

**NEW JERSEY PRESCHOOL EXPANSION
ASSESSMENT RESEARCH STUDY (PEARS)**



Statewide Report

December, 2009

Allison Friedman, Ed.M.
Ellen Frede, Ph.D.
Dale Epstein, Ph.D.
Rachel Sansanelli, M.A.
Debra Ackerman, Ed.D., and
Judi Stevenson-Boyd, Ed.M.

National Institute for Early Education Research
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University

Submitted to the New Jersey Department of Education
Division of Early Childhood Education
Lucille Davy, Commissioner

The research reported in this document was conducted under a Memorandum of Understanding with the New Jersey Department of Education (NJ DOE). The conclusions are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the funding agency. The authors would like to thank the advisory board and Dr. Ellen Wolock for assistance in designing the data collection and interpreting the results. We also gratefully acknowledge the technical expertise of Christopher Gilbert.

Table of Contents

<u>The Promise of Preschool in New Jersey</u>	2
• Research on New Jersey’s Current Preschool Program.....	3
• The School Funding Reform Act of 2008 and Preschool Expansion.....	4
• The Preschool Expansion Needs Assessment.....	6
• Selected Results by Research Question.....	7
• Recommendations.....	17
<u>Technical Report</u>	18
Methodology.....	18
• Procedures.....	19
• Instrumentation.....	21
• Sample.....	28
Full Results.....	49
• Capacity of Existing Classrooms to Serve Preschoolers.....	49
• Qualifications of Administrators.....	51
• Curriculum.....	56
• Professional Development.....	59
• Preschool Children with Disabilities in District Preschool Programs.....	63
• Preschool English Language Learners In District Preschool Programs.....	65
• Preschool Program Eligibility by Auspice.....	67
• Supervision of Staff by Auspice.....	69
• Administrative Practices Specific to Child Care and Head Start.....	71
• Preschool Facilities.....	74
• Parent Involvement by Auspice.....	77
• Classroom Level Information.....	78
• Adequacy and Cost of Materials by Auspice.....	84
• Background and Other Information on Teaching Staff by Auspice.....	99
• Collaborations Between Districts and Other Agencies.....	128
• Districts’ Plans for Preschool Expansion and Perceived Barriers.....	129
<u>References</u>	134

THE PROMISE OF PRESCHOOL IN NEW JERSEY

Introduction: Why Is the State Investing in Preschool?

Nationally, more than two million 3- and 4-year olds attend some form of publicly funded preschool program, including state-funded preschool initiatives, special education, and Head Start (Barnett, Epstein, Friedman, Boyd, & Hustedt, 2008). During the 2007-2008 school year, 1,134,687 children attended a state-funded preschool program, and nearly one million children attended Head Start programs. Counting all forms of center-based services nationally, more than 80 percent of 4-year-olds in the country attend some kind of program each year. However, the quality and purpose of these programs varies. Research shows that attending high-quality preschool makes a difference, especially for children at risk of school difficulties due to poverty, having English as a second language, or having teen parents or parents with low educational levels. However, the quality of preschool programs has a significant impact on future learning and benefits (Barnett, 2008). A large body of research has shown the following benefits to starting school in preschool:

- Improved achievement from kindergarten entry through high school;
- Reduced grade retention;
- Decrease in placement in special education;
- Greater rates of high school graduation;
- More college and post secondary school attendance;
- Fewer arrests and less criminal behavior;
- Increased participation in the work force as adults with greater tax contributions; and
- Less participation in welfare.

These benefits, taken together, result in large savings to society from reduced costs of education, increased taxes, decreased costs of social services, and lower justice system costs. This has led economists to estimate a cost savings of between \$3 and \$18 for every dollar invested (Barnett, 2008).

Clearly, access to high-quality preschool programs can significantly reduce the gap at school entry for children at risk; however, school failure does not end at the poverty line and the majority of children who are placed in special education, retained in grade or who drop out of school are in the middle-income bracket. In addition, the gap in readiness scores at kindergarten entry between children from middle-income families and those from the wealthiest families is exactly equal to that of the gap between children in poverty and in the middle class (Barnett & Yarosz, 2007). Preschool can provide benefits to all children and result in savings in school related costs.

Acting on their understanding of this strong research base showing not only the long-term educational benefits of preschool education but the economic benefits to society at large, the New Jersey Legislature funded preschool in Early Childhood Program Aid (ECPA) districts in 1995 and the Supreme Court in the 1998 *Abbott v. Burke* decision mandated that the state establish high-quality preschool education for the highest-poverty school districts in the state (the so-called Abbott districts). Since the Abbott Preschool Program began in the 1999-2000 school

year, enrollment in the program has increased dramatically. In 2008-2009, the tenth year of implementation, the program served more than 43,000 3- and 4-year-old children in a mix of settings including public schools, private child care centers, and Head Start agencies.

What Are the Effects of Participation in New Jersey Preschool?

Considerable attention and resources have been invested in the Abbott Preschool Program. According to the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) annual report on state-funded preschool, the Abbott program ranks as one of the highest quality state preschool programs in the nation, as one of the highest in providing access to 3-year-olds, and as the most well-funded (Barnett, Epstein, Friedman, Boyd, & Hustedt, 2008). As such, there is a great deal of interest in whether it is effective in helping children enter kindergarten with the knowledge, skills and dispositions that will lead to success in school. The Abbott Preschool Program Longitudinal Effects Study (APPLES; Frede, Jung, Barnett, & Figueras, 2009), which is funded by the New Jersey Department of Education and The Pew Charitable Trusts to investigate the effects of the preschool program, shows clear evidence that by participating in a high-quality program children, whether in public schools, private child care or Head Start, are improving in language, literacy, and math. These results are detailed in the following excerpt from the executive summary of the most recent report.

The APPLES Blossom Executive Summary: Abbott Preschool Program Longitudinal Effects Study (APPLES) Preliminary Results through 2nd Grade
(Frede, Jung, Barnett & Figueras, 2009)

- **Pre-K Effects on Oral Language and Conceptual Knowledge Remain Strong-** Oral language (as measured by the PPVT) forms not only the basis of social communication but reveals conceptual knowledge and is essential for both reading and writing acquisition. At the end of kindergarten, one year of Abbott pre-K had an effect size of 0.18 ($p < .05$) and the two year effect size was 0.38 ($p < .01$). At the end of second grade, the benefits of Abbott pre-K participation continued to be significant with results of 0.22 ($p < .05$) for one year of attendance and 0.40 ($p < .01$) for two years.
- **Reading Skills Differences Favor the Abbott Preschool Group and All Children Are Performing Well** - Most first and second grade tests of academic achievement tend to measure phonics and other discrete early literacy skills. These are important predictors of reading ability, more broadly including reading comprehension. Differences in these literacy outcomes tended to favor children who had attended Abbott pre-K, but generally did not reach statistical significance. The most prominent exception is passage comprehension on which the former pre-K attendees scored higher ($p < .05$, one-tailed test) with effect sizes of 0.16 for one year and 0.20 for two years.
- **Strong Mathematics Effects of Pre-K Persist** – As with literacy all results in mathematics favored the Abbott preschool attendees with two years having more impact than one. Math measures included applied problems, calculation, math fluency and broad math. The most consistently observed effects were for applied problems. In first grade, effect sizes were 0.18 ($p < .05$) for one year and 0.26 ($p < .05$) for two years. In second grade, effect sizes were 0.24 ($p < .05$) for one year and 0.44 ($p < .01$) for two years. Some significant effects also were found for calculation and broad math in second grade.

- **Grade Retention Is Cut in Half** – Since study children have entered second grade we can investigate the effects of pre-K on early grade retention. By second grade the effect on grade retention of two years of pre-K is statistically significant ($p < .05$) and twice as large as the effect of one year of pre-K. Grade repetition is 10.7 percent for children who did not attend pre-K, 7.2 percent for those who attended for one year, and 5.3 percent for those who attended two years. This reflects Pre-K's considerable effects on learning and ability and results in savings to taxpayers.

The estimated effects through second grade from two years of Abbott pre-K are roughly comparable in size to the effects of the well-known Chicago Child Parent Centers, which also began at age 3 and returned \$10 for every dollar invested in the program. Given the trajectory of achievement and progression in grade found so far, we can expect that the future will reveal not only lasting benefits for the children who attended Abbott pre-K but eventual pay-off to society in the reduction of school costs, decreases in delinquency and crime, and increased productivity in the workforce.

Can Preschool Be Provided Effectively in Settings Outside of the Public Schools?

The Abbott Preschool Program serves children in a mix of public school, child care and Head Start classrooms. This mixed delivery system was designed to take advantage of both expertise and space that was available in the existing private preschool programs. NIEER has reported previously that the quality of classrooms is uniformly high across these settings (Frede, Jung, Barnett, Lamy & Figueras, 2007). This is relevant because quality is a clear predictor of effects and it seems likely that expansion of preschool in New Jersey will require some collaboration between districts and private providers.

In 2006-2007, the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment conducted a study of center director's views of the mixed delivery system. *Partnering for Preschool: A Study of Center Directors in New Jersey's Mixed-Delivery Abbott Program* (Whitebook, Ryan, Kipnis, and Sakai, 2008) reports that, according to the center directors interviewed, participation by their center in the Abbott program resulted in:

- Access to more and better services for children,
- Stable and sufficient funding for materials and operations,
- Resources to offer comprehensive services, and
- Teachers motivated to pursue further education.

Thus, a mixed-delivery system not only allows for faster expansion and support of existing private programs in each community, it provides effective and efficient choices for families.

The School Funding Reform Act of 2008 and Preschool Expansion

Recognizing these benefits for children and society, New Jersey's new school funding formula includes significant expansion of preschool throughout the state. In January 2008, the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey enacted the School Funding Reform Act of 2008. Under this new law, all at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds in the state will be eligible to attend

high-quality (Abbott-like) preschool programs during their two years before kindergarten by 2013.

All school districts in the state are designated as either universal or targeted districts for preschool expansion. Universal districts will be required to offer high-quality state-funded preschool to all 3- and 4-year-olds residing in the district, regardless of family income level. Universal districts include all District Factor Group (DFG) “A” and “B” school districts and DFG “CD” school districts with 40 percent or greater low-income students. This group includes all current Abbott districts as well as most other ECPA districts. Low-income is defined as students who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (185 percent of the federal poverty level). Targeted districts will be required only to offer a high-quality state-funded preschool program to 3- and 4-year-olds who qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. Targeted districts are all other districts in the state except those that do not serve elementary school children.

Preschool expansion in New Jersey will be gradually implemented over a six-year period, with the goal of serving an additional 30,000 children by 2013 for a total of 70,000 3- and 4-year-olds. It is anticipated that funding for preschool will also increase by \$300 million, bringing the total funding for state-funded preschool in New Jersey to \$850 million. The original preschool expansion roll-out plan allowed for districts to apply for funding beginning in the 2008-2009 school year. Only five districts (Fairfield in Cumberland County, Woodbine, Red Bank, Little Egg Harbor, and Pemberton Boro) received funding to begin preschool expansion during the 2008-2009 school year. Districts will have five years to expand and serve their eligible populations of 3- and 4-year-olds. In the original preschool expansion plan, districts were recommended to serve at least 20 percent of their universe during the 2009-2010 school year with the expectation that they serve 90 percent of their eligible population by the 2013-2014 school year. However, due to the current economic situation the proposed roll out of preschool expansion has been delayed, and with the exception of those five districts that received funding in 2008-2009 to begin expansion, it is unclear when expansion will be funded.

The School Funding Reform Act of 2008 requires districts to implement a high-quality, Abbott-like preschool program. Under preschool expansion, preschool class sizes will be limited to 15 children with one teacher and one assistant teacher. Lead preschool teachers will be required to have at least a bachelor’s degree and be licensed to teach preschool. Assistant preschool teachers will be required to meet district requirements and be appropriately trained. In most districts assistant preschool teachers will be required to have a high school diploma. However in schools receiving Title I funding, assistant preschool teachers will have to meet the more stringent Title I requirements. Districts will also be required to have a master teacher and other consultants to provide coaching and mentoring to preschool teachers in curriculum implementation, improving services for children with disabilities and challenging behaviors, working with English Language Learners and other teaching strategies. In addition, districts must choose one of the five state recommended curricula for preschool or submit their curriculum to the state for approval. These curricula are *Bank Street Developmental Interaction Approach* (Nager & Shapiro, E., 2000); *The Creative Curriculum*, (Dodge, Bickart, Heroman, & Boyle, 2009), *Curiosity Corner* (Chambers, 2009), *HighScope Preschool Curriculum* (Epstein, & Schweinhart, 2009), and *Tools of the Mind Project* (Bodrova, & Leong, 2009). Programs will also be required to develop and implement plans for the following: Serving ELL children, increasing provision of services for special

education children in regular education classrooms, ensuring a coherent and articulated approach preschool through grade 3, and integrated parent involvement.

Districts must also form an Early Childhood Advisory Council made up of important stakeholders and experts in early childhood care and education, possibly including kindergarten teachers, district administrators, child care and Head Start representatives, pediatricians, local community leaders, municipal employees and higher education, among others. Districts are encouraged to serve their eligible population of 3- and 4-year-olds using a mixed delivery system of in-district classrooms and classrooms in private child care providers or Head Start agencies. Districts can also form collaborations with other nearby districts to offer preschool. Models for collaboration will be discussed later in this report.

THE PRESCHOOL EXPANSION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

To better prepare for the preschool expansion required by the School Funding Reform Act of 2008, the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) – Division of Early Childhood Education entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with NIEER in the spring of 2008 to conduct a needs assessment of preschool programs and school districts throughout New Jersey. The results of this needs assessment will be used to inform the NJDOE about the resources, circumstances, and needs relevant to preschool quality and expansion of school districts and private preschool providers throughout the state.

The purpose of the New Jersey Preschool Expansion Assessment Research Study is to assess the capacity and quality of child care centers, Head Start programs, and school district preschool programs across the state that are not currently funded by the state through Abbott Districts. In order to accomplish this goal, information was collected on the school district, school/center, classroom, and teacher level. The following questions were used to focus our data collection:

- How many 3- and 4-year-old children can be offered a high quality preschool education in existing public schools, private child care centers and Head Start programs within the identified districts?
- What is the basic environmental quality of these classrooms, as measured by the Basic Classroom Climate and Materials Checklist (NIEER, 2008)?
- What are the educational backgrounds, credentials and experience levels of the current child care, Head Start and public school preschool teaching workforce in these settings?
- What are common issues that need to be addressed to improve the quality of current Pre-k classrooms?
- What, if any, early childhood education experience do administrators and center directors have?
- What are the district's plans for preschool expansion, including plans for overcoming perceived barriers and plans for collaboration?

Three methods of data collection were used in the study: surveys, interviews, and observations. District, child care and Head Start administrators were interviewed regarding a wide variety of issues related to expansion and current service provision. In districts that will be expected to serve all or large numbers of their preschool population we also conducted direct classroom and

facility observations. Similar observations were also conducted in child care centers and Head Start programs. The needs assessment was conducted in phases, with more intensive data collection and larger samples used in districts with larger percentages of eligible population. This study is built on a previous study conducted in collaboration with New Jersey Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (NJACCRA), which collected information via phone interview and written work force surveys from licensed child care and Head Start programs located in the state's non-Abbott districts with larger proportions of low-income families (Ackerman and Sansanelli, 2008).

Below we present selected results for each of the major research questions. A full description of all of the methods, procedures, results and instruments follow in the full technical report.

Selected Results for the Preschool Expansion Assessment Research Study (PEARS)

How many 3- and 4-year-old children can be offered a high-quality preschool education in existing public schools, private child care centers and Head Start programs within the identified districts?

We estimated the number of preschoolers that could be served in district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start centers that were visited during this needs assessment, as well as those that were not. Please note that this estimate includes classrooms regardless of whether they meet DOE facilities standards (e.g., in-class bathroom, 950 square feet, etc).

Overall, the total estimated capacity of all child care centers serving preschool-age children, not located in Abbott districts, was estimated to be 157,023. The capacity of child care centers visited was estimated by assuming that each classroom in the center could serve 15 preschoolers. All classrooms, including classrooms that were currently serving infants and toddlers were included. Child care centers that were visited have the capacity to serve 71,055 preschoolers. The capacity of child care centers not visited (and not located in an Abbott district) was estimated by multiplying the number of centers not visited by the average number of classrooms per center visited (4.8), and assuming that each classroom could serve 15 children. Child care centers not visited have the capacity to serve 85,968 preschoolers.

In total, the Head Start centers in non-Abbott districts have the capacity to serve 4,524 preschoolers, assuming a class size of 15. The capacity of Head Start centers was estimated in a similar manner to the child care centers. Head Start centers visited as part of this needs assessment have the capacity to serve 3,390 preschoolers. The average number of classrooms in the Head Start centers visited during this needs assessment was 3.6. Head Start centers not visited (and not located in Abbott districts) have the capacity to serve 1,134 preschoolers.

Overall, the non-Abbott districts' preschool programs have an estimated capacity to serve 21,197 preschoolers. Assuming 15 preschoolers per classroom, district preschool programs that participated in this needs assessment have the capacity to serve 19,665 children. The capacity of district preschool programs that did not participate to serve preschoolers was estimated based on the statewide ASSA count. Based on the ASSA count, non-Abbott districts that did not participate in this needs assessment served 1,532 preschoolers. This estimation is likely an

underestimation of the capacity of these districts to provide preschool because many of the districts serve fewer than 15 children per classroom. Therefore, they could increase their capacity by enrolling additional children without exceeding the 15-child class size limit. Conversely, this may also overestimate the capacity of the districts to provide preschool under preschool expansion if some classrooms serve more than 15 children.

Based on these estimations, district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start programs in non-Abbott districts have a capacity to serve 182,744 preschoolers. According to the July 2008 census, there are 223,137 three- and four-year-olds living in New Jersey and 51,732 of these preschool-age children reside in Abbott districts. Therefore, there are 171,495 preschool age children who are not yet eligible for high-quality state-funded preschool in New Jersey. Not all of these children will qualify for preschool under the state's new school funding formula. However, based on our estimations described above, there are more than enough spaces available among the child care centers, Head Start centers, and district preschool programs to serve all the children who will be eligible for preschool under preschool expansion.

There are several potential problems with our estimation that could result in either an over- or underestimation of the state's capacity. Most of the centers/schools and classrooms included do not meet the state's facilities regulations for preschool expansion. This will be more of an issue for contracted sites than in-district sites. Child care centers will be required to have at least six classrooms in order to be eligible to contract with a district to provide preschool under preschool expansion. Since the average number of classrooms per child care center was 4.8, the majority of centers that have fewer than 6 classrooms. Additionally, all classrooms will be required to be at least 950 square feet and have a child-sized bathroom. The overwhelming majority of classrooms did not meet this requirement. In an effort to be expansive, our estimations also assume that all self-contained classrooms would be converted to inclusion classrooms and that all infant and toddler and school age child care center classrooms would be converted to preschool classrooms. It is not the state's intention or our assumption that classrooms used for other age groups should be converted. In fact, there are strong reasons to expand offerings for infant and toddler care but we felt it was important to determine how tempting it might be for centers to convert their space. Given the adequacy of licensed capacity, the use of this space is not necessary to meet the preschool demands. Therefore, the estimated capacity of child care centers and Head Start centers to provide preschool under preschool expansion is an over-estimation and should only be used to determine whether facility standards should be relaxed during the initial phases of expansion. While district programs are exempt from the requirements to have at least six preschool classrooms and can request a waiver for the 950 square feet requirement, these classrooms must still be large enough to serve 15 preschool students.

What, if any, early childhood education experience do administrators and center directors have?

In general, child care and Head Start administrators are much more likely than school administrators to have specialized experience or qualifications in early childhood education with almost all Head Start administrators and more than half of child care administrators having a college degree related to ECE. However, fewer than one quarter of district principals who supervise preschool classrooms and not even 10 percent of district administrators in charge of preschool planning having similar specialization. This information is critical to the effectiveness of a preschool program. Research has consistently shown that without expert supervision the promise of preschool is unlikely to be met (Frede, 1998). Administrators in child care centers are not required to hold a bachelor's degree; however, close to 90 percent have completed at least an undergraduate degree.

What are the educational backgrounds, credentials and experience levels of the current child care, Head Start and public school preschool teaching workforce in these settings?

Under the existing Abbott, ECPA, and ELLI programs, lead district preschool teachers in New Jersey are required to have at least a bachelor's degree. They are also required to have teaching certification in early childhood education. Under the preschool expansion, teacher degree and certification requirements will be the same. Lead teachers will be required to have a bachelor's degree and a preschool through third grade certification, with some specific exceptions. Preschool teachers in child care or Head start programs contracting with a district in its first year of implementing the preschool program have until September 2012 to obtain a bachelor's degree and approved certification.

We conducted surveys to determine how many current teachers meet the teaching qualifications that will be required. Across all settings, almost two thirds (65 percent) of lead preschool teachers had a bachelors degree or higher. As expected, all district lead preschool teachers had earned at least a bachelor's degree (with one exception where an emergency waiver had been obtained). New Jersey child care licensing does not require lead preschool teachers to have a minimum degree. Therefore, it is not surprising that a lower percentage of child care center lead preschool teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher. The findings from child care were somewhat surprising with almost half (47.4 percent) of the teachers reporting holding at least a bachelor's degree and almost 8 percent of the teachers currently enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree. This finding is surprising in light previous reports on child care teachers' qualifications when the Abbott program was first implemented. At that time only 35 percent of the child care center teachers in those districts held undergraduate degrees (Barnett, Tarr, & Frede, 1999). In addition, national data shows much lower rates of college degrees for child care teachers (Herzenberg, Price, & Bradley, 2005).

These results vary, however, by region of the state with more than half of the child care center teachers in northern districts meeting the requirement. In the central region this drops to just under half and in the south, barely one third of the child care teachers have at least a bachelor's degree. Thus more resources will be needed in the southern region to ensure that child care centers are able to contract with districts to provide preschool, especially in light of the fact that access to higher education programs in ECE is less available in that area.

Because the Head Start Reauthorization Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-134) requires that by September 20, 2013, at least 50 percent of Head Start lead teachers must have a bachelor's degree or higher, we expected to find a larger percentage of those teachers having the qualification. Indeed, 58.6 percent of the Head Start lead preschool teachers had earned at least a bachelor's degree and an additional 16 percent of the lead Head Start preschool teachers are enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree.

Although all district lead preschool teachers should be appropriately certified in early childhood education, we found that only 86 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. This is likely due to lack of understanding in some districts that the former Nursery through Grade 8 license does not qualify teachers for preschool unless they majored in early childhood education or have taught for two years in a preschool classroom. This percentage of qualified teachers still exceeds that of child care and Head Start lead preschool teachers which was expected. Slightly fewer than 20 percent of all child care center lead preschool teachers have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the child care center lead preschool teachers who have a bachelor's degree or higher, 38.3 percent have a preschool certification or the equivalent. Almost 30 percent of Head Start lead preschool teachers have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the Head Start lead preschool teachers who have a bachelor's degree or higher, almost 50 percent have a preschool certification or the equivalent.

What is the basic environmental quality of these classrooms, as measured by the Basic Classroom Climate and Materials Checklist (NIEER, 2008)?

We developed the Basic Classroom Climate and Materials Checklist (NIEER, 2008), a classroom observation checklist that assesses minimal standards for classroom quality and environment. The new instrument was based on minimal standards in existing research instruments. Previous research on the Abbott preschool program shows that with increased resources and technical assistance, the quality of classroom practices can be improved dramatically (Frede, et al., 2007). Although actual physical plant deficiencies may be insurmountable or extremely costly, this research shows that materials and equipment inadequacies can be addressed as can poor quality teaching. Our purpose here was to help gauge the difficulties across settings in ensuring that programs have the basics upon which to build. This information can provide a baseline for determining the need for technical assistance, professional development and materials costs. Data from the classroom direct observation sites are collected in four areas; furniture and room arrangement, health and safety, teacher and peer interaction, and daily schedule.

We found that in general classrooms are adequately supervised and that teacher and peer interactions are warm and respectful. This is a good basis upon which to build an educational intervention. Although most classrooms are conveniently equipped for routine care, in general child care classrooms are somewhat less likely to be organized to foster basic learning; e.g. materials or areas of the classroom might be less well-organized. Child care and Head Start classrooms were more often found to have at least one safety hazard. These hazards could include poorly maintained equipment or lack of adequate supervision by staff. These are remediable conditions that could be corrected with financial resources and professional development. All classrooms provided some consistency in their daily routine; however, Head Start and child care classrooms were more likely to give children time to play outside daily. A consistent daily routine with an opportunity to play outside daily is a basic element of quality in

preschool programs. Only district classrooms were equipped with bathrooms and running water. Without initiatives to enhance facilities, then about one third of Head Start classrooms and half of child care classrooms will not be able to meet state regulations for this criterion.

Adequacy of preschool classroom materials and related costs

We also examined the cost of fully furnishing and supplying preschool classrooms in district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start agencies. Using the New Jersey Department of Education Division of Early Childhood Education's Abbott Preschool Classroom recommended materials list, we developed furnishing and materials checklists that include materials from nine domains: art, sand/water, blocks, technology, woodworking, dramatic play, books, manipulatives, and music/movement. These checklists inventory furniture and materials that are important and appropriate for high-quality preschool programs. Prices were assigned to items in the checklists based on internet searches for the items from typical suppliers.

The total cost to fully furnish and equip a preschool classroom with all of the furniture and items on the DOE list would be more than \$18,300. However, existing classrooms bring resources with them, and, indeed, based on our data, we estimate that on average the cost to fully furnish and equip the classrooms is just over \$7,600. The need for supplemental furnishing and materials varies considerably by auspice, however. For every category except woodworking, child care center classrooms, on average, require the most money to be fully furnished and equipped, approaching \$9,000. District preschool and Head Start classrooms are closer to each other, with district classrooms on average needing \$5,800 and Head Start classrooms, being better equipped than district classrooms, requiring somewhat more than \$5,000. Many district preschool programs are only a few years old, whereas many Head Start programs have been in operation for many years. These programs would have had more training in early childhood education which would lead to more appropriate purchases, as well as more time to amass durable furniture and materials. Clearly, contracting with Head Start and child care classrooms could result in considerable savings in start up costs compared to equipping new classrooms in school district buildings. On an individual classroom level the savings would range between \$10,700 and \$13,300.

Across all settings, the most money will need to be spent on purchasing furniture, which is the most expensive category of supplies. An average of \$3,011 will need to be expended on furniture which means that current classrooms could contribute 65.3 per cent of the total furniture cost of \$8,673. Looking across categories of materials, the areas most lacking across all auspices are sand and water table materials (necessary for physical science and math learning), blocks (necessary for science and math learning), woodworking (necessary for science and math learning), small manipulatives and puzzles (necessary for physical science and math learning) dramatic play (necessary for all areas of learning but particularly needed for self-regulation and language development), and books (necessary for conceptual development, language and literacy). However, the remaining materials categories are still underequipped with no category being above two-thirds complete on average.

What are common issues that need to be addressed to improve the quality of current pre-k classrooms?

Research on the effectiveness of preschool education has established that certain elements are critical to success. In addition to qualified teachers with specialized knowledge of young children, these elements include but are not limited to, the following:

- Small class sizes with high teacher-to-child ratios;
- A well-designed curriculum that intentionally focuses on all domains of learning and development;
- A system of classroom support based on a continuous improvement model;
- Education of children with disabilities in regular classrooms unless it has been shown that the child cannot thrive there;
- Specific attention and explicit plans for meeting the needs of emergent bilingual children; and
- Provision of programs to enhance family engagement (Frede, 1998).

With knowledge of this research, the New Jersey Department of Education has promulgated regulations that detail program standards in each of these areas and require districts to provide evidence that plans are in place to meet the requirements. We investigated the readiness of the districts and their potential partners in child care and Head Start to meet these standards.

Class size

Interestingly, across all settings, preschool class size just exceeds the mandate of 15 children per classroom with an average enrolled class size of 15.1. In district schools, 53 percent of classrooms served no more than 15 children. Thirty percent of classrooms enrolled between 16 and 20 children and 13 percent enrolled more than 21 children. In the 2007-2008 school year, ECPA-funded district preschool programs were allowed to enroll up to 25 children per classroom. This requirement changed for the 2008-2009 school year when ECPA-funded district preschool programs could only enroll up to 18 children per classroom. Data collectors visited ECPA preschool classes in the spring of 2008 when the classroom size requirement was 25 and in the fall of 2008 when the classroom size requirement was 18. Therefore, many of the classrooms that enrolled 16-20 or more than 21 children per classroom could have been following the current state requirements. Similarly, districts receiving ELLI funding may enroll up to 20 children per classroom.

In child care centers, 70 percent of classrooms served no more than 15 children. These classrooms would meet the preschool expansion class size requirement. Seventeen percent of child care center classrooms enrolled 16-20 children and 7 percent enrolled more than 21 children. In Head Start centers, only 42 percent of classrooms served no more than 15 children. However, 54 percent of classrooms served between 16 and 20 children. Fewer than 3 percent of Head Start classrooms have more than 21 children enrolled. Head Start performance standards require a class size of up to 20 children for 4-year-old classes and up to 17 children for 3-year-old classes. This requirement could explain why a greater percentage of classrooms in Head

Start settings enroll more than 15 children. However, if these Head Start programs partner with school districts for preschool expansion, they will have to decrease the number of children enrolled per classroom.

DOE regulations also require that contracting child care centers have at least 6 classrooms per site. The purpose of this regulation is to keep the site level administrative costs lower by spreading them across more classrooms. Across all classrooms, 278 of the child care centers (27 percent) that were visited during this needs assessment have at least six classrooms. The average number of total classrooms including all ages in child care centers was close to five. Thus, most centers come very close to the requirement and may well qualify for a waiver.

Implementation of State- Recommended Curriculum Models

NJ DOE regulations on preschool provision require that districts “implement a comprehensive, evidence-based preschool curriculum in order to meet the preschool standards” (p. 6 New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards of Quality, 2009). As part of the preschool expansion plan, each district must choose one of the five state-recommended curricula for preschool. These curricula are *Bank Street Developmental Interaction Approach* (Nager & Shapiro, E., 2000); *The Creative Curriculum*, (Dodge, Bickart, Heroman, & Boyle, 2009), *Curiosity Corner*(Chambers, 2009), *HighScope Preschool Curriculum* (Epstein, & Schweinhart, 2009), and *Tools of the Mind Project* (Bodrova & Leong, 2009).. Thus, to determine how ready districts and their potential private partners are for preschool expansion, district and private provider administrators were asked what types of curricula are being used in their preschool classes. Please note, we did not attempt to measure actual fidelity of implementation of the curriculum, nor did we collect information on the extent of teacher training in the model. Thus, these results should not be interpreted to mean that the curricula are necessarily well implemented.

Almost 60 percent of the districts report implementing one of the recommended curricula. However, 24 of the 339 districts mention using more than one curriculum. This finding may indicate less than adequate fidelity of implementation of the approved curriculum model since none of the approved models can easily be combined with another approach and still be implemented with fidelity. In some of these cases, districts may use different curricula in different schools or in preschool special education vs. their general education classrooms. This approach is likely more costly and more difficult to supervise effectively.

Child care and Head Start directors were also asked about the curriculum used in their centers. Virtually all Head Start programs use one of the recommended curriculum models but in contrast almost none of the child care centers do. This is not surprising given that the cost of professional development to implement these models would be prohibitive for a small agency. Approximately 50 percent of child care centers report using a center- or teacher- designed curriculum instead. Some child care centers even report “making the curriculum up as they go along.” This finding indicates that centers are not using a curriculum that has been researched and validated and may not be developmentally appropriate for preschool-aged children. Aligning curriculum across district and private partners will be a major effort for expansion.

Classroom Support through Teacher Coaching and Technical Assistance

Current research on effective professional development is fairly clear that in-class support is critical for improving teaching (Klein & Gombay, 2009). Information was collected on whether or not the districts provided any type of coaching or technical assistance to teachers in preschool classrooms. Of the districts asked this question, more than half provide some type of assistance or coaching. The majority of districts (64.3 percent) provide ongoing, regular assistance, while 6.3% report providing assistance only 1-5 times a year. The majority of the support to teachers came either from special education staff (54.1 percent) or district administrators (33.3 percent) and, not surprisingly, the topics of support varied widely but the most common topic was curriculum support followed by behavior and classroom management and special education/inclusion.

Preschool Children with Disabilities in District Preschool Programs

Serving children with disabilities in general education classrooms with their age-appropriate peers whenever possible is required by federal and state law and regulation. “To the maximum extent appropriate, preschool children eligible for special education will be enrolled in general education preschool programs with their non-disabled peers” (p. 19 New Jersey Preschool Program Implementation Guidelines). Respondents from districts, child care centers and Head Start agencies were asked about their experiences working with and serving children with special needs. Fifty-eight percent (58 percent) of the 375 districts in our sample provide services for at least some of their preschool children with disabilities in inclusive settings. Across all classrooms, including preschool disabled classes, the mean number of children with special needs in each classroom was 5.5. However, it should be noted that in some cases the number of children with special needs reported per classroom might include children in both morning and afternoon sessions resulting in larger numbers. Almost two-thirds of child care centers and virtually all Head Start centers reported having experience serving children with special needs. The mean for child care and Head Start was considerably lower than for districts at fewer than two children with disabilities per classroom which is not surprising given that only districts are likely to have self-contained special education classes. Thus, all of the child care and Head Start classrooms that serve children with disabilities do so in the regular classroom environment.

Preschool English Language Learners in District Preschool Programs

The number of young children in this country who come to school speaking a language other than English is rising dramatically (Garcia & Frede, in press). Preschool is an effective time to provide supports for these children. However, few programs offer appropriate programs for English Language Learners (ELL). Districts were asked questions related to the ELL population in their districts and what, if any, programs and support services are offered. The percentage ranged from 0 to 43 percent of the preschool population being considered English Language Learners. The average number of ELLs per classroom is three. Districts that were most likely to serve preschool children and who reported serving ELLs were asked whether they had a specific program for ELL and if they support the maintenance of home language in their schools and prekindergarten programs; 56.7 percent said that they do not have an ELL program and 73.2 percent said they do not have any programs in place to support the maintenance of home

language. More than three quarters (76 percent) of child care center directors, on the other hand, reported experience serving ELL children with 37.4 percent having established methods for promoting maintenance of children’s home language. Almost all Head Start centers (98.5 percent) reported having experience serving ELLs, and 84.8 percent reported that they have established methods for promoting maintenance of children’s home language.

Supports for Preschool Teachers of English Language Learners. Administrators who served preschool English Language Learners were asked about the kinds of supports provided to preschool teachers with students who are ELLs. Thirty-two percent of districts responded that they had English as Second Language (ESL) teachers for their preschool students and 33 percent responded that they had ESL teachers, coordinators or supervisors who supported preschool teachers who had ELL students. Approximately 26 percent of districts reported other types of ELL programs offered to preschool students such as classroom aides, translated materials such as books provided in the classroom, tutoring, or parent assistance.

Provision of Family Engagement Programs

Mutual and supportive partnerships with families in preschool programs can be important for the overall well-being and success of a child. As part of the preschool expansion, districts are required to have a “wide range of family involvement and educational opportunities” (p. 10 NJ Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards of Quality, 2009) including involving parents in the governance of the program, creating workshops, classes and structured activities to enhance parents knowledge of the program and parenting skills, and developing policies to encourage more parent participation in the preschool program (New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards of Quality, 2009).

More than 95 percent of all district preschool, Head Start and child care programs offer opportunities for family involvement. However, while the overwhelming majority of pre-K programs provide parents with administrative information about the program and hold conferences between parents and staff, fewer pre-K programs have parents regularly volunteer in the classroom. Only 68 percent of district preschool programs and child care centers have parents regularly volunteer whereas 86 percent of Head Start programs have parent volunteers in the classroom. The Head Start program is designed to offer comprehensive services to children and families and child care is obviously mostly used by families where parents are working and thus this finding is not surprising.

What are the district’s plans for preschool expansion, including plans for collaboration and plans for overcoming perceived barriers?

In the current, highly successful Abbott Preschool Program more than 65 percent of the children are served in private nonprofit and for-profit child care centers and Head Start agencies. Given the lack of space and ECE expertise in the expansion districts described elsewhere in this report, and in order to take advantage of the early childhood expertise, facilities, and human resources available in other districts and early care and education programs, districts should consider collaborations with neighboring districts and local private ECE providers. Districts that already have experience with collaborations and contracts with other agencies will likely be more willing

to collaborate. Thus we asked districts about their current collaborations such as before- and after-school care, providing special education and bilingual services, and sharing professional development.

The vast majority of school districts do not currently collaborate with other entities for before- and after-care programs with 7 percent collaborating with other districts and 25 percent with other non-profit entities such as YWCAs, Boys and Girls Clubs, child care centers, and other non-profit and for-profit agencies. However, school districts are fairly likely to collaborate in providing/receiving special education services with 66.6 percent of those interviewed having already established relationships for services. Similarly, 50.8 percent of the districts share student transportation. Over 70 percent of the districts are also sharing professional development opportunities. Few districts work together or with other agencies to share ELL/Bilingual resources as only 12 percent report collaboration.

At the time of the interviews, most districts reported being at an early stage of planning for preschool expansion. Many reported that they needed to develop solutions to their specific difficulties for providing preschool. Few districts responded that they are considering collaboration as one of the solutions for lack of space. Slightly more than 20 percent plan to subcontract with a local child care agency, only 9 percent plan to subcontract with Head Start and slightly fewer than 17 percent will collaborate with a nearby district. Fewer than 1 percent are planning to use temporary classroom units (trailers).

The districts reported a variety of barriers to parent participation and to expansion generally. More than 50 percent of the district administrators reported lack of space and concern for a lack of funding as their primary concerns regarding preschool expansion. Funding concerns included the uncertainty of the state providing adequate funding or funding at all; cost effectiveness for small numbers of eligible children; and the lack of adequate funding to expand special education classes by half to full day or to create more integrated classrooms. Other concerns were more specific to certain groups of districts such as still providing half-day kindergarten programs, particular facility requirements, lack of experience with preschool, and board of education approval.

District officials speculated that there might be a number of barriers for parent participation in the preschool program. The most frequent concern was that the program's hours would not be compatible with parents' work schedules. The second most noted concern was the perception that parents want their young children at home with them. District administrators also believe that parents might think that 3 years old (and for some even 4) is too young for school. Transportation to school and the cost of tuition were also expressed as possible problems. On the other hand, for some a concern was the possibility that parents would think a full school day was too many hours for preschoolers. A small number of districts responded that parents may already have an existing relationship with a child care center and therefore not choose the public school program but these same districts did not plan to collaborate with child care agencies. However, 13 percent of interviewees reported that they were not aware of any reasons that parents wouldn't want their children to participate in preschool.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The state should proceed with funding preschool expansion. For the most part, districts and their potential partners are prepared and willing to serve 3- and 4-year-olds in high-quality preschool. Based on research we would predict that this investment will lead to improved achievement, reduction in school failure and savings to society.

Recommendation 2: Incentives should be provided to districts to contract and work collaboratively with child care centers and Head Start agencies to provide services. These private providers bring facilities and human resources to the collaboration. In particular, child care and Head Start administrators are much more likely to have formal qualifications and experience with preschool than do their district counterparts.

Recommendation 3: Construction funding for new and upgraded facilities is clearly needed if schools and their private partners are to meet facility standards. During the first few years of expansion it will be necessary to relax facility standards and provide waivers for the 950 square feet requirement on a case-by-case basis. Districts and private partners should be required to submit plans for how and when they will meet the requirements and no new facilities should be approved that do not meet the standards.

Recommendation 4: The Division of Early Childhood Education in the Department of Education is already active in providing early childhood professional development for leaders in districts and other agencies. Given the responses to our interviews, some specific areas of continued focus are recommended:

- Choosing and implementing state-recommended, effective preschool curriculum models;
- Providing in-class support to teachers using a continuous improvement cycle;
- Equipping classrooms with appropriate learning materials;
- Serving children with disabilities in regular education classes;
- Identifying and providing appropriate instructional support to young children who speak a language other than English at home;
- Implementing appropriate child assessments that inform instruction; and
- Studying the advantages of and methods for collaborating with other districts, child care agencies and Head Start centers

TECHNICAL REPORT

Methodology

Three methods of data collection were used in the study: surveys, interviews, and observations. District, child care and Head Start administrators were interviewed regarding a wide variety of issues related to expansion and current service provision. In districts that will be expected to serve all or large numbers of their preschool population we also conducted direct classroom and facility observations. Similar observations were also conducted in child care centers and Head Start programs.

The needs assessment was conducted in phases, using the following three tiers of districts that decrease in terms of low-income population served.

- **Tier 1**
Non-Abbott A, B, & CD districts with ≥ 40 percent F&R lunch rates (n=38)
 - **Tier 2**
 - A. All remaining non-Abbott A & B districts (with ≤ 39 percent F&R lunch rates) (n=43)
 - B. Any additional ECPA districts with ≤ 39 percent F&R lunch rates) (n=32)
 - C. Any other non-ECPA districts with an estimated eligible population of 3- and 4-year-olds that exceeds 30 (n= 37) (See Table 1)
- Total n = 112

Table 1: Tier 2C Districts by DFG and Eligible Population

Estimated universe of eligible 3- and 4-year-olds	District Factor Group					Number of districts by eligible population
	CD	DE	FG	GH	I	
31 - 90	5	6	6	8	2	27
> 91	2	4	4			10
Number of districts by DFG	7	10	10	8	2	37

- **Tier 3**
Non-Abbott/non-ECPA/non-A & B districts with <15 percent F&R lunch rates and CD districts with fewer than 31 eligible children (n=320)

This study built on a previous study conducted in collaboration with the New Jersey Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (NJACCRA), which collected information via phone interview and written workforce surveys from licensed child care and Head Start programs located in the state’s non-Abbott A, B, & CD districts, the majority of which are Tier 1 and 2 districts (Ackerman and Sansanelli, 2008). This survey yielded findings which suggest that early child care and education programs located in districts expected to be most impacted by the preschool expansion initiative have resources that could support this expansion of publicly funded preschool. However, such programs also present challenges to providing high-quality care in all domains. Some of the resources include experience serving preschoolers, directors’ administrative experience, centers’ having Department of Human

Services licensing, and access to full-time staff who often speak the home language of English Language Learner students (particularly Spanish). Furthermore, Head Start programs demonstrated experience implementing a research-based curriculum and a knowledge base of early learning standards.

