California Head Start Programs Improve Child Development

Participation in Head Start was associated with seven to nineteen percentage point increases in the number of children in the top developmental levels. This finding comes from the first ever analysis of child assessment data on 6,600 children collected from 15 Head Start programs from across California. Such increases in child development are comparable to those found in other quality preschool programs and is direct evidence that these California HeadStarts provide quality child development programs.

These quality preschool programs provide significant developmental advancement to children and significant benefits to society as a whole are well established in the academic literature. The key word, of course, is "quality." While many regulations are in place to ensure that Head Start and other government subsidized preschool programs maintain high quality standards, there are currently few, if any, operational metrics against which to track quality or program impact.

Many Head Start programs in California use the Desired Results Developmental Profile – Revised (DRDP-R) to assess and track child development. The DRDP-R was developed by the California Department of Education. Use of this operational data to measure program outcomes is imperfect, but does provide reasonable estimates of the positive impact that Head Start has on child development.

Children from all backgrounds were better prepared for school in all areas of development thanks to these Head Start programs. For example, as shown in the graph below, the estimated percentage of children in the top two developmental levels was 11% for children with Head Start the prior year and 4% for children without Head Start. The difference, 7 percentage points, is the estimated impact of these Head Start programs in the areas of Language and Literacy.

**Head Start Programs Improve Language and Literacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Point Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Head Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Expect More From Your Data

Learning Objectives

- Understand the results of the Child Outcomes Bulletin 2010
- Understand how we got these results (what was our methodology?)
- Understand the strengths and weakness of this type of operational analysis
- Use the Outcomes Bulletin to promote Head Start
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The Collaboration

- The California Head Start Child Outcomes Bulletin 2010 was constructed through a collaboration of:
  - Child Care Results
  - California Head Start Association
  - 15 participating Head Start programs
- Data was collected during the 2008-2009 school year and analyzed in the fall of 2009
- Seven people served on the advisory committee
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Fifteen Participating Agencies

1. Center for Community and Family Services, Los Angeles County
2. Child Care Resource Center, Los Angeles County
3. Child Development Resources of Ventura County
4. Community Action Commission of Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County
5. Community Action Partnership of Kern, Kern County
6. Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County
7. Kidango, Santa Clara and Alameda Counties
8. MAAC Project, San Diego County
9. Merced County Office of Education
11. Orange County Head Start
12. Placer Community Action Council, Placer County
13. Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center, Santa Cruz County
14. Sierra Cascade Family Opportunities, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, & Sierra Counties
15. Tulare County Office of Education
Desired Results

A Very Brief Overview
About the DRDP-R

- The California Department of Education (CDE), Child Development Division (CDD), provided funding and the leadership to develop the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP-R).

- WestEd manages the Training and Technical Assistance services related to Desired Results.

- The DRDP-R is an observation based assessment tool, not a test based assessment tool.

- The tool has 39 measures (41 counting ELL!) which are grouped into 10 indicators.
10 Indicators become 6 Developmental Domains

1. Self Concept – Social Interpersonal Skills
2. Self Regulation – Safety and Health
3. Language – Literacy
4. Learning – Cognitive Competence
5. Math
6. Motor Skills

Validating the Tool
In validating the tool, researchers combined the indicators into six developmental domains (or indicator groupings). Since the validity of the tool was demonstrated using scores combined at the level of the developmental domains, the analysis was conducted at that level and the Child Outcomes Bulletin reports on these 6 developmental domains.
How We Got Here
Understanding the Methodology and the Sample
Method Acting Instructions

• It is the fall of 2008...

• You are a child...

• You know your name, age, if you were enrolled in Head Start last year or not and...

• You also know your developmental level for Math 5...

• We are going to divide the children into groups depending on whether or not you were in Head Start last year.

• Children not enrolled in Head Start last year (no prior enrollment), place your post-it note on the graph at the appropriate intersection of age and developmental level

Hi, My name is Alice
I’m 4.5 years old
Not in Head Start last year
Math 5 Rating: 2-Understanding
What is a Regression Analysis?

