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INTRODUCTION

The readiness assessment described in this report was conducted on behalf of First 5 San Francisco, and is part of ongoing monitoring of how well San Francisco is preparing its children for school. School readiness is a central objective and driving force behind several programs and initiatives and informs stakeholders and policymakers across the city, including but not limited to the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, the Office of Early Care and Education, the Our Children, Our Families Council, and the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). An initial countywide assessment was conducted on a random sample of classrooms in 2007 and again in 2009. In 2013 and 2014, the samples were smaller and more targeted, as a pilot test of the assessment procedure which is in consideration of being adopted district-wide. These studies help SFUSD and First 5 establish a uniform method of measuring readiness.

The order and layout of this report is designed to serve as both a “snapshot” of readiness that portrays not just what readiness looks like, but how different states of readiness may be shaped by family context and other community, health, and educational resources. The first section of the report presents the study’s methodology: sample design, instruments, and data collection methods. The next section describes the demographic and health and well-being characteristics of the children assessed according to teachers’ reports. This is followed by a detailed analysis of student readiness across the different building blocks of readiness and by assorted factors associated with readiness.

Key Findings

• 62% of entering kindergartners in San Francisco were “school ready”.
• Children with special needs, English learners, African American, and students from low-income households were less ready for school.
• Preschool attendance gave an important boost to school readiness and 92% of kindergartners had preschool or transitional kindergarten in the year prior to kindergarten entry.
• How often children come to class sick, hungry, or tired had a significant impact on their school readiness.
• Family engagement in activities at home with the child, such as including them in household chores, singing songs, reading aloud for at least 5 minutes at a time, arts and crafts, sports, and playing games also helps to boost children’s readiness for kindergarten.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

Definition of School Readiness:

• Readiness of children for the social and academic institution of school
  o Physical Well-Being & Motor Development
  o Social & Emotional Development
  o Approaches Toward Learning
  o Communication & Language Usage
  o Cognition & General Knowledge
• Readiness of families and communities to prepare children for school
• Readiness of schools to meet the diverse needs of incoming students and their families
What is School Readiness?

School readiness is broadly defined as the set of physical, social/emotional, and academic skills students need to make a successful transition to kindergarten. Children's readiness for school can be further categorized into various domains or dimensions of development. In one of the early large-scale efforts to establish a common framework for addressing school readiness issues, the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) organized school readiness skills into five domains: Physical Well-Being & Motor Development, Social & Emotional Development, Approaches Toward Learning, Communication & Language Usage, and Cognition and General Knowledge.

More recent research conducted by ASR found that readiness skills measured by the Kindergarten Observation Form (KOF) reliably sort into four primary domains, termed the Building Blocks of Readiness. These Building Blocks overlap with, but are distinct from the NEGP dimensions: Motor Skills, Self-Regulation, Social Expression, and Kindergarten Academics.

Despite differences in the measurement of school readiness, there is a robust body of research pointing to the impact of school readiness on future academic and social outcomes. Experts in the field have noted that cognitive and behavioral readiness skills generally predict children's ability to smoothly transition into and through elementary school (Pianta, Cox, & Snow, 2007). More specifically, children who demonstrate proficiency across an array of readiness dimensions are more likely to succeed academically in first grade than are those who are competent in only one or two dimensions (Hair, Halle, Terry-Humen, & Calkins, 2003). Stakeholders in both the early education and K-12 communities are eager to gather information about children's strengths and needs as they enter kindergarten and begin their school careers. Although there is somewhat less agreement on exactly which readiness skills matter most, and how broad and long-lasting their potential impact, there is a clear indication that school readiness matters. This report offers a snapshot of how ready children in San Francisco are for school across a range of readiness skills.

The ASR School Readiness Assessment Model

Beginning with ASR's first school readiness assessment in 2001, and continuing through over 20 further studies, ASR's readiness assessment materials and protocols have been designed to reflect both the state and local context of school readiness as well as the current research from early education and K-12 literature. The central instrument of the assessment, the Kindergarten Observation Form (KOF), was created from the input of a variety of subject matter experts, including community stakeholders, child development and education experts, preschool teachers, and kindergarten teachers and administrators and has been refined over the years in response to changes in the local educational contexts and developments in the early childhood education literature. Technical refinements to the KOF are described in the Appendix.

The school readiness skills measured on the KOF group into four primary dimensions of readiness referred to as the Basic Building Blocks of readiness. They are described as follows:

- **Motor Skills** includes those skills needed for demonstrating fine and gross motor coordination.
- **Self-Regulation** includes basic emotion regulation and self-control skills that are needed to be able to perform well in the classroom.
- **Social Expression** includes measures related to interacting with others and engagement with play and learning.
- **Kindergarten Academics** represents the basic “nuts and bolts” academic skills that tend to be explicitly taught to children at home, in early care settings, and in kindergarten.
METHODS

This section first describes the instruments and procedures used for data collection and then discusses how the data presented in this report were prepared, analyzed, and interpreted.

Data Collection Instruments

Three instruments were used to collect data for this assessment. Kindergarten teachers completed the *Kindergarten Observation Form* while parents provided information about their child and family circumstances on the *Parent Information Form*. The figure that follows provides a summary of each of the instruments, their content, and who completed each one.

**Figure 1. Overview of Data Collection Instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>What Key Data Are Assessed?</th>
<th>Who Completes It</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Observation Form (KOF)</td>
<td>20 school readiness skills of children in selected classrooms</td>
<td>Participating kindergarten teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Information Form (PIF)</td>
<td>Kindergarten transition activities; activities and routines in the home; parental supports, attitudes, and stressors; demographic and SES variables</td>
<td>Consenting parents of children in the assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kindergarten Observation Form (KOF)

The *Kindergarten Observation Form* was originally developed in 2001 using guidelines from the *National Education Goals Panel (NEGP)* framework of readiness. The *KOF* uses teacher observation as the method of assessment across 20 readiness skills. This is the most appropriate, valid, and reliable method of assessment for the following reasons:

- Because student behavior can change from day to day, teachers are in a better position than outside observers to assess their students, as teachers can draw on the knowledge gained through four weeks of daily interactions.
- Teacher observation is less obtrusive and less intimidating for students than assessment by outside observers.
- Teachers are entrusted by the school system to be children’s “assessors” in other respects, such as grading, and, therefore, it is presumed that they are aware of the need for assessments to be carried out in a fair manner.

Although teacher observation is most valid and reliable, there is some risk of natural variability between teacher observers. To minimize variability, the assessment tool includes measurable indicators (items), clear assessment instructions, a clearly defined response scale, a comprehensive scoring guide describing appropriate proficiency levels for each of the 20 readiness skills, and a thorough teacher training (see “Implementation” section for details on the trainings conducted).

Teachers were asked to observe and score each child according to his or her level of proficiency in each skill, using the following response options: Not Yet (1), Beginning (2), In Progress (3), and Proficient (4). An option of Don’t Know / Not Observed was provided as well. If teachers felt they could not provide an accurate assessment on items that require oral communication due to language barriers, they were instructed not to assess students on these items and instead check Don’t Know / Not Observed or leave those items blank.

The *KOF* also captures students’ basic demographic information to understand who took part in the study and to examine what characteristics are associated with children’s skill development (e.g., experience in curriculum-based early education settings, child age, child gender, presence of special needs).
Parent Information Form (PIF)

To better understand how family factors are related to children’s levels of readiness, a Parent Information Form was first developed in 2004 for completion by parents. The PIF collects a wide variety of information, including: types of child care arrangements for children during the year before kindergarten entry; ways in which families and children prepared for the transition to kindergarten; engagement in family activities and daily routines; use of parenting supports and family resources; parenting support and stressors; health and health care measures; and several demographic and socioeconomic measures. Care was taken to ensure that the questions could be read at a sixth grade reading level and the survey was offered in English, traditional Chinese, and Spanish. Parents were given a children’s book (bilingual Chinese/English and Spanish/English) as an incentive and thank you for their completion of the PIF. To enhance their privacy, parents were provided with an envelope in which they could seal their completed survey prior to returning them to their child’s teacher.

Sample

A total of 893 students in 50 classrooms across 47 schools participated in the assessments. The total number of participants by school is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>KOF total</th>
<th>KOF completion rate</th>
<th>PIF total</th>
<th>PIF return rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Carmichael</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret Harte (2 classrooms)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Horace Mann</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Education Center</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Immersion School at DeAvila</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodore Sloat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles R. Drew</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Washington Carver (2 classrooms)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.R. Taylor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado (2 classrooms)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scott Key</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Peabody</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon J. Lau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>KOF total</td>
<td>KOF completion rate&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>PIF total</td>
<td>PIF return rate&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Parker</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Muir</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Yehall Chin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ortega</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junipero Serra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton Alternative</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcom X</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Education Center</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Revere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Louis Stevenson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Parks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Community School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Public Montessori</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr King</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The KOF completion rate is calculated as percentage of all students enrolled in the class assessed.  
<sup>b</sup> The PIF return rate is calculated as percentage of all parents who consented.
Implementation

To launch this study, ASR worked with the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) to coordinate recruitment and implementation through the Early Education Department (EED). EED staff launched recruitment efforts in early spring of 2015 and reached out to assistant superintendents and principals to encourage kindergarten classroom teachers to participate in the assessment. First 5 provided principal stipends to enlist their support and assistance in recruitment efforts, and teachers were provided stipends upon completion of the assessments.