Despite this, many of these centers present challenges, including small facilities, a lack of experience implementing a research-based curriculum based on early learning standards at most child care centers, and mixed background experience of directors specific to early childhood education. These findings suggest that while child care centers and Head Start programs present the experience and potential to serve 3- and 4-year-old children, it may be necessary to provide training, technical assistance, and new materials to these centers to provide a high level of care (Ackerman & Sansanelli, 2008).

The current study was conducted by Tier as follows:

- From March – July 2008 in the 38 Tier 1 districts we documented district facility and human resource capacity via telephone and site visit interviews and conducted facility evaluations and classroom observations in public, private, and Head Start classrooms serving 3- and 4-year old children. District reports were prepared for each district and provided the NJDOE for distribution.
- From July 2008 – December, 2009, these procedures were repeated with some modifications in Tier 2 districts and in a sample of child care and Head Start agencies that served children in these districts.
- From January – February, 2009, telephone interviews were conducted in the remaining eligible public school districts and in a sample of child care and Head Start centers in those districts.

Procedures

Needs Assessment Procedures in Tiers 1 and 2

Data collectors interviewed key personnel and observed in preschool classrooms in districts, child care centers, and Head Start agencies using three methods of data collection: surveys, interviews, and observations. Interviews conducted with school district personnel, child care directors and Head Start directors and observations conducted in the classrooms used the same protocol, with a slightly different set of questions used in the school district programs. In districts with a smaller eligible preschool population, a subset of child care centers (25 %) was randomly selected for participation. Buildings housing these programs were evaluated for their suitability in terms of the overall size and quality of the facility. Classrooms across settings serving preschool-aged children were observed to assess their general quality. Classroom observations focused on furniture, materials, classroom display, health and safety, room arrangement, teacher interaction, and classroom schedule. The items used for the observation protocol were based on research-based measures of classroom quality. Research demonstrates that preschool classrooms meeting higher standards of quality result in higher outcome scores for children in attendance (Frede, 1998). These classroom observations lasted approximately one hour and were administered in one class in each center or school. An abbreviated version of this classroom observation was conducted in all or a fraction of the remaining classes in each center

or school. This abbreviated version did not include the materials checklist and lasted about 20 minutes. For Tier 2, data was collected using handheld electronic palm pilots.

Another part of data collection included asking teaching staff in district preschool classes, child care centers, and Head Start centers to complete a brief questionnaire about their education background and teaching experience. This survey was initially sent to teaching staff in child care and Head Start centers as part of the previous study (Ackerman & Sansanelli, 2009). When data collectors visited child care centers and Head Start programs, they asked teaching staff who had not already completed the questionnaire to do so and return the survey to NIEER. Teaching staff in district preschool programs were also asked to complete a similar questionnaire. Because of a low return rate of these questionnaires after Tier 1 data collection in spring 2008, data collectors contacted center directors and school principals in the winter of 2009 to collect data on teaching staff who had not completed the survey. A shortened version of the questionnaire was completed by school principals and center directors about their preschool teaching staff. During Tier 2 data collection, preschool teaching staff were asked the survey questions by data collectors during classroom observations in order to facilitate higher rates of participation among the teaching staff.

The names and contact information for the child care and Head Start centers that were included in this needs assessment were obtained from the New Jersey Department of Children and Families' state-wide database of licensed settings. Child care and Head Start centers located in the districts (or in some cases nearby towns) and serving preschool age children were included in the sample for each district.

Letters were mailed to child care centers and Head Start agencies prior to data collection to alert them to the needs assessment and to explain what data collection and center visits would entail. In response to these letters, some directors called to express interest in participating, or to refuse to participate. Up to five phone calls were made to child care center and Head Start agencies to arrange for visits to the centers. Messages were left each time for the director explaining the needs assessment.

Letters were also mailed to the early childhood education contact and/or the superintendent in each district prior to data collection to explain the needs assessments. Early childhood education contacts and/or superintendents were then called by data collectors and asked if they were the most appropriate person in the district to answer questions about the district's preschool program and plans for preschool expansion. If another district administrator was suggested, that person was then contacted. Often phone calls and messages were followed up with emails to the desired contact. Generally, up to ten attempts were made to contact the correct district personnel to schedule an interview and preschool classroom observations.

Needs Assessment Procedures in Tier 3

Preschool programs in Tier 3 districts were not visited. Instead, information from both districts and centers was obtained through a phone survey conducted by Abt-SRBI. Current preschool administrators and/or district personnel responsible for overseeing preschool expansion were interviewed using a questionnaire based on a combination of the district and school level

instruments used in Tiers 1 and 2. District superintendents were called first and asked who the best person in the district was to speak to about preschool and preschool expansion. Once appropriate respondents were identified, they were asked whether they were able to complete the phone survey at that time. If respondents did not have time to complete the phone survey a call back time was arranged. If the respondent was not available, the phone interviewer would make a note of it and call back at a later time. Overall, the number of callback attempts to districts ranged from one time (*i.e.*, reaching the person the first time and completing the interview then) to a maximum of 21 callback attempts. The average amount of callback attempts was 7.6, and often, if many attempts were made, it was because the phone interviewer was unable to get through to the respondent even to schedule an appointment. For the districts, 246 phone interviews were completed, while the other 65 districts were either non-responsive or refused to participate.

A sample of child care and Head Start directors were interviewed using a questionnaire based on the center level instruments used in Tiers 1 and 2. The sample of centers for Tier 3 was based on the proportion of non-Abbott, non Tier 1 or Tier 2 centers in each county, with the goal of having a representative sample of Tier 3 centers by county. Phone interviewers from Abt-SRBI randomly selected child care and Head Start centers within a particular county to call until the assigned sample size was met in order to obtain a representative sample. In counties where there were smaller sample groups to select from, centers might be called multiple times to meet the quota. In a few instances, if all the centers in a particular county had been called and had either completed the survey or refused to participate, additional child care and Head Start centers were called from a larger nearby district. However, in all counties, with one exception, the completion rate exceeded 85 percent. Most of them exceeded a 95 percent completion rate. In the one county that had only a 67 percent completion rate, there were only four possible centers to interview based on the selection criteria, thus making it difficult to complete phone surveys for all four of them.

Instrumentation

Several different instruments were used during this needs assessment. During data collection for Tier 1 and Tier 2, there were more than 20 instruments used at the district, district school, child care/Head Start center, classroom, and teacher level. During Tier 3, only two telephone surveys were administered, one at the district level, and one at the child care/Head Start center level. These two instruments attempted to collect some information about schools, classrooms, and teachers as well.

Tiers 1 & 2

In Tiers 1 and 2, four levels of data were collected: District/center, site (school building/agency center), classroom, and teacher. Instruments at each level were revised for Tier 2 after feedback from Tier 1 data collection. In Tier 1, there were separate teacher background surveys for all teachers in child care or Head Start centers, lead teachers in district preschool programs, and assistant teachers in district preschool programs. In Tier 2, all lead and assistant teachers were asked to complete the same background survey.

District Demographic Survey and District Capacity Interview

In Tiers 1 and 2, the District Demographic Survey and District Capacity Interview were used to collect information on the district overall and on the district's preschool program. The majority of questions in the survey and interview were open-ended questions and responses were not prompted. Common responses discovered in Tier 1 were added on the survey in Tier 2 and data collected. We coded the responses but only in certain cases used these as prompts after respondents were given an opportunity to answer the question unprompted.

Upon scheduling a meeting with the district administrator(s) responsible for preschool, the district demographic survey was sent by mail, email or fax to the district. The administrators were asked to complete the district demographic survey prior to their meeting with the data collector. The data collector reviewed the form during the interview to check for completeness and consistency with other information collected.

The district capacity interview was an in-person interview with key district personnel with administrative authority for the district's preschool program. The interview was conducted over the phone with a few districts that did not currently operate a general education or inclusion preschool program. The district capacity interview lasted anywhere between half an hour and an hour, depending on how much the district had to say about preschool.

In these surveys and interviews, districts were asked general questions about the size and demographics of the school district as well as questions regarding current and planned provision of preschool services. In addition, information on the administrator's experience with early childhood education and concerns about the expansion was also gathered. In Tier 2 only, much of the data was collected by asking administrators to complete a chart that contained all of the information on preschool children and preschool classes and classrooms.

District Site Suitability Instrument

In Tiers 1 and 2, the District Site Suitability Instrument was used to collect information on district schools that housed preschool classrooms. It contained both a checklist about the condition of the building and outdoor gross motor space, and a brief interview to be completed with the building principal. The interview portion of the District Site Suitability Instrument was more extensive in Tier 1. For Tier 2, most of the questions were either moved to the District Demographic Survey and District Capacity Interview or were eliminated. A few additional questions about teachers' benefits were added (and removed from the teacher questionnaire).

The checklist component of the District Site Suitability Instrument gathered information about the condition of the school building, accessibility for those with physical disabilities, and suitability and condition of the outdoor space for gross motor activities. Building administrators were asked about the kinds of educational leadership provided to preschool staff and opportunities for family involvement in the preschool program. In Tier 2 we added questions to the interview portion to gather more information about the early childhood education background of the building administrator in an effort to determine the level of expertise available in districts; regarding the opportunities for professional development for preschool teaching staff, and about

health-related benefits. In Tier 1 (but not Tier 2), the interview contained questions about the demographics of the children served in the building and district practices that were later asked of the district administrator in Tier 2. As part of the district site suitability in Tier 1, data collectors were also asked to record the size of each room, the age of children served in each room, the maximum number of children allowed to enroll, the actual number of children enrolled, the number of children present, and any major concerns with the classroom. This information was incorporated into the classroom observation during Tier 2.

Center Suitability Instrument

During Tier 1 and Tier 2, the Center Suitability Instrument was used to collect information on child care and Head Start center buildings that housed preschool programs. It contained both a checklist about the condition of the building and outdoor gross motor space, and a brief interview to be completed with the center director or Head Start administrator. The checklist and the interview portions of the Center Suitability Instrument were mostly the same for Tiers 1 and 2. The few differences are noted below. Both components are more extensive than the District Site Suitability Instrument.

In both Tiers 1 and 2, the checklist portion of the center suitability like the district instrument gathered information about the condition of the school building, accessibility for those with physical disabilities, and suitability and condition of the outdoor space for gross motor activities. The remainder of the checklist items focused on the facilities. Items included if lighting, ventilation, and temperature could be controlled in the building, if classrooms are accessible to children and adults with physical disabilities, and if the building had a kitchen and if that kitchen could be used to prepare meals for children. Additional items focused on whether or not there was an easily accessible separate adult bathroom, space for meetings/conferences/breaks during the school day, and storage space for extra materials. All checklist items were asked during Tiers 1 and 2, but some items were combined for Tier 2.

In Tier 2, as with the district site level data, information was added regarding the background of the center director in an effort to determine the level of ECE-specific expertise available in centers. Additionally in Tier 2, directors were asked if their teaching staff attend professional development workshops or trainings outside of the centers, and if so, who pays for teaching staff to attend these workshops. They were also asked if teaching staff receive paid vacation and holidays, sick leave, full or partially paid health care, and a pension. These questions also were asked of individual teachers during Tier 1.

In Tier 1, but not Tier 2, data collectors, collected information on all the preschool classrooms. This information included the room dimensions, age range of children served in the classroom, and any major concerns about the classroom. It also included the maximum enrollment allowed in the classroom, the actual number of children enrolled in the classroom, and the number of children present during the observation. This information was incorporated into the classroom observation instruments for Tier 2.

The majority of the interview questions were asked during both Tiers 1 and 2. Interview items included questions aimed at determining the fiscal practices of the center as well as experience

with specific populations or practices that would be useful in contracting with the school district such as whether the center is accredited, has participated in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), served children with special needs or who are English Language Learners, and teaching and leadership practices.

Classroom Observations: Basic Environmental Quality Classroom Observation and Basic Equipment and Materials Observation Checklist

Three versions of the Basic Environmental Quality Classroom Observation were used to collect classroom level data in district, child care, and Head Start classrooms. In Tier 1 districts, only the full and abbreviated classroom observations were used. The full and abbreviated classroom observations were updated slightly for Tier 2 data collection. No classroom observations were conducted in Tier 3 districts.

Data collectors were given detailed instructions on which version of the classroom observation form to use in which classrooms. During Tier 1 and Tier 2, one full classroom observation was completed in one preschool (general education or inclusion) classroom in each school or center visited. If the school or center had between one and four preschool classrooms, one full classroom observation was completed and an abbreviated classroom observation was completed in the remaining preschool classrooms. In Tier 2, a classroom details form was completed in any non-preschool classrooms or preschool self-contained classrooms. If the site had five to 10 preschool classrooms, one full classroom observation was completed and an abbreviated classroom observation was completed in half of the remaining preschool classrooms. In Tier 2, a classroom details form was completed in the remaining preschool classrooms, any non-preschool classrooms, and any preschool self-contained classrooms. If the school or center had more than 10 preschool classrooms, one full classroom observation was completed and an abbreviated classroom observation was completed in one third of the remaining preschool classrooms. In Tier 2, a classroom details form was completed in the remaining preschool classrooms, any non-preschool classrooms, and any preschool self-contained classrooms. Table 2 shows the number of each type of observation to be completed in schools with a certain number of preschool classrooms.

In Tier 1, information in the classroom details form was collected during the center suitability and the district site suitability visit. The full classroom observation took approximately one hour to complete. The abbreviated classroom observation took approximately half an hour to complete. And the classroom details form took approximately 15 minutes to complete. Generally, all classroom observations could be completed in one day but occasionally in large schools or centers, two days were needed to complete all the necessary classroom observations.

Table 2: Number of Classroom Observations to be Completed

Number of Preschool Classrooms in the Site	Number of Observations to Be Completed		
	Full Classrooms Observations	Abbreviated Classroom Observations	Classroom Details Forms – Tier 2 (in Preschool Classrooms) ¹
1	1	0	0
2	1	1	0
3	1	2	0
4	1	3	0
5	1	2	2
6	1	3	2
7	1	3	3
8	1	4	3
9	1	4	4
10	1	5	4
11	1	3	7
12	1	4	7
13	1	4	8
14	1	4	9
15	1	5	9

The full classroom observation was the most comprehensive classroom observation used for data collection. In Tier 1, the full classroom observation asked for basic information about the classroom such as the number of staff present, the highest number of children present, and the age of the children in the classroom. In Tier 2 additional questions were included such as the maximum and actual classroom enrollment, the number of children with disabilities enrolled, the room size, and if the classroom was in a district preschool program, Head Start program, or child care center. Many of these items were asked in Tier 1 in the center suitability or district site suitability. Additionally, the full classroom observation contained items related to very minimal quality for a preschool classroom. The Basic Equipment and Materials Observation Checklist assessed the presence of materials and furniture recommended by the NJ DOE-DECE.

The Basic Environmental Quality Classroom Observation changed slightly between Tier 1 and Tier 2. For Tier 2, some questions from Tier 1 were either eliminated or combine. Data from the classroom direct observation sites are collected in five areas; furniture and room arrangement, health and safety, television/computer, teacher and peer interaction and daily schedule. The furniture and room arrangement section contains information about the type and condition of the furniture in the room, how the room is organized and set up. Furniture and room arrangement can not only impact a child’s ability to learn, but also the quality of the learning environment. The health and safety section includes questions about health practices such as hand washing and knowledge of health as well as safety procedures indoors and outdoors. Teacher and peer interaction items include how staff work with and respond to children to help them develop social emotional skills and positive interactions with their peers. Lastly, the daily schedule section contains items on whether there is a written schedule and how the day is divided up and

¹ The classroom details form was also to be completed in all infant/toddler classrooms and self-contained district preschool classrooms.

organized. In Tier 1, there was also a section on use of TV and computers. These questions were eliminated for Tier 2.

The furniture checklist was also included in the Basic Environmental Quality Classroom Observation and provided a count of essential furniture items such as shelving units, tables and child-sized play furniture. The materials checklists assessed materials by type of activity and included art, sand/water, blocks, technology, woodworking, dramatic play, books, manipulatives, and music/movement. The music/movement checklist was used primarily in Tier 2 and also in a few classrooms at the end of the Tier 1 data collection period.

The abbreviated classroom observations used in Tiers 1 and 2 included all items from the classroom observation but did not contain the materials checklists. The classroom details form was developed for Tier 2 to replace the section of the center suitability and district site suitability that asked for the number of children enrolled in each classroom and the size of the classroom. It was designed to collect basic classroom information for classrooms in which the full or abbreviated classroom observations were not completed. The classroom details form asked for the number of staff present, the highest number of children present, the maximum enrollment allowed, the actual enrollment, number of children with disabilities, age of children, room size, and any major concerns with the classroom.

Teacher Surveys

In Tiers 1 and 2, teacher surveys were used to collect information on the backgrounds and experience of lead and assistant teachers. The teacher surveys were changed between Tier 1 and Tier 2 and also differed slightly for lead and assistant teachers. In Tier 1, a different survey was used for teachers in child care and Head Start centers than for teachers in district preschool programs.

The Tier 1 child care and Head Start teacher survey was initially used in the previous study of child care and Head Start capacity (Ackerman and Sansanelli, 2008). Prior to beginning Tier 1 data collection, this survey was mailed to teachers in child care and Head Start centers that participated in the phone survey for that study. Because only a small number of the total sample of teachers completed the survey and returned it to NIEER, we amended the methods for data collection to be in-person or via telephone interview.

The teacher workforce survey collected information on the teacher and assistant teacher's qualifications (educational attainment, ECE-related coursework and degrees, certification and years of experience), demographic information (race/ethnicity, languages spoken, gender and age), and other work-related questions such as salary, opportunities for professional development, and benefits. They were also asked how long they planned to stay in their current position. Teaching staff in district preschools were given a slightly different version of the teacher survey and lead and assistant teachers received slightly different surveys as well. District lead teachers were not asked if a high school diploma, CDA, or associate's degree was their highest level of education. District assistant teachers were asked for the number of years they have been working as an assistant teacher in their district. With the exceptions of these questions, the district and child care/Head Start teachers surveys were the same.

However, additional changes were made to the teacher surveys for Tier 2. Data collectors asked teachers the questions directly and entered their responses into their hand held data collection instrument. Teachers were given the choice to enter some of the more private information themselves. In Tier 2, all lead teachers were given the same set of questions and all assistant teachers were given the same set of questions. Lead teachers in district preschool programs were asked for the number of years they had been teaching in the district. All lead teachers were asked for the number of years they had been working as a preschool teacher at their current school/center and their number of years teaching preschool anywhere. Assistant preschool teachers were asked for the number of years they had been working as an assistant preschool teacher at their current school/center and at any school/center. The Tier 2 lead and assistant teacher surveys did not ask about professional development or if teachers received paid vacation and holidays, paid sick leave, health care, or a pension. In Tier 2, these questions were asked at the school and center level about all teachers in that school or center rather than of individual teachers in order to shorten the teacher survey.

Because of a low response rate among teaching staff in Tier 1, data collectors made a second attempt to collect information on teachers and assistant teachers. A new, shortened version, of the teacher survey was developed for this purpose. Separate surveys were used for district preschool teachers, child care center teachers, and Head Start teachers. School principals and center directors were contacted and asked to collect the information on their teaching staff. They were provided with names of teachers who already completed the process. District teachers were asked if they teach in general education or inclusion classrooms. They were asked for the number of years they had been teaching in the district, in the school, and anywhere. They were also asked for their highest degree earned, if they majored in early childhood education, and about their New Jersey teaching certifications. District teachers were also asked if they speak any languages other than English fluently, what best describes their ethnicity, and their age. Child care center and Head Start teachers were asked similar questions. However, they were asked if they had a CDA. They were also asked for the number of years they had been teaching at their current centers and at any center or school.

Tier 3

Only two data collection instruments were used in Tier 3, a district interview and child care interview, both of which were conducted through phone surveys. The district interview was administered to the district personnel most responsible for overseeing the preschool expansion, such as the superintendent, director of curriculum and instruction or sometimes the principal. The child care interview was administered to the director of the child care center, although sometimes the owner of the center or assistant director would be the respondent instead. For both surveys, questions pertained to the overall district or center rather than classroom or teacher specific questions.

On average, the district interview lasted approximately 20 minutes and the child care interview lasted approximately 10 minutes. All questions were open-ended, but contained pre-coded responses for the interviewer to check off. For the majority of questions, there was an “other” response choice where the interviewer could type in a respondent’s answer if something was

mentioned that was not one of the coded responses. When cleaning the data, if there were multiple “other” responses that were the same, a new coded response was created.

District Interview

The District Interview in Tier 3 contained similar questions to those used in the other districts including current demographic information about the district, preschool services that are provided, teacher professional development and technical assistance available to teachers, preschool administration and plans for preschool expansion. It should be noted that some of the Tier 3 districts do not currently have a preschool program, but under the preschool expansion plan they will be required to start a program. For these districts, they were asked only about general demographic information of the district and their plans for preschool expansion.

Child Care Interview

The Child Care Interview for Tier 3 was also similar to that used in other districts and was used to obtain demographic information about the center as well as staffing information to get a better understanding of the capacity of child care and Head Start centers to serve preschool-aged children as part of the expansion. First, child care and Head Start administrators were asked whether their center enrolls 3- and 4-year-old children. If they said no, the interviewer ended the call and the center was removed from the sample. For centers that enrolled preschool-aged children, questions were asked about the current enrollment and ages of the children, and the number of classrooms, including questions about infant and toddler classrooms, as well as preschool classrooms. Interview items also included information about the teachers in the center, such as languages spoken and their education levels. Directors were also asked about their own credentials and those of the teaching staff.

Sample

District

New Jersey has 593 school districts, 498 of which serve elementary school students. These 498 districts include the 31 Abbott districts, which already offer a high-quality preschool program to all 3- and 4-year-olds in the district. The sample of districts for this needs assessment includes the remaining 467 non-Abbott school districts that serve elementary school students, which represent 79 percent of the school districts in the state.

Of the 467 school districts in the sample, a total of 375 (80.3 percent) were interviewed either in-person or over the phone as part of this needs assessment. Another 20 districts (4.3 percent) refused to participate and 72 districts (15.4 percent) could not be reached or were not responsive to phone calls and emails. Tables 3-7 describe the sample of non-Abbott districts serving elementary school students included in the sample.

Tier 1 had the highest rate of participation with 95 percent of districts participating in the needs assessment. Tier 2 followed with 87 percent of districts participating while 76 percent of Tier 3 districts participated. Among the districts that did not participate in the needs assessment,

districts were more likely to be non-responsive than to refuse to participate. Of these districts, 22 percent refused to participate after being contacted by data collectors whereas 78 percent did not respond to calls from data collectors. District superintendents are busy and difficult to reach, which could explain the higher rate of non-responders than refusals. Most districts were amenable to participating once they spoke to a data collector who explained the project and its purpose.

Table 3: District Participation by Tier

Status	Tier 1 ²		Tier 2		Tier 3		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Complete	36	7.7	96	20.6	243	52.0	375	80.3
Refused	0	0.0	8	1.7	12	2.6	20	4.3
Non-Responsive	2	0.4	6	1.3	64	13.7	72	15.4
Total	38	8.1	110	23.6	319	68.3	467	100

Districts were divided into universal and targeted categories based on their district factor groups and percentages of their population eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. As described earlier, universal districts will be required to offer preschool to all 3- and 4-year-olds in the district. Targeted district will be required to offer preschool to only 3- and 4-year-olds who are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. For the most part, the universal districts have more at-risk children and will have to serve more preschoolers under the preschool expansion than the targeted districts. There are 81 universal and 386 targeted districts in the sample. Table 4 shows the participation of universal and targeted school districts. Ninety-one percent of the universal districts and 80 percent of the targeted districts participated in the needs assessment.

Table 4: District Participation by Universal/Targeted Designation

Status	Universal		Targeted		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Complete	74	15.8	301	64.5	375	80.3
Refused	2	0.4	18	3.9	20	4.3
Non-Responsive	5	1.1	67	14.3	72	15.4
Total	81	17.3	386	82.7	467	100

New Jersey currently has three state-funded preschool programs: Abbott Preschool Program, Non-Abbott Early Childhood Program Aid (ECPA), and Early Launch to Learning Initiative (ELLI). This sample includes districts receiving ECPA and/or ELLI funding and districts not currently receiving state funding to provide preschool. Table 5 shows the breakdown of districts by state preschool funding type. The sample includes 101 ECPA district, 12 ELLI (non ECPA) districts, and 354 districts not receiving ECPA, ELLI, or Abbott funding. Twelve districts received both ECPA and ELLI funding. These districts are treated as ECPA districts throughout this report. Eighty-nine percent of the ECPA districts, 100 percent of the ELLI districts, and 77 percent of the non Abbott, ECPA, ELLI districts participated in this needs assessment. A higher rate of participation among districts receiving ECPA and ELLI funding could be due in part to these districts being more familiar with, and receptive to, preschool and that they are more likely to have a designated preschool administrator.

² Two Tier 1 districts were unable to participate during the Tier 1 data collection period. They did participate during the Tier 2 data collection period and were assessed using the revised Tier 2 data collection instruments.

Table 5: District Participation by ELLI/ECPA Designation

Status	ECPA		ELLI, non-ECPA		Non-ELLI or ECPA		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Complete	90	19.3	12	2.6	273	58.5	375	80.3
Refused	6	1.3	0	0	14	3.0	20	4.3
Non-Responsive	5	1.1	0	0	67	14.3	72	15.4
Total	101	21.6	12	2.6	354	75.8	467	100

For purposes of this report counties and the school districts residing within them were divided into three geographical regions: North, Central, and South. The North region contains Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, Passaic, Sussex, Union, and Warren counties. The Central Region includes Burlington, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Ocean, and Somerset counties. The South region consists of Atlantic, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem counties. Table 6 shows the participation rates in the three geographical regions. Participations rates were similar in all three regions. Seventy-nine percent of districts in the North, 82% of districts in the Central region, and 81% of districts in the South participated in the needs assessment.

Table 6: District Participation by Geographical Region

Status	North		Central		South		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Complete	152	32.5	136	29.1	87	18.6	375	80.3
Refused	6	1.3	8	1.7	6	1.3	20	4.3
Non-Responsive	35	7.5	22	4.7	15	3.2	72	15.4
Total	193	41.3	166	35.5	108	23.1	467	100

Districts were divided into three categories based on the number of elementary school (including kindergarten and prekindergarten schools) in the district. Number of elementary schools per district served as a proxy for district size. It was estimated that each elementary school serves up to approximately 600 students (seven grades per elementary school, up to four classes per grade, and up to 20 students per class). Small districts are estimated to have up to 600 elementary school students. Medium districts are estimated to have between 601 and 2,400 elementary school students. Large districts are estimated to have more than 2,401 elementary school students.

Districts with only one elementary school are considered small districts for the purposes of this report. Districts with two, three, or four elementary schools are considered medium-size districts. Districts with five or more elementary schools are considered large school districts. There are two districts in the sample that do not have any elementary schools, Pemberton Borough and Shiloh. These two districts are not included in Table 7, which shows the participation rates of districts by district size.

There were 205 small districts, 181 medium districts, and 79 large districts in the sample. The larger districts tended to have higher participation rates. Eighty-nine percent of the large districts participated in the needs assessment. Eighty-two percent of the medium districts and 76 percent of the small districts participated in the needs assessment.

Large districts will, for the most part, have a larger estimated number of eligible preschoolers to serve under preschool expansion. These districts may have a harder time finding space in the district to serve them and therefore might be more likely to have to subcontract with child care and/or Head Start centers. Small districts will, for the most part, have a smaller estimated number of eligible preschoolers to serve under preschool expansion. However, since some of these districts are quite small, finding space in-district for even a small preschool program may be difficult. Therefore, some of these districts will likely also have to contract with child care and/or Head Start centers. Some districts (large and small) may only have to provide preschool to one or two children. These districts may also be more likely to subcontract with a child care or Head Start center, than to start an in-district program when they can only receive state-funding for one or two children.

Table 7: District Participation by Size Category

Status	Small		Medium		Large		Total ³	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Complete	156	33.5	148	31.8	70	15.1	374	80.4
Refused	12	2.6	8	1.7	0	0	20	4.3
Non-Responsive	37	8.0	25	5.4	9	1.9	71	15.3
Total	205	44.1	181	38.9	79	17.0	465	100

Table 8 shows the type of preschool program offered by the 375 districts that participated in the needs assessment. A total of 256 school districts (68 percent) offered a general education and/or inclusion preschool program. These districts may have also had a preschool self-contained program. Eighty-three school districts (22 percent) offered only a preschool self-contained program and 36 districts (10 percent) did not have any type of preschool program at time of data collection. Prior to the implementation of preschool expansion, two-thirds of districts that participated in this needs assessment already had a general education and/or inclusion preschool program. This number may over-represent the percentage of districts in the state that currently have preschool because districts with preschool programs may have been more likely to participate in the needs assessment.

Table 8: Type of Preschool Program offered by Districts

	General Education and/or Inclusion ⁴		Self-Contained Only		No Preschool		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tier 1	36	9.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	36	9.6
Tier 2	80	21.3	12	3.2	4	1.1	96	25.6
Tier 3	140	37.3	71	18.9	32	8.5	243	64.8
Total	256	68.3	83	22.1	36	9.6	375	100

District Schools, Child Care Centers, and Head Start Programs

³ Two districts did not have any elementary schools and are not included in this table.

⁴ These districts may have self-contained preschool classes in addition to General Education and/or Preschool Inclusion classes.

District preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start programs in New Jersey were visited as part of Tiers 1 and 2 of this needs assessment. In Tier 3, district personnel, child care center directors, and Head Start administrators or site directors were interviewed but sites were not visited. A total of 568 district schools housing preschool classrooms, child care centers, and Head Start centers were visited as part of this needs assessment in Tiers 1 and 2, including 176 district schools, 338 child care centers and 54 Head Start centers. Information on 975 schools and centers was obtained through phone interviews in Tier 3 data collection, including information on 261 district schools, 698 child care centers, and 16 Head Start programs. Overall, information was obtained on 1,543 preschool programs including 437 district schools with preschool, 1,036 child care centers, and 70 Head Start sites. Table 9 provides more information the sample of schools and centers.

Table 9: District Preschools, Child Care Centers, and Head Start Program Sites that Participated in this Needs Assessment by Tier

	District Schools		Child Care Centers		Head Start Programs		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tier 1	59	3.8	103	6.7	27	1.7	189	12.2
Tier 2	117	7.6	235	15.4	27	1.6	379	24.6
Tier 3	261 ⁵	16.9	699 ⁵	45.3	15 ⁵	1.0	975	63.2
Total	437	28.3	1,037	67.2	69	4.5	1,543	100

District Schools

All district schools with inclusion and/or general education preschool programs in districts who participated in Tier 1 or Tier 2 of the needs assessment were visited, with the exception of schools in one district (Somerville). This district participated in the interview part of the needs assessment but would not allow data collectors to visit their preschool program. Therefore no information is available about schools housing preschool, preschool classrooms, or preschool teaching staff in that district. In Tier 3, basic information was obtained during the phone interview on all district schools housing preschool. This information included the name of the school, the number of preschool classes, number of classrooms used for preschool, and grades served in the school. There were 59 district schools with preschool that were visited in Tier 1 and 117 in Tier 2. In Tier 3, information was obtained on 261 schools with preschool.

Child Care Centers & Head Start Programs

The New Jersey Department of Children and Families’ (DCF) statewide database of licensed settings was used to determine which child care and Head Start centers are located in Tier 1, 2, and 3 districts. As of the spring of 2008, there were 4,208 licensed child care and Head Start centers in the state. Of these, 1,104 were located in Abbott districts and were not included in this needs assessment because they were thought to already contract with their respective Abbott school districts to serve preschoolers. An additional 769 of the remaining 3,104 licensed settings only served infants and toddlers (10) or school age children (759) and therefore were not

⁵ These schools were not visited but some data on the schools were obtained through a phone interview with district personnel and center/program directors.

included in the sample. Therefore the total population of child care and Head Start centers that serve preschool age children and are located in preschool expansion districts was 2,335. Child care and Head Start centers located in Tier 1 and Tier 2 districts were selected from the DCF statewide database of licensed settings based on the city in which the center was located. Occasionally, centers in nearby towns were included if they were known to be towns that sent children to the nearby districts. Centers serving only infants and toddlers or school age children were excluded from the sample.

In Tier 1, there were a total of 181 centers that served preschool age children, including 152 child care centers and 29 Head Start centers. A total of 130 of these programs were visited, including 103 child care centers and 27 Head Start Sites. Of the child care and Head Start centers that did not participate in the needs assessment, 38 (74 percent) refused to do so and 13 (26 percent) were not responsive to data collectors.

In Tier 2, there were a total of 622 centers that served preschool age children (non-Abbott), including 586 child care centers and 36 Head Start centers. Eleven of these 622 centers had either closed or were planning on closing at time of data collection. Three of the Head Start centers in Middlesex County were not visited because the Head Start contract was up for rebid and the programs were not likely to be housed in the same centers the following year. Therefore the total sample of licensed settings in Tier 2 was 608, including 575 child care centers and 33 Head Start centers.

A total of 262 licensed settings participated in Tier 2 data collection, including 235 child care centers and 27 Head Start centers. Table 10 shows the participation rates of child care and Head Start centers in Tier 2. Overall in Tier 2, the two most common reasons for centers not participating were directors refusal or directors not responding to phone calls and messages from data collectors. Additional reasons for not participating in this needs assessment include: using a Montessori curriculum (one center), using a faith-based curriculum (three centers), the center being located in a hospital and/or serving only children with severe medical problems/disabilities (two centers), serving only children of staff members (two centers), moving the center (one center), and in the process of renovating the centers (1 center). The centers that used a faith-based or Montessori curriculum likely did not participate because neither is a state-approved preschool curriculum. Therefore, these centers would have to change their curricula in order to contract with a district under preschool expansion.

In Tier 2A and 2B districts, data collectors attempted to visit all child care and Head Start centers. In Tiers 2A and 2B, there were 174 licensed settings including 159 child care centers and 15 Head Start centers that served preschool age children and did not exclusively serve Abbott children. Six of these centers had either closed or were planning to close and one of the Head Start centers in Middlesex County was not visited because the Head Start contract was up for rebid and the programs were not likely to be housed in the same centers the following year. Therefore, the total sample of licensed centers in Tiers 2A and 2B was 167, which includes 153 child care centers and 14 Head Start centers. Data collectors visited 117 licensed settings (70 percent) in Tier 2A and 2B districts, including 106 child care centers (69 percent) and 11 Head Start centers (79 percent).

In Tier 2C, data collectors attempted to visit 25% of child care centers in each district and all Head Start centers. We only sampled a fraction of these child care centers because districts in Tier 2C are all targeted districts and therefore will not have to serve as many 3- and 4-year-olds as Tier 1, Tier 2A, and Tier 2B districts. Our purpose here was to randomly select centers to provide a representative sample of centers in Tier 2C districts. There were 448 licensed settings in Tier 2C districts that served preschool age, non-Abbott children, including 427 child care centers and 21 Head Start centers. Five of these centers had either closed or were planning to close and two of the Head Start centers in Middlesex County were not visited because the Head Start contract was up for rebid and the programs were not likely to be housed in the same centers the following year. Therefore, the total sample of licensed centers in Tier 2C was 441, which includes 422 child care centers and 21 Head Start centers. The targeted number of child care centers in Tier 2C districts was 117. Data collectors visited 129 child care centers in Tier 2C and 16 Head Start centers, for a total of 145 licensed settings.

Table 10: Rates of Participation of Child Care and Head Start Centers in Tier 1 and Tier 2

	Child Care Centers					Head Start Centers			All Centers		
	Total	Targeted #	# Visited	% of Total Visited	% of Targeted Visited	Total	# Visited	% Visited	Total	# Visited	% Visited
Tier 1	152	152	103	67.8	100	29	27	93.1	181	130	71.8
Tier 2	575	270	235	40.8	87.0	35	27	77.1	611	262	42.9
2A&2B	153	153	106	69.3	69.3	14	11	78.6	167	117	70.0
2C⁶	422	117	129	30.6	110.3	21	16	76.2	443	145	32.7
Total	727	422	338	46.5	80.1	64	54	84.4	791	392	49.6

Data collectors visited 68 percent of child care and Head Start centers that reside in those districts that will be required to offer a universal preschool program. They visited 40 percent of child care and Head Start centers that reside in districts that will be required to offer a targeted preschool program. (See Table 11) As explained above, we did not attempt to visit all child care centers in all targeted districts, which accounts for why the participation rate of centers in targeted districts is lower than in universal districts. Since the universal districts will have to serve more preschoolers than the targeted districts (for the most part) under preschool expansion, centers in those districts will likely have to serve more children as well.

Table 11: Rates of Participation of Child Care and Head Start Centers in Universal and Targeted Districts in Tiers 1 & 2

	Child Care Centers					Head Start Centers			All Centers		
	Total	Targeted #	# Visited	% of Total Visited	% of Targeted Visited	Total	# Visited	% Visited	Total	# Visited	% Visited
Universal	230	230	149	64.8	64.8	39	33	84.6	269	182	67.7
Targeted⁷	497	204	189	38.0	92.6	25	21	84.0	522	210	40.2
Total	727	434	338	46.5	77.9	64	54	84.4	791	392	49.6

⁶ We only attempted to visit 25% of child care centers in Tier 2C and actually visited greater than 25% of these centers.

⁷ We did not attempt to visit all child care centers in all of the targeted districts.

There were 1,532 child care and Head Start centers that were not included in Tier 1 or 2, were not located in an Abbott districts, and served preschool age children. For Tier 3, the goal was to obtain information via phone survey on 700 of these centers across all counties in New Jersey. The target number of centers in each county was based on the percent of the 1,532 in each county. Table 12 shows the targeted number of centers in each county and the number of child care and Head Start centers in each county that actually participated in the needs assessment. In Tier 3, there were a total of 714 centers that participated in the needs assessment phone survey, which includes 698 child care centers and 16 Head Start centers. In most counties, the targeted number of centers was met or exceeded.

Table 12: Tier 3 Child Care and Head Start Participation by County

County	Target # Centers	Completed # Centers		
		Total	Child Care Centers	Head Start Centers
Atlantic	8	8	7	1
Bergen	108	97	97	0
Burlington	44	46	46	0
Camden	29	30	29	1
Cape May	8	7	6	1
Cumberland	2	2	1	1
Essex	35	36	36	0
Gloucester	31	32	30	2
Hudson	2	2	2	0
Hunterdon	22	23	23	0
Mercer	32	33	32	1
Middlesex	44	48	47	1
Monmouth	60	68	67	1
Morris	91	88	87	1
Ocean	14	14	13	1
Passaic	29	31	30	1
Salem	3	3	3	0
Somerset	53	54	54	0
Sussex	25	28	26	2
Union	44	46	46	0
Warren	16	18	17	1
STATEWIDE	700	714	698	16

Head Start Programs

Head Start programs from 14 of 16 agencies in New Jersey that serve non-Abbott children participated in this needs assessment. Table 13 shows the number of Head Start sites per agency that participated in the needs assessment, either via a phone interview (Tier 3) or in-person interview and observation (Tier 1 and Tier 2).

Table 13: Participation of Head Start Sites by Agency

Head Start Agency	Type of Districts Served	# of Head Start Sites Visited	Total # of Head Start Sites	Reason for Centers Not Participating
Acelero Learning Monmouth County	Abbott & Expansion	5	8	2 Abbott – Not in Sample, 1 Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Atlantic Human Resources, Inc.	Abbott & Expansion	10	21	2 Abbott – Not in Sample, 5 Not Responsive, 4 Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Bayonne Economic Opportunity Foundation/B.E.O.F.	Expansion	3	3	
Bergen County Community Action Program, Inc.	Abbott & Expansion	4	5	1 Abbott – Not in Sample
Burlington County Community Action Program	Expansion	2	4	Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Camden County Council on Economic Opportunity	Abbott & Expansion	7	21	11 Abbott – Not in Sample, Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Center for Family Resources	Expansion	4	8	Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Mercer County Head Start Child Development Program	Expansion	5	5	
Middlesex County Economic Opportunity Corp.	Abbott & Expansion	6	14	3 Abbott – Not in Sample, 2 Not Visited because contract up for rebid, 2 Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3, 1 Not Responsive
Montclair Child Development Center, Inc.	Abbott & Expansion	0	3	2 Abbott – Not in Sample, 1 Not Responsive
Morris County Head Start Community Program Inc.	Expansion	3	3	
North Hudson Community Action Corp.	Abbott & Expansion	3	7	3 Abbott – Not in Sample
Northwest New Jersey Community Action Agency/NORWESCAP	Abbott & Expansion	3	6	2 Abbott – Not in Sample, 1 Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Ocean County Economic Action NOW, Inc	Expansion	6	7	Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Somerset Community Action Program	Expansion	0	4	1 Refused, Not Randomly Selected Tier 3
TRI-County Community Action Agency, Inc.	Abbott & Expansion	8	26	16 Abbott – Not in Sample, 2 Not Randomly Selected in Tier 3
Head Start Agencies Not in Preschool Expansion Sample				
Acelero Learning Camden Early Head Start	Abbott	0	NR	Abbott & Expansion
CDI Head Start Plainfield	Abbott	0	3	Abbott – Not in Sample
Concerned Parents for Head Start	Abbott	0	4	Abbott – Not in Sample
East Orange Child Development Corp.	Abbott	0	10	Abbott – Not in Sample
Friendly Fuld Neighborhood Center, Inc	Abbott	0	3	Abbott – Not in Sample
H.O.P.E.S Head Start (Hoboken)	Abbott	0	3	Abbott – Not in Sample
Jersey City Child Development Centers, Inc.	Abbott	0	15	Abbott – Not in Sample
Leaguers Early Childhood Development Center	Abbott	0	11	Abbott – Not in Sample
Newark Central Early Head Start	Abbott	0	2	Abbott – Not in Sample
Newark Pre-School Council	Abbott	0	55	Abbott – Not in Sample
Passaic Family Head Start	Abbott	0	3	Abbott – Not in Sample
Trenton Head Start, Inc.	Abbott	0	6	Abbott – Not in Sample

Classrooms

All Ages

Information was obtained on a total of 5,076 classrooms in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 of data collection. These classrooms include 1,311 (25.8 percent) district preschool classroom, 3,529 (69.5 percent) child care centers classrooms, and 236 (4.6 percent) Head Start classrooms. Data collectors visited a total of 2,052 classrooms in Tiers 1 and 2, including 558 (27.2 percent) district preschool classrooms, 1323 (64.4 percent) child care center classrooms, and 171 (8.3 percent) Head Start classrooms. Additionally, information was obtained on 4,222 classrooms through a phone interview in Tier 3, including 753 (17.8 percent) district preschool classrooms, 3,414 (80.9 percent) child care center classrooms, and 55 (1.3 percent) Head Start classrooms. Only very basic information was obtained on classrooms in Tier 3 districts, including the number of classrooms per school/center, enrollment, and operating schedule. Tables 14 & 15 provide information on the number of classrooms in the sample in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 and the number of classrooms visited in Tiers 1 and 2.

