DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 412 UD 028 918

AUTHOR Coppola, Mary Allison
TITLE Identifying a Difference between Teachers' and School-Based Administrators' Perceptions of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools' Chapter 1 Preschool Program.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 66p.; Master's Thesis, University of North Carolina.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Compensatory Education; Curriculum Development; *Educational Attitudes; Federal Programs; *Individual Differences; Needs Assessment; Preschool Education; *Preschool Teachers; *Principals; Program Implementation; Program Improvement; Remedial Instruction; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to identify a difference between preschool teachers' and school-based administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the numerical ranking assigned to those issues in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools' (North Carolina) Chapter 1 Preschool Program. The study tested three hypotheses, and sought to ascertain what teachers and administrators understood to be critical issues in Chapter 1 education, the difference between rankings of the issues, value placed on the program, and the relationship between length of experience with the program and value assigned to it. The study involved administering 2 surveys based on the Delphi Technique to 34 preschool teachers, 11 principals, and 12 assistant principals. The rate of return of usable surveys for each round of mailings was 57 and 56 percent, respectively. Analysis of the responses found that there was a difference between the responses of the 2 groups and that of 10 issues, only 2 were ranked the same by teachers and administrators. Overall, it appears that teachers have a micro-level perspective focused on individual classroom concerns. Administrators have a macro-level perspective, evaluating prioritized needs of all program components. Included are an appendix containing samples of the correspondence, forms, and instruments used; and 40 references. (JB)

IDENTIFYING A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TEACHERS' AND SCHOOL-BASED ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS' CHAPTER I PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

by

Mary Allison Coppola

A thesis submitted to the faculty at The University of North Carolina at Charlotte in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Political Science, Public Administration program.

Charlotte

1991

Approved by:

Dr. Timothy Mead

Dr. Gary Rassel

Dr. Bryan Robinson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Questionnaire I Results

Questionnaire II Results

ABSTRACT

MARY ALLISON COPPOLA. Identifying A Difference Between Teachers' and School-Based Administrators' Perceptions of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools' Chapter I Preschool Program

(Under the direction of GARY RASSEL)

The purpose of the study was to identify a difference between preschool teachers and school-based administrators perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues in The Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools Chapter I Preschool Program. Three hypotheses were developed. A modified Delphi Technique was used to obtain necessary data.

Hypothesis #1 stated that there would be a difference between C.M.S. Preschool teachers and administrators perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues. This hypothesis was supported. Differences in the groups perceptions of specific aspects of ten critical issues as well as differences in the rankings of ten critical issues were identified using quantitative and qualitative measures.

Hypothesis #2 stated that years of experience in the program would be related to the level of program value assigned. This hypothesis was not supported. Regardless of the number of years of services, the majority of respondents rated the program as valuable.

Hypothesis #3 stated that position held would be related to the level of program value assigned. This hypothesis was supported. Teachers rated the program value higher than administrators did.

BACKGROUND

Since 1965, the federal government has provided the Head Start Program for children who were educationally or economically disadvantaged. Sharon Kagan, Assistant Director for The Yale Center for Public Policy and Early Childhood, notes that over 100 child-care related bills were introduced in the 100th Congress (Kagan 1984 p. 434). The number of child care related bills on the legislative docket indicates that early childhood issues are being considered. Legislators are becoming increasingly receptive to early childhood issues by funding a greater number of programs that serve preschool children.

For instance in North Carolina there are currently 113 public schools that receive funding for Chapter I Preschool Programs. Chapter I is a federally funded program that provides preschool and remedial academic activities for economically and educationally disadvantaged children. Two of the 113 North Carolina public schools that provide Chapter I Preschool Programs are state models. The two state model programs combine family services with a preschool program. These programs are in Graham and High Point City school districts. Another model in Warren, N.C., combines family services with a Chapter I Preschool Program. All three models are federally funded.

Once funding has been set aside, a curriculum must be chosen. Professional educators hold various theories about what constitutes the ideal curriculum. Some programs are academically geared, while others focus on social and emotional growth. Many educators agree that no matter what the content and format of the program, activities must be developmentally appropriate for the age, physical size and motor development of preschool children. What constitutes developmentally appropriate activities varies among preschool providers. Sue Bredekamp,

writing in a publication for The North Carolina Association for Education of Young Children, defines developmentally appropriate programs.

> Developmentally appropriate programs are both age appropriate and individually appropriate; that is, the program is designed for the age group served and implemented with attention to the needs and differences of the individual children enrolled (Bredekamp 1987 p.51).

Once funding has been legislated and curriculum established, a school district must choose locations for preschool classes. Where will the preschool classes be housed? Can they function in existing facilities or will it be necessary to construct new buildings? In many cases, the solution is to use facilities already owned by the district. By 1989, 22 public school systems in North Carolina had expanded their Kindergarten through twelfth grade academic programs to include the preschool population. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (C.M.S.) is one such system. The Chapter I Preschool Program began in 1986.

In the fall of 1986, C.M.S. had several schools with declining enrollments and empty classrooms. Some of these buildings became sites for Chapter I preschool classes. A school's eligibility to become a Chapter I site is not determined by availability of space alone. The school in question must be located in an officially designated Chapter I area. This determination is based on the number of free lunch applications submitted by parents. A large number of applications indicates a high density of low income families. Areas that have a high density of low income families are designated as Chapter I Areas. This means that a school in the designated area is eligible to receive Chapter I Funding.

The C.M.S. Chapter I Preschool Program currently serves 544 children in 34 classes, housed in eleven different schools. As the program finishes its fifth year, it is desirable to evaluate its success. One way to do so would be to determine if the original goals have been met. According to the enabling legislation, a certain portion of the federal funds for the Chapter I Program were to be used to establish and maintain a Preschool Project. The goal of the Chapter I Preschool Project is to "provide learning opportunities for children who, as kindergartners, will

attend schools served by Chapter I, and through screening, demonstrate an educational need" (Chapter I Parent Handbook p. 3). If goal attainment is a measure of success, the C.M.S. Preschool Project is a success. Designated funds are being used and Chapter I eligible preschool children are being identified and served.

Nevertheless, these measures are only indicators for external evaluation. A more comprehensive evaluation would include examination of internal components as well. For this study one internal component was examined: the professional personnel directly involved with the preschool program. To further limit the study, only one factor was considered: the differences between teachers' and school-based administrators' perceptions of the preschool program.

This study was designed to answer several questions. First, what do C.M.S. Preschool teachers and administrators consider to be the critical issues in the Preschool Program? Second, is there a difference between preschool teachers' and school-based administrators' rankings of critical issues? Third, do preschool teachers and school-based administrators value the preschool program? Fourth, do preschool teachers rate the value of the program higher than administrators do? Finally, is length of experience with the program related to the level of value assigned, that is, do participants who have worked in the program since its inception assign a higher value than those participants who are relatively new to the program?

These questions were answered by taking the following steps: 1) conducting a literature review, 2) designing and completing a survey and 3) analyzing the survey data. The objective of the directed study project has been met: to determine if there was a difference in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of critical issues in the Chapter I Preschool Program.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of a federally funded preschool program is a relevant topic for a thesis in public administration. Examining a variety of literature demonstrates that the study of an early childhood program is a relevant topic for current research. Since this study is based on a federally funded preschool program, the discussion will be focused on public preschool programs. The goal is to identify differences between C.M.S. Preschool teachers' and school-based administrators' perceptions of a preschool program.

The literature review has three objectives: First a brief historical perspective, followed by a discussion of the current status of early childhood programs, provides understanding of the rationale of early childhood programs. Second, critical issues common to federally funded preschool programs are identified. Third, teachers' and administrators' perceptions of certain educational issues are examined.

A rationale for the need to study teachers' and administrators' perceptions of critical issues in public school preschool is provided in the conclusion.

Concern for Quality of Public Education

In the late 1950's, with the launching of Sputnik I, the American public became more aware of the inferiority of American education (Plunkett 1985 p. 534). In the 1960's and 1970's, compensatory education programs, such as Chapter I, were given much attention. Compensatory education in the elementary schools was primarily aimed at helping those students who were having difficulties in academic achievement. Some of these students were those targeted for drop out. These particular students were identified as being less likely to complete high school.

Educators now feel that compensatory education, while worthwhile, may be too late. Waiting for students to fail, before providing remediation, may not be the solution to educational failure.

A quick scan of most popular or scholarly indices to periodical literature shows that problems in the schools are not issues for educators alone. The business and financial communities are turning their attention to the crisis in education. A recent *Wall Street Journal* article on the subject of school reform notes that,

> Big Business, its future dependent on a well-educated work force, is appalled at the continuing crisis and is increasingly impatient with mere tinkering. Executives who have learned a thing or two about restructuring to meet world competition now insist that this is what the schools need, too (Graham 1989 R. 3).

Nancy Perry, writing in *Fortune*, said that

> Companies that cannot hire enough skilled workers now realize they must do something to save the public schools. Not to be charitable, not to promote good public relations, but to survive (Perry 1988 p. 42).

In many articles describing the ills of education, one suggestion for improvement is common: provision of quality early childhood programs.

Rationale for Early Childhood Programs

Financier magazine carried an article, "Corporate Culture of Education Changing Under Public Pressure," which points out that, "The most efficient way to improve education for disadvantaged children is in the earliest years" (Butler 1988 p. 25). The literature indicates that early childhood programs should receive a high priority. Writing in *NEA Today*, a periodical for professional educators, David Elkind lends support to the call for quality early childhood programs.

> Public school programs, along with privately supported preschool programs, can provide an educational setting for children whose parents cannot provide it at home. Some 23 states already have legislation pending to provide schooling for four-year-olds, so there is a growing recognition that early childhood education should become a legitimate part of public education (Elkind 1988 p. 26-27).

Many articles on improvement of educational programs for all children call for early identification of "at risk" students, followed by provision of quality programs. Among educators the phrase "at risk" is used to describe students whose cultural, socio-economic or parental

lifestyle characteristics are typical of the population most frequently involved with substance abuse, teenage pregnancy and school drop out. Rather than waiting for students to fail and then providing remediation, it seems prudent to offer a quality preschool experience as one means to lessen the possibility of failure. Elkind suggests that early childhood education may increase a disadvantaged child's chances for academic success.