Teacher Trainings

Prior to and at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year, ASR conducted a series of in-depth assessment trainings for teachers on location at the district offices and by web conference. The trainings included an overview of the project and study purpose and a detailed explanation of the data collection steps, student assessment protocol, parent survey administration, and timeline.

Parent Consent

Parents granted consent for their children to participate through a process of passive consent. At the beginning of the school year, teachers explained the project and the consent process to parents before distributing the parent consent forms and Parent Information Forms (PIF). If, after being informed of the study, parents requested that their child not participate, the child was excluded from the study. All families whose children were members of the assessed kindergarten classes (participating and non-participating) were given a bilingual (Spanish/English or Chinese/English) children’s book as a token of appreciation for their consideration. Teachers collected completed PIFs and mailed them back to ASR.

Conducting Student Assessments

Teachers were instructed to conduct their student assessments approximately three to four weeks after the start of the school year, drawing upon their knowledge and observations of children during those first few weeks of school. The average length of time that elapsed between the start of school and teachers’ observations was 23.67 days – just over three weeks after their classes had started. Once complete, each teacher mailed the packet of completed Kindergarten Observation Forms and Parent Information Forms to ASR. When the final packets were received and vetted by ASR, each of the teachers was mailed a thank-you letter and a $500 stipend in appreciation of their contribution to the assessment.

Statistical Notation

Throughout this report, ASR uses the following standard abbreviations:

- $N$ denotes the sample size for a chart or an analysis table.
- $P$ values (e.g., $p<.01$) are used to note whether mean differences and correlations are statistically significant. $P$-values that are less than .05 are statistically significant; $p$-values that are between .06 and .10 are marginally significant.
- $R^2$ is a statistic that represents the degree of variance or change in one measure (e.g., readiness) that is explained by changes in other indicators or “predictors” (e.g., preschool, family income). $R^2$ is measured on a scale of 0 (no correlation) to 1 (perfectly correlated).

Sampling Weights

Ideally, samples from which data are collected are a very close approximation of the population from which they are drawn. However, when sample descriptive statistics indicate otherwise, weights are often used to bring the sample into closer alignment with the population on key characteristics in order that more accurate estimates might be made. The sampling weight is calculated based on the distribution of race/ethnicity as: the proportion present in the population divided by the proportion in sample. This weight is applied to all
descriptive and bivariate analyses in this report. All multivariate analyses include measures to control for race/ethnicity.

A PORTRAIT OF STUDENTS AND FAMILIES

This section uses data collected from the KOF and PIF to describe the background of kindergarten children and their families across the sample.

Child Demographic and Background Characteristics

The basic demographic characteristics of the sample, including gender, race, language, and household economic indicators, are described in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (at date of assessment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form; Parent Information Form, 2015; N=893.

RACE/ETHNICITY

Students are from a diverse range of racial and ethnic backgrounds, as illustrated in Table 2. The majority of students who participated in the study were identified as Asian and Hispanic/Latino, which closely reflects the overall SFUSD kindergarten population. White students represented the next largest race/ethnic group. In the 2015 sample, African American students comprise the next largest group, representing 17% of the sample. However, African American students comprise only 8% of the SFUSD kindergarten population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2. RACE/ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form; Parent Information Form, 2015; N=893. Note: SFUSD kindergarten population figures obtained from the California Department of Education DataQuest portal. The 2014-15 academic year is the most current for which data are available.

In order to produce results that more accurately reflect the SFUSD kindergarten population, the descriptive statistics reported in the following sections will all be statistically weighted to bring the sample estimates into greater alignment with the population. Note that when weights are applied, the total number of cases will not accurately reflect the actual data collected. Rather, the number of cases reflects the weighted numbers based on race/ethnicity.
**CHILD LANGUAGE**

Teachers were asked to identify the language each child is most comfortable communicating in as a gauge of students’ preferred language. The majority (65%) of students were identified as having a preference for English. **59%** of students were identified as English Learners by their teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. PREFERRED LANGUAGE</th>
<th>Average or Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi or Punjabi</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi or Dari</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don’t know</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015.

Teachers were asked to rate receptive and expressive English language skills of their English Learners. As illustrated below, most of the English Learners were rated as having “beginning” to “early intermediate” English expressive and receptive language skills.

**FIGURE 1. ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY**

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form; Parent Information Form, 2015.

Teachers indicated having difficulty communicating with about 9% of the English Learner students in their classrooms due to language barriers and 67% of English Learner students were not assessed in his/her preferred language.
HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Again, this year’s sample is characterized by few economic challenges, as indicated by the indicators of household stability presented in the table below, which shows lower proportions of single parent households and lost jobs in 2015 as compared to 2009.

TABLE 4. HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average or Percentage 2009</th>
<th>Average or Percentage 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Households</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers of K students...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were teenagers when child was born</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age at birth of K child</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of different home addresses since K child was born...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family has not had stable housing in past 2 months</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently behind on rent or other household bills</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary parent/guardian lost job in past year</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$15,999</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000-$31,999</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$32,000-$52,999</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$53,000-$84,999</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85,000-$104,999</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105,000-$125,999</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$126,000-$157,999</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$158,000+</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education (Highest level attained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than HS</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or higher</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form; Parent Information Form, 2015. * Denotes the items were not asked in 2009.
Pre-Kindergarten Experiences

ASR used three sources to identify the specific types of preschool experiences children in the assessment had in the year prior to kindergarten entry. The Kindergarten Observation Form and Parent Information Form asked teachers and parents a series of questions about the child’s child care and/or preschool arrangements during the year prior to kindergarten entry. Enrollment records from First 5 were also obtained to supplement these sources and to identify children enrolled in First 5-funded preschool environments. By combining data we received from parents with data completed by teachers, a child was considered to have had preschool experience in the year prior to kindergarten entry if at least one of the following conditions was satisfied: 1) the kindergarten teacher indicated that the child had participated in a Head Start program or another licensed child care center, or a licensed family child care home program; 2) parents indicated their child attended a licensed preschool/child care center, or a licensed family child care home for preschool; or 3) student was identified in the First 5 PFA enrollment database.

The vast majority of students for whom such information was available have had some kind of preschool experience prior to kindergarten entry. Taken together with transitional kindergarten, 92% of SFUSD kindergartners had some kind of curriculum-based pre-kindergarten schooling. Of those students who were in transitional kindergarten program, 81% had also had some kind of center-based or PFA-funded preschool program experience prior to kindergarten entry.

FIGURE 2. PRE-KINDERGARTEN EXPERIENCES IN THE YEAR PRIOR TO KINDERGARTEN ENTRY

- Any preschool in year prior to K: 88%
- Other licensed center-based preschool/child care center: 49%
- Preschool For All preschool: 42%
- Transitional kindergarten last year: 22%
- Head Start preschool: 14%
- Short-term summer pre-K program: 12%
- Licensed home-based child care: 10%

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015, Parent Information Form, 2015, PFA administrative data. Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, as some reported more than one type of preschool or childcare. Short-term summer pre-k and Transitional kindergarten are not included within the measure of “Any preschool in year prior to K.”

In addition, two students were identified as currently in transitional kindergarten and thirteen students were identified as repeating kindergarten this year (1.5%).

---

1 PFA data were merged into the primary KOF and PIF data by matching cases on date of birth, first initial, middle initial, last initial, sex, and race.

2 The 92% weighted figure includes all students who had preschool at center-based preschools, any PFA-funded site, and transitional kindergarten.
WHO GOES TO WHAT TYPE OF PRE-KINDERGARTEN ENVIRONMENT?

Using the pre-kindergarten experiences collected on the PIF and KOF, this section examines the different types of environments that different families send their children to in the year prior to school entry, and at earlier points in their kindergarten child’s life stages.

Pre-K Experience by Child Age

The PIF asked parents to identify the various types of pre-school experiences that their kindergarten child had throughout his/her stages of development prior to kindergarten entry.

As illustrated in the table below, at infancy, the most common type of care that parents seek is with a family, friend, or neighbour. Once the child reaches toddlerhood, a licensed preschool or childcare center appears to be the preferred pre-k venue up to kindergarten entry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Stage of Child</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Toddler</th>
<th>Preschooler</th>
<th>Transitional Kindergartner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed preschool or childcare center</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed family child care home</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, friend, neighbor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term/summer pre-k program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Kindergarten</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child had none of the above experiences</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parent Information Form, 2015. Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, as more than one type of pre-k experience may be reported for each case.