No database exists that provides the number of classrooms per district school, child care center, or Head Start center. Therefore, the proportion of the actual universe of classrooms in these auspices (district schools, child care centers, and Head Start centers) that we visited or interviewed is unknown. Of the 132 Tier 1 and 2 districts that participated in this needs assessment, we visited in-district preschool classrooms in 114 districts (86.4 percent). Of the 243 Tier 3 districts that participated in this needs assessment, we obtained information via the phone survey on preschool classrooms in 206 districts that serve preschool children (84.8 percent). Thus, we obtained some classroom level information about classrooms in 338 districts, 67 percent of 498 districts that serve elementary school children. We estimated that there are 10,468 child care center classrooms in non-Abbott districts in New Jersey and we visited (or obtained information via the phone survey on) 4,737 (45.3 percent) of these classrooms. We also estimated that there are 301 Head Start center classrooms in non-Abbott districts in New Jersey and we visited (or obtained information via the phone survey on) 226 (75 percent) of these classrooms. With the exception of self-contained classrooms, we attempted to observe in/obtain information on all preschool classrooms in school districts and all classrooms in child care and Head Start centers.

Table 14: Number of Sample Classrooms by Auspice and Tier – All Ages

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tier 1	153	2.4	397	6.3	91	1.5	641	10.2
Tier 2	405	6.5	926	14.8	80	1.3	1,411	22.5
Tier 3⁸	753	12.0	3414	54.4	55	0.9	4,222	67.3
Total	1,311	20.9	4,737	75.5	226	3.6	6,274	100

⁸ Classrooms in Tier 3 were not visited but information was obtained on enrollment in those classrooms during the phone interview with district administrators, child care center directors, and Head Start administrators or site directors.

Table 15: Number of Sample Classrooms Visited by Auspice in Tiers 1 and 2 – All Ages

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tier 1	153	7.5	397	19.3	91	4.4	641	31.2
Tier 2	405	19.7	926	45.1	80	3.9	1,411	68.8
Total	558	27.2	1,323	64.5	171	8.3	2,052	100

Schools/Centers varied in the number of classrooms they had. Across all settings and all auspices the number of classrooms ranged from 1 to 24 (See Table 16). Infant and/or toddler classrooms ranged from 0 to 12 and preschool classrooms ranged from 1 to 23 per center/school. District preschool programs did not have any infant and toddler classrooms and had between 1 and 15 preschool age classrooms. Child care centers had between 0 and 12 infant and/or toddler classrooms and between 1 and 23 preschool classrooms. Head Start centers had between 0 and 6 infant and/or toddler classrooms and between 1 and 13 preschool classrooms. The average number of infant and/or toddler classrooms per center/school was the largest in child care centers (2.0). The average number of preschool classrooms per center/school was 2.4 in district schools, 2.7 in child care centers, and 3.3 in Head Start programs. However, the average number of total classrooms per center/school was 2.4 in district schools, 4.8 in child care centers, and 3.6 in Head Start programs. Child care centers tended to have the most total classrooms but Head Start centers tended to have the most preschool age classrooms.

Table 16: Number of Classrooms per School and Center – All Ages

Program Type Age of Children	District Preschool Program			Child Care Center			Head Start Program		
	Min.	Max.	Mean	Min.	Max.	Mean	Min.	Max.	Mean
Infant & Toddler	0	0	0	0	12	2.0	0	6	0.4
Preschool	1	15	2.4	1	23	2.7	1	13	3.3
All Ages	1	15	2.4	1	24	4.8	1	19	3.6

New Jersey preschool regulations require that child care centers and Head Start sites that enter into new contracts with school districts to provide preschool have at least six classrooms. Across all tiers of data collection, 278 child care centers (27 percent) that were visited during this needs assessment have at least six classrooms. Centers that have six or more classrooms would be eligible to contract with a school district for preschool expansion without needing a waiver. Table 17 reports the number of child care centers and Head Start sites that have at least six classrooms in universal and targeted districts.

Table 17: Number of Centers with at Least 6 Classrooms by District Type (Tiers 1, 2, 3) – All Ages

District Type	Child Care and Head Start Centers	
	# Centers with at Least 6 Classrooms	% (Of Centers Participating in Needs Assessment)
Universal	16	11.1
Targeted	262	29.6
ALL	278	27.0

Table 18 reports the number of classrooms visited in universal and targeted districts. The sample was fairly evenly split between universal districts. A total of 935 (45.6 percent) classrooms in universal and 1,117 (54.4 percent) classrooms in targeted districts were observed. Of the 935 classrooms in universal districts, 292 (31.2 percent) were in district schools, 536 (57.3 percent) were in child care centers, and 107 (11.4 percent) were in Head Start centers. Of the 1,117 classrooms in targeted districts, 266 (23.8 percent) were in district schools, 787 (70.5 percent) were in child care centers, and 64 (5.7 percent) were in Head Start centers.

Table 18: Classrooms Visited (Tier 1 & Tier 2) by Universal/Targeted District – All Ages

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Universal	292	14.2	536	26.1	107	5.2	935	45.6
Targeted	266	13.0	787	38.4	64	3.1	1,117	54.4
Total	558	27.2	1,323	64.5	171	8.3	2,052	100

Table 19 reports the number of classrooms visited in ECPA, ELLI, and non ECPA/ELLI districts. There were more classrooms visited in ECPA (61.7 percent) districts than in ELLI (3.9 percent) and non-ECPA/ELLI (34.4 percent) districts combine. While there are more non-ECPA/ELLI (354) than ECPA (101) districts in the sample, ECPA districts are more likely to have district preschool classrooms. Additionally, all the ECPA districts were in Tier 1 or Tier 2A, or 2B and therefore, we attempted to visit all child care centers in those districts. Many of the non-ECPA/ELLI districts were in Tier 2C or Tier 3, and we only attempted to visit a random selection of centers. Therefore, it is logical that there would be a greater number of classrooms in the sample from ECPA districts. There were only 12 ELLI districts in the sample, which accounts for the small number of classrooms in ELLI districts visited.

A total of 1,267 classrooms in ECPA districts were visited, including 416 (32.3 percent) in district schools, 731 (57.7 percent) in child care centers, and 120 (9.5 percent) in Head Start centers. A total of 80 classrooms in ELLI districts were visited, including 19 (23.8 percent) in district schools, 57 (71.3 percent) in child care centers, and four (5.0 percent) in Head Start centers. A total of 705 classrooms were visited in non-ECPA/ELLI districts, including 123 (17.4 percent) in district schools, 535 (75.9 percent) in child care centers, and 47 (6.7 percent) in Head Start centers.

Table 19: Classrooms Visited (Tier 1 & Tier 2) by District Type (ECPA/ELLI) – All Ages

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ECPA	416	20.3	731	35.6	120	5.8	1,267	61.7
ELLI	19	0.9	57	2.8	4	0.2	80	3.9
Non ECPA/ELLI	123	6.0	535	26.1	47	2.3	705	34.4
Total	558	27.2	1,323	64.5	171	8.3	2,052	100

Most schools/centers only enrolled up to 15 children per classroom. More than 60 percent of classrooms enrolled between zero and 15 children. Preschool expansion regulations require a class-size maximum of 15 children. Classrooms currently enrolling more than 15 children will

have to decrease their enrollment. Twenty-four percent of classrooms had 16-20 children enrolled. Fewer than 10 percent of classrooms had more than 21 children enrolled.

Table 20 reports the number of classrooms that have each range of children enrolled. In district schools, 53 percent of classrooms served no more than 15 children. These classrooms would meet the preschool expansion class size requirement. Thirty percent of classrooms enrolled between 16 and 20 children and 13 percent enrolled more than 21 children. In the 2007-2008 school year, ECPA-funded district preschool programs were allowed to enroll up to 25 children per classroom. This requirement changed for the 2008-2009 school year and ECPA-funded district preschool programs could only enroll up to 18 children per classroom. Data collectors visited ECPA preschool classes in the spring of 2008 when the classroom size requirement was 25 and in the fall of 2008 when the classroom size requirement was 18. Therefore, many of the classrooms that enrolled 16-20 or more than 21 children per classroom could have been following the current state requirements. Similarly, districts receiving ELLI funding may enroll up to 20 children per classroom.

In child care centers, 70 percent of classrooms served no more than 15 children. These classrooms would meet the preschool expansion class size requirement. Seventeen percent of child care center classrooms enrolled 16-20 children and 7 percent enrolled more than 21 children. In Head Start centers, only 42 percent of classrooms served no more than 15 children. However, 54 percent of classrooms served between 16 and 20 children. Fewer than 3 percent of Head Start classrooms have more than 21 children enrolled. Head Start performance standards require a class size of up to 20 children for 4-year-old classes and up to 17 children for 3-year-old classes. This requirement could explain why a greater percentage of classrooms in Head Start settings enroll more than 15 children. However, if these Head Start programs partner with school districts for preschool expansion, they will have to decrease the number of children enrolled per classroom.

Table 20: Classrooms Visited (Tiers 1&2) by Number of Children Enrolled and Auspice – All Ages

Program Type # Children Per Class	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-15	294	14.3	932	45.4	72	3.5	1298	63.3
16-20	168	8.2	223	10.9	92	4.5	483	23.5
More than 21	74	3.6	92	4.5	5	0.2	171	8.3
Not Reported	22	3.9	76	5.7	2	1.2	100	4.9
Total	558	27.2	1323	64.5	171	8.3	2052	100

The maximum class size allowed under preschool expansion will be 15. Therefore, the classes that currently enroll more than 15 students will have to reduce their enrollment. Table 21 shows the capacity of district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start sites to enroll preschoolers with a maximum class size of 15 children. Table 21 includes Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 classrooms that served children *of all ages*. The capacity of all schools and centers that participated in this needs assessment is 94,110 children, including child care and Head Start classrooms that currently serve infants and/or toddlers and school age children. District schools have the capacity to serve 19,665 preschoolers using classrooms currently used for district

preschool programs (including self-contained preschool classrooms). Child care centers have the capacity to serve 71,055 preschoolers using all classrooms in the centers. And Head Start sites have the capacity to serve 3,390 preschoolers using all classrooms in the sites. These numbers may overestimate the actual number of preschoolers that can be served because some classrooms may be licensed for fewer than 15 preschoolers. District schools may also be reluctant to convert all their self-contained preschool classrooms to inclusion classrooms and self-contained classrooms may have a maximum enrollment that is fewer than 15.

Table 21: Capacity of Schools and Centers to Serve Preschoolers Using All Existing Classrooms

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	# Classrooms	Capacity (15 per classroom)	# Classrooms	Capacity (15 per classroom)	# Classrooms	Capacity (15 per classroom)	# Classrooms	Capacity (15 per classroom)
Universal	293	4,395	609	9,135	110	1,650	1,012	15,180
Targeted	1,018	1,5270	4,128	61,920	116	1,740	5,262	78,930
Total	1,311	1,9665	4,737	71,055	226	3,390	6,274	94,110

Table 22 shows the number of classrooms serving various age groups of children. More than 70 percent of classrooms visited served preschool age children. For the purpose of this project, preschool age children are defined as 3-year-olds who will be eligible for kindergarten in two years, and 4-year-olds who will be eligible for kindergarten in one year. The needs assessment was designed to focus on classrooms serving preschool age children, therefore it is natural that the majority of the classrooms visited served preschool age children.

Almost 100 percent of classrooms visited in district schools served preschool age classrooms. This is expected because most districts do not have programs for infants and toddlers. The age groupings of children enrolled in child care centers are more varied. While 58 percent of child care center classrooms visited serve preschoolers, 34 percent serve infants and/or toddlers. Small percentages of child care center classrooms also serve kindergarten and/or school age children and mixed-age classes (*i.e.*, some infants and toddlers and some preschool-age children). Almost 90 percent of Head Start classrooms served preschool age children. This is consistent with Head Start being a program that focuses predominantly on 3- and 4-year-olds.

Table 22: Classrooms Visited (Tiers 1&2) by Age of Children and Auspice – All Ages

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Preschool	554	27.0	761	37.1	153	7.5	1,468	71.5
Infants and Toddlers	0	0.0	452	22.0	12	0.6	464	22.6
School Age	1	0.1	42	2.0	2	0.1	45	2.2
Mixed Age	0	0.0	14	0.7	1	0.1	15	0.7
Room Not In Use	3	0.1	21	1.0	1	0.1	25	1.2
Not Reported	0	0.0	33	1.6	2	0.1	35	1.7
Total	558	27.2	1,323	64.5	171	8.3	2,052	100

The needs assessment used three different versions of the classroom observation instrument that varied in detail. The most detailed version of the classroom observation, the full classroom

observation, contained a furniture and materials checklist in addition to a checklist on basic classroom quality. This observation was completed in one preschool classroom per center, with a few exceptions. As Table 23 shows, a full classroom observation was completed in 562 classrooms, including 171 district preschool classrooms, 340 child care center preschool classrooms, and 51 Head Start preschool classrooms.

A less comprehensive classroom observation was completed in 662 classrooms. This version of the classroom observation, the abbreviated classroom observation, was also completed in preschool classrooms. It is the same instrument as the full classroom observation but does not contain the materials checklist. It was completed in 200 district classrooms, 385 child care center classrooms, and 77 Head Start classrooms. The most basic version of the classroom observation, the classroom details form, was completed in 828 classrooms. This version of the classroom observation only contained very basic information, such as the classroom enrollment. It was used in preschool and infant and/or toddler classrooms. The classroom details form was completed in 187 district preschool classrooms, 598 child care center classrooms, and 43 Head Start classrooms. The instrumentation section of this report describes the differences between these three types of classroom observations.

Table 23: Type of Classroom Observation by Auspice (Tier 1 & Tier 2) – All Ages

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full Classroom (with Materials Checklist)	171	8.3	340	16.6	51	2.5	562	27.4
Abbreviated Classroom (without Materials Checklist)	200	9.7	385	18.8	77	3.8	662	32.3
Classroom Details	187	9.1	598	29.1	43	2.1	828	40.4
Total	558	27.2	1,323	64.5	171	8.3	2,052	100

Preschool Only

The primary purpose of this needs assessment was to obtain information on preschool programs. Therefore the next several tables focus only on classrooms that served preschool-age children. Table 24 reports the number of preschool classrooms visited in Tier 1 and Tier 2 of data collection. A total of 1,468 classrooms serving preschoolers were visited in the needs assessment, including 554 (37.7 percent) in district programs, 761 (51.8 percent) in child care centers, and 153 (10.4 percent) in Head Start programs.

Table 24: Number of Preschool Classrooms Visited by Auspice and Tier

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Tier 1	152	10.4	211	14.4	81	5.5	444	30.2
Tier 2	402	27.4	550	37.5	72	4.9	1,024	69.8
Total	554	37.7	761	51.8	153	10.4	1,468	100

Table 25 reports the number of preschool classrooms visited in universal and targeted districts. The distribution of preschool classrooms between universal and targeted districts was similar to

the distribution of all classrooms and was fairly evenly split between universal and targeted district. Approximately 54 percent of preschool classrooms visited were in targeted districts and approximately 46 percent were in universal districts. Of the 677 preschool classrooms visited in universal districts, 288 (43 percent) were in district schools, 293 (43 percent) were in child care centers, and 96 (14 percent) were in Head Start programs. Of the 791 preschool classrooms visited in targeted districts, 266 (33 percent) were in district preschool programs, 568 (72 percent) were in child care centers, and 57 (7 percent) were in Head Start centers.

Table 25: Preschool Classrooms Visited (Tier 1 & Tier 2) by Universal/Targeted District

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Universal	288	19.6	293	20.0	96	6.5	677	46.1
Targeted	266	18.1	568	31.9	57	3.9	791	53.9
Total	554	37.7	761	51.8	153	10.4	1,468	100

Table 26 reports the number of preschool classrooms visited in ECPA, ELLI, and non-ECPA/ELLI districts. There were more preschool classrooms visited in ECPA districts (63 percent) than in ELLI (4 percent) or non-ECPA/ELLI districts (33 percent). As described above, although there were more non-ECPA/ELLI districts in the sample, ECPA districts were more likely to have district preschool programs and we only attempted to visit a random sample of the child care centers in many of the non-ECPA/ELLI districts.

A total of 927 preschool classrooms in ECPA districts were visited, including 412 (44%) in district schools, 408 (44 percent) in child care centers, and 107 (12 percent) in Head Start programs. A total of 55 preschool classrooms in ELLI districts were visited, including 19 (35 percent) in district schools, 33 (60 percent) in child care centers, and 3 (5 percent) in Head Start programs. A total of 486 preschool classrooms were visited in Non-ECPA/ELLI districts, including 123 (25 percent) in district schools, 320(66 percent) in child care centers, and 43 (9 percent) in Head Start programs.

Table 26: Preschool Classrooms Visited (Tier 1 & Tier 2) by District Type (ECPA/ELLI)

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ECPA	412	28.1	408	27.8	107	7.3	927	63.1
ELLI	19	1.3	33	2.2	3	0.2	55	3.7
Non ECPA/ELLI	123	8.4	320	21.8	43	2.9	486	33.1
Total	554	37.7	761	51.8	153	10.4	1468	100

Class Size in Preschool Classrooms

Most schools/centers only enrolled up to 15 children per preschool classroom. Almost 60 percent of preschool classrooms enrolled between 0 and 15 children. Preschool expansion regulations require a class size of a maximum of 15 children. Classrooms currently enrolling more than 15 children will have to decrease their enrollment. Twenty-nine percent of preschool classrooms had 16-20 children enrolled. Eleven percent of preschool classrooms had more than 21 children enrolled.

Table 27 reports the number of preschool classrooms that have each range of children enrolled. In district schools, 53 percent of preschool classrooms served no more than 15 children. These preschool classrooms would meet the preschool expansion class size requirement. Thirty percent of preschool classrooms enrolled between 16 and 20 children and 13 percent enrolled more than 21 children. As described above, ECPA-funded district preschool programs were permitted a class size if up to 25 children during the 2007-2008 school year but this requirement changed to 18 children for the 2008-2009 school year. The class size for ELLI-funded programs was 20.

In child care centers, 64 percent of preschool classrooms served no more than 15 children. These preschool classrooms would meet the preschool expansion class size requirement. Twenty-three percent of child care center preschool classrooms enrolled 16-20 children and 11 percent enrolled more than 21 children. In Head Start centers, only 40 percent of preschool classrooms served no more than 15 children. However, 58 percent of preschool classrooms served between 16 and 20 children. Less than 3 percent of Head Start preschool classrooms have more than 21 children enrolled. As described above, Head Start performance standards require a class size of up to 20 children for 4-year-old classes and up to 17 children for 3-year-old classes. This requirement could explain why a greater percentage of classrooms in Head Start settings enroll between 16 and 20 children. However, if these Head Start programs partner with school districts for preschool expansion, they will have to decrease the number of children enrolled per classroom.

Table 27: Preschool Classrooms Visited (Tiers 1&2) by Number of Children Enrolled and Auspice

Program Type # Children Per Class	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-15	293	20.0	486	33.1	61	4.2	840	57.2
16-20	168	11.4	174	11.9	88	6.0	430	29.3
More than 21	74	5.0	81	5.5	4	0.3	159	10.8
Not Reported	19	1.3	20	1.4	0	0.0	39	2.7
Total	554	37.7	761	51.8	153	10.4	1468	100

As described above, this needs assessment used three different versions of the classroom observation instrument. The most comprehensive version of the classroom observation was designed to be used predominantly in preschool classrooms and was completed in one preschool classroom per school/center. As Table 28 shows, a full classroom observation was completed in 558 preschool classrooms, including 171 district preschool classrooms, 336 child care center preschool classrooms, and 51 Head Start preschool classrooms. The abbreviated classroom observation was completed in 633 preschool classrooms, including 200 district preschool classrooms, 359 child care center preschool classrooms, and 74 Head Start preschool classrooms. The classroom details observation was completed in a total of 277 preschool classrooms, including 183 district preschool classrooms, 66 child care center preschool classrooms, and 28 Head Start preschool classrooms.

Table 28: Type of Classroom Observation by Auspice (Tier 1 & Tier 2) in Preschool Classrooms

Program Type Observation Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full Classroom (with Materials Checklist)	171	11.6	336	22.9	51	3.5	558	38.0
Abbreviated Classroom (without Materials Checklist)	200	13.6	359	24.5	74	5.0	633	43.1
Classroom Details	183	12.5	66	4.5	28	1.9	277	18.9
Total	554	37.7	761	51.8	153	10.4	1,468	100

Teaching Staff

In Tiers 1 and 2 of this needs assessment, data collectors obtained information on teaching staff through surveys. The survey used and its administration was slightly revised for each Tier. The questions asked of lead and assistant teachers also differed slightly. In Tier 3, we did not collect any information directly from teaching staff. Instead we asked child care and Head Start center directors for information on their lead and assistant teachers. Lead teachers are those who are primarily responsible for the classroom while assistant teachers serve as aids to the lead teacher.

We estimated the universe of lead and assistant teachers based on an assumption that there is one lead teacher and one assistant teacher in each classroom. Therefore, based on the number of classrooms visited in Tier 1 and Tier 2, we can estimate that our total sample include information collected on 4,104 teaching staff, including 2,052 lead teachers and 2,052 assistant teachers.

A total of 3,594 preschool teaching staff completed a survey on their background and experience, including 2,003 (55.7 percent) lead preschool teachers, 1,577 (43.9 percent) assistant preschool teachers, and 14 (0.4 percent) preschool teachers who did not specify if they were a lead or assistant teacher. Thus, our sample includes information on 88 percent of the teachers in our expected sample. We collected information on 98 percent of the lead teachers and 77 percent of the assistant teachers.

Table 29 shows the number of lead and assistant teachers who completed the survey. Of the 2,003 lead teachers, 500 (25 percent) taught in a district preschool program, 1,328 (66 percent) taught in a child care center, and 175 (9 percent) taught in a Head Start center. Of the 1,577 assistant preschool teachers, 521 (33 percent) taught in a district preschool program, 900 (57 percent) taught in a child care center, and 156 (10 percent) taught in a Head Start center. Of the 14 teaching staff who did not report if they were a lead or assistant teacher, six (43 percent) taught in a child care center, and eight (57 percent) taught in a Head Start center.

As Table 29 shows, there were more assistant teachers than teachers in the sample from district preschool programs. There were many preschool inclusion classrooms visited which often had one lead teacher and two assistant teachers, which could explain why there are more assistant than lead teachers in the district sample. However, there were many more lead teachers than assistant teachers from child care centers in the sample. In several child care center classrooms, teaching staff are not designated as a lead or assistant teacher. In these situations, the teacher staff completed the lead teacher survey.

Table 29: Teaching Staff

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lead Teacher	500	13.9	1,328	36.9	175	4.9	2,003	55.7
Assistant Teacher	521	14.5	900	25.0	156	4.3	1,577	43.9
Teacher Type Not Specified	0	0.0	6	0.2	8	0.2	14	0.4
Total	1,021	28.4	2,234	62.1	339	9.4	3,594	100

Table 30 and Table 31 show the ages of the children taught by the lead and assistant teachers. Almost 80 percent of lead teachers and almost 80 percent of assistant teachers in the sample taught preschool age children. Such a high percentage of teachers in preschool classrooms is expected because data collectors were instructed to focus primarily on collecting information from teachers in preschool classrooms and because the needs assessment was predominantly concerned with teaching staff in preschool classrooms.

Table 30: Ages Taught by Lead Teachers

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Preschool (3 & 4)	500	25.0	917	45.7	172	8.6	1,589	79.3
Infants &/or Toddlers	0	0.0	372	18.6	3	0.1	375	18.7
Kindergarten	0	0.0	18	0.9	0	0.0	18	0.9
Other Age Group	0	0.0	14	0.7	0	0.0	14	0.7
Not Reported	0	0.0	7	0.3	0	0.0	7	0.3
Total	500	25.0	1,328	66.2	175	8.7	2,003	100

Table 31: Ages Taught by Assistant Teachers

Program Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Preschool (3 & 4)	521	33.0	560	35.5	154	9.8	1,235	78.3
Infants &/or Toddlers	0	0.0	321	20.4	2	0.1	323	20.4
Kindergarten	0	0.0	7	0.4	0	0.0	7	0.4
Other Age Group	0	0.0	9	0.6	0	0.0	9	0.6
Not Reported	0	0.0	3	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.2
Total	521	33.0	900	57.1	156	9.9	1,577	100

Table 32 shows the number of preschool teachers and assistant teachers who participated in this needs assessment. The remainder of this section will focus only on teachers of preschool-age children. Of the 3,594 total teachers who completed a survey, 2,836 (78.9 percent) taught preschool age children. The sample of preschool teachers includes 1,589 lead teachers, 1,235 assistant teachers, and 12 teachers who did not report if they were a lead or assistant preschool teacher. Of the 1,589 lead teachers, 500 (31.5 percent) taught in district preschool programs, 917 (57.7 percent) taught in child care center programs, and 172 (10.8 percent) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 1,235 assistant teachers, 521 (42.2 percent) taught in district preschool programs, 560 (45.3 percent) taught in child care centers, and 154 (12.5 percent) taught in Head Start. Of the 14 teachers who did not specify if they were a lead or assistant teacher, zero (0.0

percent) taught in district preschool programs, four (33.3 percent) taught in child care centers, and eight (67.7 percent) taught in Head Start programs.

Table 32: Preschool Teaching Staff

Program Type Teacher Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lead Teacher	500	17.6	917	32.3	172	3.1	1,589	56.1
Assistant Teacher	521	18.3	560	19.7	154	5.4	1,235	43.5
Not Specified	0	0.0	4	0.1	8	0.3	12	0.4
Total	1,021	35.9	1,481	52.2	334	11.8	2,836	100

Table 33 and Table 34 show the number of preschool lead and assistant teachers in universal and Targeted districts. Of the 1,589 lead preschool teachers, 661 (42 percent) taught in universal districts and 920 (58 percent) taught in targeted districts, and eight did not report which district they taught in, and therefore it is not known if they taught in a universal or targeted district. Of the 661 lead preschool teachers in universal districts, 252 (38 percent) taught in district preschool classrooms, 323 (49 percent) taught in child care centers, and 86 (13 percent) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 920 lead preschool teachers in targeted districts, 240 (26 percent) taught in district preschool classrooms, 594 (65 percent) taught in child care centers, and 86 (9 percent) taught in Head Start programs.

Table 33: Lead Preschool Teachers in Universal and Targeted Districts

Program Type District Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Universal	252	15.9	323	20.4	86	5.4	661	41.8
Targeted	240	15.2	594	37.6	86	5.4	920	58.2
Total	492	31.1	917	58.0	172	10.9	1,581	1,000

Of the 1,234 assistant preschool teachers, 548 (44 percent) taught in universal districts, 686 (56 percent) taught in targeted districts, and one assistant preschool teacher who did not report which district he/she taught in, and therefore it is not known if they taught in a universal or targeted district. Of the 548 assistant preschool teachers in universal districts, 259 (47 percent) taught in district preschool classrooms, 203 (37 percent) taught in child care centers, and 86 (16 percent) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 686 assistant preschool teachers in targeted districts, 261 (38 percent) taught in district preschool classrooms, 357 (52 percent) taught in child care centers, and 68 (10 percent) taught in Head Start programs.

Table 34: Assistant Preschool Teachers in Universal and Targeted Districts

Program Type District Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Universal	259	20.9	203	16.5	86	7.0	548	44.4
Targeted	261	21.2	357	29.0	68	5.5	686	55.6
Total	520	42.1	560	45.4	154	12.5	1,234	100

Table 35 and table 36 show the number of lead and assistant preschool teachers in districts that were receiving ECPA or ELLI funding for preschool. Of the 1,589 lead preschool teachers, 937

(59 percent) taught in districts receiving ECPA funding, 64 (4 percent) taught in districts receiving ELLI funding, 580 (37 percent) taught in districts not receiving ECPA or ELLI funding for preschool, and eight did not report in which district they taught. Of the 937 lead preschool teachers in ECPA districts, 352 (38 percent) taught in district preschool classrooms, 492 (52 percent) taught in child care centers, and 93 (10 percent) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 64 lead preschool teachers in ELLI districts, 22 (34 percent) taught in district preschool classrooms, 39 (61 percent) taught in child care centers, and 3 (5%) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 580 lead preschool teachers in districts not receiving ECPA or ELLI funding, 118 (20%) taught in district preschool programs, 386 (67%) taught in child care centers, and 76 (13%) taught in Head Start programs.

Table 35: Lead Preschool Teachers in ECPA and ELLI districts

Program Type Preschool Funding Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ECPA	352	22.3	492	31.1	93	5.9	937	59.3
ELLI	22	1.4	39	2.5	3	0.2	64	4.0
Non-ECPA/ELLI	118	7.5	386	24.4	76	4.8	580	36.7
Total	492	31.1	917	58.0	172	10.9	1581	100

Of the 1,233 preschool assistant teachers, 726 (59%) taught in districts receiving ECPA funding, 49 (4%) taught in districts receiving ELLI funding, 459 (37%) taught in districts not receiving ECPA or ELLI funding, and one did not report in which district he/she taught. Of the 726 assistant preschool teachers in districts receiving ECPA funding, 359 (49%) taught in district preschool classrooms, 283 (39%) taught in child care centers, and 84 (12%) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 49 assistant preschool teachers in districts receiving ELLI funding, 21 (43%) taught in district preschool classrooms, 25 (51%) taught in child care centers, and 3 (6%) taught in Head Start programs. Of the 459 assistant preschool teachers in districts not receiving ECPA or ELLI funding, 140 (31%) taught in district preschool classrooms, 252 (55%) taught in child care centers, and 67 (15%) taught in Head Start programs.

Table 36: Assistant Preschool Teachers in ECPA and ELLI districts

Program Type Preschool Funding Type	District Preschool Program		Child Care Center		Head Start Program		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ECPA	359	29.0	283	23.0	84	6.8	726	58.8
ELLI	21	1.7	25	2.0	3	0.2	49	4.0
Non-ECPA/ELLI	140	11.4	252	20.4	67	5.4	459	37.2
Total	520	42.1	560	45.4	154	12.5	1234	100

Currently, in-district lead preschool teachers in districts supported by ECPA and/or ELLI funding are required to have at least a bachelor's degree and certification in prekindergarten to third grade. Assistant preschool teachers in these districts are required to have a high school diploma. However, assistant preschool teachers in districts that are also receiving Title 1 funding are required to meet the education and degree requirements specified in No Child Left Behind.

FULL RESULTS

Data were collected at the district, school or center, and classroom level in 375 of the 467 non-Abbott districts eligible for expansion across the state. The capacity of current facilities statewide is reported first then descriptive information is provided on qualifications of administrators at the district, child care center, and Head Start level. Next, data are reported at all three levels on the curricula used, followed by district-level provisions for professional development and coaching/technical assistance. Then, we present information at the district, child care center, and Head Start level on eligibility requirements for enrollment and supervision of staff. We also present center-level information reflecting program administrative practices and accreditation status. All of the above data were collected through interviews with administrative personnel. Then we present data collected through observation on the quality of facilities, parent involvement practices, classroom level practices, and classroom materials. Finally, we present teacher reported information on qualifications and experience at all three levels of data collection.

Capacity of Existing Classrooms to Serve Preschool Children

We estimate the number of preschoolers that can be served in district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start centers that were visited during this needs assessment, as well as those that were not. Please note that this estimate includes classrooms regardless of whether they meet DOE facilities standards (*e.g.*, in-class bathroom, 950 square feet, etc.) The capacity of child care centers visited was estimated by assuming that each classroom in the center could serve 15 preschoolers. All classrooms, including classrooms that were currently serving infants and toddlers were included.

Child care centers that were visited have the capacity to serve 71,055 preschoolers. The capacity of child care centers not visited (and not located in an Abbott district) was estimated by multiplying the number of centers not visited by the average number of classrooms per center visited (4.8), and assuming that each classroom could serve 15 children. Child care centers not visited have the capacity to serve 85,968 preschoolers. Overall, the total estimated capacity of all child care centers serving preschool age children, not located in Abbott districts was 157,023.

The capacity of Head Start centers was estimated in a similar manner. Head Start centers visited as part of this needs assessment have the capacity to serve 3,390 preschoolers. The average number of classrooms in the Head Start centers visited during this needs assessment was 3.6. Head Start centers not visited (and not located in Abbott districts) have the capacity to serve 1,134 preschoolers. In total, the Head Start centers in non-Abbott districts have the capacity to serve 4,524 preschoolers, assuming a class size of 15.

Assuming 15 preschoolers per classroom, district preschool programs that participated in this needs assessment have the capacity to serve 19,665 children. The capacity of district preschool programs that did not participate to serve preschoolers was estimated based on the statewide ASSA count. Based on the ASSA count, non-Abbott districts who did not participate in this needs assessment served 1,532 preschoolers. This is likely an underestimation of the capacity of these districts to provide preschool because many of the districts serve fewer than 15 children per

classroom. Therefore, they could increase their capacity by enrolling additional children without exceeding the 15-child class size limit. Conversely, this may also overestimate the capacity of the districts to provide preschool under preschool expansion if some classrooms serve more than 15 children. Overall, the non-Abbott districts' preschool programs have an estimated capacity to serve 21,197 preschoolers.

Based on these estimations, district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start programs in non-Abbott districts can serve 182,744 preschoolers. According to the July 2008 census, there are 223,137 3- and 4-year-olds living in New Jersey and 51,732 of these preschool-age children reside in Abbott districts. Thus, there are 171,495 preschool age children who might be eligible for high-quality state-funded preschool in New Jersey if all children were served. However, not all of these children will qualify for preschool under the state's new school funding formula. Based on our estimates, there are more than enough slots among child care centers, Head Start centers, and district preschool programs to serve all the children who will be eligible for preschool under preschool expansion.

However, there are several potential problems with our estimation that could result in either an over- or under-estimation of the state's capacity. Most of the centers/schools and classrooms included do not meet the state's facilities regulations for preschool expansion. This will be more of an issue for contracted sites than in-district sites. Child care centers will be required to have at least six classrooms in order to be eligible to contract with a district to provide preschool under preschool expansion. Since the average number of classrooms per child care center was 4.8, many centers have fewer than six classrooms. Additionally, all classrooms will be required to be at least 950 square feet and have a child-sized bathroom. The overwhelming majority of classrooms did not meet this requirement. In an effort to be expansive, our estimations also assume that all self-contained classrooms would be converted to inclusion classrooms and that all infant and toddler and school age child care center classrooms would be converted to preschool classrooms. It is not the state's intention or our assumption that classrooms used for other age groups should be converted. In fact, there are strong reasons to expand offerings for infant and toddler care but we felt it was important to determine how tempting it might be for centers to convert their space. Given the adequacy of licensed capacity, the use of this space is not necessary to meet the preschool demands. Therefore, the estimated capacity of child care centers and Head Start centers to provide preschool under preschool expansion is an over-estimation and should just be used to determine whether facility standards should be relaxed during the initial phases of expansion. While district programs are exempt from the requirements to have at least six preschool classrooms and can request a waiver for the 950 square feet requirement, these classrooms must still be large enough to serve 15 preschool students. Approximately 33,831 children will be eligible when the program is fully implemented. Many districts may opt to serve children who do not receive state-funding using other funds or charging tuition. Additionally, if districts choose to fund specific slots in child care centers and centers fill classrooms with tuition paying children, then this also reduces the number of spaces available and, clearly, it is not the intention of the state or this report's authors that centers convert infant/toddler space. Existing space in districts is inadequate for expansion unless districts take advantage of space available in centers and Head Start agencies and that space does not meet current regulations.

Qualifications of Administrators

Administrators in districts and child care and Head Start programs were interviewed at or around the time of classroom observations about factors that may both help and hinder the implementation of preschool. The intent of the district interview was to speak with the person in charge of preschool implementation to acquire information about current plans, programs, and supports in place to implement preschool as well as additional needs of the district to extend current initiatives. Child care and Head Start directors or key personnel were also interviewed in order to gather information about experience with various student populations, supervisory and administrative program practices, and quality child care implementation. Furthermore, we assessed the experience and qualifications of administrative personnel to identify how closely these centers meet district requirements.

District Level Administrators – Superintendent/Early Childhood Contact

Of the 356 district-level personnel in charge of preschool who reported their title and who were in charge of preschool, 35.7 percent were superintendents, 20.2 percent were principals, 16.9 percent were supervisors or directors of curriculum and instruction, and 21.1 percent fell under the category of supervisor of special projects. The remaining individuals fell under some other administrative category (see Table 37 for more detailed titles).

The administrators interviewed were able to provide multiple titles to indicate their roles within the district. Of district interviewees, 46 percent reported more than one role, so that for instance, an administrator could have a dual role of principal of the town elementary school and also superintendent of the district. It is likely that superintendents were most frequently the individuals identified as in charge of preschool because of the new status of the program and move towards expansion at the time of the interview. However, supervisors/ directors of curriculum and instruction and early childhood supervisors were more likely to be in charge of preschool in universal districts, possibly because these districts more often already have preschool as opposed to being in a planning stage. The same can be observed when comparing ECPA to non-ECPA district administrators. Overall, 8.4 percent of administrators have a major related to early childhood. There is little variability between district types in terms of administrator experience and qualifications.

In an attempt to capture the extent to which district contacts have early childhood education expertise, a series of questions regarding the respondents' background was asked. This information is critical to the effectiveness of a preschool program. Research has consistently shown that without expert supervision the promise of preschool is unlikely to be met (Frede, 1998). When asked about their early childhood education administrative background, 60 percent of administrators had current or previous administrative experience with a district preschool program. Administrative experience is a broad category that can range from being a principal or superintendent that oversees a preschool program to being a director of a child care center. Only 13 percent had some coursework or had attended trainings and workshops in early childhood, 12% had a degree or certification in early childhood education and 16 percent of respondents had no early childhood education experience. Table 38 shows the types of early childhood qualifications that district administrators have. Preschool special education experience could

include overseeing a preschool special education program, working as a teacher or assistant in a classroom with special education students, or being a member of a child study team. Similarly, Head Start or child care experience might include being a program administrator, teacher or resource specialist.

Of the total respondents 23.4 percent indicated that they have had some type of direct preschool experience (i.e., taught preschool, have Head Start or child care experience, or have a degree or certification in early childhood). For respondents who indicated that they have had some type of direct preschool experience, 28.7 percent of them are currently the principal of a preschool and/or elementary school.

Table 37: District Administrator Responsible for District Preschool Program

District Administrative Information	District Type				District Type						Total	
	Universal		Targeted		ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA or ELLI		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	63	100	293	100	75	100	12	100	269	100	356	100
Job Title of Individual in Charge of Preschool*												
Superintendent	27	42.9	112	38.2	32	42.7	2	16.7	105	39.0	127	35.7
Assistant Superintendent	1	1.6	29	9.9	4	5.3	2	16.7	24	8.9	30	8.4
Early Childhood Supervisor	12	19.0	17	5.8	20	26.7	1	8.3	8	3.0	29	8.1
Principal	23	36.5	49	16.7	31	41.3	1	8.3	40	14.9	72	20.2
Business Administrator	1	1.6	3	1.0	1	1.3	0	0	3	1.1	4	1.1
Supervisor/Director of Curriculum & Instruction	20	31.7	40	13.6	22	29.3	3	25.0	32	11.9	60	16.9
Chief School Administrator	2	3.2	9	3.1	1	1.3	0	0	10	3.7	11	3.1
Supervisor of Special Projects	1	1.6	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	1	0.3
Director of Special Services/ Special Education	5	7.9	70	23.9	8	10.7	4	33.3	65	24.2	75	21.1
Director/Supervisor of Elementary Education	2	3.2	3	1.0	2	2.7	0	0	3	1.1	5	14.0
Supervisor of Special Populations	4	6.3	6	2.0	7	9.3	0	0	3	1.1	10	2.8
Grants and Special Programs	7	11.1	13	4.4	11	14.7	2	16.7	7	2.6	20	5.6
Assistant/ Vice Principal	0	0	8	2.7	1	1.3	1	8.3	6	2.2	8	2.2
Major related to early childhood?	1	1.5	29	9.9	4	5.3	3	25.0	23	8.6	30	8.4

* Please note that for job title, individuals were allowed to report more than one job title. Therefore, the job title frequencies may add up to more than the total number of individuals interviewed.