> In the broadest sense, healthy early childhood education is crucial for all children. All young children will benefit from the opportunity and support for fully developing their intellectual, emotional, and social abilities. To the extent that disadvantaged children are perhaps less likely to receive such education at home or at school than are advantaged children, special efforts need to be made in order to insure that disadvantaged children get off to a good start (Elkind 1988 p. 24).

In a recent report, The Committee for Economic Development (C.E.D.) cited researcher David Weikart's (1989) claim that early intervention is cost efficient: "One dollar spent on early prevention and intervention can save $4.75 in the costs of remedial education, welfare and crime further down the road."

Many issues are brought to light as educators prepare students to meet the year 2000. High illiteracy rates, drop outs, teenage pregnancy and school accountability are a few that have received attention. The business and financial community is becoming increasingly involved in American public schools. Some efforts aim at restructuring the schools, while others focus on improving the image and prestige of the teaching profession. A recurrent theme woven into much of the school improvement literature is the significance of early education.

Historical Perspective

In the past, early childhood programs were offered for select groups only. These groups were chosen because of a particular financial or social need.

> The first early childhood programs were for the children of immigrants, whose parents had to work. It was hoped that these early childhood programs would socialize children and keep them from becoming delinquent as teenagers (Elkind 1988 p. 24).

Although today's early childhood programs do not serve an immigrant population, some

of the goals have remained the same. One of the goals of early intervention programs of today is to reduce the probability of children becoming drop outs or welfare recipients. The first early childhood programs were provided because of a necessity for child care. During the 1940's and 1950's, preschool was thought of as an option for parents who could afford it. Early childhood programs varied in curriculum and theory. Sharon Kagan, writing in *Phi Delta Kappan*, notes that,

> Early education was seen as a vehicle of exquisitely delicate and sophisticated intervention in the psychic development of children. Early care and education were seen as ways to strengthen children's psychological fiber (1989 p. 434).

Current Status of Early Childhood

The status of early childhood programs has changed since the 1950's. Current society dictates a greater need for child care. In the 1990's child care has a new status. It is more than an option for elite groups of parents who elect to have their children participate in particular programs. Child care is a necessity. In many cases one or both parents are working. As Cannon has pointed out:

> A generation ago, 18% of the nation's mothers worked outside the home. Today that percentage has more than tripled--and demographers estimate that by 1990, 80% of the women with children will be working outside the home (Cannon 1989 Sec. 1A).

A distinction must be made in regard to the difference between early childhood education and child care. This distinction is an issue of concern for preschool programs in general.

> The difference is very important. For the theorists, providing young children with a sound education was justification for separating a young child from its parents. For today's parents, however, work and career are the reasons they put young children into out-of-home programs. Providing children with early childhood education is often merely a rationalization for putting young children in out-of-home programs (Elkind 1988 p. 23).

The distinction between child care and early childhood education must remain clear. Elkind (1988) warns of the possible danger involved of thinking that early childhood education and child care are synonymous.

> It is because today's parents--and to some extent teachers and educational administrators--do not fully appreciate the nature and value of early childhood education that there is so much confusion in the field today. In some respects, schools are involved in early childhood education for the wrong reasons. They're responding to the demand of parents for quality child care facilities, rather than to convictions about the benefits of early childhood education (Elkind 1988 p.26).

It is the failure to understand this very distinction that can cause problems among parents, teachers and educational administrators. Parents, teachers and administrators may have very different opinions of what young children need in a program. Perceptions of teachers and administrators will be discussed in greater detail later. The need for child care is clear. Perhaps it is possible to provide quality child care as well as preschool education. A large group of children requiring care are of preschool age. Some states are reacting by providing public preschool programs. Most public programs are designed for "at risk" children. The significance of early intervention for "at risk" children is validated in a great deal of research. The next section provides discussion of research that supports early intervention.

Early Childhood Research

Literature on the topics of early childhood education and preschool as an intervention to failure was examined. Early intervention was frequently hailed as a solution to school failure. The type of intervention examined was public preschool.

A body of research suggests that there is a need to identify young children who may be at risk for school failure and provide them with experiences that will increase their chances for academic success. Early identification for preschool programs may start as early as age three. According to Schweinhart and Weikart (1985), early intervention can reduce an at-risk child's chances of experiencing teen pregnancy, illiteracy and dependance on welfare.

Educators' concepts of intervention have changed. The focus of programs for at-risk youth used to be on treatment. Once children failed they were identified as at-risk. Programs for disadvantaged children are now beginning to focus on prevention rather than treatment. Strother

notes that. "several studies conducted during the last 20 years suggest that high-quality early childhood programs have a positive effect on children" (1987 p. 306). Researchers examined how preschool participants fared in elementary school to determine if there were any lasting effects of preschool participation. Schweinhart and Weikart (1985 p. 546) examined seven different preschool programs. The preschool programs studied represented a cross section of communities. The size and composition of the samples varied with the programs examined. Sizes varied from 2,058 children in The New York Prekindergarten Program to only 40 children in Milwaukee. Another sample, the Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, Michigan, focused on children whose I.Q. range was between 60 and 90. The Milwaukee sample was composed of children whose mothers had tested I.Q.s of 75 or below. A sample in Harlem, New York, focused exclusively on males.

Although each sample had distinguishing characteristics, there was a factor of comparability in all seven samples. All samples were made up of preschool age children who were economically and educationally disadvantaged. The research measured the positive effects of preschool in terms of academic success. Children who participated in experimental preschool programs had fewer failing grades, fewer absences and were less often retained than non-participants. Preschool participants had less need for special education, greater curiosity and better developed literacy skills. They were more likely to finish high school than non-participants.

A positive preschool experience may have social implications. Research indicated that preschool participants were more employable, less dependant on public assistance, and less likely to engage in criminal activity. The Perry Preschool Project examined criminal activity in adolescence. Weikart, Schweinhart and Larner found fewer incidents of delinquent acts among children who had taken part in preschool programs using methods designed to foster child-initiated learning (1986 p. 41). It should be noted that the children were enrolled in high quality, closely monitored programs. It cannot be assumed that all preschool programs will promise the same effect.

Much of the research on the positive effects of preschool was based on longitudinal studies. In some cases researchers were able to track preschool participants through elementary, junior high and high school. In the research community, these longitudinal studies have provided evidence for the belief that quality early childhood is a significant factor in improving an at-risk child's chances for success.

Schweinhart and Weikart state that "evidence from several evaluations demonstrated that good preschool programs have both short and long term positive effects on low-income youngsters" (1985 p. 456). The need for child care has been established. The significance of early intervention is highlighted in a great deal of research. Some states are reacting by providing public preschool programs for children. In North Carolina, 22 public school systems have expanded their kindergarten through twelfth grade programs to include the preschool population.

A reality is that four-year-olds are in the public schools. Particular issues may arise as a result of this. In order to identify what some of the issues are, literature that discussed implications of preschool programs in public schools was reviewed.

Critical Issues in Public Preschool

Hours of operation, staffing, licensing, and training were mentioned by several authors as commonly cited issues in public preschool programs. The following discussion examines particular aspects of these four issues facing public school preschool programs.

Staff Requirements

"Public schools employ certified teachers whose salaries are almost double that of an average day care teacher" (Kagan 1986 p. 46). The cost of retaining certified teachers for preschool programs can be high. Some educators suggest using certified teachers in a supervisory capacity while having Child Development Associates serve as the primary care givers (Zigler 1987 p. 258). In C.M.S. Chapter I Preschool Program, the current practice is to use certified

early childhood teachers.

Typically, in a public school kindergarten classroom, the child-teacher ratio is twenty-five to one. In a preschool setting, Kagan suggests, "even two teachers would be inadequate to provide high quality care for the same number of four-year-olds" (1986 p. 46). The Chapter I Preschool Program limits the number of four-year-olds per class to 16. Each classroom is staffed by a certified teacher and a teacher's aide.

License Requirements

Preschool programs must be licensed by the state. There are specific regulations for materials and facilities. These regulations differ from standards that are acceptable for elementary age students. This again brings up the issue of cost. Before four-year-olds can be brought into a public school building, changes and alterations of the facility must take place. "In the Chapter I Preschool Program, changes and renovations were requested at many of the sites, prior to opening in 1986" (Nesbit 1990). Since school-based administrators oversee the facilities, this may be an area of concern to them.

A variety of agencies deal with preschool and elementary school mandates. To meet all standards, a preschool program administrator must communicate with many different individuals within a variety of agencies. "Indirect state services--such as licensing, technical assistance, information and referrals are under the aegis of four or five different agencies" (Kagan 1986 p. 47). Monitoring this situation requires knowledge, communication and skill on the part of a public preschool administrator. A building level administrator must follow guidelines to stay in compliance with all regulations. Adhering to these guidelines could present another difficult task for an elementary school principal.

Inservice Training

The National Day Care Study (Ruopp, Travers, Glantz, and Coelen, 1979) found that one

background characteristic of teachers that related to program quality was professional training in early childhood education. When the Chapter I Preschool Program began, certified early childhood teachers spent two weeks in intensive inservice training. Each year they must participate in at least 24 hours of inservice training. Quality programs must have trained personnel. Currently, the Chapter I Preschool Staff meets twice a month for inservice at The Villa Heights Center.

Hours of Operation

Some researchers suggest that developmentally appropriate preschool programs be offered through the public schools. Zigler (1987 p. 258) suggests that child care and preschool programs be offered in the same location.

> In addition to supplying other programs, full service schools would provide full-day, high quality child care for four and even three-year-old children in the school facilities already present in the community.

Zigler suggest that before and after school care be provided by the public school. Kagan (1986 p. 47) suggests that schools open their doors to four-year-olds who are not in a special needs category and provide full day programs from seven a.m. to six p.m., on a sliding fee basis, thereby meeting the needs of all parents.

The C.M.S. Chapter I Preschool Coordinator revealed that school hours are an issue for parents of children currently attending the Chapter I Preschool Program (Sims 1990). Currently the C.M.S. program runs from nine a.m. to one p.m. Some parents are having difficulty making child care arrangements. According to the Coordinator, some parents have expressed an interest in having before and after school child care provided by the Chapter I Program.