- A regression analysis looks at all of the different points on the scatter plot and shows the best fitting line through a series of points.

- The “best-fit” regression line minimizes the distance between points to form a line – sort of an average.

![Scatter Plot of DRDP-R Ratings by Age and Developmental Level](graph.png)
## Determining the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>County</th>
<th># of Children</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Commission of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Partnership of Kern</td>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Community and Family Services</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Resource Center</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Resources of Ventura County</td>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidango</td>
<td>Santa Clara and Alameda Counties</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAC Project</td>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced County Office of Education</td>
<td>Merced County</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood House Association</td>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Head Start</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer Community Action Council</td>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Community Counseling Center</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Cascade Family Opportunities</td>
<td>Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, &amp; Sierra Counties</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County Office of Education</td>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14,530</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Final Sample – from 14k to 6k Children

1. Data were collected on all preschool children served by the Head Start programs.

2. The analysis focuses on typically developing children in center based programs between the ages of 45 and 59 months.

3. Excluding children who do not fit into these categories or for whom key information was missing, a total of 6,619 were included in the analysis.

   • 1,034 special needs children were excluded from the analysis
   • 977 children serviced through non-center based care option were excluded from the analysis.
   • 3,335 children fell outside this age range of 45 to 59 months
   • 2,565 children were excluded from the analysis because of incomplete demographic info – most of whom we did not have information on whether the children had a special need.
## Final Sample By Prior Enrollment Status

Prior Year Enrollment at same Head Start

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% of row</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>% of row</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 to 47 months</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 to 50 months</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 53 months</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 to 56 months</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 to 59 months</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology in a nutshell

- The children were divided into those children with half a year or more of prior Head Start enrollment and those without prior enrollment (the comparison group). The group without prior enrollment were enrolled for less than 60 days.

- The developmental scores from the fall of 2008 for the two groups were compared controlling for age, race/ethnicity, language, agency and gender.

- A logit regression model was used to determine the probability of the children being in the top two of four developmental levels on the DRDP-R.
Advantages & Disadvantages
Using Operational Data
Advantages

1. Cost – the costs of analyzing operational data are much lower

2. Timeliness – the results can be released in a meaningful timeframe.

3. Easy on agencies – Gathering the data was minimally invasive for Head Start programs.

4. Scale – It is much easier to collect data on very large samples using operational data.

5. Usable findings – the results are not as reliable as a full academic study would produce, but they are far better than the anecdotal stories that so often drive policy.

Impact – All of these factors together create the potential for this type of operational analysis to have a strong impact. The findings are fresher and we can produce them more frequently than with academic studies.
Disadvantages

- Potential selection bias
- Potential inter-rater reliability issues
- Uncertainty of prior enrollment data
- Concerns over data use and accountability
## Potential Selection Bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No Prior Enrollment¹</th>
<th>Prior Enrollment²</th>
<th>All Children</th>
<th>p-value, two tailed³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Awareness – Social Interpersonal Skills</strong></td>
<td>Mean of Fall '08 Scores</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>209.4</td>
<td>204.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of Spring '09 Scores</td>
<td>231.7</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>235.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Regulation-Safety and Health</strong></td>
<td>Mean of Fall '08 Scores</td>
<td>200.6</td>
<td>211.3</td>
<td>206.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of Spring '09 Scores</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>240.8</td>
<td>237.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language-Literacy</strong></td>
<td>Mean of Fall '08 Scores</td>
<td>201.4</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>206.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of Spring '09 Scores</td>
<td>231.7</td>
<td>239.0</td>
<td>235.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inter-rater reliability

- The DRDP-R assessment results are based on individual teacher observations and assessments.
- Research on the DRDP-R tool shows that it has high inter-rater reliability, between 0.87 and 0.90.
- It may be argued that inter-rater reliability would be lower in less controlled field settings where there may be variability in training, experience, or effort.
- Even if it were possible to demonstrate that there are issues with inter-rater reliability in our sample, we do not believe that would undermine the clear pattern of children with prior enrollment having higher levels of enrollment. It may, however, make the precise magnitude of the differences less reliable.
Uncertainty of prior enrollment data