Table 38: Early Childhood Qualifications of District Administrators Responsible for District Preschool Program*

Type of Early Childhood Experience	N (360)	% of District Administrators
Administrative experience	217	60.3
Preschool special education experience	76	21.1
Coursework and/or trainings/workshops	47	13.1
Degree or certification in EC	44	12.2
Taught preschool	39	10.8
Head Start/child care experience	27	7.5
Other	74	20.6
No experience	57	15.8

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of early childhood experiences

Analyses were also conducted to evaluate if administrators' early childhood qualifications differed by the type of district they oversaw. Crosstab analyses were run to examine whether there were differences in qualifications by the size of the district, determined by an estimated enrollment (see Table 39), by the location of the district (north, central, or south) or by whether the district was classified as a universal or targeted district, which is primarily determined by the percentage of children in the district who qualify for free and reduced-price lunch (see Table 40).

When examining differences by district size, larger districts reported having higher percentages of administrators with direct preschool experience such as having taught preschool previously, having a degree or certification in early childhood or having some type of Head Start or child care experience. Approximately nine percent of administrators from small and medium sized districts reported having a degree or certification in early childhood, while more than 26 percent of administrators from large districts reported having a degree or certification. This might be because in larger districts there is a larger administration with more specialized personnel, such as a director of early childhood or director of curriculum and instruction, whereas in smaller districts there may only be one administrator who serves as the superintendent, principal, director of curriculum, etc. When contacting the districts for this report, superintendents of larger districts which have a larger infrastructure may have referred the interviewer to another administrator that directly oversees the preschool program who would probably have a greater likelihood of having some type of direct preschool experience.

When examining differences between targeted and universal districts and differences by district location, administrators in targeted districts and in districts located in the central region of New Jersey were more likely to report having experience with preschool special education and having a degree or certification in early childhood education. Moreover, universal districts were significantly more likely to indicate that they have administrative early childhood experience and targeted districts were significantly more likely to have direct preschool experiences. Significance tests were run using one-sample t-tests after filtering for administrative and direct preschool experiences (administrative experience $t = 26.18, p < .001$; direct preschool experience $t = 19.54, p < .001$).

Table 39: Early Childhood Qualifications of District Administrators Responsible for District Preschool Program by District Size

	District Size					
	Small		Medium		Large	
Type of Early Childhood Experience	N (150)	%	N (145)	%	N (65)	%
Administrative experience	92	61.3	86	59.3	39	60.0
Preschool special education experience	28	18.7	36	24.8	14	21.5
Coursework and/or trainings/workshops	19	12.7	19	13.1	8	12.3
Degree or certification in EC	14	9.3	13	9.0	17	26.2
Taught preschool	12	8.0	15	10.3	12	18.5
Head Start/child care experience	9	6.0	5	3.4	13	20.0
Other	35	23.3	28	19.3	11	16.9
No experience	25	16.7	22	15.2	10	15.4

Table 40: Early Childhood Qualifications of District Administrators Responsible for District Preschool Program by District Type and Location

Type of Early Childhood Experience	Universal districts		Targeted Districts		North region districts		Central region districts		South region districts	
	N (68)	%	N (292)	%	N (150)	%	N (127)	%	N (83)	%
Administrative experience	53	77.9	171	58.6	88	58.7	65	51.2	64	77.1
Preschool special education experience	8	11.8	68	23.3	32	21.3	35	27.6	9	10.8
Coursework and/or trainings/workshops	7	10.3	39	13.4	18	12.0	15	11.8	13	15.7
Degree or certification in EC	5	7.4	39	13.4	15	10.0	20	15.7	9	10.8
Taught preschool	7	10.3	32	11.0	17	11.3	15	11.8	7	8.4
Head Start/child care experience	5	7.4	22	7.5	12	8.0	9	7.1	6	7.2
Other	19	27.9	55	18.8	23	15.3	31	24.4	20	24.1
No experience	7	10.3	50	17.1	26	17.3	22	17.3	9	10.8

Districts were also asked about other personnel in the district who are responsible for preschool expansion related planning. Fifty-four percent of districts that were interviewed mentioned that there were other people in the district who were also responsible for preschool planning, and 44% had at least one other person in the district who had some type of experience with early childhood education. Thirty-four percent of districts interviewed indicated that there was no one else in the district responsible for the expansion.

District Preschool Program Site Personnel

Principals in charge of buildings housing preschool classrooms were also interviewed about their ECE-related background and their experience overseeing the current district preschool program. On average, principals have been overseeing the district preschool program for 4.68 years, and 22.1 percent reported that they had a major related to early childhood education. There existed some variability among universal and targeted, and ECPA, ELLI, and non-ECPA or ELLI districts in terms of the average number of years that these individuals have been overseeing the district preschool program (See Table 41). Specifically, on average universal district personnel have been overseeing the district preschool program for two years longer than targeted district personnel. Similarly, ECPA district personnel reported that on average, they have been overseeing the district preschool program for one to one and a half years longer than did ELLI and non-ECPA or ELLI district personnel. These differences likely exist because universal and ECPA districts, by the nature of their district type, have had preschool longer than these other district types.

Table 41: Experience of District Preschool Program Site Personnel

District Administrative Information	District Type				District Type						Total	
	Universal		Targeted		ECPA		ELLI		No-ECPA or ELLI			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Average number of years overseeing the district preschool program?	44	100	69	100	68	100	6	100	39	100	113	100
	5.87		3.90		5.16		3.67		3.99		4.68	
Major related to early childhood?	8	18.2	17	24.6	17	25.0	1	16.7	7	17.9	25	22.1

Child Care and Head Start Administration

Child care and Head Start administrators who were interviewed were also asked about their job titles, and as expected, the majority of child care and Head Start individuals in charge of the program had the title of director (79.1 percent and 65.8 percent respectively). A large percent of Head Start interviewees had a job title that fell under the category of other, largely because in some cases the individual interviewed was a site supervisor as opposed to the director, who often oversees multiple site locations rather than a single site location.

Personnel were also asked to report the number of years that they have been overseeing preschool. On average, child care center administrators reported more years overseeing preschool (M = 8.70) than Head Start personnel (M = 6.08). (See Table 42)

Table 42: Experience and Background of Child Care Center Directors and Head Start Site Supervisors

Center Administrative Information	Program Type			
	Child Care		Head Start	
	N	%	N	%
	918	100	38	100
Job Title of Individual in Charge of Preschool				
Director	726	79.1	25	65.8
Assistant Director	58	6.3	1	2.6
Owner	50	5.4	0	0
Director & Owner	27	2.9	0	0
Teacher/Head Teacher	12	1.3	2	5.3
Director/Assistant Director & Teacher	3	0.3	1	2.6
Other	42	4.6	9	23.7
Average number of Years Overseeing Preschool	M = 8.70		M = 6.08	

Child care and Head Start administrators were asked about their highest educational degree obtained and whether or not their major for any of their degrees was related to early childhood. The tables below indicate the frequencies and percentages of directors and their highest degrees obtained and whether the degree relates to early childhood. Virtually no differences were noted between child care and Head Start administrators' degree level, as the majority of administrators at both program types had a bachelors degree or higher. All Head Start central administrators hold college degrees. However, 11.1 percent of all child care and Head Start site supervisors reported that they had less than a bachelor's degree. Head Start and child care administrators are much more likely to have a major related to ECE than district administrators (79.5 percent Head Start and 59.1 percent child care vs. 8.4 for district ECE contacts and 22 percent for principals.). See Tables 43 and 44 for further details on child care and Head Start administrator qualifications.

Table 43: Child Care and Head Start Administrator Qualifications

	Head Start center		Child Care center		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
CDA	1	2.5	33	3.3	34	3.3
Associate’s degree	3	7.5	85	8.5	88	8.4
Bachelor’s degree	23	57.5	570	56.8	593	56.8
Master’s degree	9	22.5	228	22.7	237	22.7
Doctorate degree	0	0	14	1.4	14	1.3
No degree	2	5.0	53	5.3	55	5.3
Don’t know/Refused	2	5.0	21	2.1	23	2.2
Not asked/NA	26		36		62	
Total	66	100	1040	100	1106	100

Table 44: Child Care and Head Start Administrator Degrees Related to Early Childhood

	Head Start center		Child Care center		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	31	79.5	575	59.1	606	60.0
No	7	17.9	368	37.8	375	37.1
Not Sure	0	0	18	1.8	18	1.8
Refused	1	2.6	12	1.2	13	1.3
Not asked/NA	26		36		62	
Total	65	100	1009	100	1074	100

Curriculum

District Curriculum

New Jersey DOE regulations on preschool provision require that districts “implement a comprehensive, evidence-based preschool curriculum in order to meet the preschool standards” (p. 6 New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards of Quality, 2009). As part of the preschool expansion plan, each district must choose one of the five state recommended curricula for preschool. These curricula are *Bank Street Developmental Interaction Approach* (Nager & Shapiro, E., 2000); *The Creative Curriculum*, (Dodge, Bickart, Heroman, & Boyle, 2009), *Curiosity Corner*(Chambers, 2009), *HighScope Preschool Curriculum* (Epstein, & Schweinhart, 2009), and *Tools of the Mind Project* (Bodrova, & Leong, 2009). Thus, to determine how ready districts and their potential private partners are for preschool expansion, district and private provider administrators were asked what types of curricula are being used in their preschool classes. Please note, we did not attempt to measure actual fidelity of implementation of the curriculum nor did we collect information on the extent of teacher training in the model. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these results.

Twenty-four out of 339 districts mentioned using more than one curriculum. Of those 24 districts, 17 reported using an approved state sanctioned curriculum along with either a district-created curriculum or with another approved curriculum. This finding is of interest because it may indicate less-than-adequate fidelity of implementation of the approved curriculum model since none of the approved models can easily be combined with another approach and still be implemented with fidelity. However, districts may also use different curricula in different schools or in preschool special education vs. their general education classrooms.

The largest percentage of districts report using Creative Curriculum (37.8 percent), followed by HighScope (13.6 percent) or a district created curriculum (31.3 percent). Almost 60 percent of districts report using one of the approved curricula (*i.e.*, Creative Curriculum, HighScope, Curiosity Corner, Tools of the Mind and Bank Street). However, some of these districts (N=6) report using more than one of the approved curricula within their district so therefore it is really 57.8 percent of districts who use only one of the approved curricula. The type of curriculum used was also examined by the type of district, whether it was an ECPA, ELLI or non-ECPA or ELLI district or a designated universal or targeted district (See Table 45). Type of curricula used was also examined by the region the district is located in within the state of New Jersey. Results indicate that over a third of ECPA districts and non-ECPA or ELLI districts use Creative Curriculum, while over two thirds of ELLI districts use the HighScope curriculum. Surprisingly, five districts or 1.5 percent of all the districts report that no specific curriculum is used in their preschool classes. Interestingly, there is not a lot of variation in type of curriculum used when examining differences between universal and targeted districts (See Table 46). Targeted districts report using Creative Curriculum at a slightly higher percentage than universal districts and universal districts report using HighScope, Curiosity Corner and Tools of the Mind curricula at slightly higher rates than targeted but there are not drastic differences. However, while universal districts do not report that any of them have no specific curriculum in place, almost two percent of targeted district report not using a specific curriculum in their classes.

Greater variation in type of curriculum used is seen when examining districts by region. Districts located in the central region of the state use Creative Curriculum at higher percentages than north and south region districts and central and south region districts use HighScope curriculum twice as much as north region districts. Interestingly, four of the 5 districts that report not using a specific curriculum are located in the north region of the state.

Table 45: Curriculum Models Used in District Preschool Programs*

	ECPA districts		ELLI districts		No-ECPA or ELLI		Total District	
	N (90)	%	N (12)	%	N (237)	%	N (339)	%
Creative Curriculum	32	35.6	2	16.7	94	39.7	128	37.8
HighScope	13	14.4	8	66.7	25	10.5	46	13.6
Curiosity Corner	7	7.8	0	0	7	2.9	14	4.1
Tools of the Mind	3	3.3	4	33.3	5	2.1	12	3.5
Bank Street	0	0	0	0	2	0.8	2	0.6
NJ/State Curriculum	2	2.2	0	0	5	2.1	5	1.5
District created curriculum	27	30.0	0	0	79	33.3	106	31.3
Other	15	16.7	0	0	16	6.8	31	9.1
No specific curriculum is used	0	0	0	0	5	2.1	5	1.5
Don't know	2	2.2	0	0	14	5.9	16	4.7

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of curricula

Table 46: Curriculum Models Used in District Preschool Programs by District Type*

	Universal districts		Targeted districts		North region districts		Central region districts		South region districts		Total district	
	N (81)	%	N (266)	%	N (135)	%	N (124)	%	N (80)	%	N (339)	%
Creative Curriculum	24	32.9	104	39.1	51	37.8	52	41.6	25	31.3	128	37.8
HighScope	11	15.1	35	13.2	12	8.9	21	16.9	13	16.2	46	13.6
Curiosity Corner	4	5.5	10	3.8	5	3.7	2	1.6	7	8.8	14	4.1
Tools of the Mind	3	4.1	9	3.4	2	1.5	8	6.5	2	2.5	12	3.5
Bank Street	0	0	2	0.8	1	0.7	1	0.8	0	0	2	0.6
NJ/State Curriculum	2	2.7	5	1.9	4	3.0	2	1.6	1	1.3	5	1.5
District created curriculum	23	31.5	83	31.2	45	33.3	30	24.2	31	38.8	106	31.3
Other	11	15.1	20	7.5	10	7.4	11	8.9	6	7.5	31	9.1
No specific curriculum is used	0	0	5	1.9	4	3.0	1	0.8	0	0	5	1.5
Don't know	3	4.1	13	4.9	10	7.4	4	3.2	2	2.5	16	4.7
No response	8											

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of curricula

Child Care and Head Start Report of Curriculum Used

Child care and Head Start directors were also asked about the curriculum used in their centers (See Table 47). Of these, 42 of 1,110 centers (3.8 percent) who responded mentioned that they use more than one curriculum. Similarly, Head Start centers reported that Creative Curriculum was the most frequently used approved type of curriculum, with more than 63 percent of Head Start centers using this curriculum. On the other hand, approximately 50 percent of child care centers report using a center- or teacher-designed curriculum instead of an approved curriculum. Some child care centers even report “making [the curriculum] up as [they] go along.” This finding is of interest as it could indicate that centers may not be using a high quality curriculum that has been researched and validated and found to be developmentally appropriate for preschool-aged children. In addition, if a center is using its own curriculum, then it makes it more difficult for a district to partner with them as part of the preschool expansion. If a district is planning to expand its preschool program and would like to partner with local child care and Head Start centers, having different curricula, especially a center- or teacher- created one, makes it more time consuming and costly to expand compared to when the centers already use an approved curriculum.

Table 47: Curriculum Models used in Child Care Centers and Head Start Programs

	Child Care Centers		Head Start Centers		Total Centers	
	N (1037)	%	N (67)	%	N (1104)	%
Creative Curriculum	160	15.4	35	52.2	195	17.7
HighScope	24	2.3	12	17.9	36	3.3
Curiosity Corner	4	0.4	0	0	4	0.4
Tools of the Mind	3	0.3	1	1.5	4	0.4
Bank Street	4	0.4	0	0	4	0.4
Center- or Teacher-Designed	516	50.0	2	3.0	518	46.9
Montessori	44	4.2	0	0	44	4.0
A Beka/Religious curriculum	15	1.4	0	0	15	1.4
Other	206	19.9	2	3.0	208	18.8
Do not use a curriculum	55	5.3	1	1.5	56	5.1
Don't know	23	2.2	0	0	23	2.1

Professional Development

Professional Development Attended by District Preschool Teachers

Within districts, overall, approximately twice as many teachers have the opportunity to attend professional development (PD) workshops as assistant teachers; 83 percent of district teachers attend PD workshops as compared to 46.6 percent of assistant teachers. Of those reporting that they attend PD, 77.2 percent of teachers reported that the district usually pays for them to attend these workshops, where as 90.5 percent of assistant teachers reported that the district usually pays. It is possible that this apparent high proportion of assistant teachers receiving funding to attend PD is not because districts allocate more money towards assistant teachers than teachers, but rather that districts that ensure that assistant teachers attend PD workshops are more likely inherently to be those that fund such attendance. It is also interesting to note that small districts appear much more likely to ensure that both teachers and assistant teachers attend PD, and to pay for these staff members' attendance as compared to medium and large districts. See Table 48 for more details on professional development attendance and funding by district size.

Table 48: Professional Development for District Preschool Teachers

District Level Professional Development for Teachers	District Size						Total	
	Small		Medium		Large		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	49	100	48	100	78	100	176	100
Teachers attend professional development workshops?	42	85.7	36	75.0	67	85.9	146	83.0
Assistant Teachers attend professional development workshops?	27	55.1	20	41.7	34	43.6	82	46.6
District usually pays for teachers to attend PD workshops?	39	92.9*	26	74.3*	46	68.7*	112	77.2*
District usually pays for assistant teachers to attend PD workshops?	26	96.3*	18	90.0*	31	86.1*	76	90.5*

* Please note that these percents represent the percent of those that attend professional development, not of the overall sample asked.

Also noteworthy is the fact that both district teachers and assistant teachers in targeted districts are much more likely to attend PD workshops than in universal districts. For instance, 93.3 percent of teachers and 57.3 percent of assistant teachers in targeted districts attend PD, as compared to 75.2 percent of teachers and 38.6 percent of assistant teachers in universal districts. This difference is likely due in large part to the fact that targeted districts tend to have more resources available for such workshops. Differences between universal and targeted districts were not as striking, and in fact were virtually the same when comparing the source of funding for teaching staff to attend PD workshops. Finally, it is noteworthy that a higher proportion of non-ECPA or ELLI districts and ELLI district teachers attend PD workshops than teachers in ECPA districts. However, a higher proportion of ECPA districts whose teachers attend PD pay for those teachers to receive PD than non-ECPA or ELLI districts. See Table 49 for further details on differences between ECPA, ELLI, and Non-ECPA or ELLI districts.

Table 49: Professional Development for District Preschool Teachers by District Type

District Level Professional Development for Teachers	District Type				District Type						Total	
	Universal		Targeted		ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA/ELLI			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	101	100	75	100	130	100	6	100	40	100	176	100
Teachers attend PD workshops?	76	75.2	70	93.3	102	78.5	6	100	38	95.0	146	83.0
Assistant Teachers attend PD workshops?	39	38.6	43	57.3	59	45.4	4	66.7	19	47.5	82	46.6
District usually pays for teachers to attend PD workshops?	59	78.7*	53	75.7*	81	80.2*	5	83.3*	26	68.4*	112	77.2*
District usually pays for assistant teachers to attend PD workshops?	36	90.0*	40	90.9*	54	91.5*	4	66.7*	18	90.0*	76	90.5*

* Please note that these percents represent the percent of those that attend professional development, not of the overall sample asked.

Types of Preschool Teacher Professional Development Offered by Districts

When comparing the type of PD workshops that district teachers and assistant teachers receive, overall, teaching staff most frequently attend PD specific to curriculum and early childhood education (ECE). Many teachers also report receiving professional development specific to special education and English language learners. It is not surprising that these two content areas are less frequently attended than the more broad areas of curriculum and ECE, because district needs vary by their student population. It is also likely that due to early stages of preschool implementation, district preschool teachers still need fundamental training in ECE more generally and specific to preschool curricula. PD attendance by content area for assistant teachers, although lower, was systematically similar to attendance of district teachers. For instance, 91 percent of district teachers attend professional development in the district curriculum, as compared to 78.9 percent of district assistant teachers. Proportions were comparable for PD in ECE, whereas for special education, 80.1 percent of district teachers attended PD specific to this focus area while 67.6 percent of assistant teachers attended PD in special education. Numbers for PD specific to ELLs was comparable to that of special education.

On average, districts spend \$7,664 per classroom annually for PD for both teachers and assistant teachers. However, the range in cost is large, with districts spending anywhere from \$33 per classroom to \$20,000 per classroom on professional development. Despite this range, the median amount of money spent per classroom on professional development is \$670. Differences between universal and targeted, and ECPA and non-ECPA districts are marginal in terms of spending on PD. ELLI districts appear to spend substantially more per classroom on PD than do ECPA and non-ECPA/ELLI districts (\$9,326 annually). However, the number of ELLI districts reporting their spending is small (N = 1111 districts and 42 classrooms) compared to ECPA and non-ECPA/ELLI districts. It is likely that ELLI districts spend more per classroom on PD because they have been newly infused with funds and are recently implementing curricula, which necessitates additional PD. It also appears as though universal districts spend, on average, over \$300 more per classroom on PD than do targeted districts. For reference, Abbott programs are allotted \$750 per classroom or \$50 per child to spend on PD.

Finally, on average, teachers attend 34.7 hours of professional development annually, whereas assistant teachers attend 22 hours of professional development annually. Teachers in universal districts reported attending approximately five hours more of PD than do teachers in targeted districts, but assistant teachers in universal and targeted districts report receiving virtually the same number of hours of PD annually. Both teachers and assistant teachers in ELLI districts report receiving the most hours of professional development when compared to ECPA and non-ECPA/ELLI districts. See Tables 50a & 50b for further details on type, amount, and cost of professional development by district type.

Table 50a: Teacher Professional Development in Universal and Targeted Districts

Professional Development for both Teachers and Assistant Teachers	District Type						Total (N=256)	
	Universal (N=69)			Targeted (N=187)			N	%
	N	M	%	N	M	%		
Professional Development Workshops are offered for teachers in:								
Curriculum	64	21.4	92.8	169	18.3	90.4	233	91.0
Early Childhood Education	62	30.5	89.9	167	17.4	89.3	229	89.5
Special Education	39	23.5	56.5	166	18.1	88.8	205	80.1
English Language Learners	31	3.5	44.9	163	7.6	87.2	194	75.8
Other forms of PD	27	6.2	39.1	159	12.1	85.0	186	72.7
Professional Development Workshops are offered for assistant teachers in:								
Curriculum	61	17.8	88.4	141	12.1	75.4	202	78.9
Early Childhood Education	59	45.6	85.5	140	12.7	74.9	199	77.8
Special Education	36	20.2	52.2	137	11.8	73.3	173	67.6
English Language Learners	27	0.15	39.1	137	7.0	73.3	164	64.0
Other forms of PD	23	4.25	33.3	134	11.0	71.7	157	61.3
Average cost of PD per classroom for both teachers and assistant teachers	61	\$1,685		180	\$1,352		239	\$1,445
Average number of hours lead teachers attend PD annually	69	38.3		187	33.4		256	34.7
Average number of hours assistant teachers attend PD annually	64	22.0		183	22.0		247	22.0

Coaching/Technical Assistance Provided to District Preschool Teachers

Information was collected on whether or not the districts provided any type of coaching or technical assistance to teachers in preschool classrooms. Of the 270 districts that responded to this question, 53.7 percent said that they did provide some type of assistance or coaching. When asked how often the assistance was provided, responses ranged from ongoing to 1-2 times a year. The majority of districts (64.3 percent) report that they provide ongoing assistance, while 6.3 percent report providing assistance only 1-5 times a year. Administrators were also asked who provided the assistance and what topics were covered (see Tables 51 and 52). The majority of the support to teachers came either from special education staff (54.1 percent) or district administrators (33.3 percent) and, not surprisingly, the topics of support varied but the most common response was curriculum support followed by behavior and classroom management and special education/inclusion. It should be noted that for districts responding that they do not provide any type of coaching or technical assistance, questions about who provided the support and what topics were covered were not asked.

Table 50b: Teacher Professional Development in ECPA, ELLI, & Non ECPA/ELLI Districts

Professional Development for both Teachers and Assistant Teachers	District Type									Total (N=256)	
	ECPA (N=84)			ELLI (N=12)			Non-ECPA or ELLI (N=160)				
	N	M	%	N	M	%	N	M	%	N	%
Professional Development Workshops are offered for teachers in:											
Curriculum	78	21.6	92.9	12	17.8	100	143	17.9	89.4	233	91.0
Early Childhood Education	76	29.5	90.5	12	21.0	100	141	16.3	88.1	229	89.5
Special Education	50	21.2	59.5	12	17.2	100	143	18.6	89.4	205	80.1
English Language Learners	41	3.3	48.8	11	12.2	91.7	142	7.6	88.8	194	75.8
Other forms of PD	37	6.3	44.0	10	8.5	83.3	139	12.8	86.9	186	72.7
Professional Development Workshops are offered for assistant teachers in:											
Curriculum	74	18.6	88.1	10	12.0	83.3	118	11.0	73.8	202	78.9
Early Childhood Education	72	43.4	85.7	10	14.0	83.3	117	10.2	73.1	199	77.8
Special Education	46	18.9	54.8	10	16.3	83.3	117	11.2	73.1	173	67.6
English Language Learners	36	.8	42.9	10	11.3	83.3	118	6.9	73.8	164	64.0
Other forms of PD	33	5.7	39.3	9	7.4	75.0	115	11.4	71.9	157	61.3
Average cost of PD per classroom for both Teachers and Assistant Teachers	79	\$1,404		11	\$1,728		151	\$1,446		239	\$1,445
Average Number of Hours Lead Teachers Attend PD Annually	84	38.0		12	40.9		160	32.5		256	34.7
Average Number of Hours Assistant Teachers Attend PD Annually	79	25.9		12	29.3		156	19.5		247	22.0

Table 51: Who Provides Coaching to District Preschool Teachers

Who provided the support in the district for teachers*	N (183)	%
Special Education Dept Staff (Director of Special Education, Child Study Team, Psychologist or Social Worker)	99	54.1
District Administrators (Principal, Staff, Supervisors)	61	33.3
Coaches/Master Teacher	30	16.4
Consultant from Curriculum Publisher	16	8.7
Other	51	27.9
Don't know	2	1.1

* Respondents could mention multiple responses

Table 52: In What Topics do District Preschool Teachers Receive Coaching?

What topics are covered?*	N (128)	%
Curriculum	60	46.9
Behavior/Classroom Management	38	29.7
Inclusion/Special Education	34	26.6
Differentiated Instruction/Instructional Strategies	17	13.3
Technology	12	9.4
English Language Learners	10	7.8
Working with parents	10	7.8
Speech and Language Development	9	7.0
Whatever is needed	8	6.3
Child Development	6	4.7
Literacy	6	4.7
Other	61	47.7
Don't know	11	8.6

* Respondents could mention multiple responses

Preschool Children with Disabilities in District Preschool Programs

Districts, child care and Head Start centers were asked about their experiences working with and serving children with special needs. Districts ranged in how many children with special needs they served; some served none while in other districts their prekindergarten program was a special education program only. For all classrooms in the study (district preschool, Head Start and child care), including preschool disabled classes, the number of children with special needs in each classroom ranged from one to 22 children, with a mean number of 5.50 children per classroom. However, it should be noted that in some cases the number of children with special needs reported per classroom might include children in both morning and afternoon sessions resulting in larger numbers. Next, the mean number of children with disabilities by type of program was examined and large differences were seen in the mean number of children with disabilities per classroom as can be seen in Table 53.

Table 53: Number of Children with Disabilities per Classroom

Classroom Type	Range of children	Mean
District	1-20 ⁹	6.22
Head Start	1-8	1.69
Child Care	1-6 ¹⁰	1.76

Child care and Head Start centers were asked if they had experience serving children with special needs. For the child care centers, 61.9% of them said yes, while 94.4% of Head Start centers said they do have experience serving children with special needs.

Technical Assistance for Preschool Teachers with Students with Disabilities

The districts were also asked questions about how they provide technical assistance, coaching or mentoring to teachers with students with disabilities. These were open-ended questions with no prompts that were then coded based on the information provided. The majority of districts responded that they provide it to teachers in both inclusion and self-contained classrooms. However, this was more common in ELLI districts where 58 percent of districts provide it to teachers in both types of classrooms whereas 41 percent of ECPA and 42 percent of non-ECPA or ELLI districts provide it in both classroom types. Targeted districts were more likely than universal districts to provide technical assistance, coaching or mentoring to teachers in both inclusion and self-contained classrooms and universal districts were more likely to not offer any support compared to targeted districts. A total of 56 districts reported that they do not provide any technical assistance or coaching to teachers who have preschool students with disabilities. Of these 56 districts, only one had self-contained classrooms only, eight had inclusion-only classrooms while the others had a combination of either general education classrooms, inclusion classrooms or self-contained classrooms.

⁹ It should be noted that these numbers are per classroom rather than individual classes. Therefore, in some cases the number of children per classroom with special needs include children in both morning and afternoon classes resulting in larger numbers. For example, in one district classroom, they report having 17 children with disabilities where 5 children are in the morning session and 12 children are in the afternoon session. Eight districts reported having fifteen or more children with disabilities enrolled in one classroom.

¹⁰ Two additional child care classrooms reported having 15 and 22 children with disabilities in their classrooms, which is most likely the result of combining morning and afternoon session enrollment numbers.

If a district responded that they provided some type of support for teachers with students with disabilities, they were also asked who provided this support and what the training/support encompassed. For districts that responded that no support was provided for teachers with students with disabilities, they were not asked the follow up questions. Most frequently the child study team provided the support to the teachers (48.2 percent) followed by an outside consultant or vendor (15.7 percent) or the supervisor/director/coordinator of special education (15.1%). When asked what the training encompassed, 27.4 percent of the districts responded that it included methods and strategies for inclusion and working with special needs students. Tables 54, 55, and 56 provide more detailed information based on the findings.

Table 54: Does the District Provide Technical Assistance, Coaching, or Mentoring to Teachers with Students with Disabilities?

	ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA, ELLI		Universal		Targeted		Total	
	N (85)	%	N (12)	%	N (163)	%	N (72)	%	N (188)	%	N (260)	%
For both inclusion and self-contained classes	35	41.2	7	58.3	69	42.3	27	37.5	84	44.7	111	42.7
For inclusion classes only	21	24.7	2	16.7	34	20.9	17	23.6	40	21.3	57	21.9
For self-contained classes only	5	5.9	1	8.3	15	9.2	5	6.9	16	8.5	21	8.1
None is provided	17	20.0	1	8.3	38	23.3	14	19.4	42	22.3	56	21.5
Other	2	2.4	0	0	0	0	2	2.8	0	0	2	0.8
Don't know	0	0	1	8.3	2	1.2	0	0	3	1.6	3	1.2
Don't have preschoolers with disabilities	5	5.9	0	0	1	0.6	4	5.6	2	1.1	6	2.3

Table 55: Who Provided Support to District Preschool Teachers of Students with Disabilities?

Who provided the support in the district for teachers with students with disabilities? *	N (166)	%
Child Study Team (including resource teachers, ABA specialist, learning consultant)	80	48.2
Outside consultant/vendor	26	15.7
Supervisor/Director/Coordinator of Special Education	25	15.1
Administration/Staff	15	9.0
Professional development/workshop	13	7.8
Special Education teacher	11	6.6
Behavior specialist/Consultant	10	6.0
Technology Coordinator	3	1.8
Other	41	24.7
Don't know	6	3.6

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of supports

Table 56: What Does Training About Preschool Students with Disabilities Encompass?

What does this training encompass? *	N (190)	%
Methods/strategies for inclusion and working with special needs students	52	27.4
Courses, trainings, workshops on special education	24	12.6
Services such as OT, PT, speech	13	6.8
Child Study Team	11	5.8
Transition to Kindergarten or general education classes	10	5.3
Co-teaching model	8	4.2
Response to Intervention (or Recognition and Response)	5	2.6
None	1	0.5
Other	121	63.7
Don't know	11	5.8
Refused	1	0.5

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of supports

Preschool English Language Learners in District Preschool Programs

The number of young children in this country who come to school speaking a language other than English is rising dramatically (Garcia and Frede, in press). Preschool is an effective time to provide supports for these children. However, few programs offer appropriate programs for English Language Learners (ELL). Districts were asked questions related to the ELL population in their districts, and what, if any, programs and support services are offered. This information is presented in Table 57. Of the districts that reported enrollment of ELL preschoolers, districts ranged from having zero to 43 percent of their preschool population being considered English Language Learners. Out of all the districts that were likely to serve preschool students (Tiers 1 and 2), 116 (90.6 percent) of them were able to report on the number of ELL students that were being served ranging from none to 176 preschool ELLs; with an average of 7.92 ELL students being served in each district.

Examining the number of ELL preschool students at the classroom level, 62 classrooms reported that they had ELL preschoolers enrolled, with a range of one to 16 ELL children in a class and a mean of 3.02. Meanwhile, 622 classrooms reported serving no ELL preschoolers. Districts in Tiers 1 and 2 were asked about whether they had a specific program for ELLs and if they support the maintenance of home language in their schools and prekindergarten programs. Of the districts that were likely to serve preschool aged children (Tiers 1 and 2), 63.6 percent said that they do not have an ELL program and 73.5 percent said they do not have anything in place to support the maintenance of home language.

Supports for Preschool English Language Learners and Their Teachers

In all three tiers of data collection, administrators who stated that they had preschool English Language Learners were asked about the kinds of in-district ELL programs offered to preschool students as well as supports provided to preschool teachers with students who are ELLs. The two questions were asked differently in all three tiers of data collection; in Tier 1 the questions were combined as one question, while in Tier 2 administrators were asked only about the kinds of ELL programs offered, but not supports for teachers. In Tier 3, administrators were asked separately about the ELL programs for students and supports for teachers although many districts

did not respond to the questions either because they did not have a preschool program or ELL children enrolled currently. There were 271 districts that reported serving ELLs in their preschool programs. This included 61 Tier 3 districts with only preschool self-contained programs who were not asked about supports for ELLs or preschool teachers with ELLs in their classrooms. Of the 210 districts that reported having preschool ELLs enrolled in their programs and were asked about supports for ELLs, 139 (66.2 percent) reported having some type of in-district program available for ELLs and 136 (64.8 percent) reported having supports in place for preschool teachers with ELLs in their classrooms. Some districts mentioned that if in the future they had ELL students, then they would create an ELL. Sixty-seven districts (31.9 percent) responded that they had English as Second Language (ESL) teachers for their preschool students and 69 (32.8 percent) responded that they had ESL teachers, coordinators or supervisors that supported preschool teachers who had ELL students. Tables 58 and 59 show other supports that districts with preschool ELL provide for preschool ELLs and preschool teachers with ELLs. Approximately 26 percent of districts reported other types of ELL programs offered to preschool students such as classroom aides, translated materials such as books provided in the classroom, tutoring, or parent assistance.

Table 57: Programs for English Language Learners by District Type

Does the district have a program for preschool ELLs?	ECPA		ELLI		Not ECPA or ELLI		Universal District		Targeted District	
	N (90)	%	N (3)	%	N (39)	%	N (75)	%	N (57)	%
Yes	31	34.4	2	66.7	11	28.2	24	32.0	20	35.1
No	57	63.3	1	33.3	26	66.7	49	65.3	35	61.4
NA (No preschool program or no preschool ELLs)	2	2.2	0	0.0	2	5.1	2	2.7	2	3.5
Does the district support the maintenance of home language?										
Yes	14	15.5	3	100	9	23.1	10	13.3	16	28.1
No	70	77.8	0	0	27	69.2	58	77.3	39	68.4
NA	6	6.7	0	0	3	7.7	7	9.3	2	3.5

Table 58: District ELL Programs Offered to Students

In-district ELL programs offered to preschool students (N=210) *	N	%
None	71	33.8%
ESL teachers	67	31.9%
Bilingual classes/teachers	13	6.2%
Support of maintenance of home language	25	11.9%
Translators provided	7	3.3%
Speech and Language therapy/support	5	2.4%
Computer/software programs	2	1.0%
Other	30	14.3%
Don't know	4	1.9%

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of programs

Table 59: District Supports for Teachers with ELL Students

Support for preschool teachers with ELL students (N=210) *	N	%
None	74	35.2%
ESL teacher/coordinator/supervisor	69	32.9%
Trainings/workshops	35	16.7%
Bilingual translators/interpreters	7	3.3%
Classroom aides	3	1.4%
Support from speech language therapists	2	1.0%
Online/computer/software/video program	3	1.4%
Other	16	7.6%
Don't know	7	3.3%

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of supports

Eligibility Requirements

District Eligibility Requirements

Questions about eligibility criteria for districts were asked only of those districts that currently serve preschool-aged children. This information is presented in Tables 60 and 61. These were open-ended questions with no prompts that were then coded based on the information provided. When examining eligibility criteria across all districts, almost half of the districts interviewed reported that all 4-year-olds who live in the district are eligible to participate in the prekindergarten program. When examining eligibility by district type, approximately 74.2 percent of ECPA districts reported that all 4-year-olds can participate, compared to 33.3% of ELLI districts and 30.5 percent of districts that were not ECPA or ELLI designated districts. Interestingly only 61.8 percent of ECPA districts mentioned residency status requirements, and even fewer ELLI districts (25 percent) or other types of districts (32.3 percent) mentioned residency status requirements. By regulation ECPA districts can not provide preschool to non-resident children. ELLI districts cannot use state funding to support non-eligible children but they could charge tuition for non-resident children. However, the respondents may have assumed this was unnecessary to mention in the context of a district program. Out of all the districts interviewed, only 18 (6.8 percent) indicated that they had no criteria to determine who participates in the pre-K program. Alarming, some district requirements violate state regulations, with almost 11 percent of all districts stating that children must be toilet trained to attend the preschool program, two districts requiring that children must be fluent in English, and one district stating that the child must not have behavior problems. These districts with requirements to be fluent in English and have children without behavior problems were not ECPA or ELLI districts. Again in violation of state regulations, a few ECPA-designated districts admitted to not serving all preschool-aged children in their districts and instead had specific criteria to determine who participates in the program. Some of these criteria included passing a developmental screening or being able to pay tuition.

Districts that had a preschool program for children other than those with special needs were asked about whether or not they charge tuition for their preschool program (See Table 62). Ninety-seven districts out of 264 reported that they charge tuition (36.7 percent) and one district reported that they charge tuition only for children out of district. Tuition costs ranged from \$250 to \$7,214 for the year. For districts that charge tuition, the average cost was \$2,489 per year for students to attend preschool.

Table 60: Eligibility Criteria For District Preschool Programs

Which criteria determine who participates in the program? *	ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA, ELLI		All Districts	
	N (89)	%	N (12)	%	N (164)	%	N (265)	%
All 4-year-olds are eligible	66	74.2	4	33.3	50	30.5	120	45.3
Residency	55	61.8	3	25.0	53	32.3	111	41.9
Classified as Special Ed/have IEP	18	20.2	4	33.3	61	37.2	83	31.3
All 3-year-olds are eligible	7	7.9	1	8.3	33	20.1	41	15.5
Determined by lottery	0	0	2	16.7	34	20.7	36	13.6
Must pass developmental screening	1	1.1	2	16.7	28	17.1	31	11.7
Must be toilet trained	10	11.2	1	8.3	18	11.0	29	10.9
Able to pay tuition	1	1.1	2	16.7	9	5.5	12	4.5
Qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch/ income eligible	0	0	5	41.7	4	2.4	9	3.9
First come, first serve	1	1.1	1	8.3	5	3.0	7	2.6
Academic need	0	0	1	8.3	2	1.2	3	1.1
Other	10	11.2	1	8.3	17	10.9	28	10.6
No criteria	4	4.5	1	8.3	13	7.9	18	6.8
Don't know	7	7.9	1	8.3	0	0	8	3.0

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of criteria

Table 61: Eligibility Criteria for District Preschool Programs by District Type

Which criteria determine who participates in the program? *	Universal districts		Targeted districts		All Districts	
	N (72)	%	N (193)	%	N (265)	%
All 4-year-olds are eligible	48	66.6	72	37.3	120	45.3
Residency	43	59.7	68	35.2	111	41.9
Classified as Special Ed/have IEP	16	22.2	67	34.7	83	31.3
All 3-year-olds are eligible	7	9.7	34	17.6	41	15.5
Determined by lottery	1	1.4	35	18.1	36	13.6
Must pass developmental screening	1	1.4	30	15.6	31	11.7
Must be toilet trained	6	8.3	23	11.9	29	10.9
Able to pay tuition	1	1.4	11	5.7	12	4.5
Qualify for free and reduced lunch/ income eligible	0	0	9	4.7	9	3.9
First come, first serve	1	1.4	6	3.1	7	2.6
Academic need	0	0	3	1.6	3	1.1
Other	7	9.7	21	10.9	28	10.6
No criteria	5	6.9	13	6.7	18	6.8
Don't know	6	8.3	2	1.0	8	3.0

* Respondents could indicate multiple types of criteria

Table 62: Use of Tuition in District Preschool Programs

What is the tuition used for? (N=79)	N	%
Offset cost of running program	39	49.4
Salaries	32	40.5
Materials/supplies	29	36.7
Curriculum	7	8.9
Transportation	4	5.1
Maintenance	3	3.8
Other	6	7.6

Child Care and Head Start Eligibility Requirements

More than half of the child care and Head Start centers interviewed reported that children are never denied enrollment or promotion for any reason (54.7 percent and 58.3 percent respectively). The most frequent reason given for denied enrollment or promotion in a Head Start center was that they did not meet the income requirement (22.9 percent) followed by the reason that the evaluation and/or screening determined that the child is not ready for enrollment or a promotion (12.5 percent). The most frequent reasons given for denied enrollment or promotion in a child care center were if a child is not yet toilet trained (22.4 percent) or if the child displays disruptive or aggressive behavior or if child is harmful to others (20.4 percent). Additional information is reported in Table 63.

Table 63: Eligibility Criteria Used in Head Start and Child Care Center Programs

Are children ever denied enrollment or promotion for any reason?	Head Start center		Child Care center		Total centers	
	N (48)	%	N (896)	%	N (944)	%
Child is not yet toilet trained	4	8.3	201	22.4	205	21.7
Disruptive/aggressive behavior/child harmful to others	3	6.3	183	20.4	186	19.7
Evaluation/screening determines child not ready for enrollment or promotion	6	12.5	128	14.3	134	14.2
Children's physical/social or learning needs/disabilities cannot be met by program	0	0	20	2.2	20	2.1
Do not meet income requirement	11	22.9	1	0.1	12	1.3
Parents cannot pay tuition	0	0	11	1.2	11	1.2
Child doesn't meet age requirement	2	4.2	5	0.6	7	0.7
Inappropriate parent behavior	0	0	4	0.4	4	0.4
Other reason	4	8.3	27	3.0	31	3.3
Don't know	0	0	8	0.9	8	0.8
Children are never denied enrollment or promotion	28	58.3	490	54.7	518	54.9

Supervision of Staff

District

At the district level, there exists little, if any variability between district types in terms of forms of supervision of staff (See Table 64). Overall, most districts, specifically 86 percent, provided orientation for new staff members. The number of respondents for this variable may seem smaller than the overall number of districts. This is because this question was only asked at Tier 1, which consisted primarily of universal districts and entirely of ECPA districts. We decided not to ask this question after the first round of data collection, as it is to be expected that most districts provide a sufficient orientation for new staff members.