Should before-school and after-school care be provided by the public school? At this point, we are back to the fundamental question of child care vs. early childhood education. Can the public school preschool provide both? Are they within the realm and goals of the public preschool program? Perhaps it is possible to provide children with quality care as well as sound early childhood education. Some researchers suggest a combination of the two.

In review, consider the issues mentioned: staff requirements, license requirements, inservice training and hours of operation. Although there may be other critical issues in public school preschool programs, those discussed were mentioned most frequently in the literature reviewed.

Perceptions of School Personnel

Researchers seem to believe that quality early childhood education is worthwhile. What about practitioners? Are the service providers truly convinced that public school preschool is worthwhile? Some researchers feel that the professionals directly involved are not convinced of the merits of a preschool program (Elkind 1988 p. 27).

In the setting of an elementary school, principals and primary grade teachers must realize and accept that early childhood teachers are educational professionals.

> Early Childhood Education is just that--education--not glorified babysitting. For early childhood education to function as a legitimate part of public education, however, means that professionals must accept early childhood as a distinct educational discipline (Elkind 1988 p. 26).

While the public school preschool teachers may be convinced of the benefits of early childhood education, their colleagues and administrators may not. This could stem from a lack of understanding of the preschool curriculum.

Many early childhood educators are in favor of including four-year-olds in the public school. However, Elkind suggests that integration of preschool programs into the public schools take place in a cautious fashion. Officials at higher levels of education may not understand early childhood education. They may perceive early childhood education as watered down elementary education. Because of this, some early childhood educators may be reluctant to encourage institutionalizing preschool in the public schools.

> Early childhood education must be taken on its own terms. We do not teach the high school curriculum at the junior high level or the junior high curriculum at the elementary school level, so why in the world should we teach the elementary curriculum at the preschool level? (Elkind 1988 p. 27).

This may happen if institutionalization of programs for four-year-olds in the public school system takes place too quickly. Elkind suggests that policy makers take age-appropriate needs into careful consideration while developing models for preschool programs.

It appears that the Chapter I Preschool Coordinator is convinced of the merits of the program (Sims 1990). What about the service providers, the professional staff directly involved with the children, the preschool teachers and school-based administrators? Their perceptions of critical issues must be examined. Perhaps there is a difference in teachers' and school-based administrators' perceptions.

Teachers' and Administrators' Perceptions

A great deal of literature discusses various aspects of preschool and child care. A smaller amount of research discusses teachers' and administrators' preceptions of a variety of educational issues. However, it is difficult to locate research or literature that examines teachers' and administrators' perceptions of public preschool programs.

Therefore, it was necessary to examine research that focused on teachers' and administrators' perceptions of other issues to determine if there was a difference between the two groups' perceptions. Teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the issues of school climate, testing and staff development will be discussed.

Jorde-Bloom (1987) examined teachers' and administrators' perceptions of organizational climate in an elementary school. Participants were early childhood teachers and administrators. A survey was used to determine differences in perceptions of organizational practices that influence school climate. Organizational climate of their school was consistently viewed in a more positive light by administrators than by teachers. When asked to rate the organizationa.

climate on a scale. Jorde-Bloom (1987)found that administrators selected more favorable ratings than teachers did. In this study it was apparent that there was a difference in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of school climate.

Page and Page (1986 p. 5) examined teachers', administrators', school board members', and parents' perceptions of testing children in early childhood grades. In particular, they were interested in participants' perceptions of the increased emphasis on testing in early childhood grades. A survey was developed that focused on areas of concern. Problems identified included students' negative attitudes towards testing, student stress and children's lack of readiness for tasks demanded by testing. Although the sample population was a diverse group, the researchers were able to identify similarities in perceptions. The authors found that subjects shared many concerns related to the increased emphasis on testing. Researchers were able to identify a similarity between the perception of teachers, adminstrators, and school board members. They found that members of each of these groups held negative perceptions of testing. Teachers, administrators and school board members stated that testing caused stress and young children were not familiar with test taking behaviors. Parents and children were also found to hold a negative view of testing and test-taking characteristics. Page and Page found that teachers and administrators felt that testing in early childhood grades had a negative impact on children. Page and Page illustrated that teachers and administrators had similar perceptions in regards to the issue of testing.

Young (1988) examined the status of teacher participation in curriculum development and principals' attitudes of teacher status in curriculum development. Young felt that principals' attitudes toward teacher participation needed to be clarified. "Teachers revealed that their lack of status impedes professional development" (Young 1988 p.119). Young concluded that principals need to encourage teacher participation in developing curriculum.

Conran and Chase (1988 p. 26) found that a critical factor for successful staff development was to have consistently strong leadership and support. In examining principals' percep-

tions of staff development Dillion and found that "principals who understand and participate in staff development gain credibility and visibility with staff and parents alike" (Dillion 1978 p. 3). This concept is applicable for the study of The Preschool Program. If school-based adminstrators are supportive of preschool staff development, preschool teachers may gain credibility with their colleagues.

Young (1988) found a relationship between teachers' perceptions of status and level of participation in curriculum development. Purcell (1987) discussed the relationship between level of principals' support for staff development and positive school change. Both studies indicate that teachers' and administrators' perceptions of curriculum and staff development are important.

Studies that identified teachers' and administrators' perceptions of school climate, testing and staff development have been examined. It was determined that in some cases the two groups' perceptions were different. The results of Jorde-Bloom's studies support the hypothesis that there will be a difference between teachers' and administrators' perceptions.

Summary and Conclusions

American education and its flaws are in the media spotlight. It is rare to read a major newspaper or watch a television news broadcast that does not mention education. High rates of illiteracy and student drop outs have an impact on the quality of the work force. Thus business leaders have joined educators in a struggle to reform the public school system. Educators are interested in the improvement of the quality of education for philosophical reasons, while corporations have a vested interest in the impact of quality education for potential workers.

Alternatives have been examined that call for improving the quality of education. Regardless of the source of reform, one suggestion is common--that the provision of early childhood programs for at-risk children is necessary. Remediation and treatment of students having academic difficulty is not enough. Experts suggest that quality early childhood experiences can enrich the lives of all children, especially economically and educationally disadvantaged children.

Currently 23 states have some kind of prekindergarten program. Chapter I receives federal funding and is administered by state offices. Twenty-two public school systems in North Carolina have Chapter I Preschool Programs. The C.M.S. Chapter I Preschool Program, which began in 1986, is based on a developmentally appropriate curriculum. The program serves 544 children, characterized as "at risk." As the program enters its sixth year, it is necessary to evaluate its success.

Chapter I Central Office Administrators must evaluate their programs each year. Evaluations are required in order to receive federal funds. One of the components used to measure success is the parents' perceptions of the quality of the program. C.M.S. Preschool Program has completed several surveys to determine parents' levels of satisfaction with the program. Overall, these surveys have provided positive feedback about the program. While parental perception of program quality is an important evaluation component, it is not the only one.

As the literature indicated, there is a need for quality child care. There is also a growing recognition of the significance of early childhood education. If public school preschool programs are to be a service of the future, we need to examine the delivery of that service. Specifically, we need to examine perceptions of the service providers.

Most research that examines the benefits of the preschool experience concentrates on academic and intellectual gains made by the children who participate. In general, existing research has shown that the effects of preschool are very positive. Not enough research has studied the preschool personnel who are responsible for providing this positive experience. There is a need to examine the professional personnel who are involved in preschool programs. We must study and understand the relationship among the service providers. Literature indicates there may be a difference in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of particular educational issues. However, there is not enough research that examines teachers' and administrators' perceptions of preschool programs.

Hypotheses

This study has three hypotheses. In the following section each hypothesis will be given and a rationalization for each hypothesis will be provided.

Hypothesis #1 states that there will be a difference between C.M.S. Preschool teachers' and school-based administrators' perception of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues. Differences in teachers' and administrators' perceptions will be identified when participants are asked to list and describe specific aspects of critical issues. Differences in priorities will be identified when participants are asked to rank critical issues. Teachers' priorities are expected to focus on curriculum and hours of operation. School-based administrators' perceptions are expected to center on funding and facilities. This expected difference in perceptions may be based on the difference in professional roles.

Teachers are interested in their immediate surroundings: their own classrooms. They are mainly concerned with those issues that will affect their personal lives. Their perception of the preschool program could be called a micro perspective.

School based administrators are responsible for the program as a whole. Hence, they may have a macro perspective of the program. This implies that when school based administrators' priorities are determined, they will consider all program components rather than individual classroom concerns.

Hypothesis #2 states that years of experience in the program will be related to the level of program value assigned. It is expected that personnel who have been involved with the program since its inception will rate the value of the program very high. Those teachers and school based administrators who are newer to the program will consider it valuable, but not to the

same extent as the original staff.

Hypothesis #3 states that position held will be related to perceived value of the program and teachers will rate the program value higher than school based administrators. This may be due to the difference in roles and job responsibility. Teachers are focused on their own classrooms, while school-based administrators are involved with the preschool program as well as other academic, resource, and enrichment programs at their own schools.

METHODOLOGY

The data necessary to identify teachers' and school-based administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the value of The Preschool Program were obtained through a survey. The survey was based on the Delphi Technique. The sample consisted of 34 preschool teachers, 11 principals and 12 assistant principals.

Explanation of Delphi Technique

In the middle 1950's, The Rand Corporation developed the Delphi Technique as an aid to decision making. The Delphi requires participants to complete a series of questionnaires. Between each round, information is synthesized and summarized (Skutsch and Hall 1973 p.3). This information is returned to participants for further refinement. Skutsch and Hall explain how participants receive feedback in Delphi. "This means that between each round, the participant receives feedback, not from individuals as would occur in an open group discussion but rather from the group as a unit" (Skutsch and Hall 1973 p. 3). Responses at all stages are anonymous.

At the end of the series of rounds, it may be assumed that the answers given are indicative of total group perspective. Once organized, information generated by the Delphi can be used for planning and decision making. This information provides decision makers with a sound reference point for their decisions.

