

**Pilot Test of a Quality Rating and Improvement System  
in Early Education Programs  
in Magadan Oblast, RU and in Minnesota, USA**

Elizabeth J. Sandell, PhD, Professor  
College of Education, Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN

Vera G. Kashin, MA, Graduate  
College of Education, Minnesota State University, Mankato, MN  
North-eastern State University, Magadan, RU

13 December, 2021

For the 2021 Children of the North conference,  
Petrozavodsk State University, Karelia, Russian Federation

## ABSTRACT

Quality in early childhood education matters. Scholarly research has demonstrated the critical importance of the first three years of a child's life. The experiences and interactions children have in these early years significantly affects brain development and helps to establish the foundation for future learning. The topic of this study was to pilot test a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) in early education programs in Magadan, Russian Federation (RU) and in Mankato, Minnesota, United States of America (USA). The purpose of this study was to understand the use of a specific instrument to provide direction for the improvement of the quality of the learning environments in early childhood classrooms in two countries.

Investigators hypothesized that the selected QRIS will be reliable for reviewers of programs in the two countries. This project examined two questions: 1. Is the Global Guidelines Assessment (GGA) useful to compare early childhood education in Magadan, RU and early childhood education programs in Mankato, Minnesota, USA? 2. What is the level of agreement among reviewers in the US and in Russia, using scores on the GGA for one early childhood education program in Magadan, RU and for one early childhood education program in Mankato, Minnesota, USA? The study included translation of the Global Guidelines Assessment (GGA) into Russian. One quality review (with multiple reviewers) was completed for one early education program in each country. Completed reviews by eleven reviewers were delivered to Minnesota State University, Mankato for data entry and analysis. The report includes: (1) descriptive data for reviewers and for early education programs and (2) inter-rater agreement (consistency among assessors). This study concluded that there was excellent inter-rater agreement among reviewers in Russia and in the US. As a result of this investigation, this study concluded that the Global Guidelines Assessment will be useful for comparing early childhood education programs in Magadan, Russian Federation and in Minnesota, USA because the GGA is easy, affordable, and reliable to use for quality improvement of early education throughout the world. Now the GGA may be used in Russia as well.

**Key words:** early childhood education; quality rating and improvement scales; United States; Russian Federation.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Quality in early childhood education matters. Scholarly research has demonstrated the critical importance of the first three years of a child's life. The experiences and interactions children have in these early years significantly affects brain development and helps to establish the foundation for future learning. The topic of this study was to pilot test a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) in early education programs in Magadan, Russian Federation (RU) and in Mankato, Minnesota, United States of America (USA).

The purpose of this study was to understand the use of a specific instrument to provide direction for the improvement of the quality of the learning environments in early childhood classrooms in two countries. Investigators hypothesized that the selected QRIS will be reliable for reviewers of programs in the two countries. This project examined two questions: 1. Is the Global Guidelines Assessment (GGA) useful to compare early childhood education in Magadan, RU and early childhood education programs in Mankato, Minnesota, USA? 2. What is the level of agreement among reviewers in the US and in Russia, using scores on the GGA for one early childhood education program in Magadan, RU and for one early childhood education program in Mankato, Minnesota, USA? The study included translation of the Global Guidelines Assessment (GGA) into Russian.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Scholars generally agree there are at least five elements of quality for early education programs: providers and caregivers, organization and administration, curriculum and instruction, environments, and parent and community involvement. Several studies have shown that early education quality influences children's social, emotional and neurological development and competence (Buysse et al., 2001; Fontaine, Torre, Grafwallner, & Underhill, 2006; Kontos et al., 2002; Pianta et al., 2005). Other researchers have shown that quality has an impact on children's school readiness and learning skills (Ceglowski, 2004; Fontaine et al., 2006; Pianta et al., 2005; Raver et al., 2008). Several investigators have shown connections between quality and children's language proficiency, vocabulary, and math skills (Belsky et al., 2007; Fontaine et al., 2006; Kontos et al., 2002; Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2001; Pianta et al., 2005; Raver et al., 2008).

Those elements of quality, in turn, influence the development of young children by enhancing: social and emotional development, cognitive competence, language skills, physical well-being, and school readiness (Mashburn et al., 2008; Pianta et al., 2005).

Jalongo et al. (2004) focused on the consequences of high-quality programs in early education. They concluded that high quality programs are an “immediate necessity” for very young children. The authors found that quality programs in Africa, Europe, India, and the United States all: (1) had strong, foundational philosophies and goals, (2) developed high-quality physical environments, (3) had curriculum and pedagogy appropriate to child development, (4) met children’s basic needs, (5) included families and community, (6) provided trained and professional teachers, and (7) conducted program evaluation.

High quality programs contribute to outcomes related to children’s learning, cognitive and social competence, and language development. Moreover, high-quality programming fosters readiness for learning and for school (Pianta, Howes, Burchinal, Bryant, Clifford, & Early, 2005).

