# CEME Technical Report

**CEMETR-2013-05 DECEMBER 2013** 

## The Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation

Technical Manual (2nd Edition) for the *Teaching Strategies GOLD<sup>TM</sup>* Assessment System

Richard Lambert Do-Hong Kim Diane Burts

RICHARD LAMBERT CHUANG WANG MARK D'AMICO SERIES EDITORS

A PUBLICATION OF THE CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION



# Technical Manual for the *Teaching Strategies GOLD™* Assessment System (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)

Richard G. Lambert
Do-Hong Kim
Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation
UNC Charlotte

Diane C. Burts Louisiana State University

### November 2013

The measurement properties of any new assessment instrument should be rigorously examined and the results made available to stakeholders. The first version of the technical manual for the *Teaching Strategies GOLD™* Assessment System (Lambert, Kim, Taylor, & McGee, 2010) presented initial reporting of reliability and validity evidence based on the information the measure provides to teachers of young children. The manual contained evidence concerning the dimensions measured by the assessment system and their interrelationships. The results outlined the measurement model used to create scale scores for each dimension. The report also contained a variety of strong statistical evidences concerning the fit of the data provided by the assessment system to the measurement model. Strong reliability evidence was presented from both classical and modern indexes of internal consistency, along with the results of a study of inter-rater reliability. Norm tables for each scale score were provided based on three month age bands spanning ages 6 to 71 months.

Four studies were conducted using the two initial national norm samples  $(n_1=10,963; n_2=33,612)$ . These samples were diverse and included children of different backgrounds, races, ethnicities, and special needs who were enrolled in varied educational programs across the United States. Sample sizes varied according to study research

questions. A total of 4,580 teachers who were new *GOLD*® users gathered the data on children in their classrooms. Following is a summary of the four studies.

**Study1** explored the (a) factorial structure of the *GOLD®*, (b) indexes of reliability, and (c) inter-rater reliability. Findings suggested that the *GOLD®* measures six separate domains as intended. Inter-rater reliability between a master trainer and teachers was high. Reliability coefficients for all three checkpoints were also high. Results of longitudinal invariance CFA indicated the constructs were equivalent across time implying that the interpretations of changes in children's development and learning obtained from the measure are valid (Lambert, Kim, & Burts, 2012).

**Study 2** examined the validity of the *GOLD*® for use with English language learners (ELLs) and for children with disabilities. Data from three-, four-, and five -year-olds with complete item responses from the fall, winter, and spring were analyzed according to each child's primary language or disability status. The majority of items in the *GOLD*® displayed little or no Differential Item Functioning (DIF) with the exception of one item, "uses conventional grammar" (Kim, Lambert, & Burts, 2013).

**Study 3** investigated child and classroom composition characteristics associated with teacher ratings and the variability between raters when controlling for these characteristics. Three-level growth curve modeling indicated that teacher ratings were associated in expected directions. Children with disabilities began the year behind their typically developing peers and grew more slowly throughout the year. Girls demonstrated advantages in some areas over boys. ELLs were rated lower at the beginning of the year but exhibited somewhat faster growth rates than native English-speakers. Differences in rater effects (i.e., how teachers used the *GOLD®* to rate the children in their classrooms) ranged

from 16% to 25%, which is considerably lower than reported in some studies (Lambert, Kim, & Burts, 2013).

Study 4 was designed to develop interval level scale scores that could be used to track children's development and learning across the entire age range of the *GOLD®*. The study examined: (a) dimensionality, (b) rating scale effectiveness, (c) hierarchy of item difficulties, and (d) the relationship of scale scores to child age. Results indicated that each subscale measures only one underlying latent construct. The rating structure functioned effectively with the exceptions that ratings at the lowest and highest ends of the scale were somewhat less reliable and in-between ratings were less distinct. Overall, items formed theoretically expected hierarchies such that items which were less difficult for children were rated by teachers as less difficult. Correlations of developmental scale scores with child age were moderate (Kim, Lambert, & Burts, in press).

At the time the initial manual was produced, the assessment system was relatively new and many of the teachers had been using the system for only one year. Since the last report, many more states and programs have adopted the assessment system, much more training has taken place, and more research has been conducted to support the use of the system.

Since *Teaching Strategies GOLD*® was released in the Fall of 2010, the number of teachers using the tool has grown to more than 45,000, with over a million children with portfolios. All teachers have access to training through the online courses, as well as Interrater reliability. In addition to the free training, thousands of teachers are trained each year, using face-to-face training, to ensure their knowledge of how to use the tool. Teaching Strategies GOLD is widely used in all states for Pre-k assessment. Additionally, Teaching

Strategies has 22 state-level agreements for Pre-k assessment and 12 state-level agreements for Kindergarten assessment."

Given the widespread use of the *GOLD®*, greater availability of teacher training, and much more sophisticated and experienced use of the system, the purpose of this manual is to provide an updated set of evidences based on a current nationally representative norm sample that reflects how the *GOLD®* is currently used. To meet this purpose, this manual provides updated reliability and validity evidence based on both classical and Item Response Theory based measurement models. A new set of norm tables is also provided that cover three month age bands for children ages birth through 71 months. For each age band, expected scores for the fall, winter, and spring assessments, age specific standard errors of measurement, and expected growth from fall to spring are provided.

### **Norm Sample**

A total population of 934,073 children had skills rated using the *Teaching Strategies*GOLD™ assessment system for the 2012-2013 academic year. These children received educational services from centers and school-based sites across all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. This total population of children was divided into the following six age or grade strata according to information provided by the teacher: birth to 11 months of age, 12 to 23 months of age, 24 to 35 months of age, 3 year old pre-kindergarten, 4 year old pre-kindergarten, and kindergarten. Within each age strata, the dataset was reduced to a subset of children with rating scale data across the fall, winter, and spring assessment checkpoints, complete age in months data at each checkpoint, and the date of assessment for each checkpoint.

Random samples were then selected from among the qualifying children within each of the six age strata in order to create six samples of 3,000 children, each of which is nationally representative with respect to race and ethnicity. The teachers collected information about the race and ethnicity of each child and entered this information into the online component of the assessment system. The questions they answered about each child were the same as those used by the U.S. Census Bureau. Given that Hispanic identity is an ethnicity, not a racial grouping, and given the importance of representing children of Hispanic ethnicity in the norm sample, the race and ethnicity variables were combined into the following seven ethnic subgroups: 1.) White, not Hispanic, 2.) African-American, not Hispanic, 3.) Native American, not Hispanic, 4.) Asian, not Hispanic, 5.) Hawaiian / Pacific Islander, not Hispanic, 6.) multiracial, not Hispanic, and 7.) Hispanic. The norm sample was created by combining the six samples for a total of 18,000 children. The sampling procedure was conducted to match the U.S. Census Bureau 2009 estimates for children ages birth to 5 years 11 months with respect to the seven ethnic subgroups.

The resulting norm sample contained children from all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The children in the norm sample received preschool services in a variety of settings including Head Start, Early Head Start, private childcare, programs based in school systems, school based sites with Title I funding, state pre-kindergarten programs, programs for military families, university-based programs, early intervention programs, and other programs for children with special needs. As shown in Table 1, the total population of children rated using the *Teaching Strategies GOLD™* assessment system closely approximates the U.S. Census Bureau estimates for the U.S. population of children under the age of 6. White children are represented in numbers very close to the population

estimates (52.1% Census estimates vs. 51.1% norm sample). A similar pattern was found for children with African-American (13.6% Census estimates vs. 14.9% norm sample), Native American (0.9% Census estimates vs. 0.8% norm sample), Asian (4.5% Census estimates vs. 3.6% norm sample), Pacific Islander (0.2% Census estimates vs. 0.1% norm sample), multi-racial (3.2% Census estimates vs. 3.9% norm sample), and Hispanic ethnic background (25.5% Census estimates vs. 25.6% norm sample). Since the ethnic subgroups percentages in the norm sample were close to those in the Census estimates, unweighted data was used for all analyses.

The 18,000 children in the norm sample are 51.4% male and 48.6% female.

Typically developing children comprised 91.0% of the norm sample. Children with an IEP (5.4%) or IFSP (3.6%) comprised the remaining 9.0% of the sample. Children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds who qualify for free or reduced lunch comprised 30.4% of the sample. Children from homes where the primary language spoken is English comprise 79.6% of the sample while the remaining 20.4% is made up of children from Spanish speaking homes (15.4%) and homes where other languages are spoken (5.0%).

### **Rasch Analyses**

Rasch scaling, the one parameter IRT model, was used to create ability estimates for each child on each construct and to examine the measurement properties of the information provided by each item. Data were analyzed using the Rasch Rating Scale Model (RSM; Andrich, 1978), with Winsteps software (Linacre, 2012). A separate Rasch analysis was conducted for each of the six domains of development.