Sample Uses

Delphi has been used in a variety of instances. The technique has been used to study the use of public transportation, educational goal setting and to identify attributes of effective teachers. The classic Delphi uses several rounds of questionnaires. However, it is not uncom-

mon to see research based on a modified Delphi approach where only a few rounds are used. For this study of The Preschool Program, a modified Delphi with two rounds of questionnaires was used.

Advantages of Delphi

Delphi allows a large group of people to respond to the same question without ever having to be brought together. This was an attractive feature for this particular study.

Group dynamics show that even when the whole group can be brought together, all perspectives are not always taken into consideration. Some people may be more verbose than others. A group may reach a consensus that is not indicative of what each person feels. Some people may be too shy or insecure to verbalize disagreement with those who are more vocal. As Skutsch and Hall note,

> The Delphi is not like a referendum, in that some people may have more influence than others; nor is it like a conference, since everybody has an equal opportunity to influence the group--each has an equal time to express his views, and stands an equal chance that these will be accepted by the group (Skutsch and Hall 1973 p. 4).

Delphi can be useful for decision making about current problems. It is also quite often used in planning. Since feedback is anonymous, Delphi can be an effective way of getting to the heart of an issue without dealing with personal conflict, which can be counterproductive to the group decision process.

Limitations

Delphi Technique has been used to obtain information from a group of varied participants. Delphi identifies group consensus and disagreement, when the group itself is very diverse. For instance, Carver (1980) used the Delphi Technique to obtain information on educational goal setting from a group that included students, parents, teachers, senior citizens, elected officials, education and business community leaders. Most Delphi studies use a group of varied participants in order to include many points of view, as well as shared experience. In this study

only perceptions of preschool teachers and school-based administrators were investigated. A more in-depth analysis would include parents, school board members, central office administration and preschool teacher assistants.

In a classic Delphi, refinement of the series of rounds produces group consensus as the number of choices becomes more limited. Since only two rounds were completed, true consensus was not possible. However, this study was not intended to identify consensus in a refined sense. The main interest was in studying selected differences between the two groups. Completing two rounds allowed for the identification of group differences without having to develop group consensus.

The length of time required is sometimes mentioned as a disadvantage of Delphi. The rounds of questionnaires may continue for an extended period of time. Often participants lose interest as well as the focus of original goals (Skutsch and Hall 1973 p. 11). In the modified Delphi, this should not be a factor. Turn around time was short (thirteen days) between each round. This was to insure that the level of interest would remain high.

Return rates for mailed questionnaires are notoriously low (Dooley 1984 p. 242). High return rates have been reported for specialized samples (Dillman 1978 p.27). In this study, questionnaires were sent to a very specific population. To help insure a high return rate, two steps were taken. First, approval for the survey was received from the Communications Department of C.M.S. This provided a professional incentive for participants to cooperate. Second, a reminder postcard was mailed on the deadline date for both rounds of questionnaires. These steps, coupled with a specialized sample, ensured a relatively high rate of return.

Factors Considered in this Study

Advantages of Delphi Technique have been examined. Of particular interest were the factors of anonymity, reasonable expense and total group participation. When choosing a methodology for this study, several limitations were considered:

1) Sample Population

It was judged necessary to study perspectives of all preschool teachers in the Chapter I Program. Identification of the perceptions of school-based administrators assigned to Preschool Sites was necessary. Meeting with teachers and administrators as a group would have posed a problem because of their conflicting schedules. Even if it could have been arranged, all participants may not have been present or fully participated. Some may not have voiced opinions for fear of group reprisal or disagreement.

2) Time

School was out of session June 1, 1990. After that time, it would have become difficult to contact participants. Finally, personal interviews would require an extended period of time.

3) Cost

Possible expenses incurred to meet with and personally interview 47 people would not be feasible.

Delphi Technique lends itself to quantitative and qualitative analysis, both of which were planned for in this study. Considering the factors mentioned, Delphi Technique was chosen as the most suitable method for this study of The Preschool Program.

Implementation

The survey participants were thirty-four preschool teachers, eleven principals and twelve assistant principals. The administrators in the sample had been assigned to a school that had at least one preschool class. An updated list of school assignments was obtained by contacting the C.M.S. Personnel Department.

On April 23, 1990, Questionnaire Form I was mailed to the participants at their school address. In the first mailing, each participant received the following: an opening letter introducing the author and the research, a participant consent form, Questionnaire Form I and two

stamped, self-addressed envelopes. The two envelopes were for the participant to return the consent form and Questionnaire I.

The participants were asked to complete the forms and return them by May 6, 1990. On May 6, 1990, a reminder postcard was mailed to all participants.

By May 13, 1990, thirty-three completed participant consent forms and thirty-two questionnaires were received. Ten issues were identified by performing a basic content analysis and tabulating the frequency of particular responses Questionnaire Form II was developed based on these ten issues.

On May 19, 1990, Questionnaire Form II was mailed to all participants. The second mailing contained the following: a letter of thanks, Questionnaire Form II and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The participants were asked to complete and return the form by June 1, 1990. On June 1, 1990, a reminder postcard was sent to all participants. By June 8, 1990, thirty-nine completed questionnaires were received.

Findings and Analysis

The findings and analysis section of this report is divided into four parts. The first part discusses the overall rate of return. The second part concentrates on Questionnaire I. The third part focuses on Questionnaire II. The fourth section provides analysis designed to test the hypotheses.

Rate of Return

Of fifty-seven first round mailings, thirty-three participant consent forms and thirty-two questionnaires were returned. The return rate for the consent forms was fifty-seven percent. The return rate for the first questionnaire was fifty-six percent. Although this rate was acceptable, it was disappointingly low. The sample was very small. A substantial return was needed to justify the recommendations. With a substantial return it could be assumed that the results were truly indicative of the group.

In the first mailing, participants had to complete two different forms and return them in specifically marked envelopes. On Questionnaire I participants had to generate and record their own ideas. This was more time consuming than completing a checklist. The amount of time and thought required to complete the questionnaire, coupled with the fact that there were two forms and envelopes may have contributed to the moderate rate of return.

After the first mailing it became apparent that the list of participants was not accurate. One participant was deceased, so her packet was returned unopened. The name of her replacement was obtained. Two participants were on maternity leave. Two teachers were on extended leave. The names of their interim replacements were obtained. In each of the cases mentioned, appropriate changes were made on the list of participants.

Fifty-seven questionnaires were sent out in the second mailing. Sixty-eight percent of

the questionnaires were returned. On Questionnaire II participants had to check the appropriate categories, and rank ten issues.

The first questionnaire was more time consuming for participants in that they had to generate new ideas. To complete Questionnaire II required time and thought, however not to the same extent as Questionnaire I. In Round II there was only one form and one envelope. The fact that participants did not have to generate and record new ideas, a more time consuming process than completing a checklist may have contributed to the higher rate of return.

Questionnaire I

Section I of Questionnaire I was designed to identify the role of the participant. Of thirty-two responses, nineteen or fifty-nine percent were teachers and thirteen or forty-one percent were administrators. Table 1 illustrates the type of position held by participants. It shows a fairly accurate representation of the certification of professional staff and position distribution in the program. The sample included thirty-four teachers and twenty-three administrators. If there had been one hundred percent return, forty-three percent would have been administrators' responses and fifty-seven percent would have been teachers' responses.

Table 1
Type of Position

Position	Frequency	Percent
Teacher	19	59
Administrator	13	41
Total	32	100

It may appear that there is a disproportionate number of administrators. It should be noted that the sample included thirty-four teachers who are assigned to eleven different schools. Each school has one administrative team. The number of school sites accounts for the large number of school-based administrators.

Section II of Questionnaire I was designed to obtain information about the participants. The variables considered were gender, length of time in the C.M.S. Preschool Program and level of education. Table 2 illustrates gender of the participants. Of thirty-two responses, eighty-eight

percent were female and thirteen percent were male. This shows a substantially higher response from females. A conclusion cannot be drawn here that indicates greater female participation. Of the original sample of fifty-seven people, only seven are male. They are all in administrative positions. Again, Table 2 illustrates an accurate representation of the gender distribution of the C.M.S. Preschool Staff.

Table 2

Gender of Participants

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	4	13
Female	28	88
Total	32	100

The second variable considered in Section II of Questionnaire I was length of time in the C.M.S. Preschool Program. Participants were asked to reveal the length of time they had been working in the Chapter I Preschool Program. If a participant wrote the response two years and three months, it was coded as two years of service. Regardless of the number of additional months, all responses were coded in terms of years only. One participant left this section blank. It was coded as no response.

Table 3 illustrates the number of years participants had worked in the C.M.S. Preschool Program. Nearly half of the responding participants, forty-seven percent, had worked in the program for four years. The other half had worked in the program between one and three years. The largest portion of the second half (twenty-two percent) had worked in the program for three years. This implies that a majority of the original staff is still working in the program. There is also a relatively low rate of turnover among the teachers. This was discovered when original staff assignments were compared to the current list of preschool staff assignments. The mean length of time that participants had worked in the program was 3.1 years.

Table 3

Length of Service in Years

Length of Service	Frequency	Percent
1	3	9
2	6	19
3	7	22
4	15	47
(No Response)	1	3
Total	32	100

Mean 3.097
Valid Cases 31 Missing Cases 1

The third variable in Section II of Questionnaire I was participants' level of education. Participants were asked to check the box that indicated the highest level of education they had completed. The choices given were bachelors, masters and doctorates. In coding responses for this section, several decisions were made in order to clarify responses. Two participants indicated they had completed their bachelors and intended to complete their masters by July or September 1990. Since they had not received the higher degree at the time the survey was completed, their responses were coded at the bachelors level. Five participants indicated they had received masters degrees. These five participants stated that they had additional coursework or certificates. To clarify responses these cases were coded at the masters level. Since there were only five cases like this, the author decided not to add a new category in the level of education section on Questionnaire II.

Table 4 illustrates participants' level of education. Of nineteen teachers that had responded, eleven or fifty-eight percent had a bachelors degree and eight or forty-two percent had a masters degree. Of thirteen administrators that responded, one, or eight percent, had a bachelors degree and twelve, or ninety-two percent, had a masters degree.