### ***Quality Rating and Assessment Tools***

Among early childhood advocates, there has been no single definition of high quality and no single measurement tool to determine quality in early childhood education. There are several instruments that are valuable in assessing the quality of programs. A review of literature resulted in the conclusion that there were five quality rating and improvement system instruments that were most commonly available and used in early childhood education in North America. Each instrument was examined in order to compare: money and time required for the assessment, reliability and validity studies, number of items on the instrument, the review process, and availability in languages other than English

***National Accreditation.*** Accreditation by a national (or international) organization is a voluntary process by which early education programs can improve and demonstrate their level of quality to families and communities. Programs need to complete an extensive self-study and participate in an external validation process established by the national organization. Some common standards include learning environment, teacher/child interactions, staff qualifications, professional development, and family involvement (NAEYC, 2021; NAFCC, 2021).

***Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS).*** This measurement assesses teacher/child interaction that have an impact on child development. The scores provide evidence of quality in

several domains: quality of relationships, routines, physical environment, and use of language (Pianta & Downer, 2006).

**Early Childhood Environment Rating Scales (ECERS).** The ECERS and related materials are standardized instruments intended to measure quality in the early education classroom. This measurement rates programs on seven subscales: space and furnishings, personal care routines, classroom activities and interactions, and family engagement (Harms, Clifford, & Cryer, 2003).

**Global Guidelines Assessment (GGA).** This is a quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) for use by early childhood education programs throughout the world. The GGA is designed to assess, improve, and communicate the level of quality on multiple elements, such as family engagement, program management, classroom environments, etc. (Association for Childhood Education International, 1999). The current GGA contains 88 items across five early childhood care and education program areas: (a) Environment and Physical Space; (b) Curriculum Content and Pedagogy; (c) Early Childhood Educators and Caregivers; (d) Partnerships with Families and Communities; and (e) Young Children with Special Needs. The GGA was developed to assist policy makers, administrators, teachers, and child care providers in making decisions about improving and developing inclusive early childhood care and education services in various regions of the world (Worhan, 2003).

Table 1. Comparison of Quality Rating and Improvement Scales

Instrument	\$ and time	R	# Items	Process of Review	Languages Available
NAEYC accreditation	*	X	400	Self-study + external review	English & Spanish
NAFCC accreditation	**	X	289	Self-study + external review	English & Spanish
CLASS self-study	***	X	30	Self-study + external review	English & Spanish
ECERS self-study	****	X	43	Self-study	13 languages
GGA-ACEI self-study	*****	X	88	Self-study	10 languages

One star indicates less useful QRIS (due to high cost and lots of time). Five stars indicates a very useful QRIS (due to low cost and less amounts of time).

## METHODOLOGY

### *Settings*

The specific locations for this research (Russia and the USA) were selected because of a pedagogical partnership between North-Eastern State University in Magadan and Minnesota State University, Mankato. This pedagogical partnership includes joint curriculum development for initial teacher licensure programs. Faculty members in both universities would like to understand early childhood education programs in the other regions so that they can develop sensible joint curriculum.

Table 2. Country Population Statistics

	Russian Federation	Magadan Oblast	United States	Mankato, Minnesota
Population	140,702,100	107,500	283,000,000	42,500
Children Age 0-14	21,611,000	14,700	60,420,000	7,200
Early childhood education enrollment	7,811,000	8,200	7,200,000	4,400

Magadan Oblast, Russian Federation is in the area known as Russia's Far East. This area is 11 time zones east of Moscow, the capital of the Russian Federation. Magadan, the principle city and the location for the Russian program under review, has a population of approximately 107,500. Minnesota, United States is in the area known as the Midwest. This area is one time zone west of Washington, DC, the capital of the United States. The main city of interest for this study is Mankato, with a population of approximately 42,500.

The programs that were selected had similar formats for children aged three and four years old. Each program was licensed by the appropriate governmental agency. Each program had a partnership with the nearby university to prepare teachers for early childhood education.

#### Golden Key Kindergarten

- ◆ Government-sponsored
- ◆ Serves urban area

- ◆ Diverse SES
- ◆ Family tuition
- ◆ 189 children enrolled
- ◆ Children meet in multi-age groups
- ◆ Program available for 12 months
- ◆ Serves children from 1 – 7 years

Golden Heart Child Care Center

- ◆ Business-sponsored
- ◆ Serves 2 counties
- ◆ Average SES
- ◆ Family tuition & business funds
- ◆ 116 children enrolled
- ◆ Children meet in single-age groups
- ◆ Program available 12 months
- ◆ Serves children from 6 weeks – 6 years

*Sample (Reviewers)*

In each country, there were internal and external reviewers. The internal reviewers included administrators and teachers who were staff members at the specific early childhood education programs that were in the sample. The external reviewers included university faculty members and students who were part of nearby university early childhood education teacher preparation programs.

Table 3. Research Sample Characteristics

Positions of Reviewers	RU Golden Key	US Golden Heart	Total
Directors/Assistants	1	1	2
Teachers	2	1	3
University Faculty	0	1	1
University Students	2	2	4
Other (curriculum)	1	0	1

Total	6	5	11
-------	---	---	----

Table 4. Characteristics of Reviewers

Characteristic	Specific	RU Golden Key	US Golden Heart
Gender	Female	6	4
	Male	0	1
Education	Secondary	0	0
	Some College	2	2
	Bachelor's Degree	3	2
	Master's Degree	1	1

### ***Measurement Instrument***

Based on the literature review, this study selected the Global Guidelines Assessment as the QRIS. The rationale included:

1. The GGA is available free from ACEI.
2. The GGA has been researched for reliability and validity.
3. The GGA is not very long. It includes 88 items organized into five sections.
4. The GGA is designed as a self-study process for program staff and administrators. It does take much time to complete the review.
5. The GGA is designed for use in many cultural settings and for implementation throughout the world.