Pre-K Experiences by Race/Ethnicity

The table on the following page illustrates the frequency with which families rely on various types of pre-k experiences by race.

While preschool and TK are widely experienced across race/ethnic groups, it is nearly a universal experience among White families, among whom 99% send their children to preschool or TK. However, this group is least likely to send their children to PFA or Head Start sites, preferring instead, to send their children to other centers.

Only about one-quarter of White families go to PFA-funded sites for pre-k and only 1% use Head Start sites, compared to over half of African American who use PFA sites and over one-quarter of African Americans who use Head Start. 77% of White families identify using “other” licensed centers for pre-k.
### TABLE 6. PRE-K EXPERIENCES BY RACE/ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of pre-k experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Any preschool, including TK: 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Any preschool, including TK: 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Any preschool, including TK: 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Any preschool, including TK: 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi/Other</td>
<td>Any preschool, including TK: 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any center-based, incl all PFA sites, excluding TK: 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PFA-funded site: 52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Start site: 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other licensed center: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Licensed home-based care: 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term/Summer program: 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Kindergarten: 31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015; Parent Information Form, 2015; PFA enrollment data. Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, as more than one type of pre-k experience may be reported for each case.

### Pre-K Experiences by Household Income

Examining pre-k experiences by annual household income, we find a slightly greater proportion of higher-income families send their children to some kind of preschool experience, as compared with lower-income families. As might be expected, lower-income families are more likely to rely on PFA or Head-Start sites, although one-quarter of families earning $105,000 and higher do also rely on PFA-funded sites and 5% of these families use Head Start. However, the highest-earning families are more likely to use other licensed centers. Additionally, a relatively larger proportion of lower-income families send their children to transitional kindergarten programs as compared to higher-income families.

### TABLE 7. PRE-K EXPERIENCES BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of pre-k experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any preschool, including TK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any center-based, incl all PFA sites, excluding TK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA-funded site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other licensed center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed home-based care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term/Summer program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015; Parent Information Form, 2015; PFA enrollment data. Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, as more than one type of pre-k experience may be reported for each case.
PFA Participation

Participation in First 5 PFA was particularly high among students at Spring Valley Elementary School where 80% of assessed students had been formerly enrolled in a PFA preschool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students assessed</th>
<th>Students in PFA</th>
<th>% of assessed students in PFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne - Extended Year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Carmichael (PreK-5 Campus)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret Harte (2 classrooms)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Horace Mann</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>César Chávez</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Education Center</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Immersion School at DeAvila</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodore Sloat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles R. Drew</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. George Washington Carver (2 classrooms)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.R. Taylor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado (2 classrooms)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Scott Key</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Peabody</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon J. Lau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Parker</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Muir</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Yehall Chin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ortega</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junipero Serra</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton Alternative School (K8)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm X</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Education Center</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Revere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Louis Stevenson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Parks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F. Community School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F. Public Montessori</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr King</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutro</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form 2015 and First 5 service records.
As shown in the table below, children participating in First 5 PFA preschool programs were more likely than other children in the sample to be non-White and to be English Learners.

Children enrolled in First 5-funded preschools were slightly more likely to come from single-parent families and from households earning lower incomes as compared to those not enrolled in PFA.

TABLE 9. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRST 5-ENGAGED STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PFA Participants (N=367)</th>
<th>Non-PFA Participants (N=458)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Learner Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English Learner</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Needs Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child has special needs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child does not have special needs</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$15,999</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000-$31,999</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$32,000-$52,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$53,000-$84,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85,000-$104,999</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105,000+</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent family</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen mother</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form 2015, Parent Information Form 2015, and First 5 service records. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
Child Health

This section describes results from the Parent Information Form and teachers’ observations on the KOF about children’s health and well-being.

Insurance, Access to Care and Screenings

According to parents, nearly all children had health insurance (96%) and a regular doctor (99%). While most students had received vision and hearing screenings (77% and 68%, respectively), but just 44% had received a developmental screening.

![Figure 3. Insurance, Access to Care and Screenings](image)

Source: Parent Information Form, 2015. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Special Needs

The KOF asked teachers to indicate whether a student had a designated special need or Individualized Education Program (IEP). The PIF also asked parents for this information about their child. If no special need or IEP had been formally designated, parents and teachers were also asked to indicate whether they believed the child may have a special need that had perhaps not yet been formally diagnosed.

As shown in the next table on the following page, while 53 of the 885 (6%) assessed students with completed teacher-reported data on this item have a designated special need or IEP, an additional 70 students out of the 832 (8%) completed teacher or parent responses are believed by either their parent or teacher to have an undiagnosed special need.

While the numbers are small and should be interpreted cautiously, when examined by race/ethnicity and by household income, we find that Hispanic and lower-income students are more likely to have a designated IEP. These students and African American students are also more likely to have a parent or teacher believe that they have a special need, as the following table demonstrates.

---

3 Chi-square tests for independence were conducted to examine the relationship between the special needs measures and race/ethnicity and income. Findings indicate statistically significant associations, such that Hispanic students are more likely have a designated IEP and...
In addition, of the 57 students whose parents identified as having special needs, 58% indicate that they have received professional help to address the need. While these figures should be interpreted with caution, as the numbers are quite small, when examined by race and income, we find that a greater proportion of White and higher-income households with special needs students receives professional assistance. Indeed, although a greater proportion of Hispanic children have or are believed to have special needs, a substantially smaller proportion of these children receive professional help with that need, as compared to others.

TABLE 10. SPECIAL NEEDS BY RACE AND INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristic</th>
<th>Percent designated special needs/IEP</th>
<th>Percent parent/teacher believe to have special need</th>
<th>Child received professional help with special need (parent report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample N</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
<td>13% (15)</td>
<td>70% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4% (9)</td>
<td>5% (12)</td>
<td>70% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12% (27)</td>
<td>13% (26)</td>
<td>44% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4% (5)</td>
<td>5% (6)</td>
<td>83% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
<td>7% (11)</td>
<td>63% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$31,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11% (27)</td>
<td>56% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$32,000-$52,999</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13% (15)</td>
<td>56% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$53,000-$104,999</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4% (4)</td>
<td>100% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105,000+</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1% (3)</td>
<td>100% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parent Information Form, 2015; Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015. Note: Total Ns in the table are unweighted.

The PIF also asked parents to indicate how they came to believe their child has a special need. Table 12 shows the different ways in which parents discovered their child’s special need, either through diagnosis by professionals, or by their own or other assessment. On average, children were 2 and a half years old at the time of diagnosis.

TABLE 11. HOW PARENTS LEARNED ABOUT THEIR CHILD’S SPECIAL NEED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you learn that your child has special needs?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis from a doctor or other medical professional</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis from other professional</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own diagnosis/assessment</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parent Information Form, 2015.
**CHILD WELL-BEING AND ATTENDANCE PATTERNS**

On the KOF, teachers were asked to indicate how frequently each student displayed physical well-being or attendance concerns over the first month of school. More specifically, teachers were asked to report the degree to which students were hungry, tired, sick, absent, or tardy at school.

For the most part, children appear to be coming to class on time, healthy, and well-rested. However, some children do appear in class showing signs of concerning well-being.

**FIGURE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHER-REPORTED CHILD**

As might be expected, these items are all correlated with each other, such that children who appear hungry in class also tend to be tired, sick/ill, absent, and/or tardy. Appearing hungry is most strongly correlated with being tired, and being sick or ill is also most strongly correlated with absence. However, it is not the case that the same children who are hungry are also tired, sick, tardy, and absent. A small subgroup comprising approximately 6% of the sample is reported by their teachers as appearing hungry and tired on most or just about every day. A greater proportion of these students is Hispanic/Latino and their households earn less than $32,000 annually. Their families are characterized by a greater average number of risk factors (housing instability, job loss, teen pregnancy, etc.), lower levels of social support, and lower frequency of engagement in both local community resources (park, zoo, library, Family Resource Centers, etc.) and in activities in the home (reading, chores, playing games, sports, etc.).

Overall, children from households earning less than $32,000 annually are statistically significantly more likely to appear tired or hungry in class, and are more likely to be tardy, compared to children from higher-income households.

Race/ethnicity also plays a role in children’s well-being, such that African American and Hispanic/Latino students are more likely than other students to appear hungry, tired, or sick in class. Teachers also report that African American students are tardy or absent from class with significantly greater frequency relative to their peers.

---

4 Bivariate correlations (p<0.001).
5 T-tests comparing low-income families (household income less than $32k) to other families at the p<0.05 level.
6 One-way Analysis of Variance comparing frequency of well-being items by race/ethnic categories finds African American and Hispanic students with significantly lower levels of well-being than their peers (p<0.05).
Family Activities

To better understand children’s home environments, parents were asked a series of questions on the *Parent Information Form* about family practices and routines.