Examination of the returned questionnaires revealed that not all assistant principals had earned advanced degrees. It was assumed that all administrators were required to have a masters degree. Apparently this is not true, or perhaps an exception had been made. One participant who identified herself as a female administrator indicated that she had not earned her

masters degree. She intended to have it completed by July 1990. This administrator's credentials must have been an exception because all other administrators indicated that they had earned the higher degree.

In all, there were thirty-two responses to Questionnaire I. Of thirty-two responses, twelve, or thirty-eight percent, had a bachelor's degree and twenty, or sixty-three percent, had a master's degree. Table 4 indicates a majority of respondents had earned the higher degree. None of the participants had a doctoral degree.

Table 4

Highest Degree Completed

	Frequency	Percent
Highest Degree Completed		
Bachelors	12	38
Masters	20	63
Doctorate	0	0
Total	32	100

Analysis of demographic information provided an understanding of particular characteristics of the responding participants. Closer examination of the breakdown of gender and role of participants showed that the study results accurately represent the demographic characteristics of the preschool staff.

In Section III of Questionnaire I participants were asked to do two things. First, they were asked to "list up to five issues that affect the Charlotte Mecklenburg Chapter I Preschool Program." Second, they were asked, "in a few words, but as specifically as possible, explain the aspect(s) of each issue that are critical to the program." The listing section was designed to identify the critical issues. As the questionnaires came in, a record was kept of the issues mentioned. Also noted were the specific aspects that participants added to describe a particular issue. Ten major issues were identified using these categories. If an issue was cited by at least five participants, it was considered a critical issue. In all, forty-one different issues were mentioned. Appendix IV includes a detailed list of all issues and frequencies. Table 5 presents a frequency distribution of the ten critical issues identified by respondents to Questionnaire I.

Table 5

Critical Issues

Issue	Frequency
Transportation	20
Screening	15
Hours of Operation	14
Staffing	12
Parent Involvement	8
Curriculum	7
Funding	5
Inservice	5
Training for Assistants	5
Expanding The Program	5

The issue cited most frequently was transportation. Specific aspects mentioned were that the rides were too long, the costs too high, and that vans should be used instead of buses. The second most frequently mentioned issue was screening. The specific aspect mentioned most often was the need for a new instrument to identify a greater number of children. The third most frequently cited issue was hours of operation. With this issue there were a variety of specific aspects mentioned. Some participants felt that the instructional day should be lengthened. Others felt that before and after school care should be provided for children of working parents. One participant felt that the instructional day should not be lengthened but day care should be included.

The next most frequently named issue was staffing. In the area of staffing, two aspects were mentioned; 1) a need for resource staff such as psychologists, nurses, speech clinicians and social workers to serve the preschool population and 2) a need for clerical personnel to handle the paperwork.

The fifth most frequently cited issue was parent involvement. Several participants felt that greater parent involvement was needed. Some participants mentioned that offering parent training would result in greater parent involvement.

The sixth most frequently identified issue was curriculum. There was one aspect mentioned by several participants; that activities and curriculum must be developmentally appropriate. In order of frequency, the issues of funding, inservice, training for assistants and expanding the

program were each cited by five participants. Questionnaire II was developed using the information generated by Questionnaire I.

Questionnaire II

Section I of Questionnaire II was designed to identify the position of the participant. Of thirty-nine responses twenty-four, or sixty-two percent, were teachers and fifteen, or thirty-nine percent, were administrators. Table 6 illustrates the type of position held by participants.

Table 6

Type of Position

Position	Frequency	Percent
Teacher	24	62
Administrator	15	39
Total	39	100

Section II of Questionnaire II was designed to elicit information about the participant. The variables listed were gender, length of time in the C.M.S. Preschool Program and level of education.

Table 7 illustrates distribution of gender of participants. Of thirty-nine responses, five, or thirteen percent, were male and thirty-three or eighty-five percent, were female. One participant left this section blank. This was coded as no response and accounted for three percent of the group that responded.

Table 7

Gender of Participant

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	5	13
Female	33	85
No Response	1	3
Total	39	100

In Section II of Questionnaire II participants were asked to reveal the amount of time they had been working in the Chapter I Program. Table 8 illustrates years of service reported by participants. Two participants indicated that they had worked in the program for less than one

year. Their responses were coded as one year of service.

Table 8

Length of Service

Years	Frequency	Percent
< = 1	5	13
2	8	21
3	7	18
4	19	49
Total	39	100

Mean 3.0 years

The largest percentage of respondents, forty-nine percent, had worked in the program four years. The smallest percentage, thirteen percent, had worked in the program for one year or less. Participants had worked in the program for an average of 3.0 years.

The third variable in Section II of Questionnaire II was level of education. Participants were asked to identify their highest level of education completed. One participant checked masters degree and wrote in additional information. This response was coded at the masters level. One participant checked bachelors degree and wrote "almost" over the masters category. Since the degree had not been earned at the time the survey was completed, it was coded at the bachelors level.

Table 9 illustrates years of service. Of thirty-nine responses, thirty-six percent were at the bachelors level and sixty-four percent were at the masters level. Of the twenty-five people that had masters degrees, fifteen were administrators. This means that there were ten master degree teachers who responded. A masters degree is not required to teach in the preschool program. Although it is not required, twenty-eight percent of the teachers have earned a higher degree.

Table 9

Level of Education

Highest Degree Held	Frequency	Percent
Bachelors	14	36
Masters	25	64
Doctorate	0	0
Total	39	100

Section III of Questionnaire II was designed to identify the participants' perception of the value of the program. Participants were asked to rate the overall value of the program, one being extremely valuable and five being not valuable at all. Table 10 presents a frequency distribution of the ratings assigned to the program value.

Table 10

Rating of Value of the Program

Rating	Value	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Valuable	1	29	74
	2	3	8
	3	1	3
	4	3	8
Not Valuable at All	5	3	8
Total		39	101

Mean 1.667 Std. Dev. 1.305

Of thirty-nine respondents seventy-four percent assigned the highest rating possible; eight percent assigned it level two, three percent assigned it level three; which is moderately valuable, eight percent assigned it a rating of four and eight percent assigned it a rating of five, meaning not valuable at all. The majority of respondents rated the program as extremely valuable. However it would be unlikely for personnel to work in a program for four years and not rate it as valuable. Perhaps, the preschool teachers and administrators promote the merits of the program to insure job security. If they rate the program as valuable, it may solidify their positions and provide program validation. Anthony Downs remarks on this concept of loyalty to the organization. "Like all bureaus, a staff always seeks to retain its existing power, income and prestige and usually seeks to increase them" (Downs, 1967 p. 155). Downs' notion of a staff seeking to expand its power or prestige will be explored in greater detail later.

No attempt will be made here to identify a relationship between assigned value and position, or assigned value and length of time in the program. Such relationships are the basis of hypothesis #2 and hypothesis #3. Specific analysis designed to test the hypotheses will be provided in the final analysis section.

Section IV of Questionnaire II was designed to determine participant's perceptions of critical issues. Of the thirty-nine returned questionnaires, three or eight percent of the participants left Section IV blank or completed it incorrectly. These incomplete or incorrect portions were coded as no response.

This final section is devoted to specific analysis designed to test the hypotheses. Each hypothesis will be presented. This presentation will be followed by a discussion and a table to highlight the data. A brief discussion of the acceptance or rejection of each hypothesis will be provided.

Hypothesis #1 stated that there would be a difference between C.M.S. Preschool teachers' and administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues. Table 11 provides a list of the ten critical issues and the mean rankings given by teachers and administrators. The lower the mean the higher priority ranking an issue received.

Table 11

Ten Critical Issues and Mean Rankings
by Teachers and Administrators

Issue	Mean Ranking
Expanding the Program	3.028
Funding	4.500
Parent Involvement	5.278
Curriculum	5.472
Screening	5.500
Staffing	5.528
Transportation	5.750
Assistant Training	5.778
Inservice	6.139
Length of Day	8.028

Mean Rankings are based on 39 responses.

Table 12 provides a list of ten prioritized critical issues and the mean rankings assigned by teachers.

Table 12

Issues and Mean Rankings Assigned by Teachers

Issue	Mean Ranking
Expanding the Program	3.136
Funding	4.318
Staffing	4.909
Curriculum	4.909
Assistant Training	5.591
Parent Involvement	5.591
Transportation	5.682
Screening	6.045
Inservice	6.318
Length of Day	8.500

Mean rankings are based on 24 responses.

Table 13 presents a list of ten prioritized critical issues and the mean ranking assigned by administrators.

Table 13

Issues and Mean Rankings Assigned by Administrators

Issue	Mean Ranking
Expanding the Program	2.857
Screening	4.643
Funding	4.786
Parent Involvement	4.786
Transportation	5.857
Inservice	5.857
Assistant Training	6.071
Curriculum	6.357
Staffing	6.500
Length of Day	7.286

Mean rankings are based on 15 responses.

Table 14 illustrates the comparison of mean rankings assigned for all issues by teachers and administrators.

Table 14

Comparison of Mean Rankings by Teachers and Administrators

Issue	Teachers' Rankings	Administrators Rankings	Differences
Expanding the Program	3.136	2.857	+ .279
Funding	4.318	4.786	- .468
Parent Involvement	5.591	4.786	+ .805
Curriculum	4.909	6.357	- 1.448
Assistant Training	5.591	6.071	+ .480
Screening	6.045	4.643	+ 1.402
Staffing	4.909	6.500	- 1.591
Transportation	5.682	5.857	+ .175
Inservice	6.318	5.857	+ .461
Length of Day	8.500	7.286	+ 1.214

Mean rankings are based on 39 responses.

The goal of the project was to identify a difference between C.M.S. Preschool teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the critical issues and the rankings assigned to those issues. Therefore issue rankings had to be broken down by position. (Priority will be identified as the numerical ranking assigned to an issue.)

There were two issues that both groups assigned the same priority; first priority, expand the program and tenth priority, maintain the current length of the instructional day. However, eight issues were assigned different priorities by teachers and administrators. Teachers and administrators assigned different priorities to the issues of funding, screening, staffing, curriculum, inservice training, parent involvement, transportation and assistant training.