Table 5. Organization of Global Guidelines Assessment – ACEI

Assessment areas		# sub-categories	# of items	Possible score
Area 1	Environment	2	19	95
Area 2	Curriculum Content	6	17	85
Area 3	Educators & Caregivers	3	13	65



Area 4	Families & Communities	8	24	120
Area 5	Special Needs	4	15	75
		23	88	440

Figure 1.

**ACEI GLOBAL GUIDELINES ASSESSMENT (GGA)**  
 ADAPTED FROM THE  
 GLOBAL GUIDELINES FOR THE EDUCATION AND CARE OF YOUNG CHILDREN IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

**AREA 1: ENVIRONMENT AND PHYSICAL SPACE**  
 The young child's learning environment must be physically and psychologically safe. Physical safety includes the need to protect the child from health hazards that prohibit the child's ability to learn and develop. The need to address the child's psychological safety implies that the overall environment should instill a sense of belonging and well-being for all children. The physical space should be organized to provide a variety of learning experiences for all children of different races, gender, ethnicity, or special needs. Resources within the environment should reflect the cultural experiences and traditions of the children and families using the program. Overall, the safe environment should empower the child by providing opportunities for exploration, play, and practicing life skills.

**Subcategory: Environment and Physical Space**

1. The environment and physical space are free from hazards, including unsafe equipment, pollution, and violence.

Classroom Examples \_\_\_\_\_

excellent  
 good  
 adequate  
 inadequate  
 not available

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

2. The environment provides basic sanitation, safe and nutritious food, potable water, and adequate ventilation.

Classroom Examples \_\_\_\_\_

excellent  
 good  
 adequate  
 inadequate  
 not available

Comments \_\_\_\_\_

Figure 2.

**АСЕИ Оценка деятельности образовательного учреждения на основе «Глобального Руководства» (ОГР)**  
 Документ разработан на основе «Глобального руководства по образованию и заботе о детях в 21-ом веке».

**Сфера 1. Окружающая среда и физическое пространство.**

Для детей обучающая среда должна быть физически и психологически безопасной. Физическая безопасность включает в себя защиту ребенка от различных угроз для его здоровья, которые могут помешать его обучению и развитию. Психологическая безопасность включает в себя создание благоприятной окружающей среды для развития у ребенка чувства принадлежности и благоприятного пребывания в группе.

В процессе обучения физическое пространство должно предоставлять возможности для различных видов деятельности детей различных рас, этнического происхождения, пола, детей с особыми нуждами. Ресурсы окружающей среды должны отображать культурный опыт, традиции детей и их семей на основе используемой в учреждении программ воспитания и обучения. В целом, безопасная окружающая среда должна предоставлять детям возможности для новых открытий, проведения исследований, игр, позволять детям практиковать их жизненные знания, умения и навыки.

**Окружающая среда и физическое пространство**

1. Окружающая среда и физическое пространство исключают опасность, неисправность оборудования, загрязнение окружающей среды и жестокое обращение по отношению к детям.  
 Пример из жизни класса \_\_\_\_\_

Отлично  
 Хорошо  
 Адекватно  
 Минимально  
 Неизвестно

Комментарии \_\_\_\_\_

2. Окружающая среда соответствует необходимым санитарным требованиям, гарантирует здоровую и полезную пищу.

Отлично  
 Хорошо  
 Адекватно  
 Минимально  
 Неизвестно

Комментарии \_\_\_\_\_

## Data Collection

After translating the GGA materials into the Russian language, cooperating reviewers in Magadan and in the US collected data about the two early childhood education programs. The

researchers followed ACEI's recommendations for standard instructions and conditions under which the study occurred. This process recorded general comments, instructions for making ratings, for writing examples, and for making comments. The GGA procedures noted, "It is very important that you write in examples and comments that support your ratings. We need this evidence to help us find out if the content areas in the assessment tool are really measuring the content areas correctly."

There were at least five reviews completed for each program: one by the Research Site Coordinator, one by the program administrator, one by a teacher in the program, and two undergraduate students.

### ***Data Analysis***

Numerical data, consisting of the rating scale results, were assigned numeric values of 0 (not available), 1 (inadequate), 2 (minimum), 3 (adequate), 4 (good), and 5 (excellent). Once all data were entered into the database, two individuals verified the results for each item against the original protocol, and all errors were reconciled and corrected. Statistical analyses were generated in SPSS 14.0 for each component of the study.

The ratings of reviewers in each country were examined for the degree of consistency among their observations. Inter-rater agreement (using Cronbach's alpha) was examined to understand the extent to which different reviewers found similar results when independently assessing the program under review.

The data analysis used the intraclass correlation coefficient to examine the interrater reliability for each program area and for the total GGA.

