Conflict Resolution	2	15.4
I am Special	1	7.7
SC State Standards,	1	7.7
Portfolios / Work Sampling	1	7.7
Montessori	1	7.7
Handwriting without Tears	1	7.7

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

*Table 30b. Curricula Used in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Name of Curriculum</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Creative Curriculum	88	71.0
High/Scope	35	28.2
Montessori	6	4.8
Anderson 5	5	4.0
Doors to Discovery	4	3.2
Good Start, Grow Smart Standards	3	2.4
Everyday Math	3	2.4
SRA	3	2.4
State standards – Early Childhood Learning	2	1.6
Literacy First	2	1.6
Our World of Learning	2	1.6
Rigby Literacy	2	1.6
Leap Frog Curriculum	1	0.8
Pebble Soup	1	0.8

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

**Question 31: Methods used to assess program quality in CDEPP classrooms.**

Tables 31a and 31b present information about the methods used to assess program quality in CDEPP classrooms, according to private center and public school program teacher respondents. Approximately 93% of private center teachers reported using the ECERS-R to assess program quality. Other methods used frequently by these private center teachers include annual self-assessment in the form of teacher surveys (60%), parent surveys (approx. 53%), and the use of NAEYC guidelines (approx. 47%). Approximately 47% of Public school program teacher respondents reported using self-assessment methods to assess program quality. Other frequently used methods included parent surveys (approx. 36%) and use of the ECERS (approx. 29%).

*Table 31a. Methods Used to Assess Program Quality in CDEPP Classrooms: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Program Quality Assessment Method</b>	<b>Number using method</b>	<b>Percent (N=15)</b>
ECERS-R	14	93.3
Annual self-assessment, teacher survey	9	60.0
Parent survey	8	53.3
NAEYC guidelines	7	46.7
ELLOCC-Literacy	3	20.0
DIAL 3	2	13.3
Prism Review	2	13.3
First Steps staff and regional office personnel	1	6.7
Observation form	1	6.7
IDERS	1	6.7

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

*Table 31b. Methods Used to Assess Program Quality in CDEPP Classrooms: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Program Quality Assessment Method</b>	<b>Number using method</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Self-assessment	56	47.1
Parent Surveys	43	36.1
Early Childhood Educational Rating Scale	35	29.4
State Department of Education visits	18	15.1
NAEYC	13	10.9
PQA - Preschool Program Quality Assessment	12	10.1
Creative curriculum	12	10.1
Instructional review checklist	6	5.0
High scope assessment	5	4.2
SDE assessment based on ECERS' standards	4	3.4
Montessori	4	3.4
CDEPP Classroom Review	4	3.4
Administrator feedback/District Assessment	3	2.5
SACS	3	2.5
Early Literacy and Language CO	2	1.7
Classroom Observation Checklist	2	1.7
Federal Reading First classroom & curriculum review team	1	0.8

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

## **PUBLIC AWARENESS AND CHILD FIND**

### ***Question 32: Publicity of CDEPP availability to the community***

Tables 32a and 32b 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. Private center teacher respondents cited conducting open houses (approx. 32%), contacting community service providers (approx. 63%), advertising in the newspaper (approx. 69%), and contact with families of former students (75%) as the main methods used to publicize the CDEPP. Public school program teacher respondents cited distributing brochures about the program (approx. 78%), contacting families of former students (approx. 87%), conducting open houses (approx. 73%), and advertising in the newspaper (approx. 78%) as the main methods to publicize the CDEPP.

*Table 32a. Methods Used to Publicize Availability of CDEPP to Parents, Referral Sources, and the General Public: Private Center Teacher Respondents*

<b>Method</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=16)</b>
Contact with families of former students	12	75.0
Newspaper	11	68.8
Contact with community service providers such as doctors, social workers, and county health offices	10	62.5
Open house	10	32.3
Contact with community groups such as churches	9	56.3
Brochures	8	50.0
Radio and TV	8	50.0
Community health fair	6	37.5
Speakers	1	6.3
Internet	1	6.3
Other (describe)		
• Agency newsletter	1	
• Direct contact with Willow Creek and Saluda Terrace Apt. supervisor to identify 4 year olds	1	25.0
• Other businesses in the community	1	
• Passing out flyers		

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

*Table 32b. Methods Used to Publicize Availability of CDEPP to Parents, Referral Sources, and the General Public: Public School Program Teacher Respondents*

<b>Method</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent (N=126)</b>
Contact with families of former students	110	87.3
Brochures	98	77.8
Newspaper	98	77.8
Open house	93	73.2
Contact with community groups such as churches	81	64.3
Internet	63	50.0
Contact with community service providers such as doctors, social workers, and county health offices	55	43.7
Radio and TV	38	30.2
Speakers	27	21.4
Community health fair	15	11.9
Other (describe)		
• Newsletters	6	
• Signs in the community/outside school	2	8.7
• Center committee meetings	1	
• PTO	1	
• Telephone	1	

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