The RSM and Partial Credit Model (PCM; Masters, 1982) are the two most widely used Rasch model for polytomous response data. The RSM, rather than the PCM, was

chosen because the items share the same rating scale structure (i.e., use of the same number of rating scale categories and labels across items). In cases where each item has its own rating scale structure, the PCM would be the appropriate model to apply. The decision was also based on preliminary analysis results showing that the RSM yielded better fit of the data to the model. For example, when applying the PCM, there were less than 10 observations in the highest category labeled Level 9. Too few observations in a category can lead to inaccurate and misleading results.

### **Dimensionality**

Rasch modeling assumes what is called unidimensionality, meaning that the items in question measure one and only one underlying latent construct. The unidimensionality of each scale was evaluated by using Mean Square (MNSQ) item fit statistic and Rasch Principal Components Analysis of Residuals (PCAR). The MNSQ fit values between 0.6 and 1.4 are considered reasonable for rating scale items (Bond & Fox, 2007). For PCAR, a variance of greater than 50% explained by measures is considered good, supporting for scale unidimensionality. If a secondary dimension has an eigenvalue of smaller than 3 and accounts for less than 5% of the unexplained variance, unidimensionality is considered plausible (Linacre, 2012).

Social Emotional Scale (9 items)

The principal components analysis of the residuals (PCA) showed that for the Social Emotional scale, the Rasch dimension explained 84.8% of the variance in the data, with its eigenvalue of 50.2. The first contrast (the largest secondary dimension) had an eigenvalue of 2.3 and accounted only for 3.9% of the unexplained variance. The fit statistics for all of

the Social Emotional items were well within acceptable limits: the infit MNSQ ranged from 0.81 to 1.24; the outfit MNSQ ranged from 0.81 to 1.19.

Physical Scale (5 items)

The PCA showed that for the Physical scale, the Rasch dimension explained 88.3% of the variance in the data, with its eigenvalue of 37.6. The first contrast (the largest secondary dimension) had an eigenvalue of 1.8 and accounted only for 4.1% of the unexplained variance. The fit statistics for all of the Physical items were well within acceptable limits: the infit MNSQ ranged from 0.80 to 1.48; the outfit MNSQ ranged from 0.82 to 1.47.

Language Scale (8 items)

The PCA showed that for the Oral Language scale, the Rasch dimension explained 89.2% of the variance in the data, with its eigenvalue of 66.1. The first contrast (the largest secondary dimension) had an eigenvalue of 2.0 and accounted only for 2.7% of the unexplained variance. The fit statistics for all of the Language items were well within acceptable limits: the infit MNSQ ranged from 0.76 to 1.11; the outfit MNSQ ranged from 0.81 to 1.14.

Cognitive Scale (10 items)

The PCA showed that for the Cognitive scale, the Rasch dimension explained 87.8% of the variance in the data, with its eigenvalue of 71.8. The first contrast (the largest secondary dimension) had an eigenvalue of 2.2 and accounted only for 2.6% of the unexplained variance. The fit statistics for all of the Cognitive items were well within acceptable limits: the infit MNSQ ranged from 0.81 to 1.29; the outfit MNSQ ranged from 0.80 to 1.23.

Literacy Scale (12 items)

The PCA showed that the Rasch dimension explained 80.9% of the variance in the data, with its eigenvalue of 50.9. The first contrast (the largest secondary dimension) had an eigenvalue of 2.0 and accounted for 3.2% of the unexplained variance. All Literacy items except one (item 16a) exhibited good fit to the unidimensional Rasch model: the infit MNSQ ranged from 0.72 to 1.90; the outfit MNSQ ranged from 0.62 to 1.48. Item 16a slightly beyond the 1.4 cutoff (infit MNSQ = 1.90; outfit MNSQ = 1.48).

Mathematics Scale (7 items)

The PCA showed that the Rasch dimension explained 82.8% of the variance in the data, with its eigenvalue of 33.6. The first contrast (the largest secondary dimension) had an eigenvalue of 1.8 and accounted for 4.3% of the unexplained variance. All Mathematics items except one (item 20c) exhibited good fit to the unidimensional Rasch model: the infit MNSQ ranged from 0.67 to 1.72; the outfit MNSQ ranged from 0.66 to 1.52. Item 20c slightly beyond the 1.4 cutoff (infit MNSQ = 1.72; outfit MNSQ = 1.52).

In summary, with very few exceptions, these model fit statistics suggest that the data does in fact fit the Rasch rating scale model very well. These results indicated that the data satisfied the unidimensionality assumption of the Rasch model.

### **Rating Category Effectiveness**

The items are measured on a 10-point scale labeled 0 through 9. The use of rating scale categories was examined, which can provide information about whether teachers utilize the instrument in the manner in which it was intended. It is recommended that each rating category has a minimum of 10 observations. The average of the ability estimates for all persons in the sample who chose that particular response category was examined (Bond & Fox, 2007). Average measure score should advance monotonically with rating scale

category values. Thresholds (also called step calibrations) are the difficulties estimated for choosing one response category over another (Bond & Fox, 2007). Thresholds should also increase monotonically with rating scale category. The magnitudes of the distances between adjacent category thresholds should be large enough so that each step defines a distinct position and each category has a distinct peak in the probability curve graph (Bond & Fox, 2007).

For all six scales, the average measure increased with the category level and the thresholds advanced with the categories. An examination of the Rasch category probability curves indicated that for some of the scales, some of the in-between categories (i.e., categories 1, 3, 5, and 7) were not quite as distinct and seemed somewhat redundant with adjacent categories. It is important to note that compared to initial reporting on rating category effectiveness, the rating category structure appeared to function better. This result may suggest that teachers can more clearly distinguish between an "Indicator" level and an "In-between" level. This may be a result of the expanded teacher training and the expansion of the adoption of the assessment system since the last report.

### **Item Difficulty Measures**

For all six scales, the item location hierarchy appeared to be consistent with the expected developmental trajectory for typically developing children.

Social Emotional Scale

The item pertaining to a child's ability to balance needs and rights of self and others (3a) was found to be the most difficult item, whereas the item pertaining to a child's ability to form relationships with adults (2a) was estimated as the easiest item.

Physical Scale

The item pertaining to a child's ability to use writing tools (7b) was found to be the most difficult item, whereas the item pertaining to a child's ability to walk (4) was estimated as the easiest item. The item pertaining to a child's ability to use their fingers and hands (7a) was also rated as approximately as easy as the item pertaining to walking.

Language Scale

The item pertaining to a child's ability to use an expanding expressive vocabulary (9d) was found to be the most difficult item, whereas the item pertaining to a child's ability to ability to speak clearly (9b) was estimated as the easiest item.

Cognitive Scale

The item pertaining to a child's use of classification skills (13) was found to be the most difficult item, whereas the item pertaining to a child's ability to attend and engage (11a) was estimated as the easiest item.

Literacy Scale

The item pertaining to a child's use of letter-sound knowledge (16b) was found to be the most difficult item, whereas the item pertaining to a child's use and appreciation of books (17a) was estimated as the easiest item.

**Mathematics Scale** 

The item pertaining to a child's ability of connecting numerals with quantities (20c) was found to be the most difficult item, whereas the items pertaining to a child's ability to explore and describe spatial relationships and shapes (21a and 21b) were estimated as the two easiest items.

Taken as a whole the item difficulty statistics indicate that the test developers were very successful in creating measures that offer a developmental pathway of sequential milestones that agree with developmental theory.

### Reliability

Reliability was evaluated using person separation index, item separation index, person reliability, and item reliability provided by Winsteps. The person separation index, an estimate of the adjusted person standard deviation divided by the average measurement error, indicates how well the instrument can discriminate persons on each of the constructs. The item separation index indicates an estimate in standard error units of the spread or separation of items along the measurement constructs. Reliability separation indexes greater than 2 are considered adequate (Bond & Fox, 2007). High person or item reliability means that there is a high probability of replicating the same separation of persons or items across measurements. Specifically, person separation reliability estimates the replicability of person placement across other items measuring the same construct. Similarly, item separation reliability estimates the replicability of item placement along the construct development pathway if the same items were given to another sample with similar ability levels. The person reliability provided by Winsteps is equivalent to the traditional test reliability whereas the item reliability has no traditional equivalent. Low values in person and item reliability may indicate a narrow range of person or item measures. It may also indicate that the number of items or the sample size under study is too small for stable estimates (Linacre, 2009).