First there will be a discussion of the issues that were assigned the same priority by both groups followed by a disucssion of the issues that were assigned different priorities by both groups.

Expanding The Program

According to teachers, the number one issue was expanding the program. Administrators also ranked expanding the program as the first priority. Participants mentioned that the

program was so worthwhile it should be offered to more children. The overwhelming majority of participants felt the program should be expanded.

Downs (1987) offers some interesting thoughts on program expansion. Based on Downs theories of growth and expansion of bureaus, the teachers' and administrators' committment to expansion could be attributed to enlightened self-interest. "The expansion of any organization normally provides its leaders with increased power, income and prestige; hence they promote its growth" (Downs 1967 p.17). He goes on to suggest that when the size of an organization increases, its chances for survival may improve. Downs notes that both loyalty and self-interest can encourage officials to promote organizational growth. As Downs suggests, the interest in expansion may not solely be due to self interest. Workers and officials may also be loyal to organization for the quality of its output. Perhaps, in the case of the preschool program, expansion recommendations are based on sound understanding of program merits. Teachers and administrators may have ranked expanding the program as their first priority because they believe the program is truly valuable.

Length of Instructional Day

The second issue that both groups assigned the same priority was length of instructional day. Teachers and administrators rated this as the tenth priority. On Questionnaire II participants were asked to assign a priority ranking for the need to increase hours. Since both groups ranked length of day as the last priority, they must not want to change the hours of operation. The length of the current instructional day is four hours. Apparently length of instructional day is not a high priority for either group.

Two issues were assigned the same priority by both groups. Teachers and administrators chose expanding the program as their first priority and maintaining current length of instructional day as their tenth priority. Specific aspects of these issues have been examined. In the next section the issues that were assigned different priorities by teachers and administrators will be examined.

Funding

Teachers chose funding as the second priority. Administrators chose funding as the third priority. To assign funding a high priority is logical because for the program to expand additional monies would be needed. It was expected that administrators would rate this issue as a higher priority than teachers would. This was not the case. Although both groups assigned funding a high priority there was a difference in the exact numerical rank.

Screening

There was a great deal of difference in the way the two groups ranked the issue of screening. Administrators assigned screening as the second priority, whereas teachers assigned screening as the eighth. Both groups discussed different aspects within the issue. Several administrators felt that for the program to expand, a new screening tool would have to be developed to identify a greater number of children to participate. Administrators chose expanding the program as their highest priority. They felt that the first step in expanding the program would be to identify a larger group of children in need. As a group, administrators put screening as a very high priority. As a group, teachers put screening as a low priority. Teachers' perceptions of important aspects within screening were different from administrators' perceptions. The eighth priority for teachers was screening. On Questionnaire I, several teachers mentioned that the current screening instrument was no longer a valid indicator for children in greatest need for preschool. Several teachers felt that children had been coached, therefore the instrument was invalid. Teachers and administrators had different perceptions of the critical aspects of screening as well as the ranking of the issue.

Staffing

Teachers assigned staffing as their third priority and administrators assigned staffing as their ninth priority. Perhaps the difference in the two groups' perceptions of staffing as a critical issue may be due to their difference in professional roles. In daily contact with disadvantaged preschoolers, teachers may be more aware of the need for nurses, psychologists and social

workers. Administrators may become aware of special needs in extreme cases. However, on a day-to-day basis administators may not see additional resource staff as a high priority. In day-to-day contact with children, teachers may have a greater awareness than administrators of individual children's needs. They appeared to be more concerned than administrators were that a resource staff was needed to serve the disadvantaged preschool population. The teachers that chose staffing as a critical issue mentioned that psychologists, nurses, social workers and speech therapists needed to be employed.

Curriculum

Teachers assigned curriculum as the fourth priority. In comparison, administrators assigned curriculum as the eighth priority. Again, this difference in the two groups' perceptions of the significance of curriculum may be due to their differences in professional roles. One explanation might be that teachers are required to focus on their immediate surroundings -- their classrooms. Administrators are involved with the preschool program as well as other academic, resource and enrichment programs. The difference in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of curriculum supports the notion that teachers may have a micro perspective. They are mainly concerned with their own classrooms, whereas administrators may have a macro perspective. Administrators are concerned with total program components and may not be as interested as teachers in single issues such as curriculum.

Inservice Training

The ninth priority for teachers was inservice training. In the background section, a discusssion of the inservice component of the preschool program was provided. Administrators assigned inservice training as the sixth priority. The inservice issue was not a high priority for either group.

Parent Involvement

Administrators ranked parent involvement higher than teachers. Teachers selected

parent involvement as the sixth priority while administrators selected parent involvement as the fourth priority.

Teachers mentioned apects of parent involvement such as conferences and parental responsibility. Teachers and assistants have personal contact with each child's parent or guardian every day. Several teachers felt that the required parent conferences were not necessary because of this daily parent contact.

In addition to participating in parent conferences, administrators felt that greater parent participation was needed at school-related events. Principals must complete monthly reports that include measurement of components of parent involvement. Another incentive for administrators to be interested in parent involvement is that some Chaper I funds are contingent upon a certain level of parent involvement. Administators may be interested in the humanistic benefit of parent participation. However, they may also be aware of the financial implications of not having sufficient parent involvement. Teachers and administrators may have different perceptions of what is important in the parent involvement component.

Transportation

The seventh priority for teachers was transportation while it was the fifth priority for administrators. Although, not large there was a difference in numerical order of priority assigned. Participants' perceptions of specific aspects in transportation differ. Teachers were concerned that length of bus rides were too long for small children. They were also concerned with safety aspects such as the absence of seat belts on school buses. Teachers suggested use of vans for safety reasons. They also felt that a small van would provide a more personal experience for a young child. Administrators' main concern with transportation was that the cost was too high.

Training for Assistants

According to teachers the fifth priority was to provide training for assistants. Administrators assigned assistant training as the seventh priority. Several participants mentioned that

assistants needed training specifically geared to needs of preschool children. Suggested topics for training included discipline, guidance and child development.

Summary

There were eight issues that teachers and administrators assigned different priorities. The identified differences in participants' rankings and descriptions of funding, screening, staffing, curriculum, inservice training, parent involvement, transportation and assistant training provided concrete evidence that there was a difference in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues. In general, C.M.S. Pre-school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues differ.

To provide quantitative assessment a statistical test of significance was performed. Table 15 illustrates "t" values for the critical issues. The table was constructed by completing a two-tailed test. None of the values were large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level. This was not surprising considering the sample was quite small. Table 15 summarizes the results of the "t" tests.

Table 15

Critical Issues "t" Values

Issue	"t" Value	Significance Level
Expanding	.29	.775
Funding	- .51	.661
Parent	.99	.331
Curriculum	-1.83	.077
Screening	1.65	.108
Staffing	-1.54	.132
Transportation	- .23	.823
Assistant Training	.46	.651
Inservice	.58	.569
Length of Day	1.22	.229

Degrees of Freedom = 34

Although the results of this study are based on a small sample, the results do reflect a difference between perceptions of issues by teachers and administrators in the C.M.S. Chapter I

Preschool Program. Therefore hypothesis #1 is accepted as true. However these results could not be applied to a larger population. Welch and Comer (1983 p. 179) note that statistical significance is a function of sample size. A recommendation for further research is to use a larger population. Perhaps a study that examined perceptions of preschool personnel in several large, urban school systems and was repeaated in various locations would provide statistically significant results and increase researchers confidence in the results of this study.

Hypothesis #2 stated that years of experience in the program would be related to the level of value assigned. It was expected that personnel who had been involved with the program since its inception would rate the value of the program very high. Teachers and school-based administrators who were newer to the program were expected to rate it as valuable, but not to the same extent as the original staff.

For an understanding of the breakdown of percentages of assigned program value, consider the following: seventy-three percent of the respondents rated the program extremely valuable, twelve percent rated the program moderately valuable and fifteen percent rated the program not valuable at all.

Four, or eighty percent, of five respondents that had worked in the program for one year rated the program extremely valuable, none rated it moderately valuable and one, or twenty percent, rated it not valuable at all. Five, or sixty-three percent, of eight respondents that worked in the program for two years rated the program as extremely valuable, one, or thirteen percent rated it moderately valuable and two, or twenty-five percent, rated it not valuable at all. Five, or seventy-one percent, of seven respondents that had worked in the program for three years rated the program extremely valuable, none rated it moderately valuable and two, or twenty-nine percent, rated it not valuable at all. Fifteen, or seventy-nine percent, of nineteen respondents that had worked in the program for four years rated it extremely valuable, three, or sixteen percent, rated it moderately valuable and one, or five percent, rated it not valuable at all. Clearly

the majority of respondents in each group rated the program extemely valuable.

The two groups with the highest percentage of respondents that assigned extremely valuable ratings were those with one year and four years of service. The groups of respondents with two and three years of experience were more likely to rate the program not valuable. In order to support or reject the hypothesis, analysis had to go beyond a comparison of percentages of respondents that assigned certain ratings.

To support the assertion that those who had worked in the program for four years would assign higher ratings than those who were new to the program, an association between the variables of years of service and value assigned had to be identified. An association between the variables was identified but it was very weak. Table 16 summarizes the findings.

Table 16

Years of Service By Value Assigned to Program

Years of Service / Ratings	One N	One %	Two N	Two %	Three N	Three %	Four N	Four %
Extremely Valuable	4	80	5	63	5	71	15	79
Moderately Valuable	0	0	1	13	0	0	13	16
Not Valuable	1	20	2	25	2	29	1	5
Total	5	100	8	100	7	100	19	100

Chi Square = 4.68
Degrees of Freedom = 6
Cramer's V = .24

Chi Square was calculated as 4.68. The measure of association used for the variables of years of service by value assigned was Cramer's V. Cramer's V is a measure of the strength of association between two variables. The range of Cramer's V is 0 to 1.0. Cramer's V was calculated to be .24. This shows a weak association. The results are not statistically significant at the usually accepted level of .05. It appeared that years of service were not related to value assigned. Regardless of the number of years of service, the overwhelming majority of respondents rated the program as valuable.