Furthermore, 90.3 percent of districts required that staff submit lesson plans. This variable yielded the greatest difference among types of districts as compared to the other forms of staff supervision assessed, such that more universal than targeted districts reported requiring this of staff (92.1 percent and 88 percent respectively) and more ECPA and ELLI districts than non-ECPA or ELLI districts requiring this (91.5 percent and 100 percent versus 85 percent respectively). Despite these differences, still variation was marginal.

Finally, overall, 93.8 percent of districts held regular staff meetings, 93.8 percent engaged in informal observations of staff, and 96.6 percent engaged in formal evaluations of staff. District type differences were so small that no conclusions can be drawn, especially since most districts are already exhibiting the majority of these forms of supervision.

Table 64: Supervision of Staff in District Preschool Programs

District Staff Supervision	District Type				District Type						Total	
	Universal		Targeted		ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA or ELLI		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	101	100	75	100	130	100	6	100	40	100	176	100
Provide orientation for new staff members?*	44	86.3	5	83.3	49	86.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	86.0
Staff is required to submit lesson plans?	93	92.1	66	88.0	119	91.5	6	100	34	85.0	159	90.3
Regular staff meetings are held?	96	95.0	69	92.0	123	94.6	6	100	36	90.0	165	93.8
Informal observations of staff?	94	93.1	71	94.7	122	93.8	6	100	37	92.5	165	93.8
Formal evaluations of staff?	98	97.0	72	96.0	126	96.9	6	100	38	95.0	170	96.6

*Only asked in Tier 1

Child Care and Head Start

Child care and Head Start centers varied in their implementation of expected supervisory practices, and Head Start appeared to be implementing them more frequently (See Table 65). Specifically, while 98.5 percent of Head Start centers reported that they require staff to submit weekly lesson plans, this contrasts with 72.4 percent of child care centers reported a similar requirement. It is likely that Head Start more frequently engages in these practices because federal Head Start requirements mandate that programs conduct a minimal level of staff supervision. Furthermore, more Head Start centers (98.5 percent) reported engaging in formal evaluations of staff than child care centers (85.3 percent). This is likely due to the fact that Head Start directors are more likely to have specialization in ECE than are child care center directors, and therefore are more knowledgeable of the content areas and pedagogical strategies upon which teachers should be evaluated. Child care centers that had a director with at least a bachelor’s degree were not significantly more likely than child care centers which had a director with less than a bachelor’s degree to require staff to submit lesson plans or to conduct formal evaluations of staff.

Despite this, there were virtually no differences noted between Head Start and child care centers in terms of orientation for new staff members, holding regular staff meetings, and conducting informal observations of staff. Perhaps this is because these three forms of supervision reflect a minimal threshold of supervision necessary for staff to function appropriately.

Table 65: Supervision of Staff in Child Care and Head Start

Center Level Supervision of Staff	Program Type			
	Child Care		Head Start	
	N	%	N	%
	1,040	100	66	100
Provide orientation for new staff members?	996	95.8	65	98.5
Staff is required to submit lesson plans?	753	72.4	65	98.5
Regular staff meetings are held?	993	95.5	63	95.5
Informal observations of staff?	995	95.7	65	98.5
Formal evaluations of staff?	887	85.3	65	98.5

Center Level Program Administrative Practices

When interviewing center administrators of child care and Head Start centers, we also collected information regarding program evaluation, budgeting and accounting practices, and provisions for and experience serving various populations of children. This information is presented in Table 66.

Both child care centers (91.7 percent) and Head Start centers (98.5 percent) generally reported that their facilities and program are evaluated regularly for improvement. More Head Start centers (93.9 percent) than child care centers (85.4 percent) reported using generally accepted accounting procedures when preparing budgets, and similarly, 89.4 percent of Head Start centers have a regular audit of their budget, as compared to 74.8 percent of child care centers. These results are in line with expectations for differences between Head Start and child care centers, since Head Start typically has more stringent program requirements. That said, a large percent of child care centers appeared to be engaging in appropriate facility and budget evaluation, even if fewer in number than Head Start. Interestingly, 10 percent fewer Head Start centers than child care centers reported having substitutes available to cover for absent teachers. It is possible that with their larger agencies Head Start tends to reassign other staff to cover classrooms. Despite this, still the majority of both, specifically 80.3 percent of Head Start centers and 90.2 percent of child care centers reported having substitutes.

Table 66: Administrative Practices in Child Care and Head Start

Center Level Evaluation	Program Type			
	Child Care		Head Start	
	N	%	N	%
	1,040	100	66	100
Substitutes available to cover for absent teachers?	938	90.2	53	80.3
Facilities and program are evaluated regularly for improvement?	954	91.7	65	98.5
Program uses generally accepted accounting procedures when preparing budgets?	888	85.4	62	93.9
Program has a regular audit of the budget?	778	74.8	59	89.4

The majority of Head Start programs (95.5 percent) reported using the Child Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), whereas a very small proportion of child care centers (10.2 percent) reported using this program. Of the child care centers that were interviewed, 25 percent report being part of a larger corporation. In addition, 61.6 percent of child care centers reported that they have experience serving children with special needs, 76 percent reported that they have experience serving ELLs, and 37.4 percent reported that they have established methods for promoting

maintenance of children’s home language. Head Start centers appeared better equipped to serve these populations in all domains, as 97 percent reported having experience serving children with special needs, 98.5 percent reported having experience serving ELLs, and 84.8 percent reported that they have established methods for promoting maintenance of children’s home language. These discrepancies may be partially attributable to the fact that these student populations have greater access to Head Start and are therefore more highly concentrated there than in private child care centers.

The majority of all center directors interviewed have established methods for assessing child progress. This variable does not specify whether methods are formal in nature (i.e. a structured assessment) or informal (i.e. anecdotes written about children throughout the day), but without specification, more than 90 percent of all programs reported engaging in some method to assess child progress. A relatively high percentage of child care centers and Head Start programs reported that they deny child enrollment or promotion for some reason (38.3 percent and 30.3 percent, respectively). The primary reason for this in Head Start is that enrollment is based on income eligibility requirements as opposed to some other criteria (e.g. children not toilet trained, behavior problems, etc). See Table 67 for a more specific break down of reasons that children are denied enrollment or promotion.

A large percentage of Head Start centers reported that they collaborate with the local school district for transition to kindergarten (92.4 percent), in comparison to 65.2 percent of child care centers. The federal regulations mandate that Head Start programs develop transition plans. However, interestingly, a larger percent of child care centers (45.1 percent) than Head Start centers (12.1 percent) reported that they collaborate with the local school district for before and after care. Finally, virtually the same proportion of child care and Head Start centers (46.9 percent and 46.2 percent, respectively) reported that they own their facilities.

Table 67: Additional Administrative Information on Child Care and Head Start Centers

General Center Information	Program Type			
	Child Care		Head Start	
	N	%	N	%
	1,040	100	66	100
Part of larger corporation?	260	25.0	N/A	N/A
Currently Accredited?	176	16.9	15	22.7
Use of Child Adult Care Food Program?	106	10.2	63	95.5
Experience serving children with Special Needs?	641	61.6	64	97.0
Experience serving English Language Learners?	790	76.0	65	98.5
Established methods for promoting maintenance of children’s home language?	317	37.4	56	84.8
Established methods for assessing child progress?	957	92.0	65	98.5
Deny enrollment or promotion?	398	38.3	20	30.3
Collaborate with local school district for transition to K?	678	65.2	61	92.4
Collaborate with local school district for before and after care?	469	45.1	8	12.1
Child care agency owns the facilities?	488	46.9	30	46.2

Center Accreditation

A higher than anticipated number of programs reported being accredited with 16.9% of child care programs and 22.7 percent of Head Start centers reporting that they were accredited. Table

68 reveals that many fewer were specifically accredited by organizations such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) or the National Child Care Association (NCCA). It is possible that some portion of those that reported being accredited were unsure of what accreditation specifically is, as a handful of centers reported being accredited by “the state” or the Department of Youth and Family Services, neither of which offer accreditation.

Across both child care centers and Head Start centers, the majority of centers reporting accreditation specified that they were accredited by the NAEYC. Specifically, 10.1 percent of child care centers and 19.7 percent of Head Start centers reported that they were accredited by NAEYC. A handful (less than two percent) of both child care and Head Start centers reported that they were accredited by the NCCA.

Both NAEYC and NCCA require that accreditation be renewed every five years. Of those who reported that they are accredited, the child care centers are fairly evenly distributed across having accreditation that was awarded or renewed less than a year ago, one to three years ago, and more than three years ago. Specifically, 29 percent of child care centers were accredited less than a year ago, as compared to 6.7 percent of Head Start centers. Furthermore, 38.6 percent of child care centers were accredited between one and three years ago, as compared to 33.3 percent of Head Start centers. Finally, 25.6 percent of child care centers report that their accreditation was awarded or renewed more than three years ago, while 26.7 percent of Head Start reported that their accreditation was awarded or renewed more than three years ago.

When asked if the program has been accredited in the past, child care and Head Start centers reported similarly. Specifically, 9.1 percent of child care centers and 10.6 percent of Head Start centers report that they were previously accredited.

Table 68: Accreditation of Child Care Centers and Head Start Programs

Center Accreditation	Program Type			
	Child Care		Head Start	
	N	%	N	%
	1,040	100	66	100
<i>Is the program currently Accredited?</i>	176	16.9	15	22.7
NAEYC	105	10.1	13	19.7
NCCA	13	1.3	1	1.5
American Montessori Society	6	0.6	0	0
Other	37	3.6	0	0
Don't Know	15	1.4	2	3.0
<i>When was it awarded or Renewed?</i>				
Less than 1 year ago	51	29.0	1	6.7
1-3 years ago	68	38.6	5	33.3
More than 3 years ago	45	25.6	5	33.3
Don't Know	12	6.8	4	26.7
<i>Has the program been accredited in the past?</i>	95	9.1	7	10.6

Center Level Professional Development for Teachers

On average, teaching staff at both child care and Head Start centers attend professional development workshops of some type (See Table 69). Specifically, 94.4 percent of teaching staff at child care centers and 91.3 percent of teaching staff at Head Start centers attend some form of

professional development workshops. Also, approximately 80 percent of child care centers and Head Start programs pay for teaching staff to attend these workshops.

Table 69: Professional Development for Child Care and Head Start Teaching Staff

Center Level Professional Development	Program Type			
	Child Care		Head Start	
	N	%	N	%
	983	100	45	100
Teaching staff attend professional development workshops?	927	94.4	42	91.3
Center usually pays for staff to attend PD workshops?	742	78.2	36	81.8

Preschool Facilities - Building & Playground

District, Child Care, and Head Start

When applicable, all district, child care, and Head Start sites that currently serve preschool were visited and evaluated on basic standards of quality (See Table 70). Generally speaking, the building exterior of most programs visited, across all three programs types, was in good condition. Eighty percent of district programs housed preschool classrooms that were accessible to children and adults with disabilities, as compared to 68 percent of Head Start classrooms and 47.2 percent of child care classrooms. In many cases, the reason why child care and Head Start classrooms were not accessible to individuals with disabilities is that classrooms were located up or down a large flight of stairs, with no access to a ramp or elevator.

A large proportion of child care and Head Start programs housed kitchens on site that could be used to prepare meals for children (72.9 percent and 83.7 percent, respectively). In addition, 88 percent of Head Start programs and 68.7 percent of child care centers had a separate adult restroom. In some of these cases, although teachers did not have access to a separate adult restroom, since restrooms were not child sized to begin with, teaching staff did have access to an adult-sized restroom outside of the classroom, but not one that was separate from that which the children use. A large percent of both Head Start (84 percent) and child care centers (87 percent) house an administrative office on site. A smaller proportion of both have meeting or conference space available on site, with 66 percent of Head Start centers meeting this requirement and 54.1 percent of child care centers having such space. Lastly, an extremely low proportion of district, child care, and Head Start centers have six or more classrooms, with just 31.3 percent of district programs, 21.8 percent of child care centers, and 15.2 percent of Head Start centers meeting this requirement. It is important to note that these percentages are reflective of all classrooms, including infant and toddler classrooms, not only preschool classrooms.

Playground, outdoor space and equipment tended to be generally safe and in good repair at all three types of site locations, with a higher proportion of Head Start programs having age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children (87.2 percent) than child care and district programs (81.4 and 75.1 percent respectively). District programs likely have the smallest proportion of age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children because these preschool programs are often housed in district elementary schools, which may more often only have equipment suitable for older children.

The majority of programs at all three sites appeared to have both stationary and portable equipment, with stationary equipment consisting primarily of slides, jungle gyms, and sturdy climbing equipment, and portable equipment consisting of balls, jump ropes, bicycles, and scooters. Overall, Head Start appears to be the best equipped in terms of outdoor space and equipment, as 85.4 percent of Head Start centers compared to 79.3 percent of district and 70.7 percent of child care programs had stationary equipment available to children. In addition, 89.6 percent of Head Start centers compared to 72.3 percent of district and 79.3 percent of child care centers had portable equipment. This is likely because Head Start has been serving preschool-aged children for far longer than district programs, and because Head Start programs have more stringent outdoor play equipment standards than do child care centers.

Table 70: Building and Playground

	Program Type					
	District (N=176)		Child Care (N=339)		Head Start (N=50)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Building						
Building exterior is in good condition?	176	100	321	94.7	46	92.0
Lighting, ventilation, & temperature in the building can be controlled?	N/A**	N/A	323	95.3	47	94.0
Classrooms are accessible to children and adults with disabilities?	140	80	160	47.2	34	68.0
Kitchens in building that can be used to prepare meals for children?	N/A	N/A	247	72.9	41	83.7
Separate adult restroom?	N/A	N/A	233	68.7	44	88.0
Administrative offices on site?	N/A	N/A	295	87.0	42	84.0
Meeting or conference space available onsite?	N/A	N/A	184	54.1	33	66.0
Houses six or more classrooms?*	N/A	N/A	277	21.8	10	15.2
Playground						
Outdoor space and equipment are generally safe and in good repair?	143	82.7	281	85.7	39	81.3
Age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children?	130	75.1	267	81.4	41	87.2
Stationary equipment available?	138	79.3	232	70.7	41	85.4
Portable equipment available?	125	72.3	261	79.3	43	89.6

* The variable, "Houses 6 or more classrooms" is out of the full sample for child care centers (N=1040) and Head Start programs (N = 66). The percent reported also includes infant and toddler classrooms.

** Please note that where N/A's are reported, these questions were not asked at the district level, as it is assumed that district programs already have these provisions.

District

After comparing district building and playground equipment more globally to child care and Head Start programs, we looked more closely at district program differences by size and type of district (See Tables 71 and 72). There were few differences between districts in terms of the building exterior being in good condition and the indoor space being reasonably clean and in good repair, as virtually all district sites met these standards. There were, however, some surprising differences in terms of classroom accessibility to children and adults with disabilities. Medium sized districts (95.8 percent) were significantly more likely than small (81.6 percent) and large (68.8 percent) districts to have classrooms that were accessible to individuals with disabilities. ECPA and non-ECPA or ELLI districts were more likely than ELLI districts to have

classrooms accessible to individuals with disabilities but these differences were not significant. There were also no significant differences between universal and targeted districts in having classrooms accessible to individuals with disabilities.

When comparing playground equipment and quality among districts of varying sizes and different district types, it appeared that medium sized districts had the highest proportion of outdoor spaces and equipment that were generally safe and in good repair (95.7 percent), whereas large districts had the smallest proportion (72.4 percent) but these differences were not statistically significant. It is possible that since large districts are more likely to be in urban areas, they may not have access to a playground onsite, and therefore engage in not safe practices such as walking along busy streets to a local playground for gross motor activities.

Also, a larger proportion of small districts than medium and large districts had age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children but these differences were not significant. A larger proportion of medium and large districts had portable equipment available to children than did small districts but these differences were also not significant. However, large districts were significantly less likely than small and medium sized districts to have stationary equipment available to children. It is possible that this is the case because districts that are lacking in stationary equipment use portable equipment (e.g. balls and jump ropes) during outdoor play to compensate for the missing stationary equipment, whereas districts that have stationary equipment already may be less likely to ensure that children also have portable equipment to play with during gross motor activities.

Table 71: District Preschool Building and Playground by District Size

District Information	District Size						Total	
	Small		Medium		Large		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	49	100	48	100	78	100	176	100
Building								
Building exterior is in good condition?	49	100	48	100	78	100	176	100
Indoor space reasonably clean and in good repair?	48	98.0	48	100	77	98.7	174	98.9
Classrooms are accessible to children and adults with disabilities?	40	81.6	46	95.8	53	68.8	140	80
Playground								
Outdoor space and equipment are generally safe and in good repair?	42	85.7	45	95.7	55	72.4	142	82.6
Age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children?	41	83.7	37	77.0	51	67.1	130	75.1
Stationary equipment available?	46	93.9	39	83.0	52	67.5	138	79.3
Portable equipment available?	32	65.3	37	80.4	55	71.4	125	72.3

Finally, a number of differences were noticed between districts of different types in terms of playground equipment. For instance, a larger proportion of targeted districts had outdoor space and equipment that was generally safe and in good repair, age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children, and stationary equipment available than did universal districts but these differences were not significant. The difference between the proportion of universal and targeted districts that had portable equipment available to children was minimal. Again, these differences are in large part likely due to differences in accessible resources in these districts. ELLI districts were significantly more likely than non-ECPA/ELLI districts to have outdoor space and

equipment that was safe and in good repair and to have stationary equipment available. There were no other significant differences between ECPA, ELLI, and non-ECPA/ELLI districts.

Table 72: District Preschool Building and Playground by District Type

District Information	District Type				District Type						Total	
	Universal		Targeted		ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA or ELLI		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	101	100	75	100	130	100	6	100	40	100	176	100
Building												
Building exterior is in good condition?	101	100	75	100	130	100	6	100	40	100	176	100
Indoor space reasonably clean and in good repair?	99	98.0	75	100	128	98.5	6	100	40	100	174	98.9
Classrooms are accessible to children and adults with disabilities?	81	81.0	59	78.7	105	81.4	4	66.7	31	77.5	140	80
Playground												
Outdoor space and equipment are generally safe and in good repair?	77	77.0	66	90.4	104	81.9	6	100	33	82.5	143	82.7
Age-appropriate equipment for preschool-aged children?	71	71.0	59	80.8	94	74.0	5	83.3	31	77.5	130	75.1
Stationary equipment available?	73	73.7	65	86.7	100	78.1	6	100	32	80.0	138	79.3
Portable equipment available?	71	71.7	54	73.0	92	72.4	4	66.7	29	72.5	125	72.3

Parent Involvement

Mutual and supportive partnerships with families in preschool programs are necessary for the overall wellbeing and success of a child. As part of the preschool expansion, districts are required to have a “wide range of family involvement and educational opportunities” (p. 10 NJ Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards of Quality, 2009) including involving parents in the governance of the program, creating workshops, classes and structured activities to enhance parents’ knowledge of the program and parenting skills, and creating policies to encourage more parent participation in the preschool program (New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards of Quality, 2009).

More than 95 percent of all district preschool, Head Start and child care programs offer opportunities for family involvement. However, while the overwhelming majority of pre-K programs provide parents with administrative information about the program and hold conferences between parents and staff, fewer pre-K programs have parents regularly volunteer in the classroom. Only 68% of district preschool programs and child care centers have parents regularly volunteer whereas 86% of Head Start programs have parent volunteers in the classroom. The Head Start program is designed to offer comprehensive services to children and families and thus this finding is not surprising. See Table 73 and 74 for more information on parent involvement activities.

Table 73: Parent Involvement in District Preschool Programs

	All Districts		ECPA		ELLI		Non-ECPA, ELLI		Universal		Targeted	
	N (177)	%	N (122)	%	N (9)	%	N (46)	%	N (101)	%	N (75)	%
Opportunities for family involvement	172	97.2	118	96.7	9	100	45	97.8	98	97.0	73	97.3
Parents are given admin information about the program	166	93.8	115	94.3	9	100	42	91.3	95	94.1	70	93.3
Conferences between parents and staff	169	95.5	116	95.1	9	100	44	95.7	96	95.0	72	96.0
Parents regularly volunteer in the classroom	121	68.4	83	68.0	5	55.6	33	71.7	70	69.3	51	68.0

Table 74: Parent Involvement in Child Care and Head Start Preschool Programs

	Head Start		Child Care		All center types	
	N (71)	%	N (1041)	%	N (1112)	%
Opportunities for family involvement	70	98.6	1004	96.4	1074	96.6
Parents are given admin information about the program	68	95.8	995	95.6	1063	95.6
Conferences between parents and staff	68	95.8	910	87.4	978	87.9
Parents regularly volunteer in the classroom	61	85.9	704	67.6	765	68.8

Classroom Level Information

Information collected on district, child care and Head Start centers at the classroom level included data on the ages of the children being served in preschool classrooms, the number of children in each classroom and square footage of classrooms. These questions help to better understand the current capacity of the programs and can provide helpful information to districts and the state as expansion goes forward. For example, there are some districts that currently only serve 4-year-olds so with the expansion, they will not only need to enroll more children, but also start serving 3-year-olds. Moreover, it is important to be able to have an idea of how many children are being served in the classrooms to determine whether districts need to reduce their class sizes and create more classrooms or whether there is still enough room in the current classrooms to continue to expand. Available space in private provider programs may be needed to serve all eligible children and to capitalize on the expertise available in those programs.

Enrollment & Preschool Classrooms

New Jersey DOE regulations for preschool classrooms require a maximum class size of 15. Thus, it is useful to know how many classrooms meet this requirement and how many exceed it. Overall, almost half (46.2 percent) of the district classrooms serve only 4-year-olds and 35.8 percent serve 3- to 5- percentear-olds. On the other hand, 70% of Head Start centers serve 3- through 5-year-olds and only 18.6 percent of child care centers serve only 3- through 5-year-olds. The number of children enrolled in a prekindergarten classroom differed greatly, with a few child care centers reporting that over 40 children were enrolled in a class, although this may have included an AM and a PM session together. In the districts that were likely to have preschool (Tiers 1 and 2), approximately 54.1 percent of the 1,317 classrooms had 15 or fewer children in enrolled, while 31.5 percent had classes with 16 to 20 children and 14.4 percent of the classes

had more than 21 children in each class. In Head Start classrooms that were surveyed, 38.3 percent had zero to 15 children per classroom while 59.3 percent of the classrooms had 16 to 20 children. Two-thirds of child care center classrooms (66.0 percent) had zero to 15 children per classroom, while 22.5 percent had 16 to 20 children and 11.5 percent had more than 20 children in the classroom. While it is concerning that some classrooms have too many children than what is considered appropriate for a quality preschool classroom (*e.g.*, more than 20 children) it should be noted that in some districts, morning and afternoon preschool sessions enrollment numbers were combined, which may have contributed to the large number of classrooms being reported as having more than 20 children in the classroom. It is also important to note that over half of all classrooms (58.2 percent) have 15 or fewer children in their classrooms.

One potential benefit of preschool expansion is the opportunity to serve more children with disabilities in a general education classroom with their peers. Indeed, the NJ DOE Preschool Implementation Guidelines state:

The New Jersey School Funding Reform Act provides an historic opportunity to alleviate the educational disadvantages related to poverty for all children, including children with challenges due to a physical, learning or behavioral disability. Through this mandate, there are far greater opportunities for children to be educated in an inclusive setting with their peers and to have access to all the resources necessary to address their individualized needs. The goal of the preschool education program is to provide each child the opportunity to access a high quality preschool learning environment with the individualized supports needed for school success. (p. 16 NJ DOE, 2008)

Understanding what type of preschool classroom is currently available to children with disabilities assists in planning the roll-out and preparing for the technical assistance needs of the teachers. Almost 60 percent of districts (219 out of 375) that participated in this needs assessment reported having at least one preschool inclusion classroom. Of the classrooms that reported if they were general education, inclusion, or self-contained, there were 429 (25.1 percent) general education preschool classrooms, 563 (32.9 percent) preschool inclusion classrooms, and 718 (42.0 percent) preschool self-contained classrooms. Table 75 shows the number of preschool general education, inclusion, and self-contained classrooms in each Tier for the classrooms where this information was available.

Table 75: Type of Preschool Classroom by Tier

	Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3		All Districts	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
General Education	125	49.4	237	33.5	67	8.9	429	25.1
Inclusion	75	29.6	200	28.2	288	38.5	563	32.9
Self-Contained	53	20.9	271	38.3	394	52.6	718	42.0
Total	253		708		749		1,710	100.0

The operating schedule of most classrooms was also reported. Of the 1,690 classrooms with this information in Tiers 1, 2, and 3, there were 1,274 (75.4 percent) classrooms that operated on a half-day schedule and 416 (24.6 percent) that operated on a full-day schedule. Table 76 shows the number of preschool classrooms by Tier that operate on either a half or full day operating schedule.

Table 76: Operating Schedule of Preschool Classrooms by Tier

	Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3		All Districts	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Half-Day	156	65.5	507	72.0	611	81.7	1,274	75.4
Full-Day	82	34.5	197	28.0	137	18.3	416	24.6
Total	238		704		748		1,690	100.0

The physical size of the classroom was also measured in 1,937 classrooms to determine how many classrooms met the state requirement of 950 square feet. Out of all the classrooms with onsite observations, only 13.5 percent of all classrooms met the room size requirement. Information on classroom size and other classroom characteristics is found in Table 77.

Table 77: Preschool Enrollment and Classrooms

Ages of children being served	District		Head Start		Child Care		All Classrooms	
	N (558)	%	N (159)	%	N (871)	%	N (1,588)	%
3-year-olds only	23	4.1	14	8.8	235	27.0	272	17.1
4-year-olds only	258	46.2	19	11.9	249	28.6	526	33.1
3- 5 year-olds	200	35.8	119	74.8	252	28.9	571	36.0
4-year-olds with 3-year-olds with IEPs	32	5.7	0	0	6	0.7	38	2.4
Preschool- age unspecified	39	7.0	1	0.6	19	2.2	59	3.7
Other age groupings*	1	0.2	3	1.9	56	6.4	60	3.8
NA**	5	0.9	3	1.9	54	6.2	62	3.9
Number of children enrolled in the class	N (479)	%	N (162)	%	N (676)	%	N (1,317)	%
0-15 children	259	54.1	62	38.3	446	66.0	767	58.2
16-20 children	151	31.5	96	59.3	152	22.5	339	30.3
21 or more children	69	14.4	4	2.5	78	11.5	151	11.5
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Room size larger than 950 square feet (N=1937)	146	27.7	23	13.2	92	7.4	261	13.5
Room size larger than 950 sq feet and has a restroom (N=1937)	98	18.6	11	6.7	43	3.4	152	7.8

* Other age groupings include classrooms where there were preschool aged children and children younger or older than preschoolers.

** NA includes classrooms where data on children’s ages were not obtained, or classrooms that are not currently used for preschool.

Basic Classroom Environment

Classroom visits were done in direct observation sites in district, Head Start and child care classrooms. The purpose of the visits was to measure the basic quality of the classrooms, and to determine if there were differences, depending on the location of the classroom. This information can provide a baseline for determining the need for technical assistance, professional development and materials costs. Data from the classroom direct observation sites were collected in five areas; furniture and room arrangement, health and safety, television/computer, teacher

and peer interaction and daily schedule. The furniture and room arrangement section contains information about the type and condition of the furniture in the room, how the room is organized and set up. Furniture and room arrangement can not only impact a child's ability to learn, but also the quality of the learning environment. The health and safety section includes questions about health practices such as hand washing and knowledge of health as well as safety procedures indoors and outdoors. Teacher and peer interaction items include how staff works with and responds to children to help them develop social-emotional skills and positive interactions with their peers. Lastly, the daily schedule section contains items on whether there is a written schedule and how the day is divided up and organized.

Furniture and Room Arrangement

Table 78 shows the percentage of classrooms meeting basic furniture and room arrangement criteria. Across all auspices, furniture for routine care, such as cots, was convenient to use. However district and Head Start preschool classrooms were significantly more likely than child care center preschool classrooms to have routine care furniture that was convenient to use. In Head Start and district classrooms, furniture and room arrangement criteria were generally met. Overall, child care centers are significantly less likely to have a room arranged to maximize children's learning compared to district and Head Start classrooms. Head Start classrooms were significantly more likely than district and child care center classrooms to have centers organized for independent use by children, and district preschool classrooms were significantly more likely than child care center classrooms to do so. District (72.5 percent) and Head Start (69.5 percent) preschool classroom were significantly more likely than child care center classroom (48.3 percent) to have soft furnishings that were clean and in good repair and accessible to children. In addition, child care classrooms (64.4 percent) were significantly less likely to have at least five different interest centers (such as dramatic play, art, literacy, science, etc.) than district (86.3 percent) and Head Start (89.8 percent) classrooms. (Please see the specific breakdown of furniture available by auspice in the Adequacy of Preschool Classroom Materials and Related Costs section). Another striking example of the differences in quality in the types of classrooms is seen when examining the room arrangement. For example, more than 85 percent of both district and Head Start classrooms have arranged the space in the classroom so activities are not interrupted compared to only 60 percent of child care classrooms, and this difference is significant. District and Head Start classrooms were also significantly more likely than child care center classrooms to have a woodwork bench, sand/water table, or easel able to be used.

In addition to examining furniture and room arrangement, classroom displays such as children's artwork and items on the walls were examined. Children's artwork was minimal in many classrooms; instead most classrooms had posters or teacher displays. However, Head Start classrooms were significantly more likely to have individualized children's artwork predominating the classroom display compared to district and child care classrooms.

Table 78: Furniture and Room Arrangement Checklist

	District (N=371)		Child Care (N=725)		Head Start (N=128)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adaptive furniture permits inclusion of children with disabilities with peers.¹¹	73	63.9	63	32.4	8	23.5
Routine care furniture is convenient to use	349	94.1	595	82.1	121	94.5
At least five different interest centers provide a variety of learning experiences	320	86.3	467	64.4	115	89.8
Space is arranged so most activities are not interrupted	319	86.0	434	59.9	109	85.2
Woodwork bench, sand/water table, or easel is used	309	83.3	357	49.2	108	84.4
Centers are organized for independent use by children	302	81.4	526	72.6	118	92.2
Most soft furnishings are clean and in good repair and some soft toys are accessible to children	269	72.5	350	48.3	89	69.5
Much of the display is done by the children and individualized children's work predominates	91	24.5	210	29.0	61	47.7

Health and Safety

Items related to health and safety in the classroom measured both practices taught to and used by the children as well as classroom equipment. Information on classroom health and safety is displayed in Table 79. There were significant differences between auspices in both the practices and equipment related to health and safety in the classrooms. For example, in more than 80 percent of district classrooms no major safety hazards were in the classroom, while only about half of the child care and Head Start classrooms visited met this criterion, and this difference was significant. Examples of safety hazards include exposed outlets, cleaning materials within reach of children, easy access to parking lot/road, and sharp objects. Moreover, great differences among the different auspices were seen with whether the classroom has running water and if child restrooms are located in the classroom. District classrooms were significantly more likely than Head Start and child care classrooms to have running water and child restrooms located in the classroom. Head Start classrooms were significantly more likely than child care center classrooms to have running water and child restrooms in the classrooms. This is important as the preschool facility regulations require that all classrooms that serve preschool age children have both running water and a child restroom located in the classroom. It is reassuring that the majority of district classrooms already meet these standards, but without some initiative for facilities improvement, it will be difficult to partner with local Head Start and child care centers. District and Head Start classrooms were significantly more likely than child care center classrooms to have essentials needed to handle emergencies available, such as a phone, fire extinguisher, or evacuation plans. In district preschool classrooms it was significantly more likely that there was adequate supervision than in child care center classrooms, but no other significant differences were found.

¹¹ For the majority of classrooms, this question was not applicable. Therefore the number and percentage reported in the table represents the number of classrooms that had adaptive furniture which permits inclusion of children with disabilities when applicable. The number of district classrooms where applicable is 116; the number of child care classrooms where applicable is 194; the number of Head Start classrooms where applicable is 34.

Table 79: Health and Safety Checklist

	District (N=371)		Child Care (N=725)		Head Start (N=128)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The classroom has running water	327	88.1	379	52.3	80	62.5
Child restrooms are located in the classroom	302	81.4	328	45.2	86	67.2
No safety hazards in the classroom	300	80.7	366	50.5	66	51.6
Adequate supervision to protect children’s safety indoors	362	97.6	682	94.1	121	94.5
Essentials needed to handle emergencies are available	325	87.6	529	73.0	110	85.9

Teacher and Peer Interaction

Table 80 provides information about teacher-child and peer interactions. Across all auspices our results show that teacher and peer interactions generally meet these minimum standards. All classrooms were very likely (all over 90%) to have staff that responded appropriately to children and responded in a respectful and warm supportive manner. District preschool classrooms were significantly more likely than child care center classrooms to have staff who seemed to enjoy being with the children, responded in a warm supportive manner, and showed respect but this difference was quite small.

Table 80: Teacher and Peer Interaction

	District (N=371)		Child Care (N=725)		Head Start (N=128)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Peer interactions are usually positive	361	97.3	699	96.4	123	96.1
Staff seem to enjoy being with the children, responding in a warm, supportive manner, showing respect	350	94.3	668	92.1	120	93.8

Daily Schedule

Table 81 provided information about classrooms’ daily schedule. Head Start classrooms (81.3 percent) were significantly more likely to have a written schedule posted in the room compared to district (64.4 percent) and child care (67.7 percent) classrooms. Moreover, in child care and Head Start classrooms, typically at least one indoor and one outdoor play period occurs daily (at least 90 percent in each auspice), whereas this occurs less than 70 percent of the time in district classrooms, and this difference was statistically significant. District and Head Start classrooms were also significantly more likely to have a daily schedule that is familiar to the children than child care center classrooms.

Table 81: Daily Schedule Checklist

	District (N=371)		Child Care (N=725)		Head Start (N=128)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Written schedule is posted in room¹²	239	64.4	490	67.6	104	81.3
At least one indoor and one outdoor play period occurs daily	254	68.5	648	89.4	118	92.2
Basic daily schedule exists that is familiar to children¹³	292	97.3	579	94.6	83	98.8

Adequacy of Preschool Classroom Materials and Related Costs

This section of the report examines the cost of fully furnishing and supplying preschool classrooms in district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start centers. These analyses focus on only classrooms that serve preschool age children. A sample of preschool classrooms in each district school, child care center, and Head Start center were assessed to ascertain the adequacy of their classroom furniture and materials. A furniture checklist was completed in 1,191 classrooms. This furniture checklist was part of the abbreviated classroom observation that was to be conducted in one to four preschool classrooms in each school and center in Tier 1 and 2 districts. It also was included in the full classroom observation which was administered in one preschool classroom in each school and center in Tier 1 and Tier 2. A materials checklist was also completed in 558 of these classrooms. The materials checklist was part of the full classroom observation and was only completed in one classroom in each school and center in Tier 1 and 2 districts. The materials checklist includes nine subscales: art, sand/water, blocks, technology, woodworking, dramatic play, books, manipulatives, and music/movement. The music/movement checklist was not included until the very end of Tier 1 data collection. Therefore, most of the data collected on music/movement materials is from Tier 2 and this information is available on fewer classrooms (n=384) than the rest of the materials.

Items included in the furniture and materials checklists were derived from the NJ DOE Division of Early Childhood’s Abbott Preschool Classroom materials ordering list. This list contains furniture and materials that the Division of Early Childhood believes are important and appropriate for high-quality preschool programs. The ordering list also contained prices for most items. Prices were assigned to items in the checklist that did not have prices on the ordering list based on internet searches for the items.

Table 82 shows the average additional funding classrooms would need to in order to be fully furnished and equipped. Table 83 then shows the percent of the cost of each category of materials that they already spend. For every category except woodworking, child care center classrooms, on average, require the most money to be fully furnished and equipped. District preschool program and Head Start programs are comparable in the amount of money they need to spend to be fully equipped and furnished. However, Head Start preschool classrooms are slightly better off than district preschool programs. Many district preschool programs are only a few years old, whereas many Head Start programs have been in operation for many years. These

¹² This item combined two different questions, each asked in a different tier of data collection. Both asked whether there was a written schedule posted in the room, but in Tier 1 it was also asked if the written schedule generally relates to what occurs in the room.

¹³ This item was not administered in all classrooms during Tier 1. It was administered in a total of 996 classrooms including 300 district classrooms, 612 child care center classrooms and 84 Head Start classrooms.

programs would have had more training in early childhood education and more time to purchase materials.

Table 82 also shows significant differences in the amount of money preschool classrooms in different settings will have to spend in order to be fully equipped. The average additional costs for child care center preschool classrooms were significantly higher than the average additional costs for district preschool classrooms for all categories of materials with the exception of woodworking, which was significantly higher for district preschool classrooms than child care center classrooms. The average additional costs for child care center preschool classrooms were also significantly higher than the average additional costs for Head Start preschool classrooms for all categories of materials with the exception of woodworking. District preschool classrooms and Head Start preschool classrooms did not differ significantly on the average additional costs for materials in order to be fully equipped. The two exceptions are for furniture and woodworking. The average additional costs for district preschool classrooms were significantly higher for these two categories of materials than for Head Start preschool classrooms.

Across all settings, classrooms will need to spend the most money on purchasing furniture, which is the most expensive category of supplies. However, proportionately, furniture is the category of supplies on which classrooms have to spend the least amount of money to be fully equipped. Across all settings, preschool classrooms need to spend an average of \$3,011 on furniture but the actual total price to fully furnish a classroom is \$8,673, suggesting that preschool classrooms are already spending \$5,662 on furniture. Preschool classrooms, on average, already spend 65.3 percent of costs of the furniture necessary to be fully furnished.

On the other hand, classrooms will need to spend the least money on purchasing woodworking materials, which is the least expensive category of supplies. However, woodworking is the category of supplies that classrooms are the least likely to have. Across all settings, preschool classrooms need to spend an average of \$107 on woodworking materials but the actual total price to fully equip a classroom with woodworking materials is \$115, suggesting that preschool classrooms are only spending an average of \$8 on woodworking materials. Preschool classrooms, on average, only spent 7.2 percent of the costs of the woodworking materials necessary to be fully furnished.

Table 82: Average Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed to be Fully Equipped

	District Preschool (N=171)	Child Care Center (N=336)	Head Start (N=51)	All Settings (N=558)	Total Price for All Items
Furniture¹⁴	\$2,350.76 ^{ab}	\$3,578.41 ^{bc}	\$1,812.61 ^{ac}	\$3,010.66	\$8,673.07
Art	\$460.90 ^b	\$781.47 ^{bc}	\$482.55 ^c	\$655.91	\$1,742.35
Sand/Water	\$84.52 ^{ab}	\$1,16.65 ^{bc}	\$64.26 ^{ac}	\$102.02	\$159.28
Blocks	\$881.31 ^b	\$1,061.20 ^{bc}	\$845.06 ^c	\$986.32	\$1,660.29
Technology	\$745.29 ^b	\$1,144.29 ^{bc}	\$714.93 ^c	\$985.53	\$2,129.88
Wood Working	\$110.55 ^{de}	\$106.47 ^e	\$99.29 ^d	\$107.06	\$115.39
Dramatic Play	\$513.51 ^b	\$715.19 ^{bc}	\$444.45 ^c	\$628.64	\$1,077.99
Books	\$503.62 ^b	\$807.49 ^{bc}	\$492.48 ^c	\$685.58	\$1,324.35
Manipulatives	\$470.97 ^b	\$627.89 ^{bc}	\$519.82 ^c	\$569.92	\$993.27
Music/Movement¹⁵	\$173.25 ^b	\$257.87 ^{bc}	\$162.84 ^c	\$225.05	\$478.70
TOTAL¹⁶	\$5,805.72	\$8,791.78	\$5,096.34	\$7,612.12	\$18,354.57

^a District and Head Start classrooms are significantly different, $p < 0.01$; ^b District and child care center classrooms are significantly different, $p < 0.01$; ^c Head Start and child care center classrooms are significantly different, $p < 0.01$; ^d District and Head Start classrooms are significantly different, $p < 0.05$; ^e District and Child Care classrooms are significantly different, $p < 0.05$

Table 83: Percent of Total Cost of Materials Already in Classrooms by Setting

	District Preschool (N=171)	Child Care Center (N=336)	Head Start (N=51)	All Settings (N=558)
Furniture¹⁴	72.9	58.7	79.1	65.3
Art	73.6	55.3	72.4	62.5
Sand/Water	46.9	26.8	59.7	35.9
Blocks	46.9	36.1	49.1	40.6
Technology	65.0	46.3	66.4	53.7
Wood Working	4.2	7.7	14.0	7.2
Dramatic Play	52.4	33.7	58.8	41.7
Books	62.0	39.0	62.8	48.2
Manipulatives	52.6	36.8	47.7	42.6
Music/Movement¹⁵	63.8	46.1	66.0	53.0
TOTAL¹⁶	68.4	52.1	72.2	58.5

Furniture

Table 84 shows the average amount of money preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully furnished and the percentage of classrooms that already have each item in the furniture checklist. Child care centers will need to spend the most money to fully furnish their preschool classrooms. Overall, child care center preschool classrooms were less likely than district preschool and Head Start preschool classrooms to have the items of the furniture on the furniture checklist. In fact, child care centers were less likely to have every item on the furniture

¹⁴ The furniture checklist was completed in a total of 1,119 preschool classrooms, including 371 district preschool classrooms, 695 child care center preschool classrooms, and 125 preschool Head Start classrooms.