**FAMILY ACTIVITIES IN THE HOME**

Parents were asked how often they engaged in a variety of activities (e.g., reading, story-telling) with their children in a typical week. The most frequent type of activity cited was *reading for more than five minutes*, with which parents said they engaged their children an average of nearly five times per week.

**FIGURE 5. FREQUENCY OF FAMILY ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2x a week</th>
<th>3-4x a week</th>
<th>5-6x a week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read for more than five minutes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell stories or sing songs together</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves your child in household chores</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.8/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play games or do puzzles with your child</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play a sport or exercise together</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do arts or crafts with your child</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.2/wk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Parent Information Form* 2015. Proportions less than 5% not labeled. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Engagement in these family activities varied somewhat by *family income level*. Families earning at least $32,000 in income per year read together and told stories or sang songs with their children significantly more frequently than families earning under $32,000.

**FIGURE 6. AVERAGE WEEKLY FREQUENCY OF FAMILY ACTIVITIES, BY INCOME LEVEL**

*Source: Parent Information Form 2015. Note: *Statistically significant mean differences at p<.05.*
USE OF LOCAL FAMILY RESOURCES

When asked which types of local and community resources their families used in the last year, the most commonly cited resource was local parks (88%), followed by libraries (73%) and the SF Zoo (62%). About 3% of families reportedly did not utilize any local resources listed.

FIGURE 7. USE OF LOCAL, FAMILY RESOURCES

The utilization of the above resources was also examined by family income. Lower-income families (those earning less than $32,000 annually) were significantly less likely than other families to make use of all types of community resources, with the exception of Family Resource Centers, which were used slightly more among lower-income families, though this difference was not statistically significant. Lower-income families were also significantly more likely than other families to have used none of the local family resources listed.

FIGURE 8. USE OF LOCAL FAMILY RESOURCES BY INCOME LEVEL

Source: Parent Information Form 2015. Note: *Statistically significant differences at p<.05.
OTHER HOME PRACTICES: SCREEN TIME, DAILY ROUTINES, AND INTERNET ACCESS

**Screen Time:** Parents reported that children in the sample spent an average of 1.5 hours per weekday and **2.5 hours per day on weekends** in front of a television or computer screen which is higher than the American Academy of Pediatrics’ (n.d.) guideline that young children should limit TV and videos to two hours per day. While the majority of the sample spends less than two hours in front of a screen on weekdays, 44% exceed this recommended limit on the weekends.

**Internet Access:** The Parent Information Form asked parents: *Do you have access to the internet for your personal (not work-related) use?* 13 percent of parents indicated that they do not have access to the internet for personal use. Moreover, access to the internet for personal use was significantly less common among families earning less than $32,000 than it was among families earning at least $32,000 (77% vs. 95%; p<0.01).

**FIGURE 9. HOME ENVIRONMENT: SCREEN TIME, INTERNET**

Source: Parent Information Form 2015.

**Bedtime:** According to parents, over two-thirds (70%) of kindergartners regularly went to bed no later than 9:00 pm.

**FIGURE 10. USUAL WEEK NIGHT BEDTIMES**

Source: Parent Information Form 2015.
Parent Perspectives on Children’s School Readiness

In order to gain a sense of parents’ perspectives on and engagement with their child’s school readiness, the Parent Information Form asked a series of questions about a variety of different ways in which parents may have been involved in their child’s preparation for school.

KINDERGARTEN PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AT HOME

Parents were asked to identify whether or not they engaged in a range of activities in preparation for their children’s transition to kindergarten. The majority of families reported visiting the child’s elementary school in advance of school starting (71%).

Higher-income households were more likely to engage in kindergarten preparation activities than households whose annual incomes were $32,000 or less.\(^7\)

![FIGURE 11. KINDERGARTEN PREPARATION ACTIVITIES](source: Parent Information Form 2015)

\(^7\) All differences are statistically significant at p<0.10, with the exception of reading books/articles about the transition to kindergarten.
Parental Supports and Stressors

Use of Parenting Programs, Services, and Other Support

The PIF also collected information about families’ utilization of parenting services and supports. On average, families had taken advantage of three to four of the services listed. As shown in Figure 13 (below), the two most common types of support accessed by parents were medical checkups while pregnant (61%) and WIC (56%). Less than half of all parents reported receiving other forms of services. Only 35 percent had received information from a child care provider, 34 percent had received help from family, and just one in four had received help from neighbors and friends. Eight percent did not use any programs, services, or supports listed.

As might be expected, families earning under $32,000 were significantly more likely to use the resources that primarily target disadvantaged families, including WIC and home visits from nurses, community workers, or other providers. On the other hand, families earning at least $32,000 were significantly more likely to report receiving regular medical check-ups during their pregnancy, and receiving help from extended family, and help from neighbors.\(^8\)

**FIGURE 12. PARENTS’ USAGE OF PROGRAMS, SERVICES AND OTHER SUPPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical check-ups while pregnant</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC (Women, Infants, and Children)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from neighbors/friends</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroups</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from extended family</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education classes</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visits from a nurse/provider</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support groups</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parent Information Form 2015.

\(^8\) All differences observed are statistically significant at the p<0.05 level.
**Social Support and Parenting Strain**

Most parents reported having a supportive network and feeling able to meet the demands of parenting, although percentages endorsing the statements in Figure 14 as “definitely true” for them are slightly lower than those found in 2009. This suggests that parents are experiencing somewhat lower levels of social support and coping with parenting. About 77 percent of parents felt confident in their ability to help their child grow and develop. And most parents felt it was at least “somewhat true” that they could easily find someone to talk to for parenting advice and that they were coping well with the day-to-day demands of parenting.

While single-parent families did not differ from non-single-parent families on these dimensions, parents in families earning $32,000 or higher annual income were significantly more likely than parents in lower-income families to report having a strong support system of friends, family, and community resources, being able to easily find someone to talk to for advice, and having someone to turn to for help. This is consistent with findings from the previous page that higher-income families reported having more help from friends, neighbors, and family members.

**FIGURE 13. SOCIAL SUPPORT AND COPING**

- I feel confident in my ability to help my child grow and develop. 77% definitely true, 20% somewhat true.
- I can easily find someone to talk to when I need advice about how to raise my child. 61% definitely true, 30% somewhat true, 6% not very true.
- I am coping well with the day-to-day demands of parenting. 58% definitely true, 37% somewhat true, 5% not very true.
- I have a strong support system of family, friends, and community resources. 53% definitely true, 32% somewhat true, 10% not very true, 5% not at all true.
- When I need help with problems in my family, I am able to ask for help from others. 52% definitely true, 33% somewhat true, 9% not very true, 7% not at all true.

Source: Parent Information Form 2015. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Proportions less than 5% not labeled.

As Figure 15 indicates, the majority of parents did not show signs of serious parenting strain. Less than five percent of parents reported that their child was hard to care for or bothered them a lot “most” or “all the time.” Although most parents said they never feel these kinds of emotional strain, one-third reported their child was harder to care for than other children “some of the time” and half of the parents said their child does things that bother them a lot “some of the time”.

No significant differences were found on these items by household income or structure.

**FIGURE 14. PARENTING STRAIN: THINKING ABOUT THE PAST MONTH, HOW MUCH OF THE TIME HAVE YOU FELT...**

- Your child was much harder to care for than most children. 33% all of the time, 62% most or all of the time.
- Your child does things that really bother you a lot. 50% all of the time, 47% some of the time.

Source: Parent Information Form 2015. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Proportions less than 5% not labeled.
Risk Factors

A number of questions on the Parent Information Form assessed the degree to which families were facing challenging circumstances. Results showed that families in this assessment coped with a number of potential sources of stress, including:

- Housing instability: Less than two percent of families still lived at the same address as when the child was born, and over 40 percent had moved at least twice during that period of time. In 2009, six percent of families still lived at the same address as when their kindergartner was born, but 80% had moved at least twice in that time.
- Job loss: Seventeen percent of children had a primary parent or guardian who had lost a job in the past year, representing a decrease in job loss as compared to findings from 2009, and on par with 2007 findings.
- Teen motherhood: Four percent of the mothers of these kindergarteners had been teenagers when they gave birth, which is consistent with 2009.
- Lack of support: Eleven percent of the parents reported that they had not received any of a list of ten possible parent programs, services, and supports, including regular medical check-ups while pregnant, help from extended family, neighbors, or friends, or other parent resources like home visits or education classes, which is consistent with findings from 2009.