### Social Emotional Scale

Based on the Rasch reliability indexes, the scale appear to be highly reliable, as evidenced by person separation indexes of 6.26, person reliabilities of .98, item separation indexes of 89.19, and item reliabilities of 1.00. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .975, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

### Physical Scale

Based on the Rasch reliability indexes, the scale appear to be highly reliable, as evidenced by person separation indexes of 5.50, person reliabilities of .97, item separation indexes of 55.22, and item reliabilities of 1.00. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .97, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

### Language Scale

Based on the Rasch reliability indexes, the scale appears to be highly reliable, as evidenced by person separation indexes of 7.09, person reliabilities of .98, item separation indexes of 80.86, and item reliabilities of 1.00. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .98, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

### **Cognitive Scale**

Based on the Rasch reliability indexes, the scale appear to be highly reliable, as evidenced by person separation indexes of 7.63, person reliabilities of .98, item separation indexes of 65.73, and item reliabilities of 1.00. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .98, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

### Literacy Scale

Based on the Rasch reliability indexes, the scale appear to be highly reliable, as evidenced by person separation indexes of 4.90, person reliabilities of .96, item separation indexes of

69.73, and item reliabilities of 1.00. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .98, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

### **Mathematics Scale**

Based on the Rasch reliability indexes, the scale appear to be highly reliable, as evidenced by person separation indexes of 4.92, person reliabilities of .96, item separation indexes of 44.93, and item reliabilities of 1.00. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .98, indicating high internal consistency reliability.

In addition, we examined the internal consistency reliability across each of the three assessment checkpoints and each of the six age grade strata. As shown in Table 2, the Cronbach's alpha values are very consistent for each of the scale scores across all of these conditions. For the Cognitive scale scores, the values ranged from .910 to .988, all within the acceptable range. A similar pattern emerged for each of the other scale scores: Literacy (.855 - .988), Social Emotional (.904 - .982), Physical (.907 - .974), Language (.889 - .985), and Mathematics (.882 - .985). The relatively lowest values for each scale score, though still well within the acceptable range, were associated with the fall assessments of the youngest children. The highest values for each scale score were associated with the spring assessments of the oldest children. This finding suggests that teachers may become more consistent in the ratings as they get to know children across the academic year and collect more artifacts, evidences, and anecdotes of developmental progress. It may also suggest that teachers can be more consistent when rating older children for whom it is easier to document the relevant evidences to support ratings. However, it is noteworthy that these reliability values indicate acceptable and even in some cases high levels of internal consistency reliability, even associated with ratings of infants.

### Scale Scores and Norm Tables

For the purpose of creating norm tables for the *Teaching Strategies GOLD™* assessment system, the children in the norm sample were divided into three month age bands. A total of 24 age bands were created with the youngest children falling into the 0-2 month category and the oldest children falling into the 69-71 month category. These strata were based on the ages of the children in months at the time of the first assessment. The fall assessment date for most programs took place in October of the academic year. Ratings were based on a portfolio of evidences that the teachers collected up to that date, including anecdotal records and artifacts. The children in the norm sample span the entire age range for which the assessment system is intended (birth through kindergarten).

The body of evidence to date from research studies and the Rasch modeling suggests that scale scores for each of the developmental domains outlined by the test developers would be appropriate. The scale scores were created by first creating interval level Rasch rating scale ability estimates. The ability estimates were then rescaled to conform to a distribution with a mean of 500 and standard deviation of 100. Values three or more standard deviations below the mean were given a value of 200 and values three or more standard deviations above the mean were given a value of 800. This scaling strategy is commonly used in educational and psychological testing.

For each scale score and three month age band, as shown in Tables 3 through 14, the mean, standard deviation, quartile boundaries, and standard error of measurement are reported. These results suggest that teachers are generally giving higher scores to older children and lower scores to younger children, while also discriminating between children of similar ages but differing rates of development as expected. They are also able to track

growth and development across the three assessment checkpoints. As can be seen across all six scale scores and across all 24 age bands, the mean scores for the age bands increase with age at a steady pace, enabling the tracking of developmental progress for children on an interval scale from year to year using the same measure. The quartile boundaries are also included to enable teachers to understand approximately where a child's falls relative to other children in the norm sample.

The norm tables include expected scores for fall, winter, and spring assessments and expected growth from fall to spring and clearly demonstrate that teachers can use the GOLD assessment system to track growth across the academic year for children of different ages. Children in the 0-35 month age bands can be expected to make about 50-60 scale score points of growth across the academic year. Children in the 36-71 month age bands can be expected to make about 70-100 scale score points of growth across the academic year.

It is important to note that information about these updated norm tables include children in the youngest two three month age bands (0-2 and 3-5). There was not sufficient data with acceptable reliability and validity from these subgroups to include in the first edition of this manual. Their inclusion in this manual is evidence that the expanded and ongoing training available to users and the expansion of the adoption of the assessment system has yielded useful data for even the youngest children.

### **Summary**

Overall, the *Teaching Strategies GOLD™* assessment system appears to continue to yield highly reliable scores as indicated by both the classical and Rasch reliability statistics. The high reliability statistics were not only found for the overall norm sample, but extend

to each age cohort: birth to 1, 1 to 2, 2 to 3, three year old preschool, four year old prekindergarten, and kindergarten and across fall, winter, and spring assessments for all scales and age cohorts.

The results show strong statistical evidence that the items within each scale work very well together to measure a single underlying construct or domain of development. The items within each scale yield information that fits the statistical model that was used to develop the scoring strategy that is used to create the scale scores. The results further demonstrate evidence that the ratings can be successfully organized by developmental domain or latent construct generally as intended by the instrument development team.

Analyses of the dimensionality of each scale score strongly suggest that the GOLD™ assessment system ratings measure six distinct domains of development and that each satisfies the Rasch model assumption of unidimensionality. The model fit statistics suggest that the data are a good fit for the Rasch rating scale model. These results also strongly suggest that teachers are able to make valid ratings of the developmental progress of children across the intended age range, from birth through 72 months.

There is also strong statistical evidence that teachers are able to use the rating scale to place children along a continuum of growth and development. When the items within each domain of development are arranged from the easier objectives for children to master to the most difficult objectives for children to master, the hierarchy that is created matches very well with what developmental theory indicates. Therefore, the range of item difficulties indicates that each section of the GOLD assessment can be used by teachers to help them understand the developmental trajectory that most children will follow.

### References

- Andrich, D. (1978). Application of a psychometric model to ordered categories which are scored with successive integers. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, *2*, 581-594.
- Bond, T. G. & Fox, C. M. (2007). *Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in the human sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kim, D-H., Lambert, R. G., & Burts, D. C. (2013). Evidence of the validity of *Teaching*Strategies GOLD® assessment tool for English language learners and children with disabilities. Early Education and Development, 24, 574-595.
- Kim, D-H., Lambert, R. G., & Burts, D. C. (in press). Validating a developmental scale for young children using the Rasch Model: Applicability of the *Teaching Strategies*GOLD®assessment system. Journal of Applied Measurement.
- Lambert, R. & Kim, D-H., Taylor, H., & McGee, J. (2010). *Technical manual for the Teaching Strategies GOLD assessment system.* Technical Report. Charlotte, N.C.: *Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, University of North Carolina Charlotte.
- Lambert, R. G., Kim, D-H., & Burts, D. C. (2012). [The measurement properties of the *Teaching Strategies GOLD®* assessment system]. Unpublished raw data.
- Lambert, R. G., Kim, D-H., & Burts, D. C. (2013). Using teacher ratings to track the growth and development of young children using the *Teaching Strategies GOLD®* assessment system. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*. doi:0734282913485214
- Linacre, J. M. (2012). Winsteps (Version 3.75.1) [Computer Software]. Chicago, IL: Winsteps.com.
- Masters, G. N. (1982). A Rasch model for partial credit scoring. *Psychometrika*, 47, 149-174.

Table 1
Norm Sample by Ethnic Subgroup.