¹⁵ The music/movement materials checklist was not completed in all classrooms in which the rest of the materials checklist was completed. It was completed in a total of 384 preschool classrooms, including 122 district preschool classrooms, 238 child care center preschool classrooms, and 24 Head Start preschool classrooms.

¹⁶ The total included only the 384 preschool classrooms in which all components of the materials checklist and the furniture checklist were completed.

checklist, with two exceptions. Child care center preschool classrooms were more likely to have shelving units for books than Head Start preschool classrooms. They were also more likely to have a workbench than district preschool classrooms. Child care center classrooms, on average, will have to spend more money than district and Head Start preschool classrooms on all items of furniture other than shelving units for books and workbenches.

A greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms tended to have the items on the materials checklist than district preschool classrooms. Consequently, Head Start preschool classrooms tend to have to spend less than district preschool classrooms to become fully furnished. However, there are several items that district preschool classrooms were more likely to have than Head Start preschool classrooms, such as chairs, filing cabinets, drying racks, shelving units for dramatic play, manipulatives, and books. Additionally, the differences between Head Start and district preschool classrooms were much smaller than the differences between preschool classrooms in either setting and preschool classrooms in child care centers.

There were certain items of furniture that preschool classrooms tended to have more than others. Across all settings, 97 percent of preschool classrooms had sufficient tables for preschoolers. However, only 9.7 percent of preschool classrooms had a workbench and only 11.4 percent had a child sized rocking chair. Chairs for a preschool classroom cost \$836 whereas a workbench costs \$195 and a child-sized rocking chair costs \$129. Cubbies, tables, shelving units for blocks, and shelving units for manipulatives were the most expensive items on the checklist, each costing more than \$800 per classroom. Across all settings between 64 and 97 percent of preschool classrooms already had these items. The two least expensive items of furniture on the list were the beanbag chair and the drying rack. Across all settings, only 20 percent and 32 percent, respectively, of preschool classrooms already had these items. Many of the more expensive items of furniture are items that are extremely necessary to have in a preschool classroom, such as tables and chairs. Whereas classrooms can more easily function without some of the less expensive furniture items, having these items in a preschool does enhance the quality of the classroom.

Table 84: Average Percentage of Furniture Present and Additional Costs per Classroom to be Fully Equipped with Furniture

Furniture	District Preschool (N=371)		Child Care Center (N=695)		Head Start (N=125)		All Settings (N=1191)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Cubbies for Each Child	72.0	\$234.63	55.7	\$370.93	87.2	\$107.14	64.1	\$300.79	\$837.00
Circle Time Carpet	88.7	\$39.62	70.1	\$104.75	91.2	\$30.80	78.1	\$76.70	\$350.00
All Tables	98.4	\$13.52	96.0	\$33.67	98.4	\$13.37	97.0	\$25.26	\$835.76
Chairs	96.0	\$21.15	89.6	\$54.20	94.4	\$29.30	92.1	\$41.29	\$523.00
Shelving Units For:									
Blocks	79.8	\$176.23	66.0	\$296.02	96.8	\$27.90	73.6	\$230.57	\$871.76
Art	75.2	\$108.09	62.4	\$163.69	93.6	\$27.90	69.7	\$132.12	\$435.88
House Area	47.4	\$210.23	38.3	\$246.89	44.8	\$220.79	41.8	\$232.73	\$399.98
Manipulatives	93.3	\$58.74	82.0	\$156.79	90.4	\$83.69	86.4	\$118.58	\$871.76
Book Area	61.5	\$84.75	53.4	\$102.51	50.4	\$109.06	55.6	\$97.66	\$219.88
Music Area	27.5	\$316.04	25.5	\$324.87	49.6	\$219.68	28.6	\$311.08	\$435.88
Bean Bag Chair	29.9	\$55.99	13.7	\$68.98	29.6	\$56.25	20.4	\$63.60	\$79.90
Bookrack	88.1	\$29.53	70.8	\$72.73	92.0	\$19.92	78.4	\$53.73	\$249.00
Computer Stations	73.9	\$104.57	45.8	\$216.95	83.2	\$67.19	58.4	\$166.23	\$399.95
Chairs for Computer Stations	68.7	\$47.37	39.0	\$92.43	76.8	\$35.15	52.2	\$72.38	\$151.5
Filing Cabinet	74.9	\$82.72	34.7	\$214.92	55.2	\$147.39	49.4	\$166.57	\$329.00
Easel	83.3	\$16.69	51.9	\$48.00	83.2	\$16.78	64.0	\$34.97	\$99.88
Drying Rack	46.9	\$46.17	22.0	\$67.81	40.0	\$52.17	31.7	\$59.43	\$86.95
Sand/Water Table	77.9	\$41.77	44.0	\$105.79	86.4	\$25.70	59.0	\$77.44	\$189.00
Workbench	6.2	\$182.91	9.1	\$177.32	23.2	\$149.76	9.7	\$176.17	\$195.00
Unit for Hanging Clothes	40.7	\$118.59	24.7	\$150.50	41.6	\$116.79	31.5	\$137.02	\$199.99
Play Table & Chairs	72.2	\$49.70	56.5	\$77.78	79.2	\$37.23	63.8	\$64.78	\$179.00
Play Sink	82.7	\$26.74	61.4	\$59.77	95.2	\$7.44	71.6	\$43.99	\$155.00
Play Stove	80.3	\$30.50	61.4	\$59.77	96.0	\$6.20	70.9	\$45.03	\$155.00
Play Refrigerator	72.2	\$43.03	47.8	\$80.96	91.2	\$13.64	59.9	\$62.08	\$155.00
Play Dresser	27.5	\$100.78	19.7	\$111.60	33.6	\$92.29	23.6	\$106.20	\$139.00
Play Rocking Chair	14.0	\$110.92	7.9	\$118.79	23.2	\$99.07	11.4	\$114.27	\$129.00
TOTAL		\$2,350.76		\$3,578.41		\$1,812.61		\$3,010.66	\$8,673.07

Art

Table 85 shows the average amount of money preschool programs will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with art materials and what percentage of preschool classrooms already have each art material from the art checklist. Child care centers will have to spend the most money to fully equip their preschool classrooms with art supplies. Overall, child care center preschool classrooms were less likely than district preschool and Head Start preschool classrooms to have the art items on the art checklist. Therefore, child care center classrooms, on average, will have to spend more money on each art supply on the checklist than district and Head Start preschool classrooms.

A greater percentage of district preschool classrooms had 16 of the 28 items on the art materials checklist than Head Start preschool classrooms. And a greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms than district preschool classroom had the other 12 items on art materials checklist.

There were certain items from the art materials checklist that classrooms across all settings tended to have more than others. Across all settings, 95 percent of classrooms had crayons but only 14 percent of classrooms had chalk. Although no one item on the art materials checklist is particularly expensive (with the exception of construction paper and water color sets which are both more than \$100), the majority of items on the art materials checklist will have to be replaced or replenished each year. In this way, art supplies differ from most of the other categories of classroom materials discussed in this report. It is likely that the following art supplies would need to be purchased each year: tempera paint, finger paint, water color sets, glue, glue sticks, masking tape, play dough, pencils, colored pencils, markers, crayons, chalk, construction paper, write wipe makers, and collage materials. Replenishing these materials each year would cost \$1,201 per classroom. Therefore, the average amount of money classrooms would need to spend on art supplies reported in Table 85 is likely an underestimation of the actual amount of money that would need to be spent each year.

Sand/Water

Table 86 shows the average amount of money that preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully equipped with sand/water table materials. A smaller percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than Head Start and district preschool classrooms had each item on the sand/water materials checklist. On average, child care centers will have to spend more money to get their preschool classrooms fully supplied with sand/water materials than district and Head Start preschool programs.

A greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms than district preschool classrooms have each of the items on the sand/water materials checklist. Therefore, on average, Head Start programs will have to spend less money to get their preschool classroom fully equipped with sand/water materials than district preschool programs. The differences between Head Start preschool classrooms and district preschool classrooms with regards to sand/water materials are much smaller than the differences between preschool classrooms in these two settings and preschool classrooms in child care centers.

Overall, sand/water materials were not as prevalent in preschool classrooms visited across all settings as other types of materials. Fifty-nine percent of classrooms in which the materials checklist was completed had a sand/water table. No items on the sand/water materials checklist were seen in 50 percent or more of classrooms visited when considering classrooms in all settings. While the majority of classrooms need to purchase many items from the sand/water materials checklist, these items are not expensive. The total cost for all items on the sand/water checklist is \$159 and with the exception of sand, the items do not need to be replaced each year.

Table 85: Average Percentage of Art Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Art Materials to be Fully Equipped

Art Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Tempera Paint	89.5	\$10.79	72.0	\$27.17	90.2	\$9.52	79.0	\$20.54	\$97.11
Finger Paint	63.2	\$8.34	49.1	\$11.53	86.3	\$3.11	56.8	\$9.78	\$22.65
Water Color Sets	67.8	\$53.84	45.8	\$90.68	72.5	\$45.95	55.0	\$75.30	\$167.40
Paint Brushes	88.3	\$4.91	74.1	\$10.36	90.2	\$3.92	79.9	\$8.10	\$40.00
Vinyl Smocks	62.0	\$34.74	42.6	\$51.70	86.3	\$12.35	52.5	\$42.90	\$90.00
Scissors	97.1	\$2.11	80.4	\$11.79	92.2	\$4.71	86.6	\$8.17	\$60.00
Glue	83.6	\$11.34	59.5	\$27.06	76.5	\$15.73	68.5	\$21.21	\$66.85
Glue Sticks	77.8	\$18.67	43.5	\$47.50	54.9	\$37.88	55.0	\$37.78	\$84.00
Masking Tape	50.9	\$22.28	29.2	\$32.13	39.2	\$27.57	36.7	\$28.70	\$45.36
Tape Dispensers	53.2	\$9.54	31.3	\$14.03	43.1	\$11.60	39.1	\$12.43	\$20.40
Staplers	52.6	\$21.32	36.9	\$28.39	43.1	\$25.59	42.3	\$25.97	\$45.00
Paper Punches	39.2	\$13.83	22.0	\$17.73	35.3	\$14.71	28.5	\$16.26	\$22.74
Play Dough	85.4	\$3.60	69.0	\$7.34	74.5	\$6.04	74.6	\$6.07	\$23.70
Rolling Pins	68.4	\$4.10	43.8	\$7.31	72.5	\$3.57	53.9	\$5.98	\$12.99
Cookie Cutters	83.6	\$3.27	57.4	\$8.51	86.3	\$2.75	68.1	\$6.38	\$20.00
Pencils	90.6	\$5.52	77.7	\$13.17	88.2	\$6.94	82.6	\$10.26	\$59.00
Colored Pencils	63.2	\$16.58	54.5	\$20.49	70.6	\$13.23	58.6	\$18.62	\$44.99
Markers	94.2	\$6.43	76.8	\$23.21	88.2	\$11.76	83.2	\$17.02	\$99.99
Crayons	99.4	\$0.76	92.9	\$4.64	94.1	\$3.82	95.0	\$3.38	\$64.99
Chalk	14.6	\$3.50	13.1	\$3.56	21.6	\$3.22	14.3	\$3.51	\$4.10
Ink Pad Stamps	66.7	\$15.45	39.6	\$28.00	54.9	\$20.90	49.3	\$23.51	\$46.35
Construction Paper	88.9	\$32.91	77.1	\$64.49	98.0	\$5.52	82.6	\$49.42	\$281.40
Stencils	56.1	\$8.15	42.9	\$10.62	68.6	\$5.83	49.3	\$9.43	\$18.59
Small Chalk Boards	40.4	\$51.00	20.5	\$67.94	29.4	\$60.35	27.4	\$62.06	\$85.5
White Boards	46.2	\$46.00	21.4	\$67.18	29.4	\$60.35	29.7	\$60.06	\$85.5
Write Wipe Markers	49.7	\$44.89	18.8	\$72.52	31.4	\$61.25	29.4	\$63.02	\$89.25
Collage Materials	84.8	\$7.02	72.0	\$12.45	90.2	\$4.36	77.6	\$10.05	\$44.49
TOTAL		\$460.90		\$781.47		\$482.55		\$655.91	\$1,742.35

Table 86: Average Percentage of Sand/Water Table Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Sand/Water Table Materials to be Fully Equipped

Sand/Water Table Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Sand	62.0	\$20.83	35.1	\$35.02	78.4	\$11.64	47.3	\$28.53	\$53.97
Shovels	64.3	\$2.66	34.2	\$4.83	78.4	\$1.59	47.5	\$3.87	\$7.35
Buckets	56.7	\$6.58	25.9	\$11.12	66.7	\$5.00	39.1	\$9.17	\$15.00
Sifters	52.6	\$7.19	24.4	\$11.34	60.8	\$5.88	36.4	\$9.57	\$15.00
Small Plastic Cars	25.7	\$11.23	15.5	\$12.68	33.3	\$10.00	20.3	\$11.99	\$15.00
Plastic Trucks	25.1	\$11.23	15.8	\$12.63	25.5	\$11.18	19.5	\$12.07	\$15.00
Tubing	8.2	\$5.53	7.4	\$5.54	21.6	\$4.69	9.0	\$5.45	\$5.98
Scoops/Funnels	45.6	\$8.24	28.6	\$10.71	64.7	\$5.29	37.1	\$9.46	\$14.99
Measuring Cups	35.7	\$11.03	24.7	\$12.79	47.1	\$8.99	30.1	\$11.91	\$16.99
TOTAL		\$84.52		\$116.65		\$64.26		\$102.02	\$159.28

Blocks

Table 87 shows the average amount of money preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with materials for the block area and the percentage of classrooms that already have each item from the blocks materials checklist. Child care centers will have to spend the most money, on average, to get their preschool classrooms fully supplied with block area materials. Child care center preschool classrooms were less likely than district and Head Start preschool classrooms to have every item on the blocks materials checklist with three exceptions. A greater percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms had small wood trains and wooden train tracks. A greater percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than district preschool classrooms had large cars.

A greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms than district preschool classrooms had 14 of the 20 items of the block materials checklist. A greater percentage of district preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms had the other six of 20 items on the block materials checklist. Overall, district programs will have to spend more money per classroom than Head Start programs to get their preschool classrooms fully equipped with block area materials. However, the difference between district preschool classrooms and Head Start preschool classrooms is much smaller than the difference between classrooms in these two settings and child care center preschool classrooms. On average, a Head Start preschool classroom will need to spend \$845 on block materials and a district preschool classroom will need an additional \$881 for block materials. However, on average, a child care center preschool classroom will need an additional \$1,061 for block materials.

The total cost of items on the block materials checklist is \$1,660, making it one of the more expensive categories of materials. However, none of the items on the block materials checklist need to be replaced each year and the majority of them will need to be replaced very infrequently. Across all settings, almost two-thirds of all classrooms had the rectangle and square unit blocks. A smaller percentage of classrooms had the other shapes of unit blocks. Only 20 percent of all preschool classrooms had hollow blocks and only 30 percent had soft colored blocks. These two types of blocks are two of the more expensive items on the block materials checklist, costing \$229 and \$200, respectively.

Table 87: Average Percentage of Block Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Block Materials to be Fully Equipped

Block Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Unit Blocks (rectangles)	78.9	\$4.20	61.9	\$7.60	94.1	\$1.17	70.1	\$5.97	\$19.95
Basic Unit Blocks (squares)	72.5	\$3.56	58.9	\$5.32	94.1	\$0.76	66.3	\$4.36	\$12.95
Double Units	74.3	\$8.99	46.7	\$18.62	88.2	\$4.11	59.0	\$14.34	\$34.95
Quad Units	46.8	\$18.60	31.5	\$23.92	68.6	\$10.96	39.6	\$21.11	\$34.95
Ramps	50.9	\$7.84	32.1	\$10.82	62.7	\$5.94	40.7	\$9.46	\$15.95
Pillar Units	67.3	\$4.57	46.7	\$7.43	86.3	\$1.91	56.6	\$6.05	\$13.95
Triangles	70.2	\$5.65	47.3	\$9.98	88.2	\$2.23	58.1	\$7.95	\$18.95
Unit Arches	56.1	\$15.35	42.6	\$20.10	80.4	\$6.86	50.2	\$17.44	\$35.00
Half Circles	44.4	\$19.44	28.0	\$25.21	70.6	\$10.29	36.9	\$22.08	\$35.00
Hollow Blocks	19.3	\$186.15	17.9	\$188.11	35.3	\$148.18	19.9	\$183.86	\$229.00
Soft Colored Blocks	33.3	\$134.50	24.4	\$151.19	45.1	\$109.80	29.0	\$142.29	\$200.00
Small Cars	76.0	\$9.58	55.4	\$17.83	68.6	\$12.53	62.9	\$14.82	\$39.95
Small Trucks	69.0	\$12.38	45.5	\$21.76	58.8	\$16.45	53.9	\$18.40	\$39.95
Dollhouse Family	51.5	\$48.44	33.3	\$66.53	47.1	\$52.84	40.1	\$59.74	\$99.80
Small Wooden Trains	42.7	\$65.88	21.7	\$89.98	5.9	\$108.19	26.7	\$84.26	\$114.95
Wooden Train Tracks	42.7	\$57.31	23.8	\$76.19	7.8	\$92.16	28.1	\$71.86	\$110.00
Large Trucks	36.3	\$69.48	31.5	\$74.61	43.1	\$61.98	34.1	\$71.89	\$109.00
Large Cars	23.4	\$83.50	25.3	\$81.43	31.4	\$74.80	25.3	\$81.46	\$109.00
Street Signs	39.2	\$16.42	14.3	\$23.13	33.3	\$17.99	23.7	\$20.61	\$26.99
Animal Sets	69.6	\$109.47	60.7	\$141.43	70.6	\$105.88	64.3	\$128.29	\$360.00
TOTAL		\$881.31		\$1,061.20		\$845.06		\$986.32	\$1,660.29

Technology

Table 88 shows the average amount of money preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully equipped with technology materials and the percentage of classrooms that already have each item from the technology materials checklist. A smaller percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than district and Head Start preschool classrooms had items on the technology checklist related to computers. Therefore, on average child care centers will have to spend more than district preschool and Head Start programs on technology materials related to computers. However, the opposite was true for technology materials related to television. A greater percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms had items on the technology checklist related to television. Child care and district preschool classrooms were very similar on these items. On average, Head Start centers will have to spend more than district preschool programs and child care center programs on television related technology materials. Some preschool development experts question the value of television and other technology related materials in the classroom (Christakis & Garrison, 2009; Burton, S. G., Calonico, J. M.; and McSeveney, D. R., 1979; Christakis, D. A.; Zimmerman, F.

J.; DiGiuseppe, D. L.; McCarty, C. A., 2004) and this particular materials deficiency may be less important than others.

A greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms, than district preschool classrooms, had items from the technology materials checklist related to computers. Therefore, district preschool programs will have to spend more money to get their preschool classrooms fully equipped with computer related technology equipment. It will be more important for preschool classrooms to spend money on computer related technology materials than on television related technology materials.

Across all settings, 65 percent of preschool classrooms already had computers, which were the most expensive item on the technology materials checklist. However, the percentage of child care center preschool classrooms that already have computers is much lower than the percentage of district and Head Start preschool classrooms that already have computers. On average, child care centers will have to spend \$554 on computers but district preschool classrooms will need to spend \$267 and Head Start preschool classrooms will have to spend only \$141 on computers. The computers on the materials checklist are computers for the children’s use that are located in the preschool classroom, as opposed to the teacher’s computer.

Table 88: Average Percentage of Technology Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Technology Materials to be Fully Equipped

Technology Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Computers	78.4	\$266.67	53.9	\$553.57	88.2	\$141.18	64.5	\$427.96	\$1,200.00
Printer	46.2	\$26.90	14.0	\$43.00	56.9	\$21.57	27.8	\$36.11	\$50.00
Printer Paper	35.1	\$6.56	9.8	\$9.11	47.1	\$5.35	21.0	\$7.98	\$10.10
Computer Programs	51.5	\$145.61	33.6	\$199.11	70.6	\$88.24	42.5	\$172.58	\$300.00
Television	49.1	\$122.08	42.9	\$137.11	19.6	\$192.90	42.7	\$137.61	\$239.95
VCR/DVD	43.9	\$177.34	38.7	\$193.66	19.6	\$253.94	38.5	\$194.17	\$315.88
Video Tapes	34.5	\$9.14	37.5	\$8.72	15.7	\$11.76	34.6	\$9.12	\$13.95
TOTAL		\$745.29		\$1,144.29		\$714.93		\$985.53	\$2,129.88

Woodworking

Table 89 shows the average amount of money preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with woodworking materials and the percentage of preschool classrooms that already have each item on the woodworking materials checklist. A smaller percentage of district preschool classrooms already had the items from the woodworking materials checklist than did child care center and Head Start center preschool classrooms. District preschool programs will, on average, have to spend more money to get their preschool classrooms fully supplied with woodworking materials. A greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms, than child care center preschool classrooms, already have items from the woodworking materials checklist. Therefore, Head Start programs, on average, will have to spend the least amount of money to get their preschool classrooms fully supplied with woodworking materials.

Across all settings, the smallest percentage of preschool classrooms had items from the woodworking materials checklist as compared to other categories of materials. However, the total price of all items on the woodworking checklist is only \$115 so even though most classrooms will have to purchase most of the items from the woodworking materials checklist in order to be fully supplied with woodworking materials, it will not cost them a lot of money. On average, district preschool classrooms will need to spend \$111, child care center preschool classrooms will need to spend \$106, and Head Start preschool classrooms will need to spend \$99. As seen in Table 84 (furniture checklist), only a small percentage of classrooms across all settings have a woodworking workbench. Therefore, in order to complete their woodworking center, most preschool classrooms will also have to purchase a woodworking workbench.

Table 89: Average Percentage of Woodworking Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Woodworking Materials to be Fully Equipped

Woodworking Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Safety Goggles	4.7	\$33.74	5.1	\$33.61	11.7	\$31.24	5.6	\$33.43	\$35.40
Hammers	5.3	\$11.37	9.8	\$10.82	17.6	\$9.88	9.1	\$10.90	\$12.00
Saws	3.5	\$11.58	8.3	\$11.00	15.7	\$10.12	7.5	\$11.10	\$12.00
Screwdrivers	4.1	\$11.51	9.2	\$10.89	13.7	\$10.35	8.1	\$11.03	\$12.00
Pliers	3.5	\$11.58	7.4	\$11.11	7.8	\$11.06	6.3	\$11.25	\$12.00
Wood Pieces	2.3	\$4.88	4.5	\$4.78	11.8	\$4.41	4.5	\$4.78	\$5.00
Nuts, Bolts, Screws, Nails	4.1	\$25.89	10.1	\$24.26	17.6	\$22.23	9.0	\$24.57	\$26.99
TOTAL		\$110.55		\$106.47		\$99.29		\$107.06	\$115.39

Dramatic Play

Table 90 shows the average amount of money preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with dramatic play materials and the percentage of classrooms that already have each item from the dramatic play materials checklist. A smaller percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than district and Head Start preschool classrooms had each item from the dramatic play materials checklist. Therefore, child care centers will have to spend more money, on average, for its preschool classrooms to be fully equipped with dramatic play materials. However, there are three exceptions. A greater percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms had shopping carts and an almost equal percentage of child care and Head Start preschool classrooms had doll highchairs. A greater percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than district and Head Start preschool classrooms had baby clothes.

The total cost of all items on the dramatic play materials checklist is \$1,078. On average, child care center classrooms will need to spend \$715 on dramatic play materials, whereas district preschool classrooms will have to spend \$514 and Head Start preschool classrooms will have to spend \$444. Despite the high total cost for dramatic play materials, all but three items on the checklist cost less than \$100. The three items that cost more than \$100 are multicultural dolls, dress up clothes, and multicultural clothing. The second two items can both be brought in from

home, rather than purchased, especially if funding is limited. Also, even though the total cost of items on the dramatic play checklist is high, the materials will last for several years and do not need to be purchased each year. Across all settings, 75 percent of preschool classrooms had plasticware and plastic fruits and vegetables. However, less than 10 percent of preschool classrooms had multicultural clothing, which is one of the more expensive items from the dramatic play checklist. However, as mentioned above, this is an item that child can bring in from home.

Table 90: Average Percentage of Dramatic Play Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Dramatic Play Materials to be Fully Equipped

Dramatic Play Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Doll Bed	62.6	\$30.36	42.9	\$45.65	72.5	\$21.93	51.6	\$38.79	\$79.88
Doll Highchair	54.4	\$20.52	30.1	\$31.47	29.4	\$31.76	37.5	\$28.14	\$44.99
Shopping Cart	37.4	\$14.39	21.1	\$18.13	15.7	\$19.38	25.6	\$17.10	\$22.99
Ironing Board	22.2	\$61.12	13.4	\$67.54	33.3	\$51.99	17.9	\$64.15	\$77.99
Mirror	55.0	\$43.33	36.6	\$60.22	78.4	\$20.49	46.1	\$51.41	\$94.99
Pots & Pans	73.7	\$8.07	49.1	\$15.26	72.5	\$8.23	58.8	\$12.41	\$29.99
Cooking Utensils	58.5	\$10.52	41.4	\$14.65	56.9	\$10.78	48.0	\$13.03	\$24.99
Tableware	70.2	\$2.24	54.5	\$3.42	74.5	\$1.91	61.1	\$2.92	\$7.50
Plasticware	85.4	\$1.14	70.8	\$2.19	88.2	\$0.88	76.9	\$1.75	\$7.50
Mixing Bowls	28.7	\$12.95	28.3	\$12.91	39.2	\$10.94	29.4	\$12.74	\$18.00
Measuring Cups	24.0	\$3.80	17.6	\$4.12	27.5	\$3.63	20.4	\$3.98	\$5.00
Measuring Spoons	20.5	\$1.99	14.6	\$2.14	21.6	\$1.96	17.0	\$2.07	\$2.50
Cash Register	55.0	\$13.49	34.8	\$19.52	52.9	\$14.09	42.7	\$17.18	\$29.95
Fruits & Vegetables	88.9	\$5.26	65.5	\$15.53	82.4	\$7.94	74.2	\$11.69	\$44.99
Multicultural Food	36.3	\$19.12	19.0	\$24.28	47.1	\$15.88	26.9	\$21.93	\$29.99
Telephones	73.1	\$4.92	40.2	\$10.71	64.7	\$6.32	52.5	\$8.53	\$17.90
Broom & Dustpan	33.3	\$11.47	13.4	\$14.90	39.2	\$10.45	21.9	\$13.44	\$17.20
Multicultural Dolls	63.7	\$72.41	36.3	\$127.19	80.4	\$39.16	48.7	\$102.36	\$199.70
Baby Clothes	38.0	\$12.73	56.5	\$18.66	29.4	\$9.70	51.6	\$16.02	\$32.99
Dress Up Clothes	71.3	\$46.77	46.1	\$86.16	66.7	\$53.32	55.7	\$71.09	\$159.95
Multicultural Clothing	9.4	\$116.93	6.5	\$120.55	19.6	\$103.71	8.6	\$117.90	\$129.00
TOTAL		\$513.51		\$715.19		\$444.45		\$628.64	\$1,077.99

Books and Other Literacy Materials

Table 91 shows the average amount of money that preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with books and related materials and the percentage of preschool classrooms that already have each item from the book materials checklist. A smaller percentage of child care center preschool classrooms, than district and Head Start preschool classrooms had each item on the book materials checklist. Therefore, child care center preschool classrooms will, on average, need to spend more money on books to be fully supplied with books and related materials, than district and Head Start preschool classrooms.

A greater percentage of district preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms had certain items from the book materials checklist but a greater percentage of Head Start preschool

classrooms than district preschool classrooms had other items from the book materials checklist. A greater percentage of Head Start preschool classrooms than child care or district preschool classrooms have anti-bias books, multicultural books, and native language books. This difference suggests more of a focus on diversity in Head Start preschool classrooms.

On average, district and Head start preschool classrooms will need to spend approximately the same amount of money to be fully supplied with books and related materials. District preschool classrooms will need to spend an average of \$504 and Head Start preschool classrooms will need to spend an average of \$492. However, child care center classrooms will need to spend an average of \$807. The total cost for all items on the book materials checklist is \$1,324.

Books and other literacy materials are an important part of a child’s early learning environment. Therefore, it is very important that preschool classrooms are fully supplied with books and related literacy materials. Across all settings, on average, classrooms need to spend about half the total cost of all items from the book materials checklist. While 95 percent of all classrooms have story books, smaller percentages of classrooms have other types of books. Many districts visited have a large ELL population. However, fewer than 20 percent of classrooms have native-language books.

Table 91: Average Percentage of Literacy Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Literacy Materials to be Fully Equipped

Book Materials	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Pillows	27.5	\$69.44	18.5	\$77.47	31.4	\$65.20	22.4	\$73.89	\$95.00
Story Books	96.5	\$2.87	93.2	\$4.79	98.0	\$1.37	94.6	\$3.89	\$70.00
Self-Concept Books	75.4	\$18.23	59.8	\$29.13	78.4	\$15.64	66.3	\$24.56	\$72.50
Multicultural Books	63.2	\$29.29	38.1	\$49.21	68.6	\$24.94	48.6	\$40.89	\$79.50
Anti-Bias Books	36.3	\$60.56	28.0	\$68.42	60.8	\$37.25	33.5	\$63.16	\$95.00
ABC Books	83.0	\$15.69	67.3	\$30.28	82.4	\$16.32	73.5	\$24.53	\$92.50
Counting Books	80.1	\$14.41	61.0	\$28.27	88.2	\$8.53	69.4	\$22.22	\$72.50
Phonemic Books	84.2	\$12.24	49.4	\$39.21	68.6	\$24.31	61.8	\$29.58	\$77.50
Science Books	82.5	\$13.51	62.2	\$28.16	80.4	\$14.61	70.1	\$22.43	\$74.50
Big Books	68.4	\$78.14	23.8	\$185.10	54.9	\$109.57	40.3	\$145.42	\$242.95
Native Language Books	13.5	\$60.58	13.4	\$60.63	64.7	\$24.71	18.1	\$57.33	\$70.00
Flannel Board	45.0	\$21.71	19.0	\$31.98	37.3	\$24378	28.7	\$28.17	\$39.50
Flannel Board Materials	34.5	\$5.86	15.8	\$7.54	31.4	\$6.14	22.9	\$6.90	\$8.95
Puppets	72.5	\$21.05	37.8	\$46.65	60.8	\$29.41	50.5	\$37.23	\$75.00
Puppet Stand	39.2	\$42.68	16.7	\$57.92	43.1	\$39.52	26.0	\$51.56	\$69.50
Magnetic Board	55.0	\$29.04	27.4	\$46.84	41.2	\$37.94	37.1	\$40.57	\$64.50
Magnetic Letters	66.7	\$8.32	36.3	\$15.89	51.0	\$12.23	47.0	\$13.24	\$24.95
TOTAL		\$503.62		\$807.49		\$492.48		\$685.58	\$1,324.35

Manipulatives

Table 92 shows the average amount of money preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with materials from the manipulatives checklist and the percentage of classrooms that already have each item from the manipulatives checklist. A smaller percentage

of child care center preschool classrooms, than district and Head Start preschool classrooms, have the items of the manipulatives materials checklist, with a few exceptions. A greater percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms have a pegboard shaped puzzle, counting cubes, dollhouse, and dollhouse family. However, on average, child care centers will have to spend the most money to get their preschool classrooms fully supplied with items from the manipulatives materials checklist. The average cost for a child care center preschool classroom would be \$628. The average cost for district and Head Start preschool classrooms, is lower: \$471 and \$520, respectively.

A greater percentage of district preschool classrooms than Head Start preschool classrooms had most of the items from the manipulatives materials checklist. However, the difference between the district preschool classrooms and the Head Start preschool classrooms is smaller than the difference between preschool classrooms in those two settings and child care preschool classrooms.

The total cost for all items in the manipulatives materials checklist was \$993. On average, across all settings, preschool classrooms need to spend almost 60 percent of that amount on additional manipulatives in order to be fully equipped. Most items from the manipulatives materials checklist are not very expensive and only one item, the dollhouse, is more than \$100. Only about 40 percent of preschool classrooms across all settings had a dollhouse. More than 70 percent of classrooms had duplo blocks and jigsaw puzzles, which cost \$68 and \$60, respectively.

Music/Movement

As mentioned above, the music/movement checklist was completed in a smaller sample of classrooms because it was not used until the very end of Tier 1 data collection. Table 93 shows the average amount of money that preschool classrooms will need to spend in order to be fully supplied with music and movement materials, and the percentage of preschool classrooms that already have each item from the music and movement materials checklist. A smaller percentage of child care center preschool classrooms than district and Head Start district preschool classrooms had the items on the music and movement materials checklist. On average, child care centers will have to spend more money to get their preschool classrooms fully supplied with music and movement materials than district or Head Start preschool programs. Child care center preschool classrooms will need an average of \$258, where as district preschool classrooms will need \$173 and Head Start preschool classrooms will need \$162.

The total cost for all items on the music and movement materials checklist is \$479. The cassette/CD player, which costs \$110, is the most expensive item on the music and movement materials checklist. Across all settings, almost 90 percent of preschool classrooms already have this item and it is the most prevalent item from the checklist. Preschool classrooms tended to be more likely to have music items than movement items. Less than 20 percent of preschool classrooms had hula hoops or scarves. However, almost 40 percent of preschool classrooms had beanbags.

Table 92: Average Percentage of Manipulatives Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Manipulatives to be Fully Equipped

Manipulatives	District Preschool (N=171)		Child Care Center (N=336)		Head Start (N=51)		All Settings (N=558)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Puzzle Storage	82.5	\$5.43	60.7	\$11.77	92.2	\$2.35	70.3	\$8.96	\$29.95
Pegboard Shape Puzzle	36.3	\$6.34	33.9	\$6.57	31.4	\$6.83	34.4	\$6.53	\$9.95
Beads & Laces	74.3	\$5.13	48.5	\$10.27	66.7	\$6.65	58.1	\$8.37	\$19.95
Duplo Blocks	78.9	\$14.32	67.3	\$22.26	68.6	\$21.33	71.0	\$19.74	\$68.00
Duplo People	48.5	\$22.90	27.7	\$32.18	33.3	\$29.67	34.6	\$29.11	\$44.50
Duplo Vehicles	50.9	\$22.11	25.9	\$33.35	27.5	\$32.65	33.7	\$29.84	\$45.00
Pegboard & Pegs	60.8	\$9.38	35.1	\$15.54	58.8	\$9.86	45.2	\$13.13	\$23.95
Counters	78.4	\$4.33	58.3	\$8.33	70.6	\$5.88	65.6	\$6.88	\$19.99
Counting Cubes	59.6	\$6.94	38.4	\$10.44	35.3	\$10.97	44.6	\$9.42	\$16.95
Unifix Cubes	55.6	\$16.11	28.9	\$25.79	39.2	\$22.03	38.0	\$22.48	\$36.25
Magnets	47.4	\$23.68	26.5	\$33.07	56.9	\$19.41	35.7	\$28.95	\$44.99
Magnifying Glass Tripod	21.1	\$39.47	6.5	\$46.72	21.6	\$39.21	12.4	\$43.81	\$49.99
Balancing Scale	54.4	\$7.75	13.7	\$14.66	39.2	\$10.33	28.5	\$12.15	\$16.99
Hand Magnifiers	49.1	\$12.46	19.6	\$19.69	54.9	\$11.05	31.9	\$16.68	\$24.50
Color Paddles	25.1	\$10.85	10.4	\$12.99	23.5	\$11.09	16.1	\$12.16	\$14.50
Knobbed Puzzles	60.2	\$23.86	48.2	\$31.07	60.8	\$23.53	53.0	\$28.17	\$59.99
Jigsaw Puzzles	79.5	\$12.27	70.2	\$17.84	76.5	\$14.11	73.7	\$15.79	\$59.95
Floor Puzzles	83.0	\$8.42	59.8	\$19.27	66.7	\$15.99	67.6	\$15.65	\$47.97
All Kinds of Families Puzzles	18.7	\$48.73	17.6	\$49.42	43.1	\$34.09	20.3	\$47.81	\$59.95
Career Puzzles	25.1	\$71.11	19.3	\$76.62	45.1	\$52.16	23.5	\$72.70	\$95.00
Dollhouse	52.0	\$52.72	37.8	\$68.39	31.4	\$75.46	41.6	\$64.24	\$109.95
Dollhouse Families	50.9	\$46.67	35.1	\$61.64	31.4	\$65.20	39.6	\$57.37	\$95.00
TOTAL		\$470.97		\$627.89		\$519.82		\$569.92	\$993.27

Table 93: Average Percentage of Music/Movement Materials Present and Additional Costs Per Classroom Needed for Music/Movement Materials to be Fully Equipped

Music/Movement Materials	District Preschool (N=122)		Child Care Center (N=238)		Head Start (N=24)		All Settings (N=384)		Actual Price for Item
	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	%	Additional \$ Needed	
Cassette/CD Player	92.6	\$8.11	86.1	\$15.25	100.0	\$0.00	89.1	\$12.03	\$109.95
Instrumental Tapes/CDs	85.2	\$9.58	70.2	\$19.38	91.7	\$5.41	76.3	\$15.39	\$64.95
Books/Stories on Tape/CD	62.3	\$26.26	34.0	\$45.95	62.5	\$26.12	44.8	\$38.45	\$69.95
Beanbags	63.9	\$13.69	25.6	\$28.22	45.8	\$20.56	39.1	\$23.13	\$37.95
Hula Hoops	23.8	\$38.04	12.2	\$43.82	25.0	\$37.43	16.7	\$41.58	\$49.90
Scarves	27.9	\$23.07	15.1	\$27.14	25.0	\$23.99	19.8	\$25.65	\$31.98
Drum	44.3	\$11.15	29.4	\$14.12	58.3	\$8.33	35.9	\$12.81	\$20.00
Triangles	57.4	\$3.62	34.5	\$5.57	58.3	\$3.54	43.2	\$4.83	\$8.50
Wrist/Ankle Bells	62.3	\$2.24	36.6	\$3.78	75.0	\$1.49	47.1	\$3.15	\$5.95
Sand Blocks	48.4	\$3.07	22.7	\$4.60	66.7	\$1.98	33.6	\$3.95	\$5.95
Maracas	61.5	\$5.77	36.1	\$9.57	70.8	\$4.37	46.4	\$8.04	\$14.99
Tambourines	61.5	\$7.70	37.4	\$12.51	62.5	\$7.50	46.6	\$10.67	\$19.99
Rhythm Sticks	67.2	\$6.22	35.3	\$12.29	66.7	\$6.33	47.4	\$9.99	\$18.99
Xylophone	26.2	\$14.72	21.4	\$15.68	20.8	\$15.79	22.9	\$15.38	\$19.95
TOTAL		\$173.25		\$257.87		\$162.84		\$225.05	\$478.70

[Please note: Further analyses of the average additional costs per classrooms needed to be fully equipped for district preschool classrooms by district type (ECPA, ELLI, and non-ECPA/ELLI) can be obtained from NIEER. In addition, further analyses by universal and targeted districts are available of the average additional costs per classroom across auspice to be fully equipped.]

Preschool Teaching Staff

Teachers and assistant teachers in Tier 1 and Tier 2 district, child care, and Head Start preschool classrooms were asked to complete a brief questionnaire about their teaching experience, educational background, and linguistic capacity. Teaching staff either filled out a survey and returned it via mail, completed the survey while a data collector was observing in the classroom, responded to questions asked by the data collectors using handheld electronic devices, or was interviewed on the phone. The purpose of the teacher survey was to understand the preschool workforce throughout New Jersey because more qualified preschool teachers and assistant teachers will be needed under the expansion. All information obtained via the teacher survey is based on self-report.

A total of 3,595 teachers and assistant teachers in Tier 1 and 2 districts provided information about their background and experience, including 2,004 teachers, 1,577 assistant teachers, and 14 teachers who did not specify if they were a lead or assistant teacher. Of the total 3,581 lead and assistant teachers, 2,825 taught 3- and/or 4-year-olds, including 1,590 lead teachers and 1,235 assistant teachers. The remaining 756 teachers, including 414 lead teachers and 342 assistant

teachers, taught infants and/or toddlers, kindergarteners, or children of other ages.¹⁷ The tables in this section of the report contain information on preschool lead and assistant teachers across auspice only in Tiers 1 and 2. Tier 3 data on child care and Head Start teachers are reported at the end of this section.

Teacher Experience

Lead and assistant teachers were asked about their years of experience working as a teacher. As explained in the instrumentation section of this report, the teacher surveys were revised several times during this needs assessment and therefore lead and assistant teachers were asked different questions about their number of years of experience teaching. Questions included number of years teaching anywhere, number of years teaching in this district, number of years in this school, number of years teaching preschool anywhere, number of years teaching preschool for your district, and number of years teaching preschool for this school or center. Table 94 reports the average number of years lead and assistant teachers have been teaching preschool. The majority of teachers included in this table reported the number of years they had taught preschool in their current school or center and therefore the information reported in Table 94 could be an underestimate of teachers' actual years of experience teaching preschool. Child care center and Head Start teachers were asked to report their number of years teaching in their current center. This number was assumed to be the same as their number of years teaching preschool at their current center.

Lead Preschool Teachers

Thirty-five lead preschool teachers did not report their number of years of experience teaching preschool. A total of 1,554 lead preschool teachers did report their number of years of experience teaching preschool. Across all settings, lead preschool teachers had an average of 6.7 years of experience teaching preschool in their current location. Their years of experience ranged from zero (meaning they had just started at the beginning of the current school year) to 43. Lead preschool teachers' average years of experience teaching preschool did not vary much between settings. However, lead preschool teachers in child care centers had the highest average number of years teaching preschool, averaging 6.9 years. Their number of years teaching preschool ranged from zero to 43. Lead preschool teachers in district schools averaged 6.7 years of experience teaching preschool. Their number of years teaching preschool ranged from zero to 42. Lead preschool teachers in Head Start settings had, on average, slightly fewer years of experience teaching preschool, averaging 6.0 years. Their number of years teaching preschool ranged from zero to 34.