Using this set of five “risk factors” that may indicate presence of stressful family circumstances, ASR constructed a summary risk score that counted the number of stressors the family had, out of five possible stressors. Families scored one point for the presence of each of the following:

- Being above the median on number of addresses the family had had since the child’s birth;
- Being in a single-parent household;
- Having a parent who lost his/her job in the last year;
- Being born to a teenage mother; and
- Having participated in/received none of the parent programs, supports, and services listed on the PIF.

On average, families in the sample faced 1 of the above risk factors, with no families identifying themselves at risk in all factors.

As illustrated in the following figure, over one-third (37%) of families face no risk factors at all. This represents a substantial increase since 2009, when only 27% of families had no risk factors.

**Figure 15. Family Risk Factors**

Source: Parent Information Form, 2015.
Family Background Summary

The families participating in the fall 2015 readiness assessment were quite similar to their 2009 counterparts, with similar levels of maternal education, family income, risk factors, and the like. While only 12% of mothers had less than a high school education, roughly one in five children were being raised by a single parent. Nevertheless, the vast majority of parents had health insurance and a regular doctor and dentist for their children. Most children also came to school healthy, alert, well-fed, and were rarely or never absent or tardy, though a small proportion of students who do come to school with lower levels of well-being on most or almost every day. The vast majority of children attended preschool or licensed child care. Indeed, it was a small minority of students (8%) who had no preschool experience at all.

Engagement in family activities and use of local resources tended to vary depending on the type of activity or resource and family income. For example, across all families, working on school skills, visiting local parks, and telling stories or singing songs were reported by the majority of families. Relatively fewer families, on the other hand, engaged their child in an arts or music program or engaged the child in arts and crafts at home.

Families earning at least $32,000 were more likely than other families to engage in family activities such as reading with the child, singing songs, and doing arts and crafts. They were also more likely to use any of the local community resources listed, with the exception of Family Resource Centers, which were more likely to be used by lower-income families.

Most families prepared themselves and their child for starting school by visiting the school campus, providing opportunities for their child to engage in small group play activities, and by attending parent orientations.

Most parents reported low levels of parenting strain and high levels of social support. However, in comparison to 2009, parents seem to be experiencing somewhat lower levels of social support and coping with parenting. In addition, low-income parents were less likely to report having strong social support as compared to their higher-income counterparts.

These family background factors set the context for the next section on school readiness. Later in the report, the link between some of these demographic, early education, and family factors and school readiness will be more closely examined.
PROFILE OF SCHOOL READINESS SKILLS

Basic Building Blocks of Readiness

Using the Kindergarten Observation Form (KOF), teachers rated the proficiency of their students across 20 readiness skills on a scale of 1-4 as follows: “Not Yet” (1), “Beginning” (2), “In Progress” (3), or “Proficient” (4). Each of these 20 skills is part of one of the four Basic Building Blocks:

- **Motor Skills** includes those skills needed for demonstrating fine and gross motor coordination. These are regarded as foundational elements to the other Blocks.
- **Self-Regulation** includes basic regulation of emotions and self-control skills that are needed to be able to perform well in the classroom.
- **Social Expression** includes measures related to interacting with others and engagement with play and learning.
- **Kindergarten Academics** represents the basic “nuts and bolts” academic skills that tend to be explicitly taught to children at home, in early care settings, and in kindergarten.

The KOF items that comprise each of the Basic Building Blocks are displayed in the pyramid below.

**FIGURE 16. THE BASIC BUILDING BLOCKS OF READINESS**

Although all of these skill dimensions are essential components of readiness, the pyramid suggests a framework of skill progression. That is, basic motor skills are at the base because they are likely to precede the more advanced socio-emotional skills of self-regulation and social expression. The top of the pyramid contains some of the early foundational academic skills that are covered in kindergarten and beyond.

The remainder of this report uses this **Basic Building Blocks** typology to describe school readiness of the kindergarten students in San Francisco this year.
Overall Levels of Readiness

School readiness is a multi-faceted construct. This section examines school readiness in SFUSD in a number of different ways to gain a more thorough understanding of the varied aspects of kindergarten readiness.

**Basic Building Blocks Scores**

For each individual readiness skill, children were scored on a scale from Not yet (1) to Proficient (4). As Figure 18 shows, scores for overall readiness – as well as the Basic Building Blocks – are between the In progress (3) and Proficient (4) levels. At the beginning of the year, assessment scores were highest in the Motor Skills area (3.41) and had the greatest room to grow in the Social Expression area (average score = 3.09).

**Figure 17. Average Scores Across the Basic Building Blocks of Readiness at Kindergarten Entry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Skills</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Expression</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Academics</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form 2015. Note: N=857-887. Average scores range from 1 (indicating a score of “Not yet”) to 4 (indicating a score of “Proficient”).

**Performance across the Individual Skills**

The figure on the following page shows the percentage of children scoring at the Not yet, Beginning, In progress, and Proficient levels across all 20 readiness skills.

The greatest number of children were proficient in the following four skills (includes skills in the Kindergarten Academics cluster, as well as Motor Skills):

- Recognizes basic colors (85% score at the Proficient level)
- Recognizes primary shapes (70%)
- Writes own first name (65%)
- Uses a pencil with proper grip (60%)

Far fewer children were proficient in the following areas (these include skills in Kindergarten Academics, Social Expression, and Self-Regulation blocks):

- Answers questions about key details in literature (32% Proficient)
- Tells about a story or experience (35% score at the Proficient level)
- Expresses empathy (37%)
- Handles frustration well (38%)
### Figure 18. Percentage of Children at Each Proficiency Level Across Readiness Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Not Yet</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motor Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses pencil with proper grip</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General coordination</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Regulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays focused</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows rules</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows directions</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works/plays cooperatively</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates succ. in large group</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handles frustration well</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Expression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses needs/wants verbally</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses empathy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells about a story</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates eagerness for learning</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten Academics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers quest. about key details in literature</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands structure of books</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes own first name</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes rhyming words</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts 20 objects</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes letters of the alphabet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes basic colors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes primary shapes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form 2015. Note: Scores range from 1 (Not yet) to 4 (Proficient). Proportions of less than 5% are not labeled. ** Indicates language-dependent items.

Figure 22 lists the sample mean score for each of the 20 readiness items in order of highest to lowest score. The dotted line at 3.23 represents the overall average readiness score across all 20 items.
Readiness scores within *Kindergarten Academics* (items noted as “KACAD” in the Figure) were the most varied of any group of skills in the four building blocks. This area contained the lowest-scored skill: recognizes rhyming words, as well as the highest-scored skills, recognizes basic colors and primary shapes.

**FIGURE 19. AVERAGE READINESS SCORES PER SKILL (HIGHEST TO LOWEST)**

- Recognizes basic colors (KACAD) [3.8]
- Recognizes primary shapes (KACAD) [3.6]
- Uses a pencil with proper grip (MS) [3.4]
- Writes own first name (KACAD) [3.4]
- Catches a ball (MS) [3.4]
- Understands basic features of books (KACAD) [3.4]
- Follows two-step directions (SELFREG) [3.3]
- Counts up to 20 objects (KACAD) [3.2]
- Follows class rules (SELFREG) [3.2]
- Appropriately expresses needs verbally (SOCEXP) [3.2]
- Works and plays cooperatively with peers (SELFREG) [3.2]
- Stays focused/pays attention (SELFREG) [3.2]
- Demonstrates curiosity, eagerness for learning... [3.2]
- Participates in large group activities (SELFREG) [3.2]
- Recognizes all the letters of the alphabet (KACAD) [3.1]
- Expresses empathy or caring for others (SOCEXP) [3.1]
- Handles frustration well (SELFREG) [3.0]
- Tells about a story or experience (SOCEXP) [2.9]
- Answers questions about details in literature (KACAD) [2.9]
- Recognizes rhyming words (KACAD) [2.8]

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form 2015. Note: N=841-887. Scores range from 1 (Not yet) to 4 (Proficient).
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS WITHIN EACH READINESS LEVEL

To determine how many students were at each level of overall readiness, each student’s overall readiness score was classified into one of four readiness levels. The benchmark for the highest level is 3.50, above which students may be considered **Fully Ready/Proficient**. Students scoring in the range just below this benchmark, with scores of 3.01-3.50, are considered **In Progress/Proficient** level. The levels further below represent **Beginning/In Progress** and **Not Yet/Beginning**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READINESS LEVEL</th>
<th>SCORE RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully Ready/Proficient</td>
<td>3.51-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress/Proficient</td>
<td>3.01-3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning/In Progress</td>
<td>2.51-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet/Beginning</td>
<td>1.00-2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below plots the readiness score of all students in the assessment in order from lowest (far left) to highest score (far right), and illustrates the proportion of students within each readiness level. At the far right of the chart are the 38 percent of students considered **Fully Ready/Proficient** due to their overall readiness score being over 3.50. The next level represents the 29 percent of students with scores between 3.01 and 3.50 (**In Progress/Proficient**). At left are the 20 percent with scores between 2.51 and 3.00 (**Beginning/In Progress**) and the 13 percent with scores at or below 2.50 (**Not Yet/Beginning**).