Racial and Ethnic Subgroup	2009 Census Bureau Estimates	Norm Sample
White, not Hispanic	52.1%	51.1%
African American, not Hispanic	13.6%	14.9%
Native American, not Hispanic	0.9%	0.8%
Asian, not Hispanic	4.5%	3.6%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, not Hispanic	0.2%	0.1%
Multirace, not Hispanic	3.2%	3.9%
Hispanic	25.5%	25.6%

Table 2 Cronbach's alpha by scale score, age group, and time of year

Scale	Age Group	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Birth to 1 year	.910	.929	.941
	1 to 2 years	.932	.941	.948
	2 to 3 years	.950	.953	.958
	Pre-kindergraten - 4 year olds	.954	.954	.962
	Pre-kindergraten - 3 year olds	.962	.965	.970
	Kindergarten	.962	.961	.967
	All age groups	.984	.986	.988
Literacy	Birth to 1 year	.855	.874	.911
	1 to 2 years	.889	.918	.934
	2 to 3 years	.923	.933	.940
	Pre-kindergraten - 4 year olds	.954	.957	.962
	Pre-kindergraten - 3 year olds	.936	.942	.953
	Kindergarten	.949	.947	.958
	All age groups	.979	.985	.988
Social Emotional	Birth to 1 year	.904	.920	.931
	1 to 2 years	.917	.923	.934
	2 to 3 years	.929	.932	.938
	Pre-kindergraten - 4 year olds	.947	.947	.956
	Pre-kindergraten - 3 year olds	.939	.937	.943
	Kindergarten	.946	.941	.941
	All age groups	.975	.979	.982
Physical	Birth to 1 year	.907	.916	.923
	1 to 2 years	.911	.913	.916
	2 to 3 years	.910	.912	.920
	Pre-kindergraten - 4 year olds	.916	.916	.922
	Pre-kindergraten - 3 year olds	.903	.897	.906
	Kindergarten	.882	.963	.975
	All age groups	.966	.971	.974
Language	Birth to 1 year	.889	.908	.924
	1 to 2 years	.928	.933	.942
	2 to 3 years	.950	.952	.954
	Pre-kindergraten - 4 year olds	.959	.961	.965
	Pre-kindergraten - 3 year olds	.953	.950	.955
	Kindergarten	.946	.971	.979
	All age groups	.981	.984	.985
Mathematics	Birth to 1 year	.882	.895	.914
	1 to 2 years	.906	.917	.921
	2 to 3 years	.922	.896	.908
	Pre-kindergraten - 4 year olds	.917	.918	.941
	Pre-kindergraten - 3 year olds	.921	.922	.937
	Kindergarten	.937	.940	.948
	All age groups	.975	.981	.985

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} Table 3 \\ Cognitive Scale Score norms by 3 month age band-ages 0-35 months \end{tabular}$ 

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
0-2	1244	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	362.97 39.27 331 365 387 13	388.87 36.62 365 387 412 11	411.31 38.58 382 402 438 11	48.34 28.53 30 46 66
3-5	823	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	367.59 34.41 351 365 387 13	392.12 33.79 371 387 407 11	415.60 38.37 392 407 432 11	48.01 32.30 28 46 65
6-8	598	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	376.90 32.76 365 377 392 12	402.96 34.03 382 397 422 11	431.29 38.23 402 427 449 12	54.39 33.10 35 51 72
9-11	335	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	385.80 29.09 371 387 402 11	416.03 32.40 397 412 432 11	440.68 34.93 417 438 460 12	54.88 31.57 35 52 74
12-14	931	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	422.41 38.14 397 417 443 12	451.74 41.63 427 449 470 12	474.85 43.66 449 470 496 12	52.44 37.07 28 48 70
15-17	786	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	427.92 39.76 402 427 454 12	457.15 40.99 432 454 481 12	483.84 44.35 454 481 507 12	55.92 38.00 32 53 76
18-20	718	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	435.01 39.95 412 432 460 12	466.82 42.42 443 465 491 12	494.57 46.65 465 491 518 12	59.55 40.36 33 57 81
21-23	565	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	445.53 40.93 422 449 470 12	477.31 45.30 449 476 502 12	507.41 50.18 476 507 537 12	61.88 44.97 32 59 89
24-26	1095	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	479.85 48.70 449 476 507 12	509.30 49.58 476 507 537 12	535.10 51.89 502 530 563 13	55.25 41.47 32 53 77
27-29	828	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	481.19 49.27 449 476 507 12	512.08 50.08 481 507 537 12	541.52 54.82 507 537 576 13	60.33 47.03 32 58 85
30-32	700	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	495.94 51.14 460 494 524 12	526.64 54.38 491 524 557	558.01 56.85 524 557 587 13	62.07 45.76 33 60 90
33-35	377	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	502.69 55.15 470 496 537 12	539.74 57.03 505 537 576 13	575.38 57.89 543 570 604	72.69 49.12 41 68 106

Table 4 Cognitive Scale Score norms by 3 month age band- ages 36-71 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
36-38	892	Mean	515.73	557.47	592.18	76.44
30-30	0,2	SD	61.70	64.28	70.37	45.93
		25 <sup>th</sup>	476	518	550	48
		50 <sup>th</sup>	518	557	587	74
		75 <sup>th</sup>	550	593	625	102
		SEM	12	13	12	
39-41	761	Mean	525.07	572.98	610.27	85.20
		SD	61.30	62.68	69.87	53.02
		25 <sup>th</sup>	491	537	570	52
		50 <sup>th</sup>	524	570	604	78
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	557 12	609 13	650 12	113
42-44	798	Moon	535.91	585.09	623.79	87.88
+2 <del>-1-1</del>	790	Mean SD	66.39	68.01	72.45	55.39
		25 <sup>th</sup>	496	543	582	57
		50 <sup>th</sup>	537	582	614	83
		75 <sup>th</sup>	570	614	665	117
		SEM	13	12	12	
45-47	549	Mean	545.27	592.76	630.94	85.67
		SD	64.69	62.70	68.74	49.94
		25 <sup>th</sup>	507	550	587	54
		50 <sup>th</sup>	537	587	620	80
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	582 13	625 12	673 12	117
48-50	792	Mean	E6F 10		660 20	102 12
10-30	192	Mean SD	565.18 61.70	620.23 61.88	668.29 66.10	103.12 54.79
		25 <sup>th</sup>	526	587	625	66
		50 <sup>th</sup>	526 570	620	673	101
		75 <sup>th</sup>	604	658	710	134
		SEM	13	12	14	-0.
51-53	826	Mean	571.12	628.19	680.70	109.58
		SD	60.26	58.19	65.87	59.75
		25 <sup>th</sup>	537	593	637	72
		50 <sup>th</sup>	576	631	681	105
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	609 13	665 12	728 14	140
54-56	773	Mean	575.72	636.00	690.71	114.99
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	59.03 543	57.05 598	61.04 650	60.12 74
		50 <sup>th</sup>	543 582	637	697	113
		75 <sup>th</sup>	609	673	733	146
		SEM	12	13	14	110
57-59	609	Mean	581.74	639.30	692.47	110.74
		SD	61.42	61.21	64.77	59.05
		25 <sup>th</sup>	543	604	650	71
		50 <sup>th</sup>	587	637	697	112
		75 <sup>th</sup>	620	681	739	143
		SEM	12	13	14	
60-62	811	Mean	600.70	655.34	704.43	107.32
		SD	80.39	74.79	81.31	69.13
		25 <sup>th</sup>	557	620	665	61
		50 <sup>th</sup>	609	665	716	102
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	658 12	703 14	767 13	144
63-65	545	Mean	609.64	669.04	721.57	114.76
05-05	543	Mean SD	83.70	76.74	80.06	68.64
		25 <sup>th</sup>	570	631	689	72
		50 <sup>th</sup>	620	673	739	113
		75 <sup>th</sup>	665	722	783	146
		SEM	12	14	12	
66-68	463	Mean	620.97	678.00	731.12	111.41
		SD	74.50	71.16	73.99	60.50
		25 <sup>th</sup>	576	637	697	73
		50 <sup>th</sup>	631	681	747	113
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	665 12	728 14	791 12	147
	400					4455-
69-71	408	Mean SD	626.46 75.87	684.16 74.75	736.22 77.68	117.78 64.49
59-71					77.68	n4.49
69-71						
59-71		25 <sup>th</sup>	589	654	716	79
69-71						