Table 95 reports teachers' years of experience teaching preschool in ECPA, ELLI, and non-ECPA/ELLI districts. Across all auspices, lead preschool teachers in ECPA and ELLI districts averaged 6.8 years of experience teaching preschool and lead preschool teachers in non-ECPA/ELLI districts averaged 6.5 years of experience teaching preschool. District lead preschool teachers in ELLI districts averaged more years of experience teaching preschool than

¹⁷ Data collection procedures required data collectors to obtain information on all preschool teachers (with the exception of self-contained teachers) and to obtain information on infant and toddler and other age group teachers whenever possible.

district preschool teachers in ECPA or non-ECPA/ELLI districts. District lead preschool teachers in ELLI districts averaged 8.9 years of experience teaching preschool whereas district lead preschool teachers in ECPA districts averaged 6.7 years and district lead preschool teachers in non-ECPA/ELLI districts averaged 6.3 years of experience.

Assistant Preschool Teachers

Fifteen assistant preschool teachers did not report their number of years of experience teaching preschool. A total of 1,220 did report their number of years of experience teaching preschool. Across all settings, assistant preschool teachers had an average of 5.6 years of experience teaching preschool in their current location. Assistant preschool teachers tended to have fewer years of experience teaching preschool than lead preschool teachers. Their years of experience ranged from zero to 39 years. On average, assistant preschool teachers in district schools had a more years of experience teaching preschool at their current school than assistant preschool teachers in child care or Head Start centers. This difference could be explained by assistant teachers in district preschool programs being more likely to receive a competitive salary with benefits. Assistant preschool teachers in district schools averaged 6.5 years of experience teaching preschool. Their years of experience ranged from zero to 39. Assistant preschool teachers in child care centers averaged 5.1 years of experience teaching preschool. Their years of experience ranged from zero to 37. Assistant preschool teachers in Head Start settings averaged 4.5 years of experience teaching preschool. Their years of experience ranged from zero to 22.

Across all auspices, assistant preschool teachers in ELLI districts averaged the highest number of years of experience teaching preschool. They averaged 6.7 years of experience. Assistant preschool teachers in ECPA districts averaged 5.4 years of experience teaching preschool and assistant preschool teachers in non-ECPA/ELLI districts averaged 5.9 years of experience. District assistant preschool teachers in ELLI districts averaged 8.6 years of experience teaching preschool which is higher than district assistant preschool teachers in ECPA and non-ECPA/ELLI districts. District assistant preschool teachers in ECPA districts averaged 5.8 years of experience teaching preschool and district assistant preschool teachers in non-ECPA/ELLI districts averaged 7.9 years of experience.

Table 94: Preschool Teachers’ Number of Years of Teaching Preschool at Current School/Center

Setting	Teacher Type	N	Mean	Min.	Max.
District School	Lead	490	6.7	0.0	42.0
	Assistant	518	6.5	0.0	39.0
Child Care Center	Lead	894	6.9	0.0	43.0
	Assistant	548	5.1	0.0	37.0
Head Start	Lead	170	6.0	0.0	34.0
	Assistant	154	4.5	0.0	22.0
All Settings	Lead	1,554	6.7	0.0	43.0
	Assistant	1,220	5.6	0.0	39.0

Table 95: Preschool Teachers' Number of Years of Teaching Preschool at Current School/Center by Preschool Funding Type

Setting	Teacher Type	ECPA				ELLI				Non-ECPA/ELLI			
		N	Ave.	Min.	Max.	N	Ave.	Min.	Max.	N	Ave.	Min.	Max.
District School	Lead	347	6.7	0.0	38.0	21	8.9	1.0	42.0	115	6.3	0.0	34.0
	Assistant	356	5.8	0.0	39.0	21	8.6	1.0	31.0	140	7.9	0.3	32.0
Child Care Center	Lead	482	7.0	0.0	43.0	37	5.7	0.1	20.0	375	6.7	0.0	30.0
	Assistant	275	5.2	0.0	37.0	24	4.9	0.2	27.0	249	5.1	0.0	30.0
Head Start	Lead	92	6.4	0.4	34.0	3	6.0	4.0	10.0	75	5.5	0.1	20.0
	Assistant	84	4.6	0.0	22.0	3	7.3	3.0	15.0	67	4.4	0.3	17.0
All Settings	Lead	921	6.8	0.0	43.0	61	6.8	0.1	42.0	565	6.5	0.0	34.0
	Assistant	715	5.4	0.0	39.0	48	6.7	0.2	31.0	456	5.9	0.0	32.0

Teacher Highest Degree Earned, Major, and Certifications

Under the existing Abbott, ECPA, and ELLI programs, lead district preschool teachers in New Jersey are required to have at least a bachelor's degree. They are also required to have a teaching certification. Accepted certifications include: Preschool-3, Nursery-Kindergarten, Elementary Education with two years of experience teaching preschool, special education pre-K-12 for classrooms for children with disabilities, Certificate of Eligibility with Advanced Standing for P-3, or Certificate of Eligibility for P-3. Assistant preschool teachers are required to have a high school diploma.

Under the preschool expansion, teacher degree and certification requirements will be the same. Lead teachers will be required to have a bachelor's degree and a preschool through third grade certification. Instead of the preschool through third grade certification, teachers can also have an elementary certification and two years of teaching 3- and 4-year-olds in a position that would require the preschool through third grade certification. Teachers could also have a standard New Jersey nursery school endorsement. During the first year of a district preschool program, teachers can teach preschool without the required certification but must obtain it during that year. Preschool teachers in child care or Head start programs during the districts first year of implementing the preschool program, have until September 2012 to obtain a bachelor's degree and approved certification. Teachers with teacher of the blind or partially sighted, teacher of the deaf or hard or hearing, and or teacher of the handicapped endorsements from before September 1, 2008 may teach in preschool self-contained classrooms. Teachers holding a preschool through third grade certification and teacher of students with disabilities certification may also teach in preschool self-contained classrooms.

Lead Preschool Teachers

Table 96 reports the number of preschool lead and assistant teachers whose highest degree earned was at least a bachelor's degree. Eight lead preschool teachers and 22 assistant preschool teachers did not report their highest degree earned. Therefore, for Table 96, the total sample of lead teachers is 1,581 and the total sample of assistant teachers is 1,213. Across all settings, 1,030 (65 percent) of lead preschool teachers had a bachelor's degree or higher, including 691 lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree, 106 enrolled in a master's degree program, 230 with a master's degree, and three enrolled in a doctoral program or with a doctoral degree. An

additional 100 lead preschool teachers were currently enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree.

Of the 499 district lead preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 498 (99.8 percent) earned at least a bachelor's degree. This includes 267 with a bachelor's degree, 72 enrolled in a master's degree program, 156 with a master's degree, and three who either have a doctoral degree or are enrolled in a doctoral program. As mentioned above, lead district preschool teachers in ECPA and ELLI districts are required to have at least a bachelor's degree. One lead district preschool teacher did not have a bachelor's degree but was currently enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree. This teacher was teaching an ECPA district but was an emergency hire. She had many years of Head Start experience and was also an assistant teacher in the district's preschool program prior to becoming a lead teacher.

Of the 913 lead preschool teachers in child care centers who reported their highest degree earned, 433 (47.4 percent) had earned at least a bachelor's degree. This includes 350 teachers with a bachelor's degree, 24 currently enrolled in a master's degree program, and 59 with a master's degree. An additional 72 (7.9 percent) of lead preschool teachers in child care centers were currently enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree. Seventy-three lead preschool teachers in child care centers had a CDA as their highest degree. New Jersey child care licensing does not require lead preschool teachers to have a minimum degree. Therefore, it is not surprising that a lower percentage of child care center lead preschool teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher. However, if any of these centers contract with a district to provide preschool under preschool expansion, the teachers will be required to earn at least a bachelor's degree by September 2010.

Of the 169 Head Start lead preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 99 (58.6 percent) earned at least a bachelor's degree. This includes 74 with a bachelor's degree, 10 enrolled in a master's degree program, and 15 with a master's degree. An additional 27 lead Head Start preschool teachers are enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree. Eleven other lead preschool Head Start teachers' highest degree was a CDA. The Head Start Reauthorization Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-134) requires that by September 20, 2013, at least 50 percent of Head Start lead teachers must have a bachelor's degree or higher. Currently almost 60 percent of teachers in this sample of Head Start classrooms have a bachelor's degree or higher and another almost 16 percent are enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree. If any Head Start centers contract with a district to provide preschool under preschool expansion, the teachers will be required to earn at least a bachelor's degree by September 2010.

Table 96 also reports the number of lead and assistant preschool teachers who had at least a bachelor's degree and majored in early childhood or a related field. Of the 1,030 lead preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, 441 (42.8 percent) majored in early childhood, child development, or a related field. An additional 328 lead preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree majored in non-early childhood education, 238 reported another major, and 23 did not report their major.

Of the 498 district preschool lead teachers who had at least a bachelor's degree, 226 (45.4 percent) majored in early childhood education or child development, 182 (36.5 percent) majored

in non-early childhood education, 81 (16.3 percent) majored in something else, and nine (1.8 percent) did not report their major. Of the 433 child care lead preschool teachers who had at least a bachelor's degree, 171 (39.5 percent) majored in early childhood education or child development, 119 (27.5 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, 132 (30.5 percent) had another major, and 11 (2.5 percent) did not report their major. Of the 99 Head Start lead preschool teachers who had at least a bachelor's degree, 44 (44.4 percent) majored in early childhood education or child development, 27 (27.3 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, 25 (25.3 percent) had another major, and three (3.0 percent) did not report their major. The percent of lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree who majored in early childhood education was similar across all settings, but was slightly higher in district and Head Start settings than in child care centers.

Additionally, Table 96 reports the number of lead and assistant preschool teachers who have a preschool certification or the equivalent. Table 97 then shows the number of lead and assistant preschool teachers who meet the early childhood certification requirement in different ways. As mentioned above, there are multiple ways a teacher can meet the preschool certification requirement. Teachers can have a P-3 certification, N-K certification, an early childhood major and any certification, or an elementary education certification with at least two years of experience teaching preschool in a district preschool program where preschool certification is required. Lead preschool teachers with an elementary education certification and at least two years of experience teaching preschool in a district preschool program are required to have had this experience before 2004. Table 97 shows the number of lead and assistant preschool teachers who meet each of these criteria to have preschool certification. Because state regulations allow only school district preschool teachers to be considered qualified if they are certified in elementary education and have at least two years of teaching experience in a district preschool classroom, we report data on this only for district teachers. In Table 97, the categories are mutually exclusive. That is, teachers are only counted once even if they meet the requirements for multiple categories. The 'P-3 or Equiv. & At Least a BA' column in Table 96 reports the sum of all categories of preschool certifications from Table 97.

Of the 1,581 lead preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 642 (40.6 percent) have earned a P-3 certification or equivalent and have at least a bachelor's degree. Of the 1,030 lead preschool teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, 62.3 percent have the required preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 642 lead preschool teachers who had a P-3 or equivalent and at least a bachelor's degree, 289 (45.0 percent) have a P-3, 69 (10.7 percent) have an N-K, 164 (25.5 percent) have an early childhood major and any certification, and 120 (18.7 percent) have an elementary education certification and at least two years of experience teaching preschool. Thirteen lead preschool teachers had both a P-3 and N-K certification but are counted as having a P-3 degree. Of the 384 lead preschool teachers who have a bachelor's degree, early childhood major, and any certification, 186 have a P-3 certification, 47 have an N-K certification, and 13 have both certifications. These lead preschool teachers are counted as having a P-3 or N-K certification. Of the 1,030 lead preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, 28.1 percent have a P-3 certification, 6.7 percent have an N-K certification, 15.9 percent have an early childhood major and any certification, and 11.7 percent have an elementary education certification and two years of experience teaching preschool.

Of the 642 lead preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent, 429 are district lead preschool teachers. Of the 498 district lead preschool teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, 86 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. The percentage of district lead preschool teachers who have a preschool certification or the equivalent is much higher than the percentage of child care and Head Start lead preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent. This result is expected because lead preschool teachers in district schools are required to be certified whereas lead teachers in child care and Head Start are not. Of the 429 district lead preschool teachers who have a P-3 certification or equivalent, 169 (39.4 percent) have a P-3 certification, 55 (12.8 percent) have an N-K certification, 85 (19.8 percent) have an early childhood major and any other certification, and 120 (28.0 percent) have an elementary education certification and at least two years of experience teaching preschool.

Of the 642 lead preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent, 166 are child care center lead preschool teachers. Of the 913 child care center lead preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 18.2 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 433 child care center lead preschool teachers who have a bachelor's degree or higher, 38.3 percent have a preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 166 child care center lead preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent and at least a bachelor's degree, 86 (51.8 percent) have a P-3 certification, 9 (5.4 percent) have an N-K certification, and 71 (42.8 percent) have an early childhood major and any certification.

Of the 642 lead preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent, 47 are Head Start lead preschool teachers. Of the 169 Head Start lead preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 27.8 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 99 Head Start lead preschool teachers who have a bachelor's degree or higher, 47.5 percent have a preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 47 Head Start preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent and at least a bachelor's degree, 34 have a P-3 certification, five have an N-K certification, and eight have an early childhood major and any certification.

District lead preschool teachers in self-contained classrooms are required to have a teacher of the handicapped certification. District lead preschool teachers hired after September 1, 2008 are also required to have a P-3 certification. Across all settings, 227 (14.4 percent) of the 1,581 lead preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, had a special education certification. This number is likely an underestimate of the actual number of lead preschool teachers with a special education certification because most teachers in self-contained classrooms were not included in this sample. A total of 194 district lead preschool teachers had at least a bachelor's degree and special education certification. This number includes 52 lead district preschool teachers who also have a P-3 certification. Twenty-nine child care center lead preschool teachers, including four with P-3 certification, have a special education certification and at least a P-3. Four Head Star lead preschool teachers have a special education certification and at least a bachelor's degree.

Assistant Preschool Teachers

Across all settings, 266 (21.9 percent) assistant preschool teachers had earned a bachelor's degree or higher, including 255 with a bachelor's degree, three currently enrolled in a master's program, seven with a master's degree and one enrolled in a doctoral program or with a doctoral degree. An additional 85 (7.0 percent) assistant preschool teachers were enrolled in a program to earn a bachelor's degree, and 58 (4.8 percent) had obtained a CDA.

Of the 510 district assistant preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 150 (29.4 percent) had earned a bachelor's degree or higher, including 145 with a bachelor's degree, two currently enrolled in a master's degree program, and three with a master's degree. An additional 27 were enrolled in a bachelor's degree program and another eight had a CDA. As mentioned above, assistant teachers in ECPA or ELLI funded preschool programs must have at least a HSD.

Of the 550 child care center preschool assistant teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 98 (17.8 percent) had earned a bachelor's degree or higher, including 93 with a bachelor's degree, one enrolled in a masters' degree program, three with a master's degree, and one either enrolled in a doctoral program or with a doctoral degree. An additional 47 child care center preschool assistant teachers were enrolled in a bachelor's degree program and 35 had a CDA. The New Jersey child care licensing requirements do not set a minimum degree requirement for preschool assistant teachers.

Of the 153 Head Start assistant preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 18 (11.8 percent) had earned a bachelor's degree or higher, including 17 assistant teachers with a bachelor's degree and one with a master's degree. An additional 11 assistant teachers were enrolled in a bachelor's degree program and 15 had a CDA. The Head Start Reauthorization Act of 2007 requires that by September 30, 2012, all Head Start preschool assistant teachers must have at least a CDA or be enrolled in a program leading to CDA, associate degree, or bachelor's degree to be obtained within two years. Currently only 9.8 percent of Head Start preschool assistant teachers have a CDA and only 25 or 16.3 percent were enrolled in a program to obtain an associate degree or bachelor's degree. Therefore, only about one-fourth of Head Start assistant teachers in this sample meet the new Head Start requirements.

Table 96 also reports the number of assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree who majored in early childhood education, child development, or a related field. Of the 266 assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, 50 (18.8 percent) majored in early childhood education. Another 79 (29.7 percent) assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree majored in non-early childhood education, 132 (49.6 percent) had another major, and five (1.9 percent) did not report their major.

Of the 150 district assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, 29 (19.3 percent) majored in early childhood education, 40 (26.7 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, 78 (52.0 percent) had another major, and three (2.0 percent) did not report their major. Of the 98 child care assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, 18 (18.4 percent) majored in early childhood education, 30 (30.6 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, 48 (49.0 percent) had another major, and two (2.0 percent) did not report a major. Of the 18 Head Start assistant teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, three (16.7%) majored in

early childhood education, nine (50.0 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, and six (33.3 percent) had other majors. The percent of assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree who majored in early childhood education was similar across all settings but slightly lower in Head Start settings than child care and district settings.

Of the 1,213 assistant preschool teachers who reported their highest degree earned, 41 (3.4 percent) have earned a P-3 certification or equivalent and have at least a bachelor's degree. Of the 266 assistant preschool teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, 15.4 percent have the required preschool certification or equivalent. Not surprisingly, a larger percentage of preschool lead teachers than preschool assistant teachers have a P-3 certification or equivalent. Lead preschool teachers are more likely to have at least a bachelor's degree than assistant preschool teachers and a teacher must have a bachelor's degree in order to obtain a certification. Additionally, lead preschool teachers in district settings are required to have this certification whereas assistant preschool teachers are not required to have this certification in any setting.

Of the 41 assistant preschool teachers who had a P-3 or equivalent and at least a bachelor's degree, 25 (61.0 percent) had a P-3 certification, two (4.9 percent) had an N-K certification, and 14 (34.1 percent) had an early childhood major and any certification. Of the 32 assistant preschool teachers who have a bachelor's degree, early childhood major, and any certification 17 have a P-3 certification, and one has an N-K certification. These assistant preschool teachers are counted as having a P-3 or N-K certification, and therefore 14 assistant teachers are counted as having at least a bachelor's degree, early childhood major, and any certification. Of the 266 assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree, 9.4 percent have a P-3 certification, 0.8 percent have an N-K certification, and 5.3 percent have an early child major and any certification. This information is presented in Table 97.

Of the 41 assistant preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent, 28 are district assistant preschool teachers. Of the 510 district assistant preschool teachers who reported their highest degree, 5.5 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 150 district assistant preschool teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, 18.7 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 28 district assistant preschool teachers who have a P-3 certification or equivalent, 19 (67.9 percent) have a P-3 certification, one (3.6 percent) has an N-K certification, and eight (28.6 percent %) have an early childhood major and any certification.

Of the 41 assistant preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent, 11 are child care center assistant teachers. Of the 550 child care center assistant preschool teachers who reported their highest degree, 2.0 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 98 child care center assistant preschool teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, 11.2 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the 11 child care center assistant preschool teachers who have a P-3 certification or equivalent, five have a P-3 certification, one has an N-K certification, and five have an early childhood major and any certification.

Of the 41 assistant preschool teachers who have preschool certification or the equivalent, two are Head Start child care assistant teachers. Of the 153 Head Start assistant preschool teachers who reported their highest degree, 1.3 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the

18 Head Start assistant preschool teachers who have at least a bachelor's degree, 11.1 percent have preschool certification or the equivalent. Of the two Head Start assistant preschool teachers with preschool certification or the equivalent, one has a P-3 certification and one has an early childhood major and any certification.

Across all settings, of the 266 assistant preschool teachers, eight have a special education certification and at least a bachelor's degree. These assistant preschool teachers would be eligible to be a lead teacher in a district self-contained preschool classroom. Seven district assistant preschool teachers, including two with a P-3 certification, had a special education certification and at least a bachelor's degree. Only one Head Start and no child care assistant teachers had a special education certification and at least a bachelor's degree.

Non-Preschool Lead and Assistant Teachers

Table 96 only reports information on lead and assistant teachers who taught preschool age students. However, staff members in classes of other age groups (i.e. infants and/toddlers, kindergarten) also completed the survey. Of the 414 non-preschool lead teachers, 404 reported their highest degree earned, this includes three Head Start lead teachers and 401 lead child care center teachers. Ninety-eight (24.3 percent) of these teachers had earned at least a bachelor's degree, including 76 with a bachelor's degree, eight enrolled in a master's degree program, 14 with a master's degree, and one who either had a doctoral degree or who was enrolled in a doctoral program. Another 22 lead teachers were enrolled in a program to obtain a bachelor's degree and 53 had a CDA. The 98 teachers with at least a bachelor's degree could teach in a preschool classroom if their center contracted with a school district for preschool expansion.

Of the 342 non-preschool assistant teachers, 329 reported their highest degree, including two Head Start assistant teachers and 327 child care assistant teachers. Thirty-seven (9.1 percent) of these assistant teachers had earned at least a bachelor's degree, including 33 with a bachelor's degree, one enrolled in a master's degree program, and three with a master's degree. Another 26 assistant teachers were enrolled in a bachelor's degree program and 17 had earned a CDA.

Of the 98 lead teachers who had at least a bachelor's degree, 29 (29.6 percent) majored in early childhood, 26 (26.5 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, 40 (40.8 percent) had another major, and three (3.1 percent) did not report their major. Of the 37 assistant teachers who had at least a bachelor's degree, five (13.5 percent) majored in early childhood, nine (24.3 percent) majored in non-early childhood education, 22 (59.5 percent) had another major, and one (2.7 percent) did not report their major.

Table 96: Preschool Teacher Degree and Certification Qualifications

	Teacher Type	Has At Least a BA		ECE Major & At Least a BA		P-3 or Equiv. & At Least a BA		Spec. Ed. Certification & At Least a BA	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Settings	Lead (N=1,581)	1,030	65.1	441	27.9	642	40.6	227	14.4
	Assistant (N=1,213)	266	21.9	50	4.1	41	3.4	8	0.7
District School	Lead (N=499)	498	99.8	226	45.3	429	86.0	194	38.9
	Assistant (N=510)	150	29.4	29	5.7	28	5.5	7	1.4
Child Care Center	Lead (N=913)	433	47.4	171	18.7	166	18.2	29	3.2
	Assistant (N=550)	98	17.8	18	3.3	11	2.0	0	0.0
Head Start	Lead (N=169)	99	58.6	44	26.0	47	27.8	4	2.4
	Assistant (N=153)	18	11.8	3	2.0	2	1.3	1	0.7

Table 97: Preschool Teacher P-3 or Equivalent Certification Types

	Teacher Type	Approved Teacher Certification							
		P-3		N-K		BA & ECE Major & Any Certification		BA & Elem. Edu. Cert. & 2 years Pre-K Experience	
		n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%
All Settings	Lead (N=1,581)	289	18.3	69	4.4	164	10.4	120	7.6
	Assistant (N=1,213)	25	2.1	2	0.2	14	1.2	N/A	N/A
District School	Lead (N=499)	169	33.9	55	11.0	85	17.0	120	24.0
	Assistant (N=510)	19	3.7	1	0.2	8	1.6	N/A	N/A
Child Care Center	Lead (N=913)	86	9.4	9	1.0	71	7.8	N/A	N/A
	Assistant (N=550)	5	0.9	1	0.2	5	0.9	N/A	N/A
Head Start	Lead (N=169)	34	20.1	5	3.0	8	4.7	N/A	N/A
	Assistant (N=153)	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	N/A	N/A

Child Care Center Teachers and Assistant Teachers

Almost all district lead teachers have at least a bachelor’s degree and some type of preschool certification. Additionally, there is not much variation between Head Start agencies in the qualifications of their teachers. However, variability does exist in the qualifications of child care center teachers. Tables 98 and 99 therefore report the degrees and certifications earned by lead and assistant child care center teachers by region of the state. A greater percentage of child care

center lead preschool teachers in the northern part of the state had earned at least a bachelor's degree (55.5 percent) than in the central (47.8 percent) or southern (33.7 percent) parts of the state. Similarly, a greater percentage of child care center lead preschool teachers in the northern part of the state had earned a preschool certification or the equivalent (25.1 percent) than in the central (15.4 percent) or southern (12.0 percent) regions of the state. Child care assistant teachers in the southern region of the state were also least likely to have earned at least a bachelor's degree or have preschool certification. These results can be expected because there are fewer colleges in southern New Jersey that have programs for preschool certification.

Table 98: Preschool Teacher Degree and Certification Qualifications in Child Care Centers by Region of the State

Region	Teacher Type	Has At Least a BA		ECE Major & At Least a BA		P-3 or Equiv. & At Least a BA		Spec. Ed. Certification & At Least a BA	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Child Care Centers	Lead (N=913)	433	47.4	171	18.7	166	18.2	29	3.2
	Assistant (N=550)	98	17.8	18	3.3	11	2.0	0	0.0
North	Lead (N=335)	186	55.5	80	23.9	84	25.1	6	3.2
	Assistant (N=190)	38	20.0	11	5.8	7	3.7	0	0.0
Central	Lead (N=370)	177	47.8	71	19.2	57	15.4	20	5.4
	Assistant (N=256)	50	19.5	6	2.3	4	1.6	0	0.0
South	Lead (N=208)	70	33.7	20	9.6	25	12.0	3	1.4
	Assistant (N=104)	10	9.6	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 99: Preschool Teacher P-3 or Equivalent Certification Types in Child Care Centers by Region of the State

Region	Teacher Type	Approved Teacher Certification							
		P-3		N-K		BA & ECE Major & Any Certification		BA & Elem. Edu. Cert. & 2 years Pre-K Experience	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
All Child Care Centers	Lead (N=913)	86	9.4	9	1.0	71	7.8	N/A	N/A
	Assistant (N=550)	5	0.9	1	0.2	5	0.9	N/A	N/A
North	Lead (N=335)	49	14.6	2	0.6	33	9.9	N/A	N/A
	Assistant (N=190)	3	1.6	0	0.0	4	2.1	N/A	N/A
Central	Lead (N=370)	24	6.5	5	1.4	28	7.6	N/A	N/A
	Assistant (N=256)	2	1.0	1	0.4	1	0.4	N/A	N/A
South	Lead (N=208)	13	6.3	2	1.0	10	6.3	N/A	N/A
	Assistant (N=104)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A

Tier 3 Child Care and Head Start Preschool Teachers

During Tier 3, child care and Head Start directors were asked about their teachers' highest degree earned and certifications. A total of 606 child care center directors reported the number of lead preschool teachers in their centers that had a bachelor's degree or higher and 553 of these centers had at least one lead preschool teacher with a bachelor's degree or higher. On average, child care centers had 2.4 lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher. Centers ranged from having no lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher to 23 lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher. Fifteen Head Start directors reported the number of lead preschool teachers in their center that had at least a bachelor's degree. Twelve of these centers had a least one lead preschool teacher with a bachelor's degree or higher. On average, Head Start centers had 2.1 lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher. Head Start centers ranged from having no lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher to 12 lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher.

A total of 545 child care center directors reported the number of lead preschool teachers in their centers who had at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification. Of these, 118 did not have any lead preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification. On average, child care centers had 1.6 lead preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification. Child care centers ranged from having no lead preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher and early childhood certification to 23 such lead preschool teachers. Twelve Head Start directors reported the number of lead preschool teachers in their centers who had at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification. Three of these Head Start centers did not have any lead preschool teachers with these qualifications. On average, Head Start center had 1.2 lead preschool teachers with at least a

bachelor's degree and early childhood certification. Head Start centers ranged from having no lead preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification to three teachers with these qualifications.

A total of 556 child care center directors reported the number of assistant preschool teachers in their centers that had a bachelor's degree or higher. Only 112 of these child care centers had at least one teacher with a bachelor's degree or higher. On average, child care centers had 0.4 assistant preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher. Child care centers ranged from having zero assistant preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher to having 12 assistant preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher. Fifteen Head Start directors reported the number of assistant preschool teachers in their Head Start centers with at least a bachelor's degree. Only three of these centers had at least once assistant preschool teacher with a bachelor's degree or higher. On average, Head Start centers averaged 0.3 assistant preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher. Head Start centers ranged from having zero to two assistant preschool teachers with at least a bachelor's degree.

A total of 115 child care center directors reported the number of assistant preschool teachers in their centers who had at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification. Only 30 of these child care centers had at least one assistant preschool teacher with a bachelor's degree or higher and early childhood certification. On average, child care centers had 0.4 assistant preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher and early childhood certification. Child care centers ranged from having zero to seven assistant preschool teachers with a bachelor's degree or higher and early childhood certification. Only one Head Start center reported having one assistant preschool teacher who had at least a bachelor's degree and early childhood certification.

Teacher Language Background

Nationwide more than one-fifth of all children under age 5 are Hispanic (Hernandez, in press) and New Jersey is no exception. The state has a diverse population and the language needs of preschool children are also quite diverse. While all preschool children are learning at least one language, non-native English speakers have the additional challenge to master two languages. Having a teacher or other adult around who speaks the child's home language can help the child master English and their home language. Besides the obvious benefits of speaking two languages, research has shown cognitive benefits to learning two languages early in life (Nañez, in press). Because of the benefits to children of having a teacher who speaks their home language, lead and assistant teachers were asked about their fluency in languages other than English.

Lead Preschool Teachers

Table 100 shows the number and percent of lead and assistant preschool teachers who are fluent in Spanish or another non-English language. Of the 1,589 lead preschool teachers, only 219 (13.8 percent) are fluent in Spanish, including 30 district lead preschool teachers, 150 child care center lead preschool teachers, and 39 Head Start lead preschool teachers. Head Start had the largest percentage (22.7) of lead preschool teachers who were fluent in Spanish. Another 143

lead preschool teachers were fluent in a language other than Spanish or English, including 22 district lead preschool teachers, 107 child care center lead preschool teachers, and 14 Head Start lead preschool teachers. Child care centers had the highest percentage of lead preschool teachers who spoke a language other than English or Spanish. Overall, a total of 362 (22.8 percent) lead preschool teachers spoke some language other than English fluently, including 52 district lead preschool teachers, 257 child care lead preschool teachers, and 53 Head Start lead preschool teachers. Approximately 30 percent of Head Start and child care lead preschool teachers spoke a language other than English fluently but only 10 percent of district preschool lead teachers did so.

Lead preschool teachers who completed the survey spoke a plethora of other languages fluently. However, all of these languages were only spoken by fewer than 2 percent of the lead preschool teachers. These languages include Arabic, Chinese, Haitian/French Creole, Hindi/Gujarati/Asian Indian, Italian, Korean, Portuguese, Polish, Urdu, American Sign Language, Russian, Tagalog, Greek, German, Hebrew, and French.

Of the 116 districts that reported the number of preschool English Language Learners that they served, 47 districts reported serving at least one preschool English Language Learner. Fourteen (29.8 percent) of these 47 districts had lead preschool teachers who spoke a language other than English (See Table 101). There were a total of 32 lead preschool teachers in these 14 districts who spoke a language other than English. In 10 (21.3 percent) of the 47 districts that report at least one preschool English Language Learner, at least one lead teacher spoke Spanish. There were 20 lead preschool teachers in these 10 districts who spoke Spanish. It is possible that these numbers underestimate the language capabilities of lead teachers if not all lead teachers completed the teacher survey.

As reported previously in this report, 76 percent of child care centers and 99 percent of Head Start programs reported having experience serving English Language Learners. There were 272 lead preschool teachers in these child care and Head Start centers who reported being fluent in Spanish or another foreign language. Of all the lead preschool teachers in child care centers, 24 percent spoke a language other than English and worked in centers that reported having experience serving ELLs. Of all the lead preschool teachers in Head Start programs, 28 percent spoke a language other than English and worked in programs that reported having experience serving ELLs.

Assistant Preschool Teachers

Of the 1,235 assistant preschool teachers, only 207 (16.8 percent) are fluent in Spanish, including 47 district assistant preschool teachers, 108 child care center assistant preschool teachers, and 52 Head Start assistant preschool teachers. Head Start had the largest percentage (33.8) of assistant preschool teachers who were fluent in Spanish. Another 113 (9.2 percent) assistant preschool teachers were fluent in a language other than Spanish or English, including 38 district assistant preschool teachers, 59 child care center assistant preschool teachers, and 16 Head Start assistant preschool teachers. Overall, a total of 320 assistant preschool teachers spoke a language other than English, including 85 assistant district preschool teachers, 167 assistant child care center preschool teachers, and 68 assistant Head Start preschool teachers. While almost 45 percent of

Head Start assistant preschool teachers and 30 percent of child care assistant preschool teachers spoke a language other than English fluently, only 16 percent of district assistant preschool teachers did so.

Assistant preschool teachers who completed the survey spoke many other languages fluently. However, none of these languages were spoken by more than 2 percent of the assistant preschool teachers. Language spoken by assistant preschool teachers include Arabic, Chinese, Haitian/French Creole, Hindi/Gujarati/Asian Indian, Italian, Korean, Portuguese, Polish, Urdu, American Sign Language, Russian, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Greek, German, Hebrew, and French.

Non-Preschool Lead and Assistant Teachers

Although not included in Table 100, information on the language background of lead and assistant teachers who taught ages other than preschool was obtained. All but three of these lead teachers and two of these assistant teachers taught in child care centers. Therefore, the following information is not reported by settings. Of the 414 lead teachers of other age groups, 82 (19.8 percent) were fluent in Spanish and 43 (10.4 percent) were fluent in another language. Of the 342 assistant teachers of other age groups, 71 (20.8 percent) were fluent in Spanish and 36 (10.5 percent) were fluent in another language. No more than 3 percent of lead or assistant teachers spoke any other language.

Of the 116 districts that reported the number of preschool English Language Learners that they served, 47 districts reported serving at least one preschool English Language Learner. Eighteen (38.3 percent) of these 47 districts had assistant preschool teachers that spoke a language other than English. There were a total of 45 assistant preschool teachers in these 18 districts that spoke a language other than English. In 13 (27.7 percent) of the 47 districts that report at least one preschool English Language Learner, at least one assistant teacher spoke Spanish. There were 28 assistant preschool teachers in these 13 districts who spoke Spanish. It is possible that these numbers underestimate the language capabilities of assistant teachers if not all assistant teachers completed the teacher survey.

There were 216 assistant preschool teachers who reported speaking Spanish or another foreign language and worked in programs that reported having experience serving English Language Learners. Of all the assistant preschool teachers in child care centers, 27 percent spoke a language other than English and worked in centers that reported having experience serving ELLs. Of all the assistant preschool teachers in Head Start programs, 42 percent spoke a language other than English and worked in programs that reported having experience serving ELLs.

Table 100: Preschool Teacher Fluency in Languages Other than English

Teacher Type	District Preschool				Child Care Center				Head Start Center				All Settings			
	Lead (N=500)		Assistant (N=521)		Lead (N=917)		Assistant (N=560)		Lead (N=172)		Assistant (N=154)		Lead (N=1589)		Assistant (N=1235)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	30	6.0	47	9.0	150	16.4	108	19.3	39	22.7	52	33.8	219	13.8	207	16.8
Fluent in Another Language	22	4.4	38	7.3	107	11.7	59	10.5	14	8.1	16	10.4	143	9.0	113	9.2
Total Fluent in any Language	52	10.4	85	16.3	257	28.0	167	29.8	53	30.8	68	44.2	362	22.8	320	25.9

Table 101: Language Background of Preschool Teachers in Child Care Centers and Head Start Programs that Report Experience Serving English Language Learners

Teacher Type	Child Care Center				Head Start Center				Child Care & Head Start			
	Lead (N=917)		Assistant (N=560)		Lead (N=172)		Assistant (N=154)		Lead (N=1089)		Assistant (N=714)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	131	14.3	99	17.7	36	20.9	50	32.5	167	15.3	149	20.9
Fluent in Another Language	93	10.1	52	9.3	12	7.0	15	9.7	105	9.6	67	9.4
Total Fluent in any Language	224	24.4	151	27.0	48	27.9	65	42.2	272	25.0	216	30.3

Certified Teachers

Table 102 shows the number of teachers who have a P-3 certification or the equivalent and at least a bachelor's degree and also reported being fluent in Spanish or another foreign language. Only 4 percent of lead preschool teachers are both certified in preschool education and speak Spanish or another foreign language. The percentage of lead preschool teachers with both preschool certification and fluency in a language other than English was higher in district and Head Start programs than in child care centers. Only 1 percent of assistant preschool teachers are both certified in preschool and speak Spanish or another foreign language. Across New Jersey, 25 percent of children speak a language other than English and this percent is probably higher among preschoolers. Therefore, it is important that teachers also be fluent in another language. Under the preschool expansion regulations, teachers will be required to be certified in preschool and only 119 of teachers currently certified in preschool also speak a language other than English.

Table 102: Teachers Certified in Preschool and Fluency in Languages Other than English

Teacher Type	District Preschool				Child Care Center				Head Start Center				All Settings			
	Lead (N=500)		Assistant (N=521)		Lead (N=917)		Assistant (N=560)		Lead (N=172)		Assistant (N=154)		Lead (N=1589)		Assistant (N=1235)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	28	5.6	3	0.6	22	2.4	3	0.5	12	7.0	1	0.6	62	3.9	7	0.6
Fluent in Another Language	18	3.6	1	0.2	22	2.4	3	0.5	5	2.9	1	0.6	45	2.8	5	0.4
Total Fluent in any Language	46	9.2	4	0.8	44	4.8	6	1.1	17	9.9	2	1.3	107	6.7	12	1.0

Language Background by Region of the State

Tables 103-106 show the language background of teachers in district, child care, and Head Start preschool programs by the region of the state in which their school or center is located. In northern New Jersey, 37.9 percent of lead preschool teachers and 38.7 percent of assistant preschool teachers spoke Spanish or another foreign language. In central New Jersey, 15.6 percent of lead preschool teachers and 22.1 percent of assistant preschool teachers spoke Spanish or another foreign language. And in the south, 14.4 percent of lead preschool teachers and 17.6 percent of assistant preschool teachers spoke Spanish or another foreign language.

In district preschool programs, child care centers, and Head Start programs, a greater percentage of lead and assistant teachers in the northern part of New Jersey spoke Spanish or another foreign language than in the central or southern part of the state. For example, 13 percent of lead district preschool teachers in northern New Jersey spoke Spanish, compared to 3.2 percent in Central New Jersey and 3.5 percent in southern New Jersey. This pattern is similar in child care centers and Head Start programs.

Table 103: Preschool Teacher Fluency in Languages Other than English By Region of the State

Teacher Type	North				Central				South				All Preschool Teachers ¹⁸			
	Lead (N=543)		Assistant (N=390)		Lead (N=553)		Assistant (N=458)		Lead (N=485)		Assistant (N=386)		Lead (N=1589)		Assistant (N=1235)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	127	23.4	109	27.9	37	6.7	53	11.6	55	11.3	45	11.7	219	13.8	207	16.8
Fluent in Another Language	79	14.5	42	10.8	49	8.9	48	10.5	15	3.1	23	6.0	143	9.0	113	9.2
Total Fluent in any Language	209	37.9	151	38.7	86	15.6	101	22.1	70	14.4	68	17.6	362	22.8	320	25.9

¹⁸ Eight district lead preschool teachers and one district assistant preschool teacher did not report their district of employment and, therefore, they could not be assigned to a region of the state.

Table 104: District Preschool Teacher Fluency in Languages Other than English by Region of the State

Teacher Type	North				Central				South				All District Preschool Teachers ¹⁸			
	Lead (N=140)		Assistant (N=149)		Lead (N=125)		Assistant (N=131)		Lead (N=227)		Assistant (N=240)		Lead (N=500)		Assistant (N=521)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	18	12.9	27	18.1	4	3.2	8	6.1	8	3.5	12	5.0	30	6.0	47	9.0
Fluent in Another Language	11	7.9	15	10.1	6	4.8	7	5.3	5	2.2	16	6.7	22	4.4	38	7.3
Total Fluent in any Language	29	20.7	42	28.2	10	8.0	15	11.5	13	5.7	28	11.7	52	10.4	85	16.3

Table 105: Child Care Center Preschool Teacher Fluency in Languages Other than English by Region of the State

Teacher Type	North				Central				South				All Child Care Center Preschool Teachers			
	Lead (N=337)		Assistant (N=194)		Lead (N=371)		Assistant (N=260)		Lead (N=209)		Assistant (N=106)		Lead (N=917)		Assistant (N=560)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	87	25.8	56	28.9	26	7.0	32	12.3	37	17.7	20	18.9	150	16.4	108	19.3
Fluent in Another Language	56	16.6	21	10.8	41	11.1	33	12.7	10	4.8	5	4.7	107	11.7	59	10.5
Total Fluent in any Language	143	42.4	77	39.7	67	18.1	65	25.0	47	22.5	25	23.6	257	28.0	167	29.8

Table 106: Head Start Preschool Teacher Fluency in Languages Other than English by Region of the State

Teacher Type	North				Central				South				All Head Start Preschool Teachers			
	Lead (N=66)		Assistant (N=47)		Lead (N=57)		Assistant (N=67)		Lead (N=49)		Assistant (N=40)		Lead (N=172)		Assistant (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fluent in Spanish	22	33.3	26	55.3	7	12.3	13	19.4	10	20.4	13	32.5	39	22.7	52	33.8
Fluent in Another Language	12	18.2	6	12.8	2	3.5	8	11.9	0	0.0	2	5.0	14	8.1	16	10.4
Total Fluent in any Language	34	51.5	32	68.1	9	15.8	21	31.3	10	20.4	15	37.5	53	30.8	68	44.2

Tier 3 Child Care and Head Start Preschool Teachers

During the Tier 3 phone interview, child care and Head Start center directors were asked about the number of teachers in their centers who spoke Spanish fluently. A total of 563 child care

center directors reported the number of lead preschool teachers in their center who spoke Spanish fluently. Of these 563 centers, 407 reported not having any lead preschool teachers who spoke Spanish fluently. Child care centers averaged 0.4 lead preschool teachers who spoke Spanish fluently. A total of 15 Head Start directors reported the number of lead preschool teachers in their center who spoke Spanish fluently. Of these 15 Head Start centers, eight did not have any lead preschool teachers who spoke Spanish fluently. Head Start centers averaged 0.6 lead preschool teachers per center who spoke Spanish fluently.