- It is possible that a child not enrolled in Head Start in 2007-2008 was enrolled in another child development program or possibly even another Head Start program.
- The impact on the analysis is that we may be underestimating the program effect of these Head Start programs.
- If a significant number of children categorized as not having prior enrollment participated in other child development programs than our estimates of Head Start’s program effect are too low – further enforcing our conclusion.
Data use and Accountability

- From the perspective of many in the ECE field – there is a fear that DRDP-R data will someday be used to punish programs and teachers.
- We recognize that there is some risk that this type of analysis (using DRDP-R data to evaluate program effect) may be misused within an accountability framework.
- There is also tremendous value in giving programs and policy makers a direct measure of program effect.
- We believe strongly that the DRDP-R tool is not appropriate for use as an accountability tool. As an observation based tool, the DRDP-R is subjective by nature.
- Finally, we should note that this methodology requires very large sample sizes making it impossible to perform on a class level – or for even a small agency.
The Results

Head Starts Makes an Impact
Children with Experience in Head Start Achieve Higher Developmental Levels Across All Developmental Domains

Percentage of Children in the Top Two Developmental Levels Controlling for Age and Other Demographic Variables. *In Parenthesis: the Percentage Point Increase Between the Two Groups*

- Language and Literacy: (7% Increase)
  - Newly Enrolled: 4%
  - Prior Year Experience: 11%

- Self-Concept and Social Interpersonal Skills: (11% Increase)
  - Newly Enrolled: 8%
  - Prior Year Experience: 19%

- Self Regulation and Safety and Health: (13% Increase)
  - Newly Enrolled: 12%
  - Prior Year Experience: 25%

- Learning and Cognitive Competence: (12% Increase)
  - Newly Enrolled: 8%
  - Prior Year Experience: 20%

- Math: (7% Increase)
  - Newly Enrolled: 5%
  - Prior Year Experience: 12%

- Motor Skills: 33%
  - Newly Enrolled: 52%
Results by Ethnicity-Language

Percentage Point Increase
Between Children with and without Prior Year Head Start Enrollment
Controlling for Age and Other Demographic Variables

![Graph showing percentage point increase between children with and without prior year Head Start enrollment, controlling for age and other demographic variables.](www.childcareresults.com)
The “effect size” was calculated to determine the relative impact of these programs compared to other programs evaluated.

The effect size is the change attributed to the program divided by the standard deviation of the comparison group.

In the Language and Literacy domain, the change attributed to the program is the 7 percentage point (0.0734) increase in children in the top two developmental levels. The standard deviation for the comparison group was 0.2165.

Effect Size = \( \frac{\text{Change}}{\text{Standard Deviation of comparison group}} \)

The effect size for Language and Literacy is: \( \frac{0.0734}{0.2165} = 0.339 \)
## Effect-Size Comparison

### California Child Outcomes Bulletin 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRDP-R Domain</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lang Lit</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Soc</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Sh</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lrn Cog</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Effect Size Range</th>
<th>Length of Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Child Outcomes Bulletin 2010</strong></td>
<td>0.323 to 0.406</td>
<td>one year of preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start National Study 2010</td>
<td>0.147 to 0.319</td>
<td>one year of preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Head Start Program</td>
<td>0.334 to 0.514</td>
<td>one year of preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Public School Pre-K Program</td>
<td>0.355 to 0.985</td>
<td>one year of preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abecedarian Project</td>
<td>1.08 average</td>
<td>three years of preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Preschool Study</td>
<td>0.77 to 1.16</td>
<td>two years of preschool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“[A] review of the rigorous evaluations of high-quality preschool programs demonstrates that well-designed programs that serve children one or two years before kindergarten entry can

• improve measures of school readiness,
• raise performance on academic achievement tests in the early elementary grades,
• generate sustained effects on academic achievement into the middle-school years ... 
• [reduce] special-education use and grade repetition and
• [increase] rates of high-school graduation”
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