DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 360 PS 019 473

AUTHOR	Kunesh, Linda G.
TITLE	Early Intervention for At-Risk Children in the North Central Region: A Comparative Analysis of Selected State Education Agencies' Policies.
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Elmhurst, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	90
CONTRACT	400-86-0004
NOTE	130p.; For Executive Summary, see ED 321 875.
AVAILABLE FROM	North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 295 Emroy Avenue, Elmhurst, IL 60126 (Order Number ECE-901, $10.00).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*At Risk Persons; Comparative Analysis; Early Childhood Education; *Early Intervention; *Educational Policy; Educational Quality; Eligibility; Federal Legislation; Financial Support; Guidelines; Kindergarten; Parent Participation; State Legislation; State of the Art Reviews; *State Programs; Student Evaluation; Teacher Education; Teacher Student Ratio; Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS	Developmentally Appropriate Programs; Rules and Regulations; United States (Midwest)

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this policy study was to identify and examine early intervention policies for young children at risk of academic failure in selected state education agencies (SEAs) in the North Central Region of the United States. The secondary purpose was to document the processes by which the selected states in the north central educational region developed their early intervention policies and legislation. Copies of state legislation, policies of departments of education, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements were obtained from SEA personnel and legislators. The literature was surveyed in an effort to gain a historical perspective on the field of early intervention. In addition, national education and government organizations and associations were contacted by letter and telephone in an effort to obtain their position or policy statements on early intervention and early childhood education. A number of research, policy, and advocacy organizations were also contacted for background information. High/Scope and the National Association for the Education of Young Children were contacted for information to be used as a basis for analysis of SEA policies and legislative mandates. This study offers discussions of the states' early intervention policies and legislation, the comparative analysis which was conducted, and policy implications of early intervention. A list of abbreviations and a glossary are included; two lists of organizations are appended. (120 references) (RH)

EARLY INTERVENTION FOR AT-RISK CHILDREN IN THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION:

A Comparative Analysis of Selected State Education Agencies' Policies

By

Linda G. Kunesh

NCREL
NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

Published in 1990 by the:

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue, Elmhurst, IL 60126
(708) 941-7677.

Order Number: ECE-901; $10.00

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under Contract Number 400-86-0004. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department of Education, or any other agency in the U.S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

In 1988, the author undertook this policy study to fulfill the dissertation requirement for the degree of doctor of philosophy in educational leadership and policy studies at Loyola University Chicago. The primary purpose of the study was to identify and examine early intervention policies for young children at risk of academic failure in selected state education agencies (SEAs) in the North Central Region of the U.S. Since state legislatures have become very active in educational policymaking and have mandated early intervention or early childhood education (ECE) programs, the policies studied included those mandated by the seven SEAs and/or their corresponding state legislatures.

Legislation often requires state agencies to promulgate rules to amplify or clarify the law. Further, SEAs frequently develop guidelines and/or requirements for implementation of policies and legislation. Thus, rules, guidelines, and requirements were also examined in order to determine the current status of the policies and legislation.

The secondary purpose of the study was to document the processes by which the selected states developed their policies and legislation. This purpose grew out of requests made by some of the SEA personnel who were contacted for information about their state's policies. They indicated it would be helpful to them to know what kinds of studies and activities were undertaken prior to a state's development of policies or legislation. Thus, brief descriptions of the processes undertaken by states are provided where information was available.

The study was guided by the following question:

What state education agency policies and legislative mandates for early intervention/early childhood education programs for preschoolers at risk of academic failure were in place as of the 1988-89 school year?

Once the status of early intervention policies and legislation was determined in terms of accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements, they were analyzed in the following manner:

1. The policies, mandates, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements were compared with what the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation (High/Scope) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) say should be components of effective ECE programs.

2. An analysis was made of the actual policies, mandates, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements in terms of their implications for state and local decisionmakers.

The SEAs selected for the study were those in the states served by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL): **Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio,** and **Wisconsin**. Data for the study, that is copies of state legislation, policies of the departments of education, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements were obtained from SEA personnel and legislators in the respective states. A list of individuals who supplied documents for review and analysis and who verified the accuracy of the descriptions in the full document is provided in the appendix.

The literature was surveyed to gain a historical perspective of the field of early intervention. In addition, national education and government organizations and associations were contacted by letter and telephone to obtain their position and/or policy statements on early intervention and ECE. Further, a number of research, policy, and advocacy organizations were also contacted for background information. A list of these organizations is also provided in the full document's appendix.

Based on the literature surveyed and the information collected, a historical review of early intervention was written and is available in a companion document by the same author through NCREL. The paper reviews pertinent educational movements and selected theorists and researchers who provided the bases for a rationale for early intervention.