Based on the preceeding discussion and the data in Table 16, hypothesis #2, that years

of service in the program will be related to value assigned, is rejected.

Hypothesis #3 stated that teachers would rate the program value higher than administrators. Of the teachers and administrators that responded, this was true. Out of twenty-four teachers that responded, twenty-one of them rated the program extremely valuable. Only one teacher rated it moderately valuable and two rated it not valuable at all. The vast majority of teachers perceived the program as extremely valuable.

This was not the case with administrators. Out of fifteen administrators that responded, roughly half of them, eight, or fifty-three percent, rated the program extremely valuable. Three administrators, or twenty percent, rated it moderately valuable and four administrators, or twenty-six percent, rated it not valuable at all. Teachers and administrators have different professional roles. In daily contact with disadvantaged preschoolers, teachers may be more likely to see the immediate gains and rewards of the program. Principals are involved with the Preschool Program, but their time and attention must also be given to other academic, resource and enrichment programs. Perhaps it is this difference in job responsibility that accounts for teachers rating the program higher than administrators did. Table 17 summarizes the findings.

Table 17

Rating of Value of the Program
by
Position of Participant

	Ratings				
	High 1and 2		Low 3thru 5		Total
	N	%	N	%	N %
Position					
Teacher	21	88	3	13	24 100
Administrator	8	53	7	47	15 100
Total	29		10		39

Chi Square	=	4.04
Cramer's V	=	.32
Degrees of Freedom	=	1
Significance Level	=	<.05

The variables considered in Table 17 were position of participant and rating assigned. Chi Square was calculated as 4.04.[1] Cramer's V for the data in Table 17 was .32. The range of Cramer's V is 0 to 1.0; .32 shows a moderate relationship between the variables. In terms of strength and direction, the association is moderate and in the direction hypothesized. These results are statistically significant below the .05 level. The variables of role of participant and rating assigned are related. Teachers did rate the program value higher than administrators did.

Based on Table 17 and the preceeding discussion hypothesis #3, that position held will be related to level of value assigned, is accepted as true.

[1] Since the expected frequency in one cell was less than five, Chi Square was calculated using a correction for continuity. See Blalock, Hubert, pgs. 285-287

CONCLUSION

The goal of this paper was to identify a difference between teachers' and school-based administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues in the C.M.S. Chapter I Preschool Program.

In program evaluation, success is often measured in terms of client satisfaction, quality of services and quantity of output. A more comprehensive evaluation should include examination of internal components. For this study, the internal component highlighted was the difference in perceptions held by personnel. To study and evaluate service delivery of the Preschool Program, this study examined the perceptions of teachers and administrators who provide the Chapter I Preschool Services.

To justify the relevance of the study a variety of literature was reviewed to determine the current status of early childhood programs. Many authors, not all educational, are aware of the need for quality early childhood education. Child advocates are singing the praises of preschool programs that bolster children's self esteem. Some reseachers state that quality early childhood programs can increase a disadvantaged child's chances for academic success. The implications of such research interests not only early childhood teachers but also social workers and law enforcement professionals. The results of school failure may include dropout and possible participation in criminal activity. This is a topic of concern for human service professionals other than educators. The literature shows that the business community is also interested in the problems associated with school failure. Perhaps because of selfish but realistic reasons, the business community is concerned with the quality of the future work force. Business leaders are

beginning to listen to educators who suggest early childhood programs as a means to lessen the chances for academic failure.

Many states are reacting to the research by providing funding for preschool programs. In North Carolina 113 public schools, including Charlotte Mecklenburg, offer Chapter I Preschool Classes. Investigation revealed that the Chapter I Program partly measures its success by examining the gains made by children who participate. The approach of this study was to focus on a different aspect of program evaluation. While the educational gains made by children are valid indicators of success, an additional focus of evaluation is the examination of the perceptions of personnel. A new focus of program evaluation is to take the spotlight from clients, the preschool children, and put it on service providers, the teachers and administrators.

First, an awareness of the significance of early childhood programs was established. Second, common issues that affect preschool programs were examined. These were: hours of operation, staffing, licensing and training.

There was very little research that examined teachers' and administrators' perceptions of preschool. This indicated the need for additional study on this topic. Therefore research that studied teachers' and administrators' perceptions of other educational issues was reviewed to determine if there was a difference in the two group's perceptions. The issues examined were staff development, school climate and testing. Although it varied with the issues, there was a difference between the two group's perceptions. Three hypotheses were constructed to study specific aspects of the perceptions of C.M.S. Preschool teachers and administrators.

Hypothesis #1 stated that there would be a difference between C.M.S. Preschool teachers' and school based administrators' perceptions of critical issues and the numerical rankings assigned to those issues. This hypothesis was supported. There were only two issues out of ten that both groups assigned the same priority. There was a difference in the two group's perceptions of the importance of curriculum, transportation, inservice training, funding, screening, staffing, parent involvement and assistant training. It appears that teachers have a micro per-

perspective. They are focused on individual classroom concerns such as curriculum and staffing. Administrators did not rate the need for additional resource staff as high as teachers did. The findings suggest that administrators may have a macro perspective of evaluating prioritized needs for the program. Instead of only focusing on individual classroom needs administrators considered all program components. The way administrators ranked the ten issues supported this assertion.

The findings of this study could have implications for other educational programs. Administrators must oversee all aspects of programs whereas teachers are responsible for those aspects that affect their own classrooms. This difference in job responsibilities applies to sports programs and special curricular activities as well as the Chapter I Preschool Program. This study has shown in quantitative terms that there was a difference in teachers' and school-based administrators' rankings of critical issues in the C.M.S. Chapter I Preschool Program.

Hypothesis #2 stated that length of time in the progam would be related to the level of value assigned. There was a weak association between the variables of years of service and level of value assigned and this did not support the expected relationship. Regardless of the number of years of service the majority of respondents in each category assigned the highest value to the program. It appeared that years of service did not indicate a higher assigned value. Therefore hypothesis #2 was rejected.

Hypothesis #3 stated that teachers would rate the program value higher than administrators. This hypothesis was supported. Of the teachers that responded, the overwhelming majority rated the program at the highest value. A majority of administrators also rated the program at the highest value. However, a greater number of administrators (forty-seven percent) assigned lower ratings than teachers did (thirteen percent). In conclusion, differences in perceptions of program value may be due to differences in professional roles. Perhaps the differences in job responsibilities is reflected in the level of value assigned. These findings have implications for the Chapter I Preschool Program. The implications need to be explored.

In planning for the 1992-1993 school year teachers and administrators could engage in a dialogue to determine critical needs. This could be done in a forum situation. This study has shown that the two groups' perceptions differ. Since both groups are providing what researchers hail as a valuable service, their perceptions and opinions are critical for effective planning. This study supports the suggestion to broaden the focus of evaluation from the client, the preschool children, to the service providers, teachers and administrators. In doing so teachers and administrators may be able to refine and perfect the delivery of their service. The results of this study may have implications outside of early childhood education.

The findings of this educational study may have transferability to other public agencies. The concept of focusing on service providers could be applied to social services and criminal justice. Consider the public agency providing social services. For evaluation of current programs, opinions of social workers and human services administrators could be considered. The two groups of professionals have different job responsibilities and perhaps their perceptions of actual needs differ. Evaluation of existing programs or planning for future needs might include consideration of an internal component -- perceptions of the service providers.

Consider the public service of law enforcement. Cultural or societal conditions, such as drug abuse and family violence, have an impact on the law enforcement community. A large part of law enforcement is corrective in nature. Whether the effort is corrective or interventive, a variety of professionals are involved. Police officers and criminal justice administrators have a vested interest in evaluating current policies and procedures. Both groups are also interested in planning for future needs and programs. The difference in professional roles may indicate a difference in perceptions of prioritized critical needs. For comprehensive evaluation, an internal component-the perceptions of personnel--could be considered.

In conclusion, the directed studies project has been a worthwhile endeavor. The findings have revealed important information. The information will be shared with teachers, school-based administrators and Chapter I Administrators. Hopefully the recommendations will be considered in planning during the next school year.

REFERENCES

Bereiter, Carl and Siegfried Engelmann. 1966. *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in The Preschool.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Blalock, Hubert. 1971. *Social Statistics.* New York: McGraw Hill

Bower, Bruce. 1985. "Promising Effects of Intensive Preschool for Disadvantaged Children." *Science News*, July.

Bredekamp, Sue. 1988. "Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children From Birth Through Age 8." In expanded edition of North Carolina Association for Education of Young Children, Position Statements, ed. Sue Bredekamp. Washington, D.C.

Butler, Owen. 1988. "Corporate Culture of Education Changing under Public Pressure." *Financier*, July.

Carl Cannon, "A Call for Day Care, Is 1989 The Year of the Child?" *Charlotte Observer*, Sunday, February 26, 1989, Sec. 1A.

Carver, Beverly. 1980. "NGT Modified Delphi Technique: Convergence Patterns in Educational Goal Development." Ph.D. dissertation Arizona State University.

Conran, PC. and Chase, A. 1983. "Staff Development for Success." *Illinois School Research and Development*, 19:3:24-9.

Dillion, E.A. 1978. "A School Board Member's Guide to Staff Development." Report for National School Board Members Association. Washington.

Dillman, D. A. 1978. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method.* New York: John Wiley.

Dooley, David. 1984. Social Research Methods. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Downs, Anthony. 1967. *Inside Bureaucracy.* Boston, Mass: Little, Brown and Company.

Elkind, David. 1988. "Educating the Very Young, A Call for Clear Thinking." *NEA Today* 6:22-27.

Elkind, David. 1986. "Formal Education and Early Childhood Education: An Essential Difference." *Phi Delta Kappan* 67:631-6.

Ellis, Gary, Kristen Smith and William G. Kummer. 1985. "A Delphi Approach to Curriculum Planning." *Parks and Recreation*, September.

Faherty, James G.. 1974. "A Value Assessment of the Long Term Future by Selected Groups in a School District Using the Focus Delphi Technique." Ph.D. dissertation Fordham University.