Table 5 Literacy Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 0-35 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
0-2	1244	Mean	354.01	379.93	403.06	49.05
· •		SD	43.86	46.86	48.60	39.10
		25 <sup>th</sup>	312	360	360	28
		50 <sup>th</sup>	360	388	406	48
		75 <sup>th</sup>	388	419	438	76
		SEM	39	28	24	70
3-5	823	Mean	355.43	381.52	406.43	51.00
		SD	43.92	45.59	48.99	44.99
		25 <sup>th</sup>	312	360	388	18
		50 <sup>th</sup>	360	388	406	48
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	388 39	406 28	438 24	76
5-8	598	Mean SD	360.29 43.14	391.32 44.32	424.08 43.29	63.79 44.86
		25 <sup>th</sup>	312	360	388	31
		50 <sup>th</sup>	360	388	429	59
		75 <sup>th</sup>	388	419	446	93
		SEM	39	28	21	
9-11	335	Mean	374.99	411.37	435.91	60.92
		SD	44.32	41.37	39.86	48.42
		25 <sup>th</sup>	360	388	419	28
		50 <sup>th</sup>	388	419	438	58
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	406 28	438 24	460 18	86
2 14	021			449.53		46.04
12-14	931	Mean	423.62		469.66	46.04
		SD	44.00	39.18	41.60	42.50
		25 <sup>th</sup>	388	429	446	17 40
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	419 446	446 472	466 493	40 69
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	21	17	15	U7
15-17	786	Mean	431.77	457.39	480.18	48.41
		SD	43.91	41.41	41.03	39.98
		25 <sup>th</sup>	406	429	453	22
		50 <sup>th</sup>	438	453	477	44
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	453 19	483 16	507 14	68
18-20	781	Mean SD	439.49 40.38	466.19 39.47	490.28 40.01	50.79 38.54
		25 <sup>th</sup>	419	446	466	26
		50 <sup>th</sup>	438	466	488	49
		75 <sup>th</sup>	466	488	515	71
		SEM	18	15	14	
21-23	565	Mean	448.97	477.37	501.24	52.27
		SD	42.85	44.51	44.08	41.16
		25 <sup>th</sup>	429	453	477	25
		50 <sup>th</sup>	453	477	502	48
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	477 17	502 14	528 13	77
4-26	1095	Mean	478.77	503.12	522.37	43.60
20	1073	SD	44.57	41.59	42.54	37.00
		25 <sup>th</sup>	453	477	497	21
		50 <sup>th</sup>	483	502	520	41
		75 <sup>th</sup>	507	528	548	62
		SEM	14	13	13	
7-29	828	Mean	480.62	506.91	528.97	48.35
		SD	42.27	38.85	42.50	39.46
		25 <sup>th</sup>	453	483	502	23
		50 <sup>th</sup>	483	507	528	44
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	507 14	532 13	555 13	67
30-32	700	Mean	491.58	517.51	541.78	50.20
,u-32	700	мean SD	43.75	44.48	541.78 44.13	37.10
		25 <sup>th</sup>	45.75	493	520	27
		50 <sup>th</sup>	493	520	536	48
		75 <sup>th</sup>	520	544	569	70
		SEM	14	13	12	
33-35	377	Mean	497.53	527.48	550.41	52.88
		SD	47.10	44.29	41.95	38.35
		25 <sup>th</sup>	472	502	528	30
		2.5	465			
		50 <sup>th</sup>	493	528	548	51
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	493 528 13		548 572 12	51 76

Table 6 Literacy Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 36-71 months

-		,	J	J		Fall to
Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Spring Growth
36-38	892	Mean	520.84	555.36	581.65	60.81
		SD	53.40	53.84	55.63	34.12 39
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	488 520	524 555	551 579	60
		75 <sup>th</sup>	551	586	614	79
		SEM	13	13	11	
39-41	761	Mean SD	529.63 51.09	566.82 49.04	594.86 53.52	65.23 36.69
		25 <sup>th</sup>	502	536	562	40
		50 <sup>th</sup>	528	566	592	60
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	562 13	595 11	629 11	84
42-44	798	Mean	536.20	575.92	605.07	68.86
		SD	54.27	52.17	56.50	41.35
		25 <sup>th</sup>	507	544	569	43
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	532 569	572 605	598 635	64 89
		SEM	12	11	11	0,
45-47	549	Mean	547.23	585.23	614.30	67.07
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	53.30 515	51.46 555	55.94 579	37.06 42
		50 <sup>th</sup>	544	582	608	64
		75 <sup>th</sup>	579	614	647	90
		SEM	12	11	11	
48-50	792	Mean	563.38	606.70	643.62	80.24
		SD	49.33	48.03	52.45	40.28
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	533 566	579 608	611 644	52 76
		75 <sup>th</sup>	595	635	678	103
		SEM	12	11	11	
51-53	826	Mean	567.46	614.70	652.60	85.15
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	50.28 540	45.58 589	51.89 623	43.69 57
		50 <sup>th</sup>	569	617	653	80
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	598 11	641 11	684 11	105
54-56	773	Mean	576.00	623.10	661.65	85.65
0.00	,,,	SD	46.18	44.37	50.50	43.78
		25 <sup>th</sup>	548	595	629	56
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	576	620	659 694	79 108
		SEM	601 11	650 11	11	100
57-59	609	Mean	580.66	627.47	665.22	84.56
		SD	49.10	49.69	53.81	43.32
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	555 582	598 626	632 668	58 81
		75 <sup>th</sup>	614	656	697	106
		SEM	11	11	11	
60-62	1018	Mean	608.45	662.99	706.95	99.70
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	62.04 572	53.98 632	57.69 668	52.81 64
		50'''	611	665	714	93
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	650 11	697 11	750 11	131
63-65	751	Mean	616.18	673.72	722.65	108.77
-5 55	,31	SD	65.69	63.78	63.45	50.15
		25 <sup>th</sup>	576	641	694	75
		50 <sup>th</sup>	620	681	737	107
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	659 11	717 11	767 12	138
66-68	630	Mean	624.87	685.07	732.37	105.26
		SD	64.48	57.86	53.45	50.66
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	589 629	656 690	710 743	73 107
		75 <sup>th</sup>	665	725	767	135
		SEM	11	11	12	
69-71	578	Mean	632.74	695.36	740.27	110.31
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	59.94 598	54.42 670	51.93 721	50.67 76
		50 <sup>th</sup>	632	700	755	108
		75 <sup>th</sup>	675	733	767	142
		SEM	11	11	13	

Table 7 Social Emotional Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 0-35 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
0-2	1244	Mean SD	364.01 47.96	395.62 45.63	422.85 47.46	58.84 39.71
		25 <sup>th</sup>	333	367	389	33
		50 <sup>th</sup>	367	389	415	56
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	389 17	421 16	452 15	80
3-5	823	Mean	369.73	399.01	428.32	58.59
		SD	43.65	41.52	44.85	38.44
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	343 367	375 395	395 421	35 56
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	389 17	421 15	452 15	80
6-8	598	Mean	376.83	412.84	446.60	69.77
0-0	370	SD	41.67	44.06	45.91	41.73
		25 <sup>th</sup>	351	389	415	44
		50 <sup>th</sup>	375	408	445	66
		75 <sup>th</sup>	395	433	469	92
		SEM	16	15	15	
9-11	335	Mean	389.23	426.38	454.30	65.07
		SD	40.06	41.46	41.61	40.89
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	367 389	402 427	427 452	42 63
		75 <sup>th</sup>	408	452	452 475	86
		SEM	16	15	15	50
12-14	931	Mean	430.21	462.69	488.32	58.11
		SD	46.74	46.20	46.61	43.51
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	402 427	433 458	458 481	34 54
		75 <sup>th</sup>	458	486	514	80
		SEM	15	15	14	
15-17	786	Mean	433.71	466.82	432.20	59.49
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	48.45 408	46.41 439	47.04 463	44.23 31
		50 <sup>th</sup>	433	469	492	57
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	463 15	492 15	519 15	82
18-20	718	Mean	441.48	474.89	503.89	62.41
10-20	710	SD	49.16	47.30	49	44.17
		25 <sup>th</sup>	415	452	475	36
		50 <sup>th</sup>	439	475	503	61
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	469 15	503 15	530 14	87
21-23	565	Mean	452.92	483.65	514.66	61.74
		SD	52.45	48.24	48.79	52.76
		25 <sup>th</sup>	427	458	481	33
		50 <sup>th</sup>	458	486 514	514	59
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	481 15	14	541 14	91
24-26	1095	Mean	483.33	510.74	535.85	52.53
		SD	51.73	49.25	50.92	44.07
		25 <sup>th</sup>	452	481	508	57
		50 <sup>th</sup>	481 514	514 535	535 557	50 77
		SEM				
27-29	828	Mean	481.97	512.15		58.05
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	51.56 452	48.45 482	53.59 508	50.35 30
		50 <sup>th</sup>	481	514	535	54
		75 <sup>th</sup>	514	541	568	82
		SEM	14	14	14	
30-32	700	Mean	495.70	524.70	552.71	57.01
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	54.35 463	55.54 492	54.53 524	47.72 28
		50 <sup>th</sup>	463 497	524	546	55
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	524 14	552 14	574 14	85
22.25	255					
33-35	377	Mean SD	504.52 64.72	539.02 57.02	570.15 57.06	65.63 54.93
		25 <sup>th</sup>	469	57.02	57.06	33
		44		535		66
		50 <sup>th</sup>	508	333	563	00
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	508 541 14	574 14	602 14	93

Table 8 Social Emotional Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 36-71 months

Age Band	n					
36-38	892	Mean	510.99	553.92	587.82	76.83
		SD	66.04	63.68	69.70	49.02
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	469 514	519 552	546 583	45 72
		75 <sup>th</sup>	546	590	520	104
		SEM	14	14	14	101
39-41	761	Mean	520.06	566.33	604.13	84.07
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	63.43 481	61.34 530	71.64 557	54.34 49
		50 <sup>th</sup>	519	563	596	77
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	552 14	602 14	638 15	110
42-44	798			581.99		92.65
42-44	790	Mean SD	573.42 69.10	67.20	619.07 73.78	83.65 57.01
		25 <sup>th</sup>	497	541	574	50
		50 <sup>th</sup>	530	574	608	77
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	568 14	614 14	658 15	113
45-47	549	Mean	540.14	585.87	622.95	82.80
10 17	017	SD	64.68	61.94	68.46	52.38
		25 <sup>th</sup>	503	546	580	49
		50 <sup>th</sup>	541	585	614	79
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	574 14	620 14	658 15	110
48-50	792	Mean	562.32	613.36	663.17	100.84
		SD	64.80	63.67	68.69	58.13
		25 <sup>th</sup>	530	580	320	61
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	568 602	614 658	658 709	94 135
		SEM	14	15	16	133
51-53	826	Mean	565.42	618.10	672.10	107.28
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	60.71 530	56.19 585	66.58 632	62.26 67
		50 <sup>th</sup>	568	620	672	98
		75 <sup>th</sup>	602	652	717	140
		SEM	14	15	16	
54-56	773	Mean SD	570.67 60.00	628.05 56.17	682.47 66.14	111.80 65.20
		25 <sup>th</sup>	535	593	638	70
		50 <sup>th</sup>	580	626	679	106
		75 <sup>th</sup>	608	658	725	148
		SEM	14	15	16	
57-59	609	Mean SD	574.86 62.44	627.94 62.15	681.17 69.27	106.30 60.83
		25 <sup>th</sup>	535	591	632	67
		50 <sup>th</sup>	580	626	679	101
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	614 14	658 15	725 16	142
60-62	1018	Mean	596.81	652.70	702.82	107.75
		SD	76.43	67.81	73.72	66.03
		25 <sup>th</sup>	546	614	656	63
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	608 645	652 701	709 760	103 148
		SEM	14	16	17	110
63-65	751	Mean	606.61	665.73	719.21	115.56
		SD	80.07 562	77.02 626	79.18 679	65.02 74
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	614	672	735	115
		75 <sup>th</sup>	658	717	795	455
		SEM	15	16	18	
66-68	630	Mean	615.57	675.39 75.00	727.04	113.13 60.26
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	75.90 574	632	73.59 686	73
		50 <sup>th</sup>	626	679	746	111
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	665 15	725 16	800 18	155
69-71	578	Mean	624.22	682.88	735.54	120.32
07.1	370	SD	81.74	74.54	735.54	63.44
		25 <sup>th</sup>	585	632	701	75
		50 <sup>th</sup>	632	686	760	120
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	679 15	725 16	800 19	162
		JLIN	13	10	1)	

Table 9
Physical Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 0-35 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
0-2	1244	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	352.39 50.17 324 353 380 15	388.58 46.60 361 380 415	416.21 48.65 380 415 451 15	63.83 37.49 37 61 87
3-5	823	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	361.33 43.73 335 361 380 15	392.81 42.03 370 380 415 15	423.38 46.29 389 415 451 15	62.05 42.55 37 61 81
6-8	598	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	377.13 37.88 353 370 389 15	411.15 40.68 380 407 424 15	442.02 44.07 415 432 461 15	64.89 40.74 43 62 83
9-11	335	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	391.33 38.28 370 389 407 15	425.41 41.17 407 424 441 15	452.52 44.20 424 451 471 16	61.19 40.09 37 62 81
12-14	931	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	433.60 47.60 407 432 461 15	462.08 48.89 432 461 482 16	484.79 49.94 461 471 514	51.19 45.99 26 46 72
15-17	786	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	439.99 49.62 415 441 461 15	468.20 49.86 441 461 494	493.40 52.19 461 482 524 17	53.41 46.74 27 52 81
18-20	718	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	446.84 49.95 415 441 471 15	474.70 49.18 451 471 504	502.44 51.82 471 494 534 16	55.60 44.71 30 53 80
21-23	565	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	456.30 53.61 424 461 482 16	483.85 53.67 451 482 514 17	513.73 53.15 482 514 543 16	57.43 53.97 30 54 83
24-26	1095	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	488.44 52.08 461 482 524 17	514.05 51.83 482 514 543 16	537.88 54.62 504 534 565 16	49.44 44.51 22 49 73
27-29	828	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	486.68 54.01 461 482 524 17	515.39 52.09 482 514 543 16	541.23 54.66 514 543 577 16	54.55 50.84 23 52 82
30-32	700	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	503.23 56.81 471 504 534 16	528.46 54.77 494 534 554 16	555.64 56.19 524 554 590 17	52.40 52.72 23 52 83
33-35	377	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	508.42 64.44 466 514 543 16	541.32 61.05 509 543 577 16	571.94 61.01 534 565 603 18	63.52 53.38 34 62 90

Table 10 Physical Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 36-71 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
36-38	892	Mean	511.81	550.36	583.24	71.43
		SD	62.66	60.34	64.46	49.88
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	471 514	514 554	543 577	39 63
		75 <sup>th</sup>	554	55 <del>4</del> 577	615	101
		SEM	16	17	18	101
39-41	761	Mean	519.83	560.19	596.95	77.12
		SD	60.27 482	58.04 524	64.08 554	54.62 40
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	524	565	590	71
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	554 16	590 18	637 18	106
	#00					#0.40
42-44	798	Mean SD	530.13 65.13	572.86 63.24	608.62 68.17	78.49 53.23
		25 <sup>th</sup>	494	534	565	47
		50 <sup>th</sup>	534	577	603	72
		75 <sup>th</sup>	565	603	647	106
		SEM	16	18	18	
45-47	549	Mean	538.31	579.74	613.65	75.34
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	57.91 504	55.99 543	62.79 577	48.84 46
		50 <sup>th</sup>	534	543 577	615	71
		75 <sup>th</sup>	577	615	647	105
		SEM	16	18	17	
48-50	792	Mean	555.96	604.16	651.62	95.65
		SD	59.85	58.84	65.11	58.80
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	524 565	577 603	615 647	57 93
		50 <sup>th</sup>	590	637	686	129
		SEM	17	18	17	12,
51-53	826	Mean	559.96	609.55	662.25	102.29
		SD	58.56	55.05	62.47	61.43
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	534 565	577 615	626 658	61 94
		75 <sup>th</sup>	590	647	706	134
		SEM	18	17	17	131
54-56	773	Mean	564.82	618.47	671.27	106.45
		SD	58.13	52.62	60.93	63.49
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	534 577	590 626	637 671	61 101
		75 <sup>th</sup>	603	647	706	140
		SEM	18	17	19	110
57-59	609	Mean	570.41	619.33	672.03	101.62
		SD	62.36	59.80	66.18	61.67
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	534 577	590 626	626 671	60 96
		75 <sup>th</sup>	603	647	706	140
		SEM	18	17	19	
60-62	786	Mean	596.95	643.76	681.73	83.13
		SD	77.68	98.05	104.54	80.47
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	554 615	626 658	658 706	45 85
		75 <sup>th</sup>	647	686	743	128
		SEM	18	17	21	
63-65	684	Mean	611.69	667.14	702.96	86.27
		SD	75.97	84.83	80.14	60.05 51
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	565 626	637 671	671 743	86
		75 <sup>th</sup>	658	743	743	113
		SEM	17	19	26	
66-68	602	Mean	620.21	669.59	702.71	78.65
		SD	72.54	77.31	70.00	56.73
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	577 626	637 658	671 706	48 81
		75 <sup>th</sup>	658	743	743	106
		SEM	17	19	26	
69-71	566	Mean SD	627.76 70.98	670.06 87.68	708.34 82.55	82.48 71.50
		25 <sup>th</sup>	590	647	686	45
		$50^{th}$	637	671	743	85
		75 <sup>th</sup>	658	743	743	117
		SEM	17	19	26	

Table 11 Language Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 0-35 months

						F-114-
Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
0-2	1244	Mean	367.99	393.28	413.44	45.45
0-2	1277	SD	38.82	35.01	35.38	27.66
		25 <sup>th</sup>	349	373	392	28
		50 <sup>th</sup>	373	392	408	42
		75 <sup>th</sup>	392	413	433	62
		SEM	14	12	12	
3-5	823	Mean	370.83	395.43	417.22	46.39
		SD	35.60	31.33	32.90	31.32
		25 <sup>th</sup>	349	380	397	25 44
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	373 392	397 408	413 433	61
		SEM	13	12	12	01
5-8	598	Mean	378.41	404.35	428.59	50.18
		SD	36.43	33.30	34.07	34.03
		25 <sup>th</sup>	366	386	408	31
		$50^{th}$	380	403	428	46
		75 <sup>th</sup>	397	418	443	65
		SEM	13	12	11	
9-11	335	Mean	388.47	414.49	436.58	48.10
		SD	32.47	28.66	29.59	33.11
		25 <sup>th</sup>	373 392	403 418	418 433	26 44
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	392 408	418	433 457	65
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	12	12	11	UJ
12-14	931	Mean	421.05	446.81	470.18	49.12
		SD	38.20	37.85	40.78	34.92
		25 <sup>th</sup>	403	423	447	28
		50 <sup>th</sup>	423	443	466	44
		75 <sup>th</sup>	443	466	487	66
		SEM	12	11	12	
5-17	786	Mean	428.26	454.79	480.91	52.65
		SD	37.94	38.17	42.38	35.24
		25 <sup>th</sup>	408	433	457	33
		50 <sup>th</sup>	428	452	476	48
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	452 11	476 11	505 12	70
18-20	718	M	436.72	463.32	491.48	54.76
10-20	/10	Mean SD	39.10	40.72	45.32	36.22
		25 <sup>th</sup>	413	443	466	31
		50 <sup>th</sup>	436	461	487	53
		75 <sup>th</sup>	461	483	517	73
		SEM	11	11	12	
21-23	565	Mean	446.67	473.24	504.23	57.56
		SD	42.54	42.72	50.70	41.87
		25 <sup>th</sup>	418	447	471	29
		50 <sup>th</sup>	447	471	499	54
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	476 11	499 12	535 13	80
24-26	1095	Mean	480.69	507.11	533.06	52.36
£ 1-20	1073	SD	51.92	53.29	56.90	39.88
		25 <sup>th</sup>	452	471	499	27
		50 <sup>th</sup>	481	505	529	50
		75 <sup>th</sup>	511	535	560	73
		SEM	12	13	13	
27-29	828	Mean	484.18	512.08	539.81	55.64
		SD	51.86	51.38	55.81	45.93
		25 <sup>th</sup>	453	481	505	27
		50 <sup>th</sup>	481 511	511	535	52 78
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	12	541 13	567 13	/0
30-32	700	Mean	501.68	527.92	557.10	55.42
	, 00	SD	56.08	59.05	61.76	48.70
		25 <sup>th</sup>	466	493	523	29
		50 <sup>th</sup>	499	523	547	55
		75 <sup>th</sup>	535	560	597	80
		SEM	13	13	13	
	377	Mean	506.73	537.11	570.75	64.02
33-35	3//					
33-35	3//	SD	58.76	61.79	64.70	47.30
33-35	3//	2 Eth	469	499	535	34
33-35	377	SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>				

Table 12 Language Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 36-71 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
36-38	892	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	509.73 65.84 466 511 547	546.17 68.69 505 541 581	580.96 76.74 535 573 625 14	71.24 46.22 42 67 95
39-41	761	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	523.08 63.16 481 523 560 13	564.69 67.81 523 567 606 13	602.95 76.76 547 597 654 15	79.87 53.07 46 73 110
42-44	798	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	533.66 70.39 493 529 573	576.94 72.18 529 573 615	617.28 79.71 560 615 663 16	83.62 55.81 48 78 113
45-47	549	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	544.76 67.18 505 541 588 13	588.69 68.81 541 581 635 15	625.59 76.58 573 615 679 16	80.83 51.89 48 74 109
48-50	792	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	560.96 66.77 517 560 606 13	612.11 69.89 567 615 663 16	660.74 74.67 615 663 711	99.78 56.35 62 95 134
51-53	826	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	566.91 64.08 529 573 606 13	620.05 64.55 579 625 663 16	674.61 72.38 625 679 720 15	107.71 60.81 68 104 144
54-56	773	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	574.43 64.57 535 573 615	630.80 66.26 588 635 671 16	686.17 70.34 645 695 730 14	111.74 61.12 68 108 148
57-59	609	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	580.16 67.49 535 588 625 14	632.05 67.68 588 635 679 16	689.83 74.27 645 695 742 14	109.67 63.18 68 105 149
60-62	1022	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	599.51 80.06 547 606 663 15	647.99 90.03 615 663 703 16	695.05 96.69 663 711 755 15	95.59 75.05 57 99 138
63-65	752	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	609.41 81.22 554 615 671 16	658.98 87.74 615 671 711 15	708.79 93.81 671 730 794 15	104.78 66.50 68 103 140
66-68	637	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	615.60 80.83 567 625 671 16	669.35 77.91 625 679 711 15	722.03 82.62 687 742 794 16	103.64 63.56 66 105 140
69-71	582	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	629.75 77.53 581 635 681 16	673.82 91.21 645 687 720 15	723.20 95.35 695 742 794 16	101.45 74.40 55 105 140

Table 13 Mathematics Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 0-35 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
0-2	1244	Mean	352.57	368.32	388.44	35.87
		SD	28.32	41.98	53.31	46.80
		25 <sup>th</sup>	343	343	343	0
		$50^{th}$	343	343	343	0
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	343 55	381 31	441 31	76
	022			265.02	202.42	40.71
3-5	823	Mean SD	351.72 27.06	365.03 40.78	392.42 53.15	40.71 47.77
		25 <sup>th</sup>	343	343	343	0
		50 <sup>th</sup>	343	343	381	37
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	343 55	381 31	441 23	79
	<b>500</b>					
5-8	598	Mean SD	351.09 27.35	373.03 42.19	411.15 50.22	60.06 46.47
		25 <sup>th</sup>	343	343	343	0
		50 <sup>th</sup>	343	343	419	61
		75 <sup>th</sup>	343	404	450	98
		SEM	55	31	23	
9-11	335	Mean	359.92	395.34	424.84	64.93
		SD	34.82	45.94	47.39	48.61
		25 <sup>th</sup>	343	343	404	23
		50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup>	343 343	404 441	441 459	61 107
		SEM	55	23	20	107
2-14	931	Mean	415.27	446.84	473.54	58.28
		SD	50.85	47.44	45.79	26.00
		25 <sup>th</sup>	381	418	450	26
		50 <sup>th</sup>	419	450	475	52
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	450 20	475 17	504 15	88
.5-17	786	Mean	426.41	457.87	484.59	58.18
.5 17	700	SD	49.62	46.09	44.68	43.60
		25 <sup>th</sup>	381	441	459	30
		50 <sup>th</sup>	436	459	490	53
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	459 20	490 16	511 15	86
18-20	718	Mean	438.31	469.22	496.75	58.44
10-20	/10	SD	44.10	40.88	40.60	41.89
		25 <sup>th</sup>	419	450	475	30
		50 <sup>th</sup>	450	475	497	54
		75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	467 17	490 15	524 15	84
						== 0=
21-23	565	Mean SD	449.17 48.25	479.32 47.70	506.22 44.99	57.05 41.64
		25 <sup>th</sup>	425	459	483	30
		50 <sup>th</sup>	459	490	511	52
		75 <sup>th</sup>	483	511	536	83
		SEM	16	15	14	
4-26	1095	Mean	485.46	510.66	532.15	46.69
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	45.52 459	41.76 490	40.97 511	36.67 22
		50 <sup>th</sup>	490	511	536	43
		75 <sup>th</sup>	511	536	557	65
		SEM	15	14	13	
27-29	928	Mean SD	488.42 43.80	516.26 38.76	538.81 39.26	50.39 39.72
		25 <sup>th</sup>	45.60	490	518	26
		$50^{th}$	490	518	541	46
		75 <sup>th</sup>	519	545	562	69
		SEM	15	14	13	
0-32	700	Mean	502.40	527.55	550.69	48.29
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	41.67 467	43.86 490	40.87 518	36.65 26
		50 <sup>th</sup>	490	518	541	46
		75 <sup>th</sup>	518	545	562	69
		SEM	14	13	12	
33-35	377	Mean	505.01	533.71	558.56	53.55
		SD 25 <sup>th</sup>	44.49	41.02	39.55	37.95
		25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup>	483 504	511 536	538 557	29 53
		75 <sup>th</sup>	533	562	581	75

Table 14 Mathematics Scale Score norms by 3 month age band - ages 36-71 months

Age Band	n		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall to Spring Growth
36-38	892	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	525.55 55.13 490 530 557 13	558.99 51.29 530 557 589 12	583.71 53.38 552 583 610 13	58.16 35.69 35 54 76
39-41	761	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	534.50 50.49 504 541 562 13	569.36 47.58 541 567 599 12	596.28 50.98 567 594 626 13	61.78 37.20 37 58 81
42-44	798	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	541.34 51.28 511 541 567 13	577.75 48.82 551 573 599 13	605.81 53.12 573 599 637 12	64.47 40.05 42 60 84
45-47	549	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	551.13 50.46 524 552 578 12	586.87 47.65 557 583 615	613.68 50.70 578 610 643 12	62.55 37.36 38 59 84
48-50	792	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	566.12 50.87 536 570 599 12	607.91 46.72 578 610 637 12	642.33 50.49 610 646 673 13	76.22 42.06 48 70 99
51-53	826	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	569.78 47.28 546 573 599	613.78 44.04 589 615 643	650.91 48.70 621 654 685 13	81.14 41.50 54 76 102
54-56	773	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	578.93 44.55 552 578 605	622.33 41.58 594 621 648 13	659.91 47.15 631 661 690 13	80.99 43.85 53 76 102
57-59	609	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	580.90 51.02 552 583 615	625.77 47.34 599 626 654 13	663.32 51.33 631 667 696 13	82.42 43.88 53 78 107
60-62	963	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	605.64 56.87 573 610 643	654.29 50.39 626 661 690 13	698.58 50.41 673 707 732 13	91.88 45.90 59 87
63-65	688	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	610.82 62.10 578 615 654 12	660.42 58.26 637 670 696	708.95 59.12 685 719 749 13	98.37 45.13 69 97 127
66-68	568	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	617.98 58.71 585 621 654 12	671.30 50.02 50 679 701	717.03 50.07 50 725 749 14	94.84 47.77 48 88 127
69-71	529	Mean SD 25 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> SEM	624.56 51.53 594 626 661 13	673.03 48.32 651 679 707 13	724.53 43.20 701 732 760 14	102.51 47.80 65 100 136

Table 15
Percentages of children meeting expectations by time of year - Birth to 1 year

Scale	Expectations	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Below Expectations	8.10%	1.50%	0.30%
doginave	Meets Expectations	73.00%	52.80%	28.60%
	Exceeds Expectations	18.90%	45.70%	71.10%
Literacy	Below Expectations	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
J	Meets Expectations	84.50%	63.10%	39.20%
	Exceeds Expectations	15.50%	36.90%	60.80%
Social Emotional	Below Expectations	7.50%	1.30%	0.30%
	Meets Expectations	75.30%	55.00%	29.50%
	Exceeds Expectations	17.20%	43.70%	70.20%
Physical	Below Expectations	16.50%	2.80%	0.20%
	Meets Expectations	71.10%	60.20%	36.30%
	Exceeds Expectations	12.40%	37.00%	63.50%
Language	Below Expectations	16.60%	4.40%	1.30%
0 0	Meets Expectations	79.90%	78.20%	57.60%
	Exceeds Expectations	3.50%	17.40%	41.20%
Mathematics	Below Expectations	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Meets Expectations	86.70%	64.20%	40.90%
	Exceeds Expectations	13.30%	35.80%	59.10%

Table 16
Percentages of children meeting expectations by time of year - 1 to 2 years

Scale	Expectations	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Below Expectations	13.20%	3.50%	1.10%
Cognitive	Meets Expectations	75.60%	65.40%	44.90%
	Exceeds Expectations	11.20%	31.10%	54.00%
			0.4007	0.000/
Literacy	Below Expectations	25.10%	9.10%	3.30%
	Meets Expectations	46.60%	40.00%	25.00%
	Exceeds Expectations	28.40%	50.90%	71.70%
Social Emotional	Below Expectations	17.70%	5.00%	1.80%
	Meets Expectations	74.50%	70.90%	53.50%
	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	7.80%	24.10%	44.70%
		22.224	0.4007	0.000/
Physical	Below Expectations	22.90%	8.10%	2.80%
	Meets Expectations	57.50%	52.80%	37.30%
	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	19.60%	39.10%	59.90%
Language	Below Expectations	36.90%	14.40%	5.40%
Language	Meets Expectations	58.50%	71.20%	59.70%
	-	4.50%	14.40%	34.80%
	Exceeds Expectations	1.50 70	11.1070	3 1.00 /0
Mathematics	Below Expectations	54.30%	29.70%	13.50%
	Meets Expectations	40.20%	53.70%	47.40%
	Exceeds Expectations	5.50%	16.60%	39.10%

Table 17
Percentages of children meeting expectations by time of year - 2 to 3 years

Scale	Expectations	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Below Expectations	31.80%	12.60%	5.40%
Cognitive	Meets Expectations	56.90%	61.80%	48.10%
	Exceeds Expectations	11.30%	25.60%	46.40%
Literacy	Below Expectations	36.60%	17.50%	7.60%
•	Meets Expectations	51.80%	55.60%	47.50%
	Exceeds Expectations	11.60%	26.90%	44.90%
Social Emotional	Below Expectations	27.60%	10.70%	4.90%
	Meets Expectations	61.50%	66.40%	53.10%
	Exceeds Expectations	10.90%	22.90%	42.00%
Physical	Below Expectations	20.30%	9.00%	4.00%
J	Meets Expectations	66.50%	63.80%	50.50%
	Exceeds Expectations	13.20%	27.30%	45.50%
Language	Below Expectations	33.60%	17.00%	8.10%
0 0	Meets Expectations	56.20%	62.10%	55.50%
	Exceeds Expectations	10.20%	20.90%	36.50%
Mathematics	Below Expectations	38.90%	18.30%	7.80%
	Meets Expectations	56.60%	67.80%	61.80%
	Exceeds Expectations	4.50%	13.90%	30.40%

Table 18
Percentages of children meeting expectations by time of year - Preschool 3

Scale	Expectations	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Below Expectations	44.80%	17.80%	7.50%
doginave	Meets Expectations	49.00%	65.20%	57.30%
	Exceeds Expectations	6.20%	17.00%	35.20%
Literacy	Below Expectations	49.70%	19.30%	8.70%
	Meets Expectations	41.60%	58.40%	49.60%
	Exceeds Expectations	8.70%	22.30%	41.70%
Social Emotional	Below Expectations	42.30%	16.00%	7.40%
	Meets Expectations	48.80%	61.80%	50.60%
	Exceeds Expectations	8.90%	22.20%	42.00%
Physical	Below Expectations	37.20%	14.70%	6.40%
-	Meets Expectations	56.90%	69.80%	60.80%
	Exceeds Expectations	5.90%	15.60%	32.80%
Language	Below Expectations	47.40%	24.30%	12.20%
	Meets Expectations	47.40%	61.40%	58.80%
	Exceeds Expectations	5.20%	14.40%	29.10%
Mathematics	Below Expectations	53.50%	25.00%	11.70%
	Meets Expectations	40.10%	58.20%	53.30%
	Exceeds Expectations	6.40%	16.80%	35.00%

Table 19
Percentages of children meeting expectations by time of year - Preschool 4

Scale	Expectations	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Below Expectations	54.80%	19.40%	5.90%
J	Meets Expectations	44.10%	73.70%	64.30%
	Exceeds Expectations	1.10%	6.90%	29.80%
Literacy	Below Expectations	44.90%	11.50%	3.80%
	Meets Expectations	53.90%	80.90%	68.40%
	Exceeds Expectations	1.20%	7.70%	27.80%
Social Emotional	Below Expectations	57.80%	22.50%	7.70%
	Meets Expectations	39.70%	66.80%	53.30%
	Exceeds Expectations	2.50%	10.70%	39.00%
Physical	Below Expectations	50.60%	19.30%	6.50%
-	Meets Expectations	48.80%	77.00%	73.40%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.70%	3.70%	20.20%
Language	Below Expectations	52.10%	24.20%	9.50%
	Meets Expectations	46.70%	70.60%	65.40%
	Exceeds Expectations	1.20%	5.20%	25.10%
Mathematics	Below Expectations	72.50%	34.50%	14.50%
	Meets Expectations	26.80%	60.80%	61.60%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.70%	4.70%	23.90%

Table 20 Percentages of children meeting expectations by time of year - Kindergaten

Scale	Expectations	Fall	Winter	Spring
Cognitive	Below Expectations	77.70%	41.20%	19.50%
doginave	Meets Expectations	22.30%	58.50%	77.80%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.10%	0.40%	2.70%
Literacy	Below Expectations	57.70%	16.50%	6.50%
	Meets Expectations	42.10%	81.00%	77.70%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.20%	2.50%	15.90%
Social Emotional	Below Expectations	69.30%	34.90%	15.60%
	Meets Expectations	30.70%	64.70%	78.20%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.00%	0.40%	6.20%
Physical	Below Expectations	60.90%	31.20%	13.10%
-	Meets Expectations	38.80%	67.70%	78.00%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.30%	1.10%	8.90%
Language	Below Expectations	78.80%	46.40%	22.10%
	Meets Expectations	20.80%	52.60%	71.50%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.40%	1.00%	6.50%
Mathematics	Below Expectations	87.10%	45.30%	19.10%
	Meets Expectations	12.70%	54.20%	75.20%
	Exceeds Expectations	0.20%	0.50%	5.70%