## **RESULTS**

- ◆ What QRIS will be useful for learning about early childhood education programs in Russia and early childhood education programs in USA?
- ◆ What is the agreement among quality reviewers in Russia and in the USA, using scores on the selected QRIS?

The response to the first research question was dependent on the literature review and the reliability analysis to respond to the second research question.

Based on the literature review, the GGA should be most useful for learning about the quality of early childhood education programs in Russia and in the USA. There were several reasons for this:

1. The GGA is available free from ACEI.
2. The GGA has been researched for reliability and validity.
3. The GGA is not very long. It includes 88 items organized into five sections.
4. The GGA is designed as a self-study process for program staff and administrators. It does take much time to complete the review.
5. The GGA is designed for use in many cultural settings and for implementation throughout the world.

Table xx presents the intraclass correlation coefficients calculated for the reviewer group in Magadan and for the reviewer in the US. Correlation coefficients higher than .70 show that the scores are highly consistent. In this study, very high correlations were found: .995 among the Russian reviewers and .987 among the American reviewers.

Out of a total of 440 possible points, the mean GGA score among the Russian reviewers was 384, compared to a mean of 383.4 for the American reviewers. This investigation was not examining and comparing the mean scores for the programs. However, this result was intriguing to the researcher because it implies that internal and external reviewers reach similar conclusions about excellent early childhood programs, regardless of location.

In this study, very high correlations were found: .995 among the Russian reviewers and .987 among the American reviewers. The study results indicate that the researchers may be 95% confident that the actual intraclass correlation coefficient is somewhere between .983 and .999 in Magadan and .958 and .988 in the US. This suggests that there may be great certainty associated with the results of this study.

Table 6. Individual Reviewers' Area Scores and Total Scores on GGA, with Group Means

Reviewer	Area 1 (95)	Area 2 (85)	Area 3 (65)	Area 4 (120)	Area 5 (75)	Total (440)	Mean
Russian 1	83	59	57	89	62	350	384.0
Russian 2	86	74	64	98	63	385	
Russian 3	95	84	65	116	71	431	
Russian 4	86	72	60	100	63	381	
Russian 5	90	70	61	93	65	379	
Russian 6	91	71	61	89	66	378	

American 1	88	78	63	115	75	419	383.4
American 2	89	79	65	120	75	428	
American 3	91	72	46	90	60	359	
American 4	89	65	60	101	68	383	
American 5	72	66	52	88	50	328	

Table 7. Inter-rater Reliability  
(Cronbach's alpha Intraclass Correlation Coefficient)

Reviewer Group	Cronbach's alpha	95% confidence interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Russia n = 6	.995	.983	.999
USA n = 5	.987	.958	.988

## DISCUSSION

For this study, the investigators used the GGA to review early childhood education programs in Magadan Region, Russian Federation and early childhood education programs in Minnesota, USA. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the intraclass reliability of the instrument under investigation. Based on the results, this study concluded that the GGA will be useful for comparing early childhood education programs in Magadan, Russia and in Mankato, Minnesota, because the GGA is reliable, easy and affordable to use for quality improvement of early education throughout the world.

This study also concluded that there was excellent inter-rater agreement among reviewers in Magadan and in Mankato, Minnesota, using scores on a QRIS for early childhood education programs. The reliability of the GGA and its related document was illustrated by this research study. Now, the GGA and its related documents are available in the Russian language free through ACEI. However, this contribution would not be meaningful unless the GGA could be used reliably. The second contribution of this study is that the GGA may be used reliably by internal and external reviewers in Russia for purposes of improvement of quality of early childhood education programs. This study showed the success of the translation of the GGA and related materials into the Russian language.

## **CONCLUSION**

One quality review (with multiple reviewers) was completed for one early education program in each country. Completed reviews by eleven reviewers were delivered to Minnesota State University, Mankato for data entry and analysis. The report includes: (1) descriptive data for reviewers and for early education programs and (2) inter-rater agreement (consistency among assessors). This study concluded that there was excellent inter-rater agreement among reviewers in Russia and in the US. As a result of this investigation, this study concluded that the Global Guidelines Assessment will be useful for comparing early childhood education programs in Magadan, Russian Federation and in Minnesota, USA because the GGA is easy, affordable, and reliable to use for quality improvement of early education throughout the world. The GGA may be used as a reliable instrument to assess early education programs. Therefore, this study serves as an important foundation for future investigations with Russian-speaking programs.

## REFERENCES

Most of the references in this list were used in the text of the article. Not all, however, so they should be double-checked.

