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Kindergartens - 40 984 (mostly 12 hours a day)
Children - 7 477 932 (6 307 103 ≥ 3 y.o.)
Teachers - 662 739
Access to ECE (≥ 3 y.o.) - 98,96% (of those who applied)
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- Licensing
- Nacional school exam etc.

Proposing of the instrument, which corresponds to National Curriculum and International context.

Adaptation of the assessment tool.

Validation with national professional community.

Research design.

Training for assessors.

Supervision of data collecting.

Interpretation of data.
Two clusters: "Best" 25% and "Random" 75%

1 stage of the Research (2016):
423 kindergartens from 40 regions
«Best» – 148
«Random» – 275

2 stage of the Research (2017):
1301 kindergartens from 74 regions*
«Best» – 323
«Random» – 978
367 kindergartens participated in both stages
2,6% of all kindergartens, 87% of regions

155 assessors
✓ Age of the teacher
✓ Professional experience
✓ The age group of children with whom the teacher works
✓ Professional education
✓ Participation of the teacher in the in-service training for the last 3 years and satisfaction with it
✓ Participation of the teacher in the development of the Curriculum of the preschool
✓ Teacher’s reflective skills (based on 10 ECERS-R indicators)
✓ Professional priorities of the teacher
✓ The type of the intervention based on the results of the 2016 study
✓ Number of children in the group
✓ The child/adult ratio during educational activities
✓ Teachers personality dimensions (Big five inventory, John & Srivastava,
Results of the study 2017

Comparison of “Best” and “Random” clusters

Average mean of scale score – \( 3.74 \) (“Random”); \( 4.05 \) (“Best”)
Results of the study in dynamics 2016-2017

Preschools which participated in both stages: 367 kindergartens

grey profile – 2016; blue profile – 2017
The feedback given by assessors after the first year of study made a critical influence on increasing the scores in those kindergartens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Results 2016</th>
<th>Results 2017 (general)</th>
<th>Results 2017 (1st time)</th>
<th>Results 2017 (2nd time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>«Best»</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>«Random»</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only in “best” cluster there is a significant correlation with the number of children.

It means that the decreasing of number of children in a group doesn’t guarantee better quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“Random”</th>
<th>“Best”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the list</td>
<td>26,6</td>
<td>28,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present during the observation</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>17,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum children at the list</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum children who are present during the observation</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The means of proportion Maximum at the list VS. Present during the observation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of preschools where 30 children and more were present</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportion of time when 2 or more adults participate in educational activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>“Random”</th>
<th>“Best”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During group activity (except musical activity and physical training)</td>
<td>33,41%</td>
<td>36,90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical group activity</td>
<td>72,61%</td>
<td>67,22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical group activity</td>
<td>59,41%</td>
<td>71,83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During indoor free play (if it is more than 30 minutes)</td>
<td>27,74%</td>
<td>25,15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During outdoor free play</td>
<td>22,21%</td>
<td>23,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During preparation for outdoor activities</td>
<td>90,62%</td>
<td>87,26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During serving the table</td>
<td>30,68%</td>
<td>34,97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During preparation for nap</td>
<td>70,38%</td>
<td>70,11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63,01%</td>
<td>70,41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant differences* between ECERS scores in clusters “1 adult” and “2 and more adults” * (≤ 0.05)

“BEST”
**Indoor play**: subscales “Personal Care Routines”, “Interaction”; items “Furnishings for relaxation and comfort”, “Greeting / Departing”, “Staff-child interactions”
**Outdoor play**: subscale “Interaction”; items “Staff-child interactions”, “Provisions with children with disabilities”, “Provisions of personal needs of staff”, “Supervision and evaluation of staff”

“RANDOM”
**Group activity**: subscale “Activities”; items “Fine motor”, “Nature / Science”
**Indoor play**: subscales “Language-Reasoning”, “Activities”; items “Furniture for routine care, play and learning”, “Space for privacy”, “Nap / rest”,
**Outdoor play**: item “Promoting acceptance of diversity”

The child/adult ratio by itself doesn’t guarantee better quality.
Thank you!
We have a lot of work ahead!
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