High/Scope and NAEYC were also contacted because of their nationally recognized expertise in the education of young children. Information from these two organizations provided the components for early intervention and ECE programs against which SEA policies and legislative mandates were analyzed. This comparative analysis is presented in Chapter III. And finally, some of the major implications of the seven states' policies and legislation for early intervention are presented in Chapter IV.

A list of abbreviations, a glossary, and a comprehensive reference list are included with the full manuscript.

It is important that the reader keep in mind that the study examined only **state-initiated** policies and legislation pertaining to early intervention/early childhood education programs for young children at risk of academic failure. It did not comprehensively examine all programs that focus on young children at risk of academic failure, such as those sponsored and/or funded by federal legislation, e.g., Head Start, Chapter I, bilingual, and provisions under PL 99-457, the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986. All of the states in the study participate in one or more of these federal programs. In addition, the study did not examine any of the privately sponsored programs for at-risk preschoolers, such as the Beethoven Project in Chicago.

Further, the policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements continue to develop in each state. The information that follows reflects the status of the states' initiatives that were developed prior to January, 1989.

Acknowledgments

Appreciation is extended to the following individuals who provided state documents for review:

Susan Andersen, Iowa Department of Education
Ann Bettenberg, Minnesota Department of Education
Linda Bond, Indiana Department of Education
Charles Bruner, Iowa State Senate
Sandra Crews, Illinois State Board of Education
Carol D'Amico, Indiana Department of Education
Lois Engstrom, Minnesota Department of Education
Nancy Floch, At-Risk Prekindergarten Program, Villa Park, IL
Susan Sullivan Fleig, Iowa Department of Education
Karen Goodenow, Iowa State Board of Education
Edith Helmich, Illinois State Board of Education
Dennis Jackson, Indiana Department of Education
Carolyn Logan, Michigan Department of Education
Harold MacDermot, Minnesota Department of Education
Kate McAuliffe, Michigan Department of Education
Corinna Moncada, Minnesota Department of Education
Chalmer Moore, Illinois State Board of Education
Joan Murray, Indiana Department of Education
Sally Pancrazio, Illinois State Board of Education
Carol Alexander Phillips, Iowa Department of Education
Mary Jo Richardson, Minnesota Department of Education
Thomas Stefonek, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Leland Tack, Iowa Department of Education
Margaret Trent, Ohio Department of Education
Dennis Van Den Heuvel, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Dorothy VanLooy, Michigan Department of Education
Jane Wiechel, Ohio Department of Education
Audrey Witzman, Illinois State Board of Education

Special thanks are also extended to the following individuals who provided helpful comments on previous drafts of the manuscript:

Arthur Dorman, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
Charles Edwards, University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Todd Fennimore, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
Carol Harding, Loyola University of Chicago
Judson Hixson, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
A. Baron Holmes, South Carolina Budget and Control Board
Marianne Kroeger, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
L. Arthur Safer, Loyola University Chicago
Lawrence Schweinhart, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
Joan Smith, Loyola University Chicago
Patricia Smith, Valley View (IL) School District

Julie Casiello and Donna Wagner of the NCREL staff deserve special mention for their assistance in word processing and proofreading.

To my family and friends for their support and encouragement: THANKS!

And to "my kids" and their families who taught me what early intervention really means: Kiddos, there is hope for the flowers.

lgk

Executive Summary

Introduction

Since A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) was released, a number of reforms have been recommended by many national organizations and groups to improve education in the U.S. Few, however, have received as much support as **Early Intervention** or **Early Childhood Education (ECE)** for young children who are at risk of academic failure. ECE generally provides developmentally appropriate activities and experiences for young children and opportunities for parents to become actively involved in the development and education of their children. In addition, health, nutrition, day-care, and social services are often provided.

Targeted to youngsters before they reach kindergarten, ECE is advocated by many diverse and influential groups as the major strategy to reduce or eliminate the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children (e.g., Committee for Economic Development, 1987; the National Governors' Association, 1986, 1987; the Council of Chief State School Officers, 1987, 1988; the National Association of State Boards of Education, 1988).

Factors Supporting Public Investment in Preschool Programs

Many factors have contributed to this diverse support for public investment in preschool programs. For example, children are now the poorest segment of the nation's population. In fact, they are seven times as likely to be poor as those over 65 years of age (Moynihan, 1986).

Children born in poverty often suffer from gross malnutrition, recurrent and untreated health problems, psychological and physical stress, child abuse, and learning disabilities. Those poor children who survive infancy are three times more likely to become school dropouts than are children from more economically advantaged homes. Frequently, they are children of children and live in single-parent homes (Committee for Economic Development, 1987).