\* Magadan Oblast; Child Trends DataBank

- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2017). KidsCount Data Book. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/>.
- Association for Childhood Education International. (1999). Global Guidelines Assessment: An Early Childhood Care and Education Program Assessment (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: ACEI. Retrieved from <https://ceinternational1892.org/globalguide/>.
- Fontaine, N.S., Torre, L.D., Grafwallner, R. & Underhill, B. (2006). Increasing quality in early care and learning environments. *Early Child Development and Care*, 176(2), 157 – 169 DOI: [10.1080/0300443042000302690](https://doi.org/10.1080/0300443042000302690)
- Harms, T., Clifford, R. M., & Cryer, D. (2003). Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. <https://ers.fpg.unc.edu/scales-early-childhood-environment-rating-scale-third-edition>.
- Harvard University Center on the Developing Child. (2007). InBrief: The Science of Early Childhood Development. <http://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/inbrief-science-of-ecd/>.
- Kashin, V. G. (2009). Pilot Test of a Quality Rating and Improvement System in Early Education Programs in Magadan, Russian Federation and in Minnesota, United States of America [Master's thesis, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/669/>
- Mashburn, A. J., Pianta, R. C., Hamre, B. K., Downer, J. T., Barbarin, O. A., Bryant, D., Burchinal, M., Early, D. M., & Howes, C. (2008). Measures of Classroom Quality in Prekindergarten and Children's Development of Academic, Language, and Social Skills. *Child Development*, 79(3), 732–749. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01154.x>
- NAEYC. (2021) Accreditation. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children. <https://www.naeyc.org/accreditation>.
- NAFCC. (2021). Accreditation. Washington, DC: National Association for Family Child Care. <https://nafcc.org/accreditation/>.
- Pianta, R. C. & Downer, J. (2006). Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. <https://education.virginia.edu/classroom-assessment-scoring-system>.
- Pianta, R.C., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., Bryant, D., Clifford, R., Early, D., & Barbarin, O. (2005). Features of pre-kindergarten programs, classrooms, and teachers: Do they predict observed classroom quality and child-teacher interactions? *Applied Developmental Science*, 9(3), 144–159. [https://doi-org.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/10.1207/s1532480xads0903\\_2](https://doi-org.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/10.1207/s1532480xads0903_2)
- Yoshikawa ..... (2013). Investing in Our Future: The Evidence Base on Preschool Education. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research n Child Development. [http://www.srcd.org/sites/default/files/documents/washington/mb\\_2013\\_10\\_16\\_investing\\_in\\_children.pdf](http://www.srcd.org/sites/default/files/documents/washington/mb_2013_10_16_investing_in_children.pdf).

The references below were copied and pasted from another bibliography. Many of the items below should be added to the article's reference list above.

- Association for Childhood Education International. (1999). Early childhood education and care in the 21st century: Global Guidelines and papers from an international symposium hosted by the World Organization for Early Childhood Education (Organisation Mondiale pour L'education Prescolaire) and the Association for Childhood Education International (Ruschlikon, Switzerland, July 5-8, 1999). ED441606.
- Association for Childhood Education International. (2006). *ACEI constitution*. Olney, MD: Association for Childhood Education International. Retrieved February 16, 2009 from <http://www.acei.org/aceiconstitution.pdf>.
- Bagnato, S. J., Suen, H. K., Brickley, D., Smith-Jones, J., & Dettore, E. (2002). Child developmental impact of Pittsburgh's early childhood initiative (ECI) in high-risk communities: First-phase authentic evaluation research. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 17*(4), 559-580.
- Barbour, A., Boyer, W., Hardin, B., & Wortham, S. (2004). From principle to practice: Using the global guidelines to assess quality education and care. *Childhood Education, 80*(6), 327-331.
- Baum, A. C., & King, M. A. (2006). Creating a climate of self-awareness in early childhood teacher preparation programs. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 33*(4), 217-222.
- Belsky, J., Vandell, D. L., Burchinal, M., Clarke-Stewart, K. A., McCartney, K., & Owen, M. T. (2007). Are there long-term effects of early child care? *Child Development, 78*(2), 681-701.
- Bergen, D. & Yang, R. (2006). *Obtaining Reliability and Validity for the Global Guidelines Assessment*. Presentation at the 2006 Annual Conference and Exhibition of the Association for Childhood Education International, San Antonio, TX.
- Boocock, S. S. (1995). Early childhood programs in other nations: Goals and outcomes. *Future Child, 5*(3), 94-114.
- Bowman, B. (2006). Standards: At the heart of educational equity. *Young Children, 61*(5), 42-48.
- Boyer, W. A. R. (2002). Exploring home schooling. *International Journal of Early Childhood, 34*(2), 19-29.
- Brandes, Brandes, J. A., Ormsbee, C. K., & Haring, K. A. (2007). From early intervention to early childhood programs: Timeline for Early Successful Transitions (TEST). *Intervention in School and Clinic, 42*(4), 204-211.
- Bright futures for exceptional learners: An action agenda to achieve quality conditions for teaching and learning for every exceptional learner. (2000). *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 32*(6), 56-69.
- Bruder, M. B. (2000). Renewing the inclusion agenda: Attending to the right variables. *Journal of Early Intervention, 23*(4), 223-230.
- Buysse, V., Skinner, D., & Grant, S. (2001). Toward a definition of quality inclusion: Perspectives of parents and practitioners. *Journal of Early Intervention, 24*(2), 146-161.
- Ceglowski, D. (2004). How stake holder groups define quality in child care. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 32*(2), 101-111.
- Chan, L. K. S. & Chan, L. (2003). Early childhood education in Hong Kong and its challenges. *Early Child Development and Care, 173*(1), 7-17.