FIGURE 20. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITHIN EACH READINESS LEVEL, BY AVERAGE OVERALL SCORE

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form 2015. Note: N=859. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.
HOW READY IS “READY”? 

To better understand how ready children in San Francisco are for school entry, this section examines mean Basic Building Block scores relative to a measure based on longitudinal observations.

There are a number of ways to define standards for how ready children should be at kindergarten entry or earlier. For example, the SFUSD Early Education Department employs its own benchmark within its Early Education Schools, based on assessments of preschool-age children. For the purposes of this report, it is possible to define a standard using Kindergarten Observation Form scores and historical data on children’s achievement on California standardized tests.

The Longitudinal Study Standard is derived by identifying students who performed at proficiency or above on both CST Math and ELA tests in the third grade and finding their mean kindergarten readiness scores from school readiness data that were collected using the KOF in 2009. In acknowledgment of the variation in student development and achievement, one standard deviation below that mean is taken as the benchmark that defines the Longitudinal Study Standard. The figure below shows the mean Longitudinal Study Standard scores across Building Blocks.

FIGURE 21. LONGITUDINAL STUDY STANDARD MEANS

Using Longitudinal Study Standard, the next figure illustrates that overall, 62% of SFUSD students meet or exceed the overall Longitudinal Study Standard.

FIGURE 22. PERCENT OF STUDENTS MEETING OR EXCEEDING THE LONGITUDINAL STANDARD BENCHMARK

62% of kindergartners are ready for school based on the Longitudinal Study Standard.
The next table contains mean scores in each Building Block based on the Longitudinal Standard. Across levels of readiness, Social Expression presents as the lowest-scoring block.

Among the group of students who meet or exceed the Longitudinal Study Standard, Motor Skills and Kindergarten Academics stand out as strengths.

**TABLE 12. MEAN BUILDING BLOCK SCORES BY READINESS LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Readiness Level</th>
<th>Motor Skills</th>
<th>Self-Regulation</th>
<th>Social Expression</th>
<th>Kinder Academics</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets/Exceeds Longitudinal Study Standard</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet Longitudinal Study Standard</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students assessed</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015
Who is More and Less Ready for School?

Figure 24 below shows the distribution within each level of readiness for selected demographic criteria. For example, of the 80 children who are Not Ready, 76 percent were boys and 24 percent were girls. Some other noteworthy group differences include:

- A substantially smaller proportion of students who are Ready for Kindergarten came to school hungry, tired, sick, or absent relative to the other readiness levels.
- A greater proportion of students Not Ready for kindergarten had special needs or an IEP designation, and/or were English language learners.
- Relative to Partially Ready and Not Ready students, a smaller proportion of those who were Ready for Kindergarten had family incomes of less than $32,000.
- While most children attended preschool in the sample, a greater proportion of students Ready for Kindergarten had prior preschool experience compared to the students in the Not Ready group.

**FIGURE 23. CHARACTERISTICS WITHIN EACH READINESS LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Ready for Kindergarten (meets/exceeds overall Longitudinal Study Standard)</th>
<th>Not Ready (below standards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (average)</td>
<td>5.58 yrs</td>
<td>5.48 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child was on most or just about every day…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungry</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tired</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick or ill</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tardy</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs/IEP</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preschool</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, Parent Information Form, 2015; Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.
FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOOL READINESS

This section presents an analysis of the most salient predictive factors of school readiness among students and examines their relationship with school readiness. The factors explored in this section have empirical associations with school readiness, however readers are cautioned to keep in mind that association does not necessarily mean causation. Rather, this section seeks to understand those factors that have strong relationships with school readiness in order that programmatic and curricular efforts might be targeted to strengthen school readiness based on the associations identified. These predictors are based on the full assortment of demographic, health, early education, and background characteristics that were collected about each child on the KOF and PIF. The range of potential factors included sex, language skill, preschool experience, and child well-being.

CHILD SEX

Girls outperformed boys in each Basic Building Block area, as shown in the figure below.

FIGURE 24. BASIC BUILDING BLOCK MEANS BY SEX

![Graph showing basic building block means by sex]

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015. Note: All differences observed are statistically significant at p<0.05 level.

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

As illustrated in the figure below, children’s development of English language receptive and expressive skills have a strong positive bivariate relationship with overall readiness scores, such that as receptive and expressive language skills become more highly developed, so too do their school readiness skills.

FIGURE 25. OVERALL READINESS MEANS BY ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILL LEVEL

![Graph showing overall readiness means by English language skill level]

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015; N=448-449.

---

5 This figure examines only the relationship between English language skills and readiness scores and does not account for other variables such as household income, mother’s education, etc.
**CHILD WELL-BEING**

A child’s well-being has a significant impact on their overall readiness for school, as illustrated by Figure 27. The more frequently a child was sick, tired, or hungry in class, the less ready they were for school.

**FIGURE 26. OVERALL READINESS MEANS BY CHILD WELLBEING**

![Chart showing readiness scores by frequency of being sick, tired, or hungry](image)

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015.

**RISK FACTORS**

Children in families coping with risk factors such as housing instability, job loss, teen motherhood, single parenthood, and lack of supports may also find school readiness more challenging than children faced with fewer family risk factors.

As illustrated by the figure below, on average, children whose families have risk factors tend to be less ready than those from families with no risk factors. The negative impact of risk factors appears strongest in the area of social emotional development, while motor skills development appears to be relatively less affected.

**FIGURE 27. OVERALL READINESS MEAN SCORES BY NUMBER OF FAMILY RISK FACTORS**

![Bar chart showing overall readiness scores by number of risk factors](image)

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form; Parent Information Form, 2015. N=712.
**Family Engagement Activities**

There are many different ways in which families can engage in activities both at home and outside of the home that can promote school readiness skills. The figure below compares the average overall readiness scores of students whose families did and did not engage in any of a variety of different activities at home and in the community, which demonstrate the importance of broad family engagement to school readiness.

Specific descriptions of each of the engagement items parents responded to on the *Parent Information Form* that are included in the figure are provided below.

**FIGURE 28. OVERALL READINESS MEAN SCORES BY FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Did not Engage in Activity</th>
<th>Engaged in Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessed local community resources</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessed parenting services/supports</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in preparatory activities</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, Parent Information Form, 2015.

**Local Community Resources**

Parents who made use of local community resources such as those listed below also helped boost their children’s readiness for school:

- Arts/music programs
- Museums
- Libraries
- Parks
- Zoos
- Recreational activities
- Family Resource Centers

**Parenting Programs, Services, Supports**

Students whose parents accessed at least one of various parenting programs, services, and supports such as those listed below were more ready for school as compared to those whose parents did not access any such services:

- Regular medical check-ups while pregnant
- WIC (Women, Infants and Children)
- Help from extended family
- Home visits from nurse, community worker, or other
- Help from neighbors/friends
- Parent education classes
- Playgroups
- Parent support groups
Preparatory Activities

Parents and caregivers can help boost their entering kindergartner’s school readiness by proactively engaging in any of the many preparatory activities listed below:

- Attend a parent meeting or orientation
- Visit the school with child
- Meet child’s kindergarten teacher
- Work with child on school skills
- Read books or watched videos about kindergarten with child
- Read books or articles about child’s transition to school
- Ask child’s care provider/preschool questions about kindergarten
- Ask child’s care provider/preschool whether child was ready for kindergarten
- Provide opportunities for child to play with other children in small groups

Activities at Home

While all parents indicated engaging their child in at least one of the following activities at home at least once a week, parents and caregivers who regularly engage their entering kindergartner in multiple household activities several times a week provide opportunities for children to develop skills necessary to succeed in school:

- Read for more than five minutes
- Tell stories or sing songs
- Involve child in household chores or pet care
- Play games or do puzzles
- Do arts or crafts
- Play a sport or exercise

As illustrated by the scatterplot below, students who engaged in home activities fewer times in a typical week tended to score lower in overall school readiness as compared to students who engaged in these activities more frequently (Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.26; p<0.001).

**FIGURE 29. ACTIVITIES AT HOME AND OVERALL READINESS**

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, Parent Information Form, 2015.
Preschool Experience

As illustrated in the figure below, children who attended a center-based preschool or any preschool supported by PFA have better school readiness outcomes across all readiness domains measured.

**Figure 30. Basic Building Block Mean Scores by Preschool Experience**

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, 2015, PFA administrative data. Note: Differences between preschool and non-preschool mean scores are all statistically significant at the p<0.05 level.