A total of 606 child care center directors reported the number of assistant preschool teachers in their center who spoke Spanish fluently. Of these 606 centers, 504 reported having zero assistant preschool teachers who spoke Spanish fluently. On average, child care centers average 0.2 assistant preschool teachers who spoke Spanish fluently. A total of 15 Head Start directors reported the number of assistant preschool teachers in their center who spoke Spanish fluently. Of these 15 Head Start centers, 10 did not have any assistant preschool teachers who spoke Spanish fluently. Head Start centers averaged 1.1 assistant preschool teachers per center who spoke Spanish fluently.

Teacher Age and Ethnicity

Teachers were asked to report which age range best described their current age and this information is reported in Table 107. A total of 1,498 lead preschool teachers reported their age including 182 between the ages of 18 and 25, 429 between the age of 26 and 35, 335 between the ages of 36 and 45, 369 between 46 and 55, 170 between 56 and 65, 11 between 66 and 75, and two between 76 and 85. Three-quarters of all lead preschool teachers were 26 to 55 years old and this was true of lead preschool teachers in district, child care, and Head Start settings. A total of 1,161 assistant preschool teachers reported their age range, including two under the age of 18, 211 between 18 and 25, 197 between 26 and 35, 281 between 36 and 45, 305 between 46 and 55, 141 between 56 and 65, 20 between 66 and 75, and four between 76 and 85.

Table 107: Age Range of Preschool Teachers

Teacher Type	District Preschool				Child Care Center				Head Start Center				All Settings			
	Lead (n=471)		Assistant (n=492)		Lead (n=881)		Assistant (n=544)		Lead (n=146)		Assistant (n=125)		Lead (n=1498)		Assistant (n=1161)	
Teacher Age Range	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Under 18	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.2
18-25	46	9.8	33	6.7	125	14.2	160	29.4	11	7.5	18	14.4	182	12.1	211	18.2
26-35	133	28.2	64	13.0	265	30.1	103	18.9	31	21.2	30	24.0	429	28.6	197	17.0
36-45	98	20.8	126	25.6	195	22.1	117	21.5	42	28.8	38	30.4	335	22.4	281	24.2
46-55	129	35.0	174	35.4	201	22.8	103	18.9	39	26.7	28	22.4	369	24.6	305	26.3
56-65	65	13.8	85	17.3	84	9.5	47	8.6	21	14.4	9	7.2	170	11.3	141	12.1
66-75	0	0.0	9	1.8	9	1.0	9	1.7	2	1.4	2	1.6	11	0.7	20	1.7
76-85	0	0.0	1	0.2	2	0.2	3	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.1	4	0.3

Table 108 shows the reported ethnicity of preschool teachers. A total of 1,554 lead preschool teachers reported their ethnicity, including 1,125 (72.4 percent) lead preschool teachers who were White/Caucasian. Another 181 (11.6 percent) lead preschool teachers were African

American, 3 were Native American, 160 (10.3 percent) were Latino/Hispanic, 51 (3.3 percent) were Asian, and 34 (2.2 percent) reported being of another ethnicity. The ethnicity of lead preschool teachers varied somewhat across settings. District preschools had the least ethnically diverse population of lead preschool teachers, with 89.2 percent of lead preschool teachers referring to themselves as White/Caucasian. Only 4.1 percent of district lead preschool teachers were African American, 4.3 percent were Latino/Hispanic, 1.4 percent were Asian, and 1.0 were other ethnicities. In child care centers, 68.0 percent of lead preschool teachers were White/Caucasian, 12.6 percent were African American, 12.1 percent were Latino/Hispanic, 4.2 percent were Asian, 2.8 percent were other ethnicities, and 0.3 percent were Native American. Lead preschool teachers in Head Start settings were the most ethnically diverse. While 47.1 percent of Head Start lead preschool teachers were White/Caucasian, almost 30 percent were African American, 18 percent were Latino/Hispanic, 4.1 percent were Asian, and 2.3 percent were other ethnicities.

A total of 1,205 assistant preschool teachers reported their ethnicity, including 780 (64.7 percent) assistant preschool teachers who were White/Caucasian, 187 (15.5 percent) who were Latino/Hispanic, 173 (14.4 percent) who were African American, 33 (2.7 percent) who were Asian, 31 (2.6 percent) who were other ethnicities, and one (0.1 percent) who was Native American. District preschools had the least ethnically diverse population of assistant preschool teachers, with 80.7 percent of them referring to themselves as White/Caucasian. Another 9.4 percent of district assistant preschool teachers were African American. 7.5 percent were Latino/Hispanic, 1.8 percent was Asian, 0.4 percent were of other ethnicities, and 0.2 percent were Native American. In child care centers, 60.1 percent of assistant preschool teachers were White/Caucasian, 18.8 percent were Latino/Hispanic, 14.0 percent were African American, 3.7 percent were Asian, and 3.5 percent were of other ethnicities. Assistant preschool teachers in Head Start settings were the most ethnically diverse, with a greater percentage of Head Start assistant teachers reporting themselves and African American and Latino/Hispanic than White/Caucasian. More than 30 percent of Head Start assistant preschool teachers reporting being African American and more than 30 percent reported being Latino/Hispanic. Fewer than 30 percent reported being White/Caucasian, 6.6 reported other ethnicities, and 2.6 percent reported being Asian.

Table 108: Ethnicity of Preschool Teachers

Teacher Type	District Preschool				Child Care Center				Head Start Center				All Settings			
	Lead (n=491)		Assistant (n=509)		Lead (n=891)		Assistant (n=544)		Lead (n=172)		Assistant (n=152)		Lead (n=1554)		Assistant (n=1205)	
Teacher Ethnicity	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
African American	20	4.1	48	9.4	112	12.6	76	14.0	49	28.5	49	32.2	181	11.6	173	14.4
White/Caucasian	438	89.2	411	80.7	606	68.0	327	60.1	81	47.1	42	27.6	1125	72.4	780	64.7
Native American	0	0.0	1	0.2	3	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.2	1	0.1
Latino/Hispanic	21	4.3	38	7.5	108	12.1	102	18.8	31	18.0	47	30.9	160	10.3	187	15.5
Asian	7	1.4	9	1.8	37	4.2	20	3.7	7	4.1	4	2.6	51	3.3	33	2.7
Other	5	1.0	2	0.4	25	2.8	19	3.5	4	2.3	10	6.6	34	2.2	31	2.6

Teacher Plans to Remain at Current Job

Lead Preschool Teachers

Table 109 shows the average number of years that lead and assistant preschool teachers plan to stay at their current job. Teachers were asked to report the range of years that best described their plans to remain in their current job. A total of 1,325 lead preschool teachers responded to this question. Another 65 lead preschool teachers declined to answer the question and 199 were not asked the question. (Information on these teachers was obtained when we followed up with Tier 1 teachers who did not respond to the initial Tier 1 survey). A greater percentage of lead preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years (39.7 percent) than reported staying at their job for less than one year (3.4 percent). In fact, the largest percentage of lead preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years.

Of the 437 district lead preschool teachers who answered the question, only four reported planning on staying at their job for less than one year. Twelve reported planning on staying for 1-2 years, 57 reported planning on staying for 3-5 years, 96 reported staying for 5-10 years, and 268 reported planning on staying for more than 10 years. An overwhelming majority (61.3 percent) of district lead preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years. Of the 769 child care center lead preschool teachers who answered the question, 37 reported planning on staying at their job for less than one year, 152 reported planning on staying for 1-2 years, 199 reported planning on staying for 3-5 years, 172 reported planning on staying for 5-10 years, and 209 reported planning on staying for more than 10 years. Three-quarters of child care lead preschool teachers plan to stay at their job for at least 3-5 years. The largest percentage of child care lead preschool teachers plan to stay at their job for more than 10 years. Of the 119 Head Start lead preschool teachers who answered the question, only four reported planning on staying at their job for less than one year. Nineteen reported planning on staying at their job for 1-3 years, 26 reported planning on staying at their job for 3-5 years, 21 reported planning on staying for 5-10 years, and 49 reported planning on staying for more than 10 years. The largest percentage of Head Start lead preschool teachers (41.2 percent) reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years. A greater percentage of district lead preschool teachers (61.3 percent) than child care center (27.2 percent) and Head Start lead (41.2 percent) preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years. District lead preschool teachers were significantly more likely to report remaining in their jobs for a longer period of time than child care center or Head Start lead preschool teachers. Head Start lead preschool teachers reported plans to remain in their current job for significantly longer than child care center lead teachers.

Assistant Preschool Teachers

A total of 977 assistant preschool teachers reported the number of years they plan to stay at their current job. Another 56 assistant preschool teachers declined to answer the question and 202 were not asked the question. (Information on these teachers was obtained when we followed up with Tier 1 assistant teachers who did not respond to the initial Tier 1 survey). A greater percentage of assistant preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than

10 years (31.7 percent) that reported staying at their job for less than one year (6.1 percent). In fact, the largest percentage of assistant preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years. However, the percentage of lead preschool teachers planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years (39.7 percent) was slightly greater than the percentage of assistant preschool teachers planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years (31.7 percent).

Of the 439 district assistant preschool teachers, 23 reported planning on staying at their job for less than one year, 59 reported planning on staying for 1-2 years, 76 reported planning on staying for 3-5 years, 99 planning on reported staying for 5-10 years, and 182 reported planning on staying for more than 10 years. The largest percentage of district assistant teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years (41.5 percent). Of the 440 child care center assistant preschool teachers, 32 reporting planning on staying at their job for less than one year, 102 reported planning on staying for 1-2 years, 132 reported planning on staying for 3-5 years, 91 reported planning on staying for 5-10 years, and 83 reported planning on staying for more than 10 years. Unlike lead preschool teachers and assistant preschool teachers in other settings, assistant preschool teachers in child care centers were not most likely to report planning on staying in their job for more than 10 years. Of the 98 Head Start preschool assistant teachers, five reported planning on staying at their job for less than one year, nine reported planning on staying for 1-2 years, 17 reported planning on staying for 3-5 years, 22 reported planning on staying for 5-10 years, and 45 reported planning on staying for more than 10 years. The largest percentage (45.9 percent) of Head Start assistant preschool teachers reported planning on staying at their job for more than 10 years. While more than 40 percent of district and Head Start assistant preschool teachers reported planning to stay at their job for more than 10 years, fewer than 20 percent of child care assistant preschool teachers did so. District and Head Start assistant preschool teachers were significantly more likely to report remaining in their jobs for a longer period of time than child care center assistant preschool teachers. There was not a signification difference between the number of years assistant preschool teachers in district and Head Start programs were planning to remain in their jobs.

Table 109: Preschool Teachers' Plans to Remain at Current Job

Number of Years Planning to Stay at Current Job		Less than 1 Year		1-2 Years		3-5 Years		5-10 Years		More than 10 Years	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
District School	Lead (N=437)	4	0.9	12	2.7	57	13.0	96	22.0	268	61.3
	Assistant (N=439)	23	5.2	59	13.4	76	17.3	99	22.6	182	41.5
Child Care Center	Lead (N=769)	37	4.8	152	19.8	199	25.9	172	22.4	209	27.2
	Assistant (N=440)	32	7.3	102	23.2	132	30.0	91	20.7	83	18.9
Head Start	Lead (N=119)	4	3.4	19	16.0	26	21.8	21	17.6	49	41.2
	Assistant (N=98)	5	5.1	9	9.2	17	17.3	22	22.4	45	45.9
All Settings	Lead (N=1325)	45	3.4	183	13.8	282	21.3	289	21.8	526	39.7
	Assistant (N=977)	60	6.1	170	17.4	225	23.0	212	21.7	310	31.7

Teacher Salary

Table 110 reports the average salary for full-time lead and assistant preschool teachers. For the purposes of this report, full-time is defined as working at least 30 hours per week, nine months per year. Teachers were asked to either report their hourly or yearly salary. Hourly salaries were converted to annual salaries using the number of hours per week and months per year teachers reported they were paid to work. Teachers who did not report either the number of hours paid to work per week or number of months paid to work per year, were not included in the average salary calculation.

Lead Preschool Teachers

Of the lead preschool teachers who reported whether they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 46.9 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 53.1 percent were paid on a yearly basis. Including only the full-time lead preschool teachers, 44.5 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 55.5 percent were paid on a yearly basis. A total of 1,001 full-time lead preschool teachers reported usable salary information. Across all settings, the average yearly salary for full-time lead preschool teachers was \$35,728 per year.

District lead preschool teachers were much more likely to be paid on a yearly than hourly basis. Of the 412 district lead preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, fewer than 1 percent were paid on an hourly basis and more than 99 percent reported being paid on a yearly basis. Of the 408 full-time district lead preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, the picture is the same, with more than 99 percent being paid on a yearly basis. A total of 339 full-time district lead preschool teachers reported usable salary information. The average yearly salary for full-time district lead preschool teachers was \$56,380. Yearly salaries for full-time district lead preschool teachers ranged from \$30,000 to

\$94,000. On average, full-time district lead preschool teachers reported higher salaries than full-time lead teachers in child care or Head Start centers. Some district lead preschool teachers may be paid on the public school teacher salary scale.

Child care lead preschool teachers were more likely to be paid on an hourly than yearly basis. Of the 758 child care lead preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 70.4 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 29.6 percent were paid on a yearly basis. Including only full-time child care lead preschool teachers, 70.6 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 29.4 percent were paid on a yearly basis. A total of 566 full-time child care center lead preschool teachers reported usable salary information. The average yearly salary for full-time child care center lead preschool teachers was \$24,699. Yearly salaries for full-time child care center lead preschool teachers ranged from \$11,154 to \$65,000.

Head Start lead preschool teachers were slightly more likely to be paid on an hourly than yearly basis. Of the 117 lead Head Start preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 56.4 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 43.6 percent were paid on a yearly basis. Including only full-time Head Start lead preschool teachers, 57.1 percent were paid to work on an hourly basis, and 43.6 percent were paid to work on a yearly basis. A total of 96 full-time Head Start lead preschool teachers reported usable salary information. The average yearly salary for full-time Head Start lead preschool teachers was \$27,827. Yearly salaries for full-time Head Start lead preschool teachers ranged from \$12,793 to \$59,000.

A total of 1,275 lead preschool teachers reported the number of hours per week they were paid to work. Across all settings, lead preschool teachers, including part-time lead teachers, were paid to work an average of 35.1 hours per week. The number of hours lead teachers were paid to work per week did not differ greatly between district (35.4), child care (34.7), and Head Start (36.0). Focusing only on full-time lead preschool teachers, the average number of hours paid to work per week was slightly higher. A total of 1,123 full-time lead preschool teachers reported the number of hours per week they were paid to work per week. Across all settings, full-time lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 37.3 hours per week. This number differed slightly by auspice. On average, full-time child care center lead preschool teachers were paid to work 38.2 hours per week, Head Start lead preschool teachers were paid to work 36.9 hours per week, and district lead preschool teachers were paid to work 35.6 hours per week.

A total of 1,369 lead preschool teachers reported the number of months per year they were paid to work. Across all settings, lead preschool teachers, including part-time lead teachers, were paid to work an average of 10.9 months per year. The number of months paid to work per year varied by auspice. Child care lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 11.4 months per year, Head Start lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.4 months per year, and district lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.0 months per year. Focusing only on full-time lead preschool teachers, the average number of months paid to work per year did not differ much. Across all settings, full-time lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.9 months per year. Full-time child care lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 11.6 months per year, full-time Head Start lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.4 months per year, and full-time district lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.0 months per year.

Assistant Preschool Teachers

Of the assistant preschool teachers who reported whether they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 61.2 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 38.8 percent were paid on a yearly basis. Including only the full-time assistant preschool teachers, 55.6 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 44.4 percent were paid on a yearly basis. A total of 624 full-time assistant preschool teachers reported usable salary information. Across all settings, the average yearly salary for full-time assistant preschool teachers was \$19,606.

District assistant preschool teachers were more likely to be paid on a yearly than hourly basis. Of the 432 district assistant preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 69.2 percent reported being paid on a yearly basis and 30.8 percent reported being paid on an hourly basis. Of the 354 full-time district assistant preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 75.7 percent were paid on a yearly basis and 24.3 percent were paid on an hourly basis. A total of 314 full-time district assistant teachers reported usable salary information. The average yearly salary for full-time district assistant teachers was \$20,612. Yearly salaries for full-time district assistant preschool teachers ranged from \$10,000 to \$43,500. On average, full-time district assistant preschool teachers reported slightly higher salaries than full-time assistant preschool teachers in child care or Head Start centers.

Child care assistant preschool teachers were much more likely to be paid on an hourly than yearly basis. Of the 435 child care assistant preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 87.8 percent were paid on an hourly basis, and 12.2 percent were paid on yearly basis. Including only full-time child care assistant teachers, 85.4 percent reported being paid on an hourly basis and 14.6 percent reported being paid in a yearly basis. A total of 251 full-time child care center assistant preschool teachers reported usable salary information. The average yearly salary for full-time child care center assistant preschool teachers was \$18,814. Yearly salaries for full-time child care center assistant preschool teachers ranged from \$10,320 to \$47,840.

Head Start assistant preschool teachers were more likely to be paid on an hourly than yearly basis. Of the 97 Head Start assistant preschool teachers who reported if they were paid on an hourly or yearly basis, 77.3 percent were paid on an hourly basis and 22.7 percent were paid on a yearly basis. Including only full-time Head Start assistant preschool teachers, 81.0 percent reported being paid on an hourly basis and 19.0 percent reported being paid on a yearly basis. A total of 59 full-time Head Start assistant preschool teachers reported usable salary information. The average yearly salary for full-time Head Start assistant preschool teachers was \$17,626. Yearly salaries for full-time Head Start assistant preschool teachers ranged from \$10,535 to \$25,862.

A total of 958 assistant preschool teachers reported the number of hours per week they were paid to work. Across all settings, assistant preschool teachers, including part-time assistant teachers, were paid to work an average of 31.9 hours per week. The number of hours assistant preschool teachers were paid to work varied by setting. Head Start assistant preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 34.1 hours per week, district assistant preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 32.1 hours per week, and child care center assistant preschool teachers were

paid to work an average of 31.3 hours per week. Focusing only on full-time assistant preschool teachers, the average number of hours paid to work per week was higher. A total of 716 full-time assistant preschool teachers reported the number of hours per week they were paid to work. Across all settings, full-time assistant preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 36.1 hours per week. On average, full-time child care center assistant teachers were paid to work 37.8 hours per week, Head Start assistant preschool teachers were paid to work 36.9 hours per week, and district assistant preschool teachers were paid to work 34.4 hours per week.

A total of 1,009 assistant preschool teachers reported the number of months per year they were paid to work. Across all settings, assistant preschool teachers, including part-time assistant teachers, were paid to work an average of 10.6 months per year. The number of months paid to work per year varied by auspice. Child care assistant preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 11.2 months per year, Head Start assistant preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.3 months per year, and district assistant preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.0 months per year. Focusing only on full-time assistant preschool teachers, the average number of months paid to work per year did not differ much. Across all settings, full-time lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.7 months per year. Full-time child care lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 11.6 months per year, full-time Head Start lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.4 months per year, and full-time district lead preschool teachers were paid to work an average of 10.0 months per year.

Table 110: Preschool Teachers’ Compensation

	Teacher Type	Full- Time Teachers Only						All Teachers			
		Yearly Salary		Hours per Week Paid to Work		Months per Year Paid to Work		Hours per Week Paid to Work		Months per Year Paid to Work	
		Ave.	N	Ave.	N	Ave.	N	Ave.	N	Ave.	N
District School	Lead	\$56,380	339	35.6	379	10.0	443	35.4	383	10.0	447
	Assistant	\$20,612	314	34.4	349	10.0	375	32.1	430	10.0	455
Child Care Center	Lead	\$24,699	566	38.2	631	11.6	662	34.7	774	11.4	801
	Assistant	\$18,814	251	37.8	288	11.6	311	31.3	435	11.2	457
Head Start	Lead	\$27,827	96	36.9	113	10.4	116	36.0	118	10.4	121
	Assistant	\$17,626	59	36.9	79	10.4	83	34.1	93	10.3	97
All Settings	Lead	\$35,728	1001	37.3	1123	10.9	1221	35.1	1275	10.9	1369
	Assistant	\$19,606	624	36.1	716	10.7	769	31.9	958	10.6	1009

Teacher Benefits

Tables 111, 112, and 113 report the number and percentage of district preschools, child care centers, and Head Start centers that reported providing benefits to their teaching staff.¹⁹

¹⁹ During Tier 1 this information was asked of individual teachers but during Tier 2, this information was asked of the school principal or center director or Head Start administrator. Tier 1 data was aggregated to the school/center level. Data in these tables are reported on the school/center level.

District Teaching Staff

Overall, as expected, a larger proportion of district preschool programs reported providing paid vacation and holidays to lead preschool teachers than to district assistant preschool teachers (81.8 percent versus 68.8 percent, respectively). A higher proportion of district preschool programs also reported providing full or partially paid health insurance to lead preschool teachers than to district assistant preschool teachers (96.9 percent versus 71.6 percent, respectively). This difference can be expected because assistant preschool teachers are more likely to work on a part time basis. However, a high percentage of district preschool programs reported providing both district lead preschool teachers (95.6 percent) and assistant preschool teachers (90.4 percent) with paid sick leave. A greater percentage of district preschool programs reported providing a pension to lead preschool teachers (95.6 percent) than to district assistant preschool teachers (84.3 percent).

District preschool programs in large districts were more likely than district preschool programs in small districts to report providing lead and assistant preschool teachers with paid vacation and holidays. However, district preschool programs in small districts (81.0 percent) were more likely than district preschool programs in medium (70.0 percent) or large (68.1 percent) districts to report providing assistant preschool teachers with full or partially paid health insurance.

Table 111 – District Preschool Teaching Staff Benefits

District Preschool Teacher Benefits	District Size						Total	
	Small		Medium		Large		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	49	100	48	100	78	100	176	100
Preschool teachers receive paid vacation and holidays?	34	75.6	33	80.5	62	86.1	130	81.8
Preschool assistant teachers receive paid vacation and holidays?	29	65.9	26	65.0	53	73.6	108	68.8
Preschool teachers receive paid sick leave?	45	100	39	95.1	67	93.1	152	95.6
Preschool assistant teachers receive paid sick leave?	38	88.4	38	95.0	64	88.9	141	90.4
Preschool teachers receive full or partially paid health insurance?	45	100	39	95.1	69	95.8	154	96.9
Preschool assistant teachers receive full or partially paid health insurance?	34	81.0	28	70.0	49	68.1	111	71.6
Preschool teachers receive a pension?	44	97.8	39	95.1	68	94.4	152	95.6
Preschool assistant teachers receive a pension?	35	85.4	33	82.5	60	84.5	129	84.3

A greater percentage of district preschool programs in targeted than universal districts reported providing lead and assistant preschool teachers with paid vacation, sick leave, health insurance, and a pension. Differences in employee benefits between universal and targeted districts could be attributable to differences in the resources available in those districts as targeted districts tend to be wealthier districts.

A greater percentage of district preschool programs in non-ECPA/ELLI districts than ECPA districts reported providing their lead and assistant teachers with paid vacation and holidays. Additionally, a greater percentage of district preschool programs in non-ECPA/ELLI districts than ECPA districts reported providing their assistant preschool teachers with full or partially paid health insurance or pensions.

Table 112: District Preschool Teaching Staff Benefits by District Type

District Preschool Teacher Benefits	District Type				District Type						Total	
	Universal		Targeted		ECPA		ELLI		Not ECPA or ELLI			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	101	100	75	100	130	100	6	100	40	100	176	100
Preschool teachers receive paid vacation and holidays?	63	73.3	67	91.8	88	77.9	6	100	36	90.0	130	81.8
Preschool assistant teachers receive paid vacation and holidays?	52	61.9	56	76.7	71	64.0	6	100	31	77.5	108	68.8
Preschool teachers receive paid sick leave?	81	94.2	71	97.3	108	95.6	5	83.3	39	97.5	152	95.6
Preschool assistant teachers receive paid sick leave?	73	86.9	68	94.4	98	89.1	6	100	37	92.5	141	90.4
Preschool teachers receive full or partially paid health insurance?	82	95.3	72	98.6	109	96.5	6	100	39	97.5	154	96.9
Preschool assistant teachers receive full or partially paid health insurance?	50	60.2	61	84.7	70	63.6	6	100	35	89.7	111	71.6
Preschool teachers receive a pension?	82	95.3	70	95.9	107	94.7	6	100	39	97.5	152	95.6
Preschool assistant teachers receive a pension?	62	75.6	67	94.4	89	68.5	6	100	34	91.9	129	84.3

Child Care and Head Start

Child care center directors and Head Start administrators were asked about benefits provided to their preschool teaching staff but were not asked to differentiate between lead and assistant preschool teachers. Therefore, Table 113 reports on the benefits that all preschool teaching staff in child care and Head Start programs receive. A significantly greater percentage of Head Start programs (95.6 percent) than child care centers (78.8 percent) reported providing their preschool teaching staff with paid vacation and holidays. Similarly, a significant greater percentage of Head Start programs (97.8 percent) than child care centers (74.7 percent) reported providing their preschool teaching staff with paid sick leave. A much larger discrepancy exists between Head Start centers that provide full or partially paid health insurance their preschool teaching staff. Only 47.2 percent of child care centers reported providing health insurance to their teaching staff whereas 95.6 percent of Head Start programs did so, and this difference was significant. This discrepancy may be at least in part explained by the high cost of health benefits and the fact that many child care centers are for-profit. The high cost of health insurance could easily erase or greatly reduce the profits of a for-profit child care center.

District preschool programs were much more likely than both Head Start and child care centers to provide their preschool teaching staff with a pension. Additionally, a significantly greater percentage of Head Start programs (40.0 percent) than child care centers (18.8 percent) reported providing their teaching staff with a pension.

Table 113: Child Care and Head Start Teacher Benefits

Center Preschool Teacher Benefits	Program Type			
	Child Care (N=983)		Head Start (N=45)	
	N	%	N	%
Teaching staff receive paid vacation and holidays?	775	78.8	43	95.6
Teaching staff receive paid sick leave?	734	74.7	44	97.8
Teaching staff receive full or partially paid health insurance?	464	47.2	43	95.6
Teaching staff receive a pension?	185	18.8	18	40.0

District Collaborations

In the current, highly successful Abbott Preschool Program more than 65 percent of the children are served in private non-profit and for-profit child care centers and Head Start agencies. Given the lack of space and ECE expertise in the expansion districts described elsewhere in this report, and in order to take advantage of the early childhood expertise, facilities, and human resources available in other districts and early care and education programs, districts should consider collaborations with neighboring districts and local private ECE providers. Districts that already have experience with collaborations and contracts with other agencies will likely be more willing to collaborate. Thus we asked districts about their current collaborations such as before- and after-school care, providing special education and bilingual services, and sharing professional development (see Table 114 for results).

Collaborations with Other Districts for Services

The vast majority of school districts do not currently collaborate with other entities for before- and after-care programs with 7 percent collaborating with other districts and 25 percent with other non-profit entities such as YWCAs, Boys and Girls Clubs, child care centers, and other nonprofit and for-profit agencies. However, school districts are fairly likely to collaborate in providing/receiving special education services with 66.6 percent of those interviewed having already established relationships for services. Similarly, 50.8 percent of the districts share student transportation. More than 70 percent of the districts are also sharing professional development opportunities. Few districts work together or with other agencies to share ELL/Bilingual resources as only 12 percent report collaboration.

Table 114: Districts' Collaborations with Other Districts

	Frequency	Percent
Provide before- or after- school care to your students? N=368	25	6.8
Provide or receive special education services? N= 368 (DK=5)	245	66.6
Provide or receive ELL/Bilingual education resources? N=367	44	12.0
Provide or receive transportation services? N=368	187	50.8
Provide or receive professional development? N=368	258	70.1

Collaborations with Child Care/Head Start Agencies for Services

The district administrators (in all tiers of data collection) were also asked about their relationships with child care and Head Start agencies for various services (See Table 115). The

majority of districts do not collaborate with either for existing services. It is rare for districts to collaborate with ECE agencies for ELL services (2.4 percent) or professional development (4.8 percent). Slightly more districts collaborate for transportation (11.9 percent) and special education (12.7 percent) and 26.2 percent report collaborating for before- and after-school care or some other preschool-related service. In addition it is noteworthy, that at the time of the interviews, there were district administrators who were unfamiliar with the Head Start program or unsure whether there was a Head Start program in their area.

Table 115: Districts’ Collaborations with Child Care and Head Start

	Frequency	Percent
To provide before and after care to students? N = 368	33	26.2
To help with special education services? N=126	16	12.7
To help with ELL/Bilingual Education Resources? N=126	3	2.4
For transportation services? N=126	15	11.9
For professional development? N=126	6	4.8
For other preschool related services? N=126	32	25.4

Districts’ Plans for Preschool Expansion and Perceived Barriers to Expansion

At the time of the interviews, most districts reported being at an early stage of planning for preschool expansion. Many reported that they needed to develop solutions to their specific difficulties for providing preschool.

District Plans to Collaborate for Preschool Expansion

Table 116 reports current plans for collaboration. Please note that these results show the spontaneous answers to open-ended questions and are not necessarily reflective of all districts plans. Few districts responded that they are considering collaboration as one of the solutions for lack of space. Slightly more than 20 percent plan to subcontract with a local child care agency, only 9 percent plan to subcontract with Head Start and slightly less than 17 percent will collaborate with a nearby district. Fewer than 1 percent of districts are planning to use temporary classroom units (trailers).

Table 116: Districts’ Plans to Collaborate for Preschool Expansion

N= 132 (Only Tiers 1 and 2)	Frequency	Percent
Subcontract with local child care center	28	21.2
Subcontract with local Head Start center	12	9.1
Collaborate with a nearby district	22	16.7
Use trailers to increase space	1	0.8
Other miscellaneous plans	75	56.8

Plans to recruit children and families

District administrators in universal and targeted districts with large eligible populations were also asked about what recruitment strategies for enrollment they currently planned to implement (see Table 117). Most of the strategies reported were similar to those used for kindergarten recruitment and included flyers, posters, and word of mouth. More than half will place

newspaper ads (59.8 percent). Nine percent of districts with currently active websites plan to add preschool ads and registration information. None reported plans to go door to door, work with community groups or local ECE providers, or any of the more innovative strategies developed by the successful Abbott districts such as having local restaurants put an announcement on their menus or sponsoring a “trike-a-thon.”

Table 117: Districts’ Plans to Recruit Children and Families for Preschool

N= 132 (Only Tiers 1 and 2)	Frequency	Percent
Ads in the local paper	79	59.8
Flyers around the community	83	62.9
Flyers around the school	39	29.5
Word of mouth	60	45.5
Flyers sent home with students	82	62.1
Flyers at apartment buildings	10	7.6
Using the district/school website	12	9.1
Other means	91	68.9

Perceived Barriers to Parents Enrolling Their Child in a District’s Preschool Program

District administrators were asked two separate but similar questions about potential barriers to children participating in the district preschool program. First they were asked what they perceived as barriers to participation in the district preschool program. Then they were asked why some families might choose not to enroll their children in the district preschool program. Responses to both of these questions overlapped and some administrators provided a response to the first question that other administrators provided for the second question. Therefore, for purposes of reporting potential barriers to families enrolling a child in a district preschool program, these questions have been combined (See Table 118). Respondents often reported multiple reasons and, therefore, the percentages do not add up to 100.

The most commonly reported barrier to participating in the district preschool program was that the program hours were not compatible with parents’ work schedules. One-third of district administrators reported this barrier. One-quarter of respondents believed that parents might want to keep their young children at home with them. Other responses included parents not being able to afford the tuition, lack of transportation, and not having enough slots for all interested children to enroll in the program.

Table 118: Perceived Barriers to Parents Enrolling Their Child in the Preschool Program

Barrier to Participation	Frequency (N=365)*	Percent
Program hours are not compatible with parents' work schedules	122	33.4
Parents want their young children at home with them	93	25.5
Currently a half-day program and parents want/need longer hours	69	18.9
Transportation not available or other transportation issues	51	14.0
Parents believe that 3-year-olds are too young for school	49	13.4
Parents have an existing relationship with a child care center	47	12.9
Parents believe the length of the school day is too long for their child to be in school	47	12.9
There are not enough slots available or space in the school	43	11.8
Parents do not know about the program	37	10.1
Parents need before- and after-care which is not offered	34	9.3
Parents believe that 4-year-olds are too young for school	28	7.7
Parents can't afford tuition	28	7.7
High Non-English speaking population – difficult to spread information about the program	25	6.8
Parents prefer family members to watch children	18	4.9
High child mobility rate	12	3.3
Parents want to send their children to a private/religious school	11	3.0
Fear of child being labeled as low-income or special needs	10	2.7
Parents do not want children in an inclusion classroom with children with special needs	5	1.4
Other Barriers	103	28.2
No Barriers/Don't Know	48	13.1

*Missing data for 10 districts

Districts' Plans for Preschool Expansion

As previously mentioned, many districts were in the early stages of planning for preschool expansion at the time of the interviews yet some had begun to write their plans or were evaluating the possibilities. Districts in all tiers of data collection were asked about potential plans for preschool expansion. Six percent reported not having any plans at that point or not knowing if someone else in the district had ideas for the plan. Information on districts' plans for preschool expansion is reported in Table 119.

When the possibility of an additional planning year, maintaining the status quo or serving fewer children the first year of the 5 year plan became an option, 5 percent reported being ready to take that option. Only 3 percent planned to serve all eligible children the first year. Three percent planned to begin with half-day programs while 1 percent reported that they would begin with 4-year-olds. One percent reported that they would follow the suggested roll-out with 20 percent of the eligible universe served in the first year.

Thirteen percent responded that they would be adding classrooms but were not specific to how they would find the space. Two percent reported ready to convert self-contained classes to inclusion classes; 2 percent would move children around; and 2 percent would build new rooms and another 1 percent would add TCUs. Three percent planned to contract in the community for space only. Seven percent of the administrators answered that they would contract with child

care centers and 10 percent planned to partner with another district. Three percent planned to collaborate with Education Services Commissions or similar organizations if approved.

Table 119: Plans to expand preschool program in 2009-2010

	Frequency (N=370)	Percent
Add or contract for space		
Use current special ed space/create inclusion program	7	1.9
Add classrooms (non -specific)	50	13.5
Add classrooms by converting self-contained classes into inclusion classes	9	2.4
Add classrooms by moving children around to different classes/rooms	6	1.6
Add classrooms by building new classes or using TCUs	7	1.9
Rent space in community (ex: church, school)	11	3.0
Contract for services		
Contract with private child care centers	25	6.8
Contract with Head Start centers	23	6.2
Partner with neighboring district	68	18.4
Partner with Educational Services Commission or other organization	10	2.7
Gradual expansion or start-up		
Serve 20% of eligible students by 09-10	4	1.1
Wait to serve children	74	20
Start with a half-day program and move to full-day	10	2.7
Start with 3-year-olds and then later add 4-year-olds	3	0.8
Start with 4-year-olds and then later add 3-year-olds	2	0.5
Miscellaneous		
Plan to serve all eligible children by 2009-2010	13	3.5
Create a full-day program	19	5.1
Other	122	33.0
Don't know or none that I know of	22	5.9
Total	370	

Perceived Barriers to Implementing Expansion

Table 120 reports administrators' perceptions of the barriers to implementing expansion. More than 50 percent of the district administrators reported lack of space and concern for a lack of funding as their primary concerns regarding preschool expansion. Funding concerns included the uncertainty of the state providing funding at all or adequate funding; cost effectiveness for small numbers of eligible children; and the lack of adequate funding to expand special education classes by half to full day or to create more integrated classrooms. Other concerns were more specific to certain groups of districts such as still providing half-day kindergarten programs, particular facility requirements, lack of experience with preschool, and board of education approval.

Table 120: Perceived barriers to implementing expansion

	Frequency (N=369)	Percent
Costs (do not have adequate funding)	200	54.2
Lack of space in current facilities	196	53.1
Too few eligible students	134	36.3
Lack of certified preschool teachers	56	15.2
New regulations requirements (bathrooms/class/size/teacher regs)	30	8.1
Transportation issues	27	7.3
Lack of experience serving 3- and/or 4-year-olds	16	4.4
Need funds to convert special education from half-day to full-day	16	4.3
The district has half-day kindergarten	12	3.3
Lack of interest among families	7	1.9
Lack of support of board of education	7	1.9
Funding from state uncertain	4	1.1
Other (please specify)	107	29.0
Total	369	

References

- Ackerman, D. J., & Sansanelli, R. (2008). *Assessing the capacity of child care and Head Start centers to participate in New Jersey's Preschool Expansion Initiative: Phase 1*. Technical report to the New Jersey Department of Education. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER.
- Barnett, W. S. (2008). *Preschool education and its lasting effects: Research and policy implications*. Boulder and Tempe: Education and Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. <http://epicpolicy.org/publication/preschool-education> .
- Barnett, W. S., Epstein, D. J., Friedman, A. H., Stevenson Boyd, J. & Hustedt, J. T. (2008). *The state of preschool 2008: State preschool yearbook*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- Barnett, W. S., Tarr, J. E., & Frede, E. C. (1999). *Early childhood education needs in low income communities: Final report of an assessment of young children's educational needs and community capacity in New Jersey's Abbott districts*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.
- Barnett, W. S., Tarr, J. & Frede, E. (1999). Early childhood education in the Abbott districts: Children's needs and the need for high quality programs. Center for Early Education at Rutgers for the Abbott District Early Childhood Consortium.
- Barnett, W. S., & Yarosz, D. J. (2007). Who goes to preschool and why does it matter? Revised. *Preschool Policy Brief, Issue 15*. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER.
- Bodrova, E., & Leong, D.J. (2009). Tools of the mind: A Vygotskian-based early childhood curriculum. *Early Childhood Services, 3*(3), 245-262.
- Burton, S. G., Calonico, J. M. & McSeveney, D. R. (1979). Effects of preschool television watching on first-grade children, *Journal of Communication, 29*(3), 164-170.
- Chambers, B. (2009). Curiosity corner: Getting all children ready for school. *Early Childhood Services, 3*(3), 227-243.
- Christakis, D. A., & Garrison, M. M. (2009) Preschool-aged children's television viewing in child care settings. *Pediatrics, 124*(6), 1627-1632. Retrieved December 14, 2009 from <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/reprint/peds.2009-0862v1.pdf>.
- Christakis, D. A., Zimmerman, F. J., DiGiuseppe, D. L., McCarty, C. A (2004). Early television exposure and subsequent attentional problems in children. *Pediatrics, 113*(4), 708-713.
- Dodge, D. T., Bickart, T. S., Heroman, C., & Boyle, K. (2009). Teaching strategies' Creative Curriculum for preschool: Opening doors for teachers, children, and families. *Early Childhood Services, 3*(3), 263-280.
- Epstein, A. S., & Schweinhart, L. J. (2009). The High/Scope preschool and curriculum and dimensions of preschool curriculum decision-making. *Early Childhood Services, 3*(3), 193-208.

Frede, E. (1998). A sociocultural analysis of the long-term benefits of preschool for children in poverty. In, W. S. Barnett & S. S Boocock (Eds), *Early care and education for children in poverty: Promises, programs, and long-term results*. Buffalo, NY: SUNY Press.

Frede, E., Jung, K., Barnett, W. S., Lamy, C., & Figueras, A. (2007). *The Abbott Preschool Program Longitudinal Effects Study (APPLES)*. Report to the New Jersey Department of Education. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER. Available at <http://nieer.org/resources/research/APPLES.pdf>

Garcia, E., & Frede, E. (in press) Early education for young English language learners: The necessity, the promise and the pitfalls. In E. Garcia & E. Frede (Eds.) *Developing the research agenda for young English language learners*. Teachers College Press.

Hernandez (in press) Young English language learners: A demographic portrait. In E. Garcia & E. Frede (Eds.) *Developing the research agenda for young English language learners*. Teachers College Press.

Herzenberg, S., Price, M., & Bradley, D. (September 2005) *Losing ground in early childhood education: Declining workforce qualifications in an expanding industry, 1979-2004*. Retrieved December 14, 2009 from Economic Policy Institute website: http://www.epi.org/publications/entry/study_ece_summary/

Klein, L. G., & Gomby, D. S. (2008). *A synthesis of federally-funded studies on school readiness: What are we learning about professional development?* Paper prepared for a meeting sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) and the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning Research and Evaluation (OPRE), Washington, DC.

Nager, N., & Shapiro, E. (Eds.) (2000). *Revisiting a progressive pedagogy: The developmental interaction approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Náñez, J.E. (in press), Bilingualism and cognitive processing in young children. In E. Garcia & E. Frede (Eds.) *Developing the research agenda for young English language learners*. Teachers College Press.

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) (2008). *Basic Classroom Climate and Materials Checklist*. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER.

New Jersey Department of Education (2009). New Jersey preschool teaching and learning standards of quality. Retrieved December 15, 2009 from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/code/expectations/>

New Jersey Department of Education (2008) New Jersey preschool program implementation guidelines. Retrieved December 15, 2009 from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/ece/dap/impguidelines.pdf>

§P. L. 110-134. The Improving Head Start Act of 2007, H. R. 1429, 110thcong. (2007).

Whitebook, M., Ryan, S., Kipnis, F., & Sakai, L. (2008). *Partnering for preschool: A study of center directors in New Jersey's mixed-delivery Abbott program*. Retrieved December 12, 2009 from http://www.irle.berkeley.edu/cscce/pdf/partnering_preschool_highlights08.pdf .