- Cheuk, J. & Hatch, J. A. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of integrated kindergarten programs in Hong Kong. *Early Child Development and Care*, 177(4), 417-432.
- Clark, P. & Stroud, J. (2002). Working together to improve the quality of care and education in early childhood programs. *Early Child Development and Care*, 172(1), 55-63.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A., Lee, Y., Allhusen, V. D., Kim, M. S., & McDowell, D. J. (2006). Observed differences between early childhood programs in the U.S. and Korea: Reflections of "developmentally appropriate practices" in two cultural contexts. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 27(5), 427-443.
- Clements, D. H. (2001). Mathematics in the preschool. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 7(4), 270-275.
- Corso, R. M., Santos, R. M., & Roof, V. (2002). Honoring diversity in early childhood education materials. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 34(3), 30-36.
- Crampton, F. E. (2007). State school finance legislation: A 50-state overview and trend analysis. *Journal of Education Finance*, 32(4), 470-487.
- Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson prentice Hall.
- Curby, T. W., LoCasale-Crouch, J., Konold, T. R., Pianta, R. C., Howes, C., & Burchinal, M. (in press). The relationship of observed pre-k classrooms quality profiles to children's academic achievement and social competence. *Early Education and Development*.
- DeBord, K., Hestenes, L. L., Moore, R. C., Cosco, N., & McGinnis, J. R. (2002). Paying attention to the outdoor environment is as important as preparing the indoor environment. *Young Children*, 57(3), 32-34.
- Early, D. M., Maxwell, K. L., Burchinal, M., Alva, S., Bender, R. H., & Bryant, D. (2007). Teachers' education, classroom quality, and young children's academic skills: Results from seven studies of preschool programs. *Child Development*, 78(2), 558-580.
- Fenech, M., Sumsion, J. & Goodfellow, J. (2008). Regulation and risk: Early childhood education and care services as sites where the "laugh of Foucault" resounds. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(1), 35-48.
- Fitzpatrick, S. (2007). Developing a culture of respecting difference in early childhood centers in Northern Ireland. *Young Children*, 62(6), 14-17.
- Fontaine, N. S., Torre, L. D., Grafwallner, R., & Underhill, B. (2006). Increasing quality in early care and learning environments. *Early Child Development and Care*, 176(2), 157-169.
- Garvis, S., & Austin, L. (2007). The forgotten children in Australian detention centres before 2005. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 32(1), 19-23.
- Geisinger, K. F. (1994). Cross-cultural normative assessment: Translation and adaptation issues influencing the normative interpretation of assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 6(4), 304-312.
- Gellens, S. (2003). Seeking NAEYC accreditation restored our program's quality. *Young Children*, 58(3), 96-102.
- Gresham, G. (2007). A study of mathematics anxiety in pre-service teachers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(2), 181-188.
- Guralnick, M. J. (2000). An agenda for change in early childhood inclusion. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 23(4), 213-222.
- Hamilton, M. E., Roach, M. A., & Riley, D. A. (2003). Moving toward family-centered early care and education: The past, the present, and a glimpse of the future. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 30(4), 225-232.



- Hannon, P. (2000). Rhetoric and research in family literacy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 26(1), 121-138.
- Hardin, B. & Peisner-Feinberg, E. (in review). Examining the Effectiveness of the Spanish Edition of the ACEI Global Guidelines Assessment in Five Latin American Countries. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*.
- Hardin, B. J. & Bergen, D. (2009). Final Report: International Study on the Reliability and Validity of the Global Guidelines Assessment. 2009 Annual Conference and Exhibition, Association for Childhood Education International, March 19, 2009, Chicago, IL.
- Hardin, B. J., Vardell, R., & de Castaneda, A. (2008). More alike than different: Early childhood professional development in Guatemala. *Childhood Education*, 84(3), 128.
- Harms, T., Clifford, R. M., & Cryer, D. (1998). *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Helm, J. H. (2007). Energize your professional development by connecting with a purpose: Building communities of practice. *Young Children*, 62(4), 12-17.
- Henry, G. T., Gordon, C. S., & Rickman, D. K. (2006). Early education policy alternatives: Comparing quality and outcomes of Head Start and state prekindergarten. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 77-99.
- Howes, C., Phillips, D. A., & Whitebook, M. (1993). Thresholds of Quality: Implications for the Social Development of Children in Center-Based Child Care. *Journal of Child Development*, 63(2), 449-461.
- Huntley, J. (2001). The development of a model of process-oriented quality in early childhood services with a preschool component. *Early Child Development and Care*, 171, 47-63.
- Ispa, J. M. (2002). Russian child care goals and values: From Perestroika to 2001. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17(3), 393-413.
- Jalongo, M. R., Fennimore, B. S., Pattnaik, J., Laverick, D. M., Brewster, J., & Mutuku, M. (2004). Blended perspectives: A global vision for high-quality early childhood education. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(3), 143-155.
- Jung, L. A., & Baird, S. M. (2003). Effects of service coordinator variables on individualized family service plans. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 25(3), 206-218.
- Kagan, S. L., Brandon, R. N., Ripple, C. H., Maher, E. J., & Joesch, J. M. (2002). Supporting quality early childhood care and education: Addressing compensation and infrastructure. *Young Children*, 57(3), 58-65.
- Katz, L. (2003). The right of the child to develop and learn in quality environments. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 35(1-2), 13-22.
- Kontos, S., & Diamond, K. (2002). Measuring the quality of early intervention services for infants and toddlers: Problems and prospects. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49(4), 337-351.
- Kontos, S., Burchinal, M., Howes, C., Wisseh, S., & Galinsky, E. (2002). An eco-behavioral approach to examining the contextual effects of early childhood classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17(2), 239-258.
- Lam, M. S. (2000). The gentle art of listening: Skills for developing family-administrator relationships in early childhood. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 27(4), 267-273.
- LaParo, K. M. L., Pianta, R. C., & Stuhlman, M. (2004). The Classroom Assessment Scoring System: Findings from the prekindergarten year. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(5), 409-426.

- Lee, J. & Walsh, D. J. (2004). Quality in early childhood programs: Reflections from program evaluation practices. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(3), 351-373.
- Lee, J., & Walsh, D. (2005). Quality in early childhood programs? underlying values. *Early Education and Development*, 16(4), 449-468.
- Liu, K. (2007). Global perspectives and childhood. *Childhood Education*, 83(5), 308-A.
- LoCasale-Crouch, J., Konold, T., Pianta, R., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., & Bryant, D. (2007). Observed classroom quality profiles in state-funded pre-kindergarten programs and associations with teacher, program, and classroom characteristics. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22(1), 3-17.
- LoCasale-Crouch, J., Konold, T., Pianta, R., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., Bryant, D., Clifford, R., Early, D., & Barbarin, O. (in press). Profiles of observed classroom quality in state-funded pre-kindergarten programs and associations with teacher, program, and classroom characteristics. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*.
- Long, T., Huang, L., Woodbridge, M., Woolverton, M., & Minkel, J. (2003). Integrating assistive technology into an outcome-driven model of service delivery. *Infants and Young Children*, 16(4), 272-283.
- Lubeck, S., & Schaack, D. (2000). "Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives," by Gunilla Dahlberg, Peter Moss, and Alan Pence. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15(1), 139-143.
- Magnuson, K. A., Ruhm, C., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). The persistence of preschool effects: Do subsequent classroom experiences matter? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22(1), 18-38.
- Mashburn, A., Pianta, R., Hamre, B., Downer, J., Barbarin, O., Bryant, D. (2008). Measures of classroom quality in prekindergarten and children's development of academic, language, and social skills. *Child Development*, 79(3), 732-749.
- Mbugua, T. J. (2004). Early childhood care and education in Kenya. *Childhood Education*, 80(4), 191.
- Minnesota Academic Standards Committee. (2008). *Minnesota academic standards K – 12*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education. Retrieved February 16, 2009 from [http://www.education.state.mn.us/MDE/Academic\\_Excellence/Academic\\_Standards/index.html](http://www.education.state.mn.us/MDE/Academic_Excellence/Academic_Standards/index.html).
- Minnesota Department of Education. (2007). *Primary home language counts by county*. Saint Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.
- Minnesota State University, Mankato. (2008). Mission of the College of Education. Mankato, MN: Minnesota State University, Mankato.
- Miranda, M. L. (2000). Developmentally appropriate practice in a Yamaha music school. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48(4), 294-309.
- Mooij, T. (2007). Contextual learning theory: Concrete form and a software prototype to improve early education. *Computers and Education*, 48(1), 100-118.
- Mundia, L. (2007). Early childhood education in Swaziland and Brunei Darussalam: Goals, achievements and challenges. *Early Child Development and Care*, 177(2), 151-158.
- National Association for Family Child Care. (2005). Quality Standards for NAFCC Accreditation. Salt Lake City, UT: National Association for Family Child Care.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2005). NAEYC Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2000). The relation of child care to cognitive and language development. *Child Development*, 71, 960-980.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2002). Early child care and children's development prior to school entry: the NICHD Study of Early Child Care. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39, 133-164.
- Nichols, J. (1998). "Choosing an Intraclass Correlation Coefficient," at <http://www.utexas.edu/cc/faqs/stat/spss/spss4.html>
- Noble, K. (2007). Parent choice of early childhood education and care services. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 32(2), 51-57.
- Peisner-Feinberg, E. S., Burchinal, M. R., Clifford, R. M., Culkin, M.L., Howes, C., Kagan, S. L., & Yazejian, N. (2001). The relation of preschool quality to children's cognitive and social developmental trajectories through second grade. *Child Development*, 72, 1534-1553.
- Pianta, R. C., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., Bryant, D., Clifford, R., & Early, D. M. (2005). Features of pre-kindergarten programs, classrooms, and teachers: Do they predict observed classroom quality and child-teacher interactions? *Applied Developmental Science*, 9(3), 144-159.
- Pianta, R. C., LaParo, K. M., Hamre, B. K. (2008). Classroom Assessment Scoring Systems. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc.
- Pretti-Frontczak, K., & Bricker, D. (2000). Enhancing the quality of individualized education plan (IEP) goals and objectives. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 23(2), 92-105.
- Purcal, C., & Fisher, K. (2006). Affordability funding models for early childhood services. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 31(4), 49-58.
- Raver, C. C., Jones, S. M., Li-Grining, C. P., Metzger, M., Champion, K. M., & Sardin, L. (2008). Improving preschool classroom processes: Preliminary findings from a randomized trial implemented in Head Start Settings. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(1), 10-26.
- Robinson, A. (2002). Financing a system of early childhood education: An NAEYC public policy priority update. *Young Children*, 57(5), 58-59.
- Roth, A. V. (2006). Early childhood curricula in Sweden from the 1850s to the present. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 38(1), 77-98.
- Rous, B., Lobianco, T., Moffett, C. L., & Lund, I. (2005). Building preschool accountability systems: Guidelines resulting from a national study. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 28(1), 50-64.
- Sakai, L. M., Whitebook, M., Wishard, A., & Howes, C. (2003). Evaluating the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS): Assessing differences between the first and revised edition. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18(4), 427-445.
- Sandell, E. J., Hardin, B. J., & Wortham, S. C. (in press). Using the ACEI's Global Guidelines Assessment for improving early education. *Childhood Education*.
- Saracho, O. N., & Spodek, B. (2007). Early childhood teachers' preparation and the quality of program outcomes. *Early Child Development and Care*, 177(1), 71-91.
- Sheridan, S. (2000). A comparison of external and self-evaluations of quality in early childhood education. *Early Child Development and Care*, 164, 63-78.
- Shore, R. (1997). *Rethinking the brain: New insights into early development*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

- Shrout, P.E. & Fleiss, J.L. (1979). Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2) 420-428.
- Smith, J. D., Warren, S. F., Yoder, P. J., & Feurer, I. (2004). Teachers' use of naturalistic communication intervention practices. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 27(1), 1-14.
- Stine, H., Aviles, J., McCreedy, B., Rajesh, A., Sethi, R., & Gupta, V. (2007). An early childhood collaboration project in India. Cross-continent training of trainers: A relationship-based approach. *Young Children*, 62(6), 33-35.
- Stork, S., & Sanders, S. W. (2008). Physical education in early childhood. *Elementary School Journal*, 108(3), 197-206.
- Suthers, L. (2008). Early childhood music education in Australia: A snapshot. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 109(3), 55-64.
- Sylva, K., Siraj-Blatchford, I., Taggart, B., Sammons, P., Melhuish, E., & Elliot, K. (2006). Capturing quality in early childhood through environmental rating scales. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(1), 76-92.
- UNICEF. (2001). *Report of the Berlin conference on children in Europe and central Asia*. Berlin, May 16-18, 2001. Retrieved July 20, 2006 from [http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/abschlussbericht\\_berlin.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/abschlussbericht_berlin.pdf)
- UNICEF. (2002a). *A World fit for children*. Retrieved July 20, 2006 from [http://www.unicef.org/publications/pub\\_wffc\\_en.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/publications/pub_wffc_en.pdf)
- UNICEF. (2002b). *UNICEF's priorities for children 2002-2005*. New York, NY: The United Nations Children's Fund.
- Varol, F. & Farran, D. C. (2006). Early mathematical growth: How to support young children's mathematical development. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(6), 381-387.
- Wachs, T. D., Gurkas, P., & Kontos, S. (2004). Predictors of preschool children's compliance behavior in early childhood classroom settings. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25(4), 439-457.
- Washington State Child Care Resource and Referral. (2008). *Quality rating and improvement system: What does it mean for child care?* Retrieved November 26, 2008, from [http://www.childcarenet.org/providers/tools-for-quality/articles/index\\_html](http://www.childcarenet.org/providers/tools-for-quality/articles/index_html)
- Wasik, B. (2008). When fewer is more: Small groups in early childhood classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(6), 515-521.
- White, J. (2005). Thin blue lines and red crosses: Signposts to quality in family day care? *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 37(2), 94-100.
- World Health Organization. (2004). *The importance of caregiver-child interactions for the survival and healthy development of young children*. Beijing, China: World Health Organization.
- Wortham, S. C. (2000). A report on the progress of the international guidelines for early childhood education and care. *Childhood Education*, 76(4), 224.
- Wortham, S. C. (2001). Global Guidelines for the education and care of young children: The work continues. *Childhood Education*, 78(1), 42-43.
- Wortham, S. C. (2003). First, the Global Guidelines—Now, a self-assessment tool. *Childhood Education*, 79(5), 320.
- Zhu-Jiaxiong, & Zhou-Nianli. (2005). A survey of current Shanghai early childhood education through kindergarten directors' self-assessment. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 13(2), 113-127.

## **Acknowledgements**

- ◆ Elizabeth Sandell PhD, Ronald Browne PhD, Peg Ballard, PhD, and Steven Reuter PhD, Mankato, Minnesota, USA.
- ◆ Olga Victorovna Klypa PhD, Elena Alexandrovna Shkatova PhD, and Svetlana Alexandrovna Yakimshuk PhD, Magadan Oblast, RU.
- ◆ Undergraduate Research Assistants in Russia and the US.
- ◆ College of Education, Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minnesota, USA.
- ◆ College of Graduate Studies and Research and the Center for Excellence in Scholarship and Research, Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minnesota, USA.
- ◆ Global Guidelines Task Force, Childhood Education International, Washington, DC, USA