To further examine the multiple factors that contribute to school readiness, the next section applies multivariate analyses to better understand the predictors of readiness.
Predictors of Overall Readiness

Each potential predictor was tested for its association with school readiness through a form of multivariate analysis. This multiple regression method of analysis allows us to simultaneously evaluate the strength of the relationship between several independent factors and a specific outcome of interest (e.g., readiness). To the extent that a regression model detects an association between an individual predictor variable and an outcome, we may infer that the predictor variable “explains” statistical variation observed in the outcome, independent and net of other predictors in the model.

It is important to note that a multivariate approach like this cannot conclusively determine why children have different levels of readiness and cannot be used to infer that certain predictors necessarily cause readiness. It is simply a method of understanding which specifically observed and measured characteristics tend to be associated with school readiness. In the absence of a controlled experiment, the possibility and likelihood remains that other factors not measured in this study hold additional explanatory power.

Figure 36 on the next page displays the results of the full regression model predicting overall kindergarten readiness among the student sample, in order of predictive strength. The predictors of readiness include well known criteria commonly observed in national studies of readiness, such as the age of the child, gender (girls are typically readier than boys on average), special needs, and English language learner status. We also include a measure of child well-being which indicates the frequency with which a child comes to school tired, hungry, or sick, a measure of how frequently the child is absent from kindergarten, preschool experience, family income, and a measure of family risk factors.

Results indicate that child well-being was strongly associated with overall school readiness. The more frequently a child was hungry, sick, or tired at school, the less ready they were.

Students with special needs and English language learners were less ready for school than other students. Older children tend to fare slightly better than younger children, and girls tend to be more school-ready than boys.

Household income was associated with readiness, such that households earning less than $32,000 annually is associated with lower levels of readiness. In addition, students from families with greater numbers of risk factors tend to be rated as somewhat less ready.

Preschool experience – both Preschool for All-funded preschools and other preschools – contributes positively to overall school readiness scores.

11 See page 24 for a more detailed description of this measure.
Engagement in activities at home such as reading, singing songs, including children in household chores, playing games, doing arts and crafts, and/or playing sports contribute to school readiness.

Use of community resources was associated with readiness, such that the more community resources a family took advantage of such as visiting the zoo, museums, parks, libraries, and First 5 Family Resource Centers, the higher the kindergartner’s overall readiness score.

The figure below shows the strength of each of the independent variables as predictors of overall school readiness, in order of the strength of association.

FIGURE 31. PREDICTORS OF OVERALL SCHOOL READINESS

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, Parent Information Form, 2015; First 5 administrative data. N=588. Notes: Adjusted R²=.306. Model includes dummy variables for race/ethnicity. A measure for “risk factors” (a measure of the number of characteristics a family has that indicates greater risk, including: Having lost a job in the past year, teen motherhood, single parenthood, moving more than once since the index child was born, and use of fewer than 3 supportive resources) was included, but was not predictive of readiness, and was excluded from the final model, as it is highly correlated with household income and mother’s education. A “social support” scale was also included in original modeling as an index composed of 5 PIF items assessing levels of social support. This item also did not demonstrate strong impact on readiness and was removed from the final model. “Child well-being” refers to the frequency with which teachers observed students sick, hungry, or tired. A measure of the number of local community activities families have engaged in was also included in the model but was not a statistically significant predictor of readiness.
The following table contains unstandardized regression coefficients which identify the unit change in overall readiness given a one-unit change in the independent variable. For example, for each additional day per week that a family engages some kind of activity in the home with their child in an average week, that child’s readiness score is predicted to increase by 0.01 points on a 4-point scale. For each unit higher of a rating on well-being (for example, a change from the child coming to school tired, sick, and/or hungry on “just about every day” to “on most days”) would be associated with a 0.266-point boost in overall readiness scores. A negative value demonstrates a negative association between the independent variable and school readiness. For example, in the regression model depicted in the table below, English language learners on average, score 0.17 points lower on the 4-point readiness scale as compared to their non-English-learner counterparts.

**TABLE 13. UNSTANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child well-being</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td>-0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language learner</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child gender</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income less than $32k</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in activities in the home</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child is African American</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kindergarten Observation Form, Parent Information Form, 2015; First 5 administrative data. N=588.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As observed in the levels of readiness and the identification of students with skills that are most predictive of later academic success, nearly two-thirds, or **62% of students appeared well-prepared and poised for academic success in kindergarten and beyond**, as measured by the Longitudinal Study Standard.

The children entering kindergarten in San Francisco elementary schools come from diverse backgrounds with a range of family environments and early childhood experiences. Many of them are on target to be successful in kindergarten, but others may require additional supports as they and their families transition to school. Readiness levels varied on a range of child and family characteristics and experiences. Consistent with findings from previous years and in other counties, children were better prepared for kindergarten when they were older, female, did not have special needs, and came to school healthy, well-rested and well-fed. In addition, children with higher readiness levels tended to come from families of higher socio-economic status. We have also consistently found that children who had attended licensed, center-based preschool (including all PFA-supported preschool environments) had significantly higher overall readiness levels than those without preschool experience. And finally, in the current study year, we also found greater readiness among students whose parents engaged in activities at home with them such as reading aloud, including children in household chores, playing sports, doing arts and crafts, and playing games.

The findings from this study can be used to help identify those children who come to school less prepared than their peers and to focus interventions (such as promoting high quality preschool and/or encouraging families to read aloud to their children) to those most in need. The following are general conclusions and areas for intervention suggested by the current study’s results.

- **The achievement gap starts before students enter kindergarten - and so should interventions to close the gap.**

Children from socio-economically disadvantaged families are less likely than children from more affluent families to demonstrate the readiness skills needed to be successful in kindergarten. Some research suggests that the readiness gap between low-income children and middle- and high-income children only grows over time (Ryan, Fauth, & Brooks-Gunn, 2006). These findings underscore the need for appropriate readiness-boosting interventions that target children and families that face the greatest disadvantages.

- **High-quality preschool experiences help reduce readiness gaps.**

Preschool attendance, particularly initiatives like Preschool for All that serve lower-income families, can help reduce the gaps in school readiness discussed above (Zhai et al., 2011). Indeed, the effects of preschool are largest for the most disadvantaged children (Magnuson et al., 2004). Given the benefits of preschool for school readiness, district and community partners should continue to promote access to high-quality preschool for all children.

- **Community interventions should target the factors that are most strongly associated with enhanced readiness levels.**

Results from this study suggest several opportunities for promising community interventions to raise the readiness levels of San Francisco students, including:

- Screen children early for developmental concerns and special needs.
Students with special needs consistently have lower readiness levels than their peers without special needs across domains of readiness. This finding highlights the importance of early developmental screening and intervention. Many families in the sample had not yet sought treatment for their child’s special need, and eight percent of the students assessed were suspected to have a special need, but had not yet been diagnosed. First 5 San Francisco should continue to support city-wide efforts to ensure that all children are screened early for developmental delays by well-trained professionals in early care and education settings and elsewhere.

- **Support children’s health and well-being.**

As is the case for children everywhere, and especially so as we observe in San Francisco, a child who lacks basic well-being – arriving at school tired, hungry or sick—is at a severe disadvantage. Although few students have chronic, obvious health and well-being concerns that are visible within the data presented in this report, the negative impact poor health and well-being have on school readiness is clear. To the extent that families are able to enhance their children’s health and well-being on a daily basis, they help to create a stronger foundation for their child’s success.

- **Promote community resources to support family activities.**

In addition to preschool, families can promote their entering kindergartners’ school readiness by engaging in any of a number of activities in the home, including reading aloud with children, involving children in household chores, playing sports, doing arts and craft, and working on puzzles or playing games. Engaging in any of these activities provides additional developmental growth opportunities, as well as nurturing time with family that enhance the foundational skills that lead to a successful transition into kindergarten.
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APPENDIX: REFINEMENTS TO THE KOF

DEVELOPMENT OF A LOCAL SCHOOL READINESS MEASURE

In 2000, stakeholders in San Mateo County helped to develop and implement the first large-scale kindergarten school readiness assessment in the Bay Area. Applied Survey Research (ASR) was contracted to develop the research materials and protocol and to conduct the assessment. ASR launched a comprehensive process to arrive at a set of tools that had local relevance as well as a foundation in the wider body of early education and K-12 research literature.