Futrell, Mary Hatwood. 1987. "Public Schools and Four Year Olds: A Teacher's View." *American Psychologist* 42:251-3.

Ellen Graham, "Retooling the Schools," *Wall Street Journal*, Friday, March 31, 1989, Sec. R1.

Hutchins, Nancy Gigoux. 1977. "Consensus Formation on Preschool Objective Using a Modified Delphi Technique." Ph.D. dissertation University of Washington.

Jorde-Bloom, Paula. 1987. "Closing the Gap: An Analysis of Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of Organizational Climate in The Early Childhood Setting." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington.

Kagan, Sharon. 1989. "Early Care and Education: Tackling the Tough Issues." *Phi Delta Kappan* 10:433-39.

Kagan, Sharon. 1986. "Four Year Olds in the Public Schools." *Education Digest* 51:44-47.

Leibowitz, Arleen and Linda J. Waite; Witsberger, Christina. 1988. "Child Care for Preschoolers: Differences by Child's Age." *Demography* 25:205-20.

Locke, Lawrence, Waneen Wyrick Spirduso and Stephen J. Silverman. 1987. "Proposals that Work A Guide for Planning Dissertations and Grant Proposals." 4th Ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Munroe, Judson. 1980. *Effective Research and Report Writing.* N.Y.: McGraw-Hill.

Page, Jane A.; Page, Fred M. Jr. 1986. "Increased Emphasis on Testing and Test Preparatory Activities in the Early Grades."

Perry, Nancy. 1988. "Saving the Schools; How Business can Help." *Fortune*, November.

Plunkett, Virginia R.L. 1985. "From Title I to Chapter I: The Evolution of Compensatory Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 66:533-37.

Purcell, Larry O.. 1987. "Principals Role in Staff Development." Report for Georgia Department of Education, Division of Teacher Education and Staff Development.

"Reach Each Child, A Focus on Thursday's Child." 1989. *E.S.S.I.A. Chapter I Handbook*, Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools. Charlotte, North Carolina.

Reece, Carolyn. 1985. "Head Start at 20." *Children Today* 14:6-10.

Ruopp, Richard and others. 1979. "Children at the Center: Summary Findings and Their Implications." Final Report of the National Day Study. Volume I. Cambridge, Mass.

Schweinhart, Lawrence J., and David P. Weikart. 1985. "Evidence That Good Early Childhood Programs Work." *Phi Delta Kappan* 66:545-50.

Skutsch, Margaret and Hall, Diana. 1973. "Delphi: Potential Uses in Educational Planning." Northwestern University. Report Funded by U.S. Office of Education ESEA Title III, Section 306. Project 71-7619

Strother, Deborah, Burnett. 1987. "Preschool Children in The Public School: Good Investment or Bad?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 69:304-8.

Weikart, David. 1989. "Quality Preschool Programs: A Long Term Social Investment." Research paper for Project on Social Welfare and The American Future. Ford Foundation. New York, N.Y.

Weikart, Schweinhart and Larner. 1986. "Consequences of Three Preschool Curriculum Models through Age 15." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 1:15-45.

Welch, Susan and John C. Comer. 1983. *Quantitative Methods for Public Administration.* Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press.

Young, Jean. 1988. "Teacher Participation in Curriculum Development: What Status Does it Have?" *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3:109-21.

Zigler, Edward F. 1987. "Formal Schooling for Four Year Olds? No." *American Psychologist* 42:254-260.

NOTES

Nesbit, James, Former Preschool Coordinator, C.M.S. 1990. Interview by Author, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Sims, Judith, Current Preschool Coordinator, C.M.S. 1990. Interview by Author, Charlotte, North Carolina.

APPENDIX I

April 23, 1990

Dear Colleague,

In addition to being a faculty member of Beverly Woods School, I am a graduate student at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. I have finished my coursework and comprehensive exams in the Master of Public Administration Program. As a final requirement, I must complete a directed studies project. My goal is to research a particular areas of the Preschool Program.

Over the next few weeks, you will be asked to complete two questionnaires. The information you provide is a significant part of my research for the directed studies project.

I plan to complete my research in May. I look forward to sharing my findings with you.

I appreciate your cooperation and support of this professional endeavor.

Sincerely,

Mary Allison

APPENDIX II

May 19, 1990

Dear Colleague,

First of all I would like to thank you for the tremendous response to the first questionnaire! I am aware this is a hectic time of year. Please know how grateful I am for your support. If you have not returned Questionnaire I, please do so at your earliest convenience.

Of the responses I received, several issues were cited frequently. Apparently many of you have the same concerns.

It is my intent to analyze your responses and provide this information to the Chapter I office. Chapter I has a genuine interest in your opinion of what is necessary for continued success. Remember your responses are confidential.

Please take a few moments to read and complete Questionnaire Form II. If you have questions, do not hesitate to call me.

Best wishes for a wonderful summer.

Sincerely,

Mary Allison

Enclosure

APPENDIX III

Please complete this form and return it in the envelope marked participant consent. Please mail it no later than May 6, 1990. Thank you.

Participant Consent Form

I, _____, on _____, _____
(name) (date)

do agree to participate in the following research study. I understand that all information I provide will be anonymous. I am aware that the purpose of this research is to identify critical issues in the Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools Preschool Program. I believe it is the author's intent to publish the findings of this research.

APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FORM I

Please complete the questionnaire. Return in the envelope marked Questionnaire Form I by May 6, 1990.

I. IDENTIFICATION OF ROLE OF PARTICIPANT (Please check one):

___ Teacher

___ Administrator

II. INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANT

A) Sex: ___ Male

___ Female

B) Length of time in C.M.S. Preschool Program: _____

C) Highest level of education completed (Please check one):

___ Bachelor's

___ Master's

___ Doctorate

III. In my research, I am attempting to identify the issues that are important to the Preschool Program. Please list five issues that you think are important. They do not have to be in any particular order.

IV. LIST

Please list up to five issues that affect The Charlotte Mecklenburg Chapter I Preschool Program.	In a few words, but as specifically as possible, explain the aspect(s) of each issue that are critical to the program.

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or need further information please feel free to contact me at 529-5029 between 4 and 6 p.m.

APPENDIX V

QUESTIONNAIRE FORM II

PLEASE RETURN IN ENVELOPE MARKED **QUESTIONNAIRE FORM II** BY JUNE 1ST.

I. *IDENTIFICATION OF ROLE OF PARTICIPANT*

☐ Teacher ☐ Administrator

II. *INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANT*

A.) Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

B.) Length of time in CMS Preschool Program _____

C.) Highest level of education completed:

☐ Bachelor's ☐ Master's ☐ Doctorate

III. *RATING THE VALUE OF THE PROGRAM*

Please rank the overall value of the Preschool Program, 1 being extremely valuable, 5 being not valuable at all.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

OVER —>

APPENDIX VI

IV. ***RATING THE CRITICAL ISSUES***

Please read over the issues. Although you may not see all the issues you mentioned in Questionnaire I, the ones listed here appeared most frequently. Please rank order the issues from 1 - 10, 1 being most important, 10 being least important. I want you to know how much I appreciate your opinions. Thank you!

Funding (more monies needed to expand the program and provide additional field trips) _____

Transportation (use of smaller buses, possibly vans, shorter routes) _____

Parent Involvement (greater participation needed) _____

InService (need for concrete topics with classroom applications) _____

Expanding the Program (to serve a greater # of children) _____

Screening (a new instrument to identify eligible children) _____

Training for Assistants (to address preschool concerns) _____

Length of Instructional Day (need to increase hours) _____

Curriculum (need to provide developmentally appropriate experiences) _____

Staffing (need clerks for paperwork and resource staff) _____

Your information is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or need further information, please feel free to contact me at 529-5029 between 4 and 6 p.m.

APPENDIX VII

Issue	Explanation of Issue	Frequency (# of times cited)
1. Screening	(need new instrument)	(11)
2. Screening	(need to screen more children)	(4)
3. Transportation	(rides too long)	(8)
4. Transportation	(costs too high)	(6)
5. Transportation	(need vans)	(4)
6. Transportation	(need to be in compliance with the law)	(1)
7. Transportation	(need to provide it to more children)	(1)
8. Funding	(more money for field trips)	(2)
9. Funding	(need more money for resources)	(3)
10. Staffing	(need additional resource staff)	(8)
11 Staffing	(need clerks for paperwork)	(4)
12. Expand Program	(make available for more children)	(5)
13. Hours of Operation	(increase to include day care)	(7)
14. Hours of Operation	(increase to lengthen instructional day)	(6)
15. Hours of Operation	(do not increase current hours)	(1)
16. Curriculum	(needs to be developmentally appropriate)	(7)
17. Methods	(need to be well defined)	(1)
18. Discipline	(appropriate techniques)	(2)
19. Inservice	(need to provide teachers with concrete topics)	(5)
20. Inservice	(needed for asst. training)	(5)
21. Meetings	(too much expected, boring)	(3)
22. Paperwork	(too much to do)	(4)
23. Facilities	(need to be in compliance with daycare regulations)	(1)
24. Supplies	(need supplies and materials for hands on experience)	(1)
25. Career Development	(needs to be adapted for Preschool level)	(1)
26. L.A.P.D.	(concern over this being best tool)	(4)
27. P.E.P.	(not sufficient)	(3)
28. Sites	(need to have more total preschool sites)	(3)
29. Location of Classes	(should not be chosen on basis of space available)	(4)
30. Stability of Classes	(preschool classes always 1st to be moved)	(3)
31. Evaluation of Teachers	(need new instrument)	(1)
32. School Support	(principals not always informed)	(1)
33. School Support	(need more from site administrators)	(3)
34. Acknowledgment	(preschool program not recognized as important)	(1)
35. Parent Involvement	(need more and greater amt. of parent training)	(8)
36. Transition to Kindergarten	(needs to be smoother, communicate with kindergarten teachers)	(3)
37. Class Size	(should be less than 16)	(3)
38. Community Resources	(need more available to program)	(1)
39. Chapter I Administration	(need to communicate effectively with teachers)	(1)
40. Summer Program	(to insure retention of learning)	(1)
41. Sites in Each School	(Preschool Classes)	(1)