The dramatic increase in the need for child-care arrangements also has contributed to a national focus on young children. During the mid-1980s, 50% of mothers with 1-year-olds had already returned to work (Hodgkinson, 1985). The Children's Defense Fund (1987) predicts that by 1995, two-thirds of all preschool children will have mothers in the work force.

By 1987, 24 states and the District of Columbia had spent state money on educational programs for preschool-aged children, and most states had targeted at-risk children for their programs (Grub, 1987; Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988). According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988), the most significant factor influencing legislative support for ECE was research that demonstrated short- and long-term academic and social benefits to disadvantaged 3- and 4-year-olds who were enrolled in ECE programs.

Children enrolled in ECE programs:

- had higher academic performance,
- required less special education,
- had better school attendance and graduation rates,
- pursued more post-secondary education and training,
- had higher levels of employment and less unemployment, and
- had fewer contacts with the criminal justice system

(Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein, & Weikart, 1984; the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, 1978, 1981).

Barnett (1985) found that **for every $1 spent on ECE, $4 to $7 for later, more costly remedial and social programs was saved.**

The National Conference of State Legislatures (1989) also reported that state legislatures were considering initiating and expanding ECE programs as a major strategy to offset "the risks faced by disadvantaged children, putting them on the road to success at an early age" (p.6). There also appears to be strong public support for federal involvement in the care and education of young children. More than 100 child-care bills were introduced during the 100th Congress. Although none became law in 1988, nor again in 1989, it was speculated at the time of this printing that a compromise child-care bill will be reached by the House and Senate in 1990.

Development of States' Policies and Legislation

Illinois

Illinois' interest in ECE was formalized in 1983 when the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) directed its staff to conduct an Early Childhood Policy Study. In May of 1985, the State Board adopted an ECE policy statement and that summer, the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation authorizing ISBE to implement a grant program for public school districts to conduct preschool screening procedures and educational programs for 3- and 4-year-olds who were at risk of academic failure. Between FY 86 and FY 89, approximately $58.3 million was appropriated for the program.

Indiana	Funds were provided for preschool programs for at-risk children in Indiana as part of the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students which was legislated in 1987. Nine types of programs were listed in the law; however, school corporations (districts) were not limited to those programs. Of the 775 proposals for new or expanded at-risk programs approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the 1988-89 school year, 20 preschool programs received $542,839 in state funding, and local districts contributed $24,633. The 20 preschool programs served 2,108 at-risk youngsters and 2,281 non-at-risk children.
Iowa	In 1986, the Iowa State Board of Education created a Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force to design a plan for establishing appropriate prekindergarten programs. The Task Force recommended guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten and kindergarten classes, as well as guidelines for a model for delivery of prekindergarten programs. Then, in 1988, with strong support of the business community, the Iowa legislature passed the Child Development Assistance Act as part of welfare reform. This act created a Child Development Coordinating Council to promote the provision of child development services to at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds. The legislature also appropriated approximately $1.2 million for the Child Development Grants Program. Approximately one-third of the grants were awarded to school districts, one-third were awarded to Head Start projects, and one-third were awarded to day-care centers. Another piece of legislation in 1988 created the Center for Early Development Education which has since been established at the University of Northern Iowa.
Michigan	The Michigan State Board of Education approved "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" in 1986 based on the work of a 22-member Early Childhood Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. Nine critical elements were included in the Standards: Philosophy; Population/Access; Curriculum; Learning Environment and Equipment; Advisory Council-Community Involvement; Parent/Family Involvement; Funding; Administrative/Supervisory Personnel; and Instructional Staff/Personnel. Since 1985, the Michigan Legislature appropriated $19.3 million for ECE programs for educationally disadvantaged 4-year-olds.
Minnesota	Minnesota has a 14-year history of providing services to young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, through the Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program. In FY 88, the ECFE program had an $18.3 million budget, $7.6 million supported by state aid and $10.7 million provided by local tax levies. Delivered through Community Education, the program requires substantial parent involvement and utilizes statewide interagency cooperation.

In 1988, a $500,000 grant program was made available through legislation which provided opportunities for eligible recipients of the grants to develop programs for children, age 3 to kindergarten enrollment age, who are poor or significantly developmentally delayed.

Ohio

In 1983, the Ohio Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed an Early Childhood Task Force (later expanded to a Commission) to review different aspects of ECE. Services to preschool children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, have been provided to Ohio children through adoption grants which were legislated in 1986 following the development of model programs for rural, suburban, and urban areas in 1985. The Ohio Department of Education has promulgated rules to accompany the provisions for the preschool programs under the Revised Code, and in 1986, began a four-year longitudinal study of preschool and kindergarten to produce information and data which may be helpful to policymakers.