With input from a variety of subject matter experts – including community stakeholders, child development and education experts, preschool teachers, and kindergarten teachers – ASR developed and pilot-tested a 19-item Kindergarten Observation Form to measure children’s school readiness skills. Based on findings from the pilot test, modifications were made to the tool, education experts again weighed in, and a more advanced skill representing phonemic awareness was added (i.e., recognition of rhyming words), resulting in a 20-item tool in which skills were organized according to the five NEGP-designated categories of school readiness:

- Physical Well-Being & Motor Development
- Social & Emotional Development
- Approaches Toward Learning
- Communication & Language Usage
- Cognition & General Knowledge

Since that initial assessment, school readiness assessments have been conducted in Alameda County (2008-2014), Marin County (2010-2014), Napa County (2014), Sacramento County (2012-2014), San Francisco County, (2007, 2009, 2013, 2014), San Mateo County (2001-2005, 2008, 2009), Santa Clara County (2004-2006, 2008, 2011-2013), Santa Cruz County (2008), in Los Angeles Unified Preschool (2008, with continued use agreements from 2011 onward), Lake County, Illinois (2005, 2006), and Coconino County, Arizona (2012-2014). During this time, the tools and methods have been continually refined and enhanced. For example, in 2004, a Parent Information Form was added to measure family factors that may play a role in enhancing readiness, and four additional skills have been added to the Kindergarten Observation Form to measure social-emotional dimensions of readiness that had not been previously captured. A formalized Scoring Guide was developed to enhance teacher training to promote consistency and accuracy in ratings. A Teacher Survey was also added to gauge teachers’ perspectives on the importance of each skill, along with the KOF II, which asked teachers to assess each student’s transition into school. These latter two tools have since been dropped from the SRA model, as new information ceased to be gained from them.

SHIFTING FROM NEGP TO THE BASIC BUILDING BLOCKS OF READINESS

For several years, the set of skills measured by the KOF was organized and reported according to the five categories established by the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP), including: Physical Well-Being & Motor Development, Social & Emotional Development, Approaches Toward Learning, Communication and Language Usage, and Cognition & General Knowledge.

In 2005, ASR took a close look at the readiness data to determine whether the pattern of results observed in the data supported the NEGP categories as the most appropriate “sorting” of the readiness skills. Using an approach called factor analysis, ASR examined the readiness data that had been collected that year to see if the observed patterns of children’s skill proficiency sorted according to NEGP categories, or if perhaps the patterns suggested a different set of readiness categories.

Results of the factor analysis showed that the readiness skills actually tended to group into four primary dimensions of readiness that differed somewhat from the NEGP categories. Those four dimensions were labeled the Basic Building Blocks of Readiness, and each block contained between three and seven skill items. They are described as follows:
Self-Care & Motor Skills include those skills needed for taking care of one’s basic needs or skills showing fine/ gross motor coordination;

Self-Regulation skills include basic emotion regulation and self-control skills that are needed to be able to perform well in the classroom;

Social Expression skills include measures related to interacting with others and engagement with play and learning;

Kindergarten Academics skills represent the “nuts and bolts” skills that are more academic in nature and tend to be explicitly taught to children at home, in early care settings, and in kindergarten.

Feedback from teachers and other early education experts and stakeholders has indicated that these categories have intuitive appeal as well – people quickly understand the four skill groups, and teachers see children’s skills sorting along these lines in their classrooms. Thus, in line with this compelling support for the Basic Building Blocks of Readiness, school readiness assessments have been focused on this sorting of the skills.

In light of developments in the early education research literature and the development of the Common Core Standards Initiative, after the round of school readiness assessments that were conducted and analyzed in 2013, ASR’s school readiness team again took a close look at the KOF and analyzed pooled assessment data across counties to examine the continued utility of the tool and to make recommendations for further refinements. Another series of factor analyses were conducted on the pooled data to examine whether and how the 24 skill items still reflected the overarching skills categories that were designated in 2005. Additional analyses examined patterns of missing values, correlations between items, interrater reliability, construct validity, and the predictive strength of each skill item to predict 3rd grade CST scores.

Results from these analyses indicated that some items were no longer demonstrating utility value and five skills were identified for omission from the 2014 KOF because they were a) not predictive, b) were highly skewed (mostly positively), c) overlapped with other items to the extent that they did not add any unique value to the assessment, d) were weak measures of the construct, or e) any combination of the above.

Remaining skill items were re-evaluated for construct validity and some refinements were made to the wording of some of the items to bring further clarity to the construct, and in some cases, to bring the measure into closer alignment with Common Core standards. One new skill was added to reflect some foundational English language arts standards in the Common Core. A crosswalk identifying changes made to the KOF is provided in the table on the following page.

Assessing School Readiness in San Francisco

In partnership with the district and First 5 San Francisco, Applied Survey Research conducted the first kindergarten readiness assessment using ASR’s School Readiness Assessment Model in Fall 2007. Information from this assessment was used in a variety of ways to improve their early education planning and curricula. In Fall 2009, ASR was again contracted to conduct another readiness assessment. ASR collected readiness information from a representative sample of kindergarten students, providing the district a generalizable view of its new kindergarten students across four readiness dimensions: Self-Care & Motor Skills, Self-Regulation, Social Expression, and Kindergarten Academics. ASR investigated (1) whether and to what extent readiness levels of entering kindergarten students changed since 2007, and (2) how early education experiences related to children’s readiness levels.

In 2013, ASR was contracted to conduct another round of readiness assessments in a preliminary effort to explore the potential for institutionalizing the assessments across the district in all entering kindergarten classrooms. A small, targeted volunteer sample of Early Education Department classrooms was recruited, as was the case in the 2014 current assessment as well.
## TABLE 14. REVISIONS MADE TO KOF IN 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous KOF - 24 items</th>
<th>UPDATED KOF – 20 items (specific changes in bold)</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses small manipulatives (i.e., effectively uses pencil and scissors)</td>
<td>Uses a pencil with proper grip (pincer or tripod grip towards tip of pencil)</td>
<td>Fine &amp; Gross Motor Skills (2 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has general coordination on playground (e.g., kicks or catches ball, runs smoothly, hops on one foot)</td>
<td>Catches a ball (from 5 feet away)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs basic self-help / self-care tasks (e.g., independently eats and uses toilet)</td>
<td>[removed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforts self, using adult guidance when appropriate (e.g., initiates strategies to soothe self)</td>
<td>[removed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays focused / pays attention during activities (e.g., stays focused in large group, completes tasks in small group)</td>
<td>Stays focused during individual and small group activities (ex: drawing a picture)</td>
<td>Self-Regulation (6 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls impulses and self-regulates (e.g., follows class rules, is not disruptive of others)</td>
<td>Follows class rules and meets behavioral expectations (ex: is not disruptive of others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows one to two-step directions (ex: “Please hang-up your jacket, and go sit on the rug.”)</td>
<td>Follows two-step directions (ex: “Please hang-up your jacket, and go sit on the rug.”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiates with peers to resolve social conflicts using adult guidance when appropriate (e.g., engages in problem-solving)</td>
<td>[removed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works and plays cooperatively with peers (ex: takes turns and shares, helps others)</td>
<td>[no change]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates successfully in circle time (ex: circle time)</td>
<td>Participates successfully in large group activities (ex: circle time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handles frustration well (e.g., does not act out, asks for help, does not withdraw/become unresponsive)</td>
<td>[no change]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates appropriately to adults other than parent/primary caregiver (e.g., converses with, seeks help from)</td>
<td>[removed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately expresses needs and wants verbally in primary language (ex: tells teacher when needs to use toilet)</td>
<td>Appropriately expresses needs and wants verbally (ex: tells teacher when needs to use toilet) [removed ‘in primary language’]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses empathy or caring for others (ex: consoles or comforts a friend who is crying)</td>
<td>[no change]</td>
<td>Social Expression (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has expressive abilities (e.g., tells about a story or experience in response to a prompt)</td>
<td>Tells about a story or experience (in response to prompt(s))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses curiosity and eagerness for learning (e.g., tries new activities, asks questions)</td>
<td>Demonstrates curiosity and eagerness for learning (ex: tries new activities, asks questions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in symbolic /imaginative play with self or peers (e.g., plays house, fire station)</td>
<td>[removed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n/a]</td>
<td>New item: Answers questions about key details in literature (answers who?, what?, where? questions)</td>
<td>Kinder Academics (8 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages with books (e.g., knows how to hold a book, knows where a book starts, pretends to read, knows a book conveys information)</td>
<td>Understands structure and basic features of books (holds upright, follows text left to right, turns pages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writes own first name (e.g., spells and writes all letters correctly)</td>
<td>Writes own first name (writes all letters correctly and facing the right direction regardless of case)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes rhyming words (can say whether two specific words rhyme or not)</td>
<td>[Item is same except rhyming pattern is shorter]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts 10 objects correctly (“Please give Maria 10 crayons” or “Please put 10 blocks in the basket”)</td>
<td>Counts up to 20 objects (correctly counts 3 sets containing 5, 10 and 20 objects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes letters of the alphabet (note: out of sequence, may be CAPs, lowercase or combination)</td>
<td>Recognizes all letters of the alphabet (can point to a letter named when presented out of sequence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes basic colors (Basic 8: red, orange, yellow, green, blue, purple, brown, black)</td>
<td>[no change]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes primary shapes (circle, triangle, square)</td>
<td>Recognizes primary shapes (circle, triangle, square, rectangle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Refinements to the KOF