By the 1988-89 school year, 70 counties had received incentive grants to initiate interagency coordination for projects serving young children and their families. Rules for the operation of preschool programs in public schools and eligible chartered nonpublic schools were developed and approved for adoption in 1988. Due to the passage of H.B. 67, school districts that are eligible for Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid have been allowed to use general revenue for those programs. A process was also established to study and formulate solutions for the at-risk population.

Wisconsin

In 1985, the Wisconsin legislature amended the Wisconsin School Code to re-establish the 4-year-old kindergarten (preschool) program which permitted school districts to provide kindergarten programs for 4-year-olds and to receive per pupil reimbursement based on class membership count in the state aid formula. Most of the 30 (of the 430) school districts that provided 4-year-old kindergarten programs during the 1988-89 school year served at-risk children.

The Wisconsin legislature also passed a bill in 1985 that targeted state resources to elementary schools in the Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit school districts that have high concentrations of students from low-income families. Between 1985 and 1989, $6.19 million was appropriated to this program, known as the Preschool to Grade 5 or P-5 Program.

In 1987, the legislature passed a bill requiring the Milwaukee school board contract with private, non-profit, non-sectarian day-care centers to provide ECE to 4- and 5-year-olds. And in 1988, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction amended requirements for teaching licenses and teacher preparatory programs in ECE leading to licensure in Wisconsin. These new requirements will go into effect in July, 1992.

Early Intervention: A Comparative Analysis

High/Scope and NAEYC recommend the following components for effective ECE programs:

- The use of developmentally appropriate curriculum and teaching practices based on theory, research, and practice;
- Staff and supervisors who are trained in early childhood education and child development and who receive ongoing training;
- Teacher/student ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20 for 4-year-olds and lower ratios and smaller class sizes for younger children;
- Strong parent involvement; and
- Ongoing assessment of the program to ensure it is meeting its stated goals and objectives and is accountable to the children and families served (Epstein, 1985; Schweinhart, 1987; Bredekamp, 1987).

NAEYC also recommends that ECE programs not deny access to children based on screening or other arbitrary determination of children's readiness. High/Scope indicates that its recommended components are especially necessary for children who are poor or at risk of academic failure. Since the focus of this study was on preschool programs for at-risk children, the researcher utilized "eligibility" as an additional component in the analysis.

The analysis of the states' polices and legislation revealed that while all of the states appeared to acknowledge the research and recommendations of both High/Scope and NAEYC, each state reflected the High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations to varying degrees.

Developmentally Appropriate Practice

All seven states (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) either specifically mention developmentally appropriate practice or imply that such practice should be used in their preschool programs.

Illinois requires educational components to be based on sound theories of child development. Indiana recommends the use of a validated, developmentally appropriate curriculum model and even refers to the one recommended by NAEYC. Iowa's legislation for the Child Development Grants Programs mandates a developmentally appropriate ECE curriculum, and one of Michigan's nine Standards specifically outlines developmentally appropriate practices.

The rules promulgated by the Ohio Department of Education for ECE programs require written policies and procedures regarding developmentally appropriate curriculum. Both Minnesota and Wisconsin imply that such practices be utilized.

Staff Training and Supervision

Training in ECE or child development is required in Illinois and Michigan, while Iowa requires training or experience in ECE or child development. New teacher certification standards for teachers of preschoolers went into effect in Illinois in 1988, in Minnesota in 1989, and will go into effect in Wisconsin in 1992, and in Michigan and Ohio in 1993. Indiana does not require training in ECE or child development for teachers who teach preschoolers.

Inservice training for staff in preschool programs is required in Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio, and recommended in Indiana. Inservice education opportunities are available statewide in Minnesota. Neither ongoing training nor staff development is specifically stipulated in legislation, rules, guidelines, or requirements in Illinois or Wisconsin.

Illinois utilizes ECE consultants to provide technical assistance to the preschool programs. Only Michigan and Ohio require administrators who supervise the programs to have training in ECE or child development.

Teacher/Student Ratio

Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan require a maximum teacher/student ratio of 1:10 for 4-year-olds which is commensurate with High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations. Ohio's teacher/student ratio is greater: 1:14, while Iowa's is smaller: 1:8. Neither Minnesota nor Wisconsin stipulate teacher/student ratio in their educational preschool programs, although Wisconsin requires a maximum ratio of 1:12 for the Milwaukee day-care programs.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement refers to services provided to parents so that they can more effectively support their children and develop themselves as parents. All seven states either require or recommend parent involvement.

Legislation in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and the legislation that created the Wisconsin P-5 Program mandates parent involvement. Indiana's guidelines suggest collaboration between parents and teaching staff. Specific requirements for parent involvement are specified in one of Michigan's nine Standards. The Ohio Department of Education promulgated rules that provide for a written plan to encourage parent involvement and participation and to keep parents informed about the ECE program and its services.

The Wisconsin 4-year-old kindergarten does not have a specific requirement for parent involvement, although it is encouraged by the Department of Public Instruction.

Assessment

Both High/Scope and NAEYC recommend ongoing evaluation or assessment of the ECE program to ensure that it is meeting its stated goals and objectives. Further, they contend that assessment should go beyond fiscal monitoring and address accountability to the children and families served.

All seven states have some type of accountability built into their programs. Beginning July 1, 1989, the ISBE must report the results and progress of students enrolled in the preschool programs to the Illinois General Assembly every three years. Further, ISBE must report which programs have been most successful in promoting excellence and alleviating academic failure. Procedures for collecting longitudinal data regarding academic progress of all students enrolled in the preschool programs have also been developed in Illinois. ISBE also requires written goals, objectives, and timelines for completion, as well as individual assessment profiles and progress plans.

The administrative guidelines prepared by the Indiana Department of Education to implement the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students specifies that program evaluation must be tied to the objectives of the program.

Iowa's Child Development Grants Program stipulates that grant recipients must provide ongoing monitoring and evaluation of program goals. Michigan's preschool programs must establish goals and objectives, and administrators and supervisors must evaluate the programs.

Advisory councils must be appointed by local boards of education that have ECFE programs in Minnesota. These councils are required to assist the school boards in monitoring the programs. The Minnesota Department of Education also adopted rules regarding annual reporting procedures for the ECFE programs.

Likewise, the Ohio Department of Education developed procedures for evaluating and monitoring the preschool programs as part of its rules promulgated under the Revised School Code.

No formal assessment requirements were stipulated for the Wisconsin 4-year-old kindergarten; however, annual testing in grades preschool through grade 5 has been required since the 1987-88 school year in the P-5 Program to determine short- and long-term effects of the Program.

Eligibility

Eligibility refers to who has access to programs. High/Scope reports that quality preschool programs should be made available at least to children who are poor or otherwise at risk of academic failure. NAEYC contends that all children should have access to preschool programs, especially programs that are in public schools, regardless of their developmental levels.

Most of the SEA policies and legislation studied were created specifically for children at risk of academic failure; however, some states have provisions that allow for greater access.

Preschool programs in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa primarily serve 3- and 4-year-old at-risk children. The local education agencies in Illinois and Indiana must define their own criteria for eligibility.

Michigan and Wisconsin identify specific programs for 4-year-olds. And the Minnesota ECFE Program and the Ohio preschool programs are open to all young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age.

While Michigan's program is specifically for 4-year-olds, the Michigan Standards appear to go the farthest in carrying out High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations. The Standards specify that programs cannot exclude or limit participation on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, handicapping condition, or socioeconomic status. Further, the Standards stipulate that support services must be provided to meet the needs of the population served.

Policy Implications

Initiatives exist in each of the seven states to provide early intervention services to academically at-risk young children. As state and local decision-makers continue to propose, implement, and expand services for young children, they may need to consider the implications of their state policies.

Major policy implications presented in the study relate to the following areas: 1) **quality** (**staff qualifications, recruitment and retention of teachers, facilities, articulation between early childhood levels, and parent involvement**); 2) **delivery and coordination of services**; and 3) **accountability**.

Quality

Although legislative activity in the past has focused primarily on the allocation of fiscal resources, it is more and more common today to find policies and mandates relating to the curriculum content, how that content is taught, and by whom. All seven states in the study either mandate or recommend that teaching practices and curriculum be developmentally appropriate in order to ensure quality.

NAEYC recommends three major policies to achieve developmentally appropriate early childhood programs: 1) ECE teachers must have college-level specialized preparation in ECE or child development and be supported and encouraged to obtain and maintain current knowledge; 2) ECE teachers must have practical, supervised experience teaching young children prior to being in charge of a group; and 3) teacher/child ratios must be appropriate for the ages of the children, and class size must be limited (Bredekamp, 1987).

Staff Qualifications

All of the states except Indiana currently require, or will require within the next few years, that teachers be trained or experienced in ECE or child development. This does not mean that six of the seven states require a baccalaureate degree with a major in ECE or child development. Some states permit persons with a CDA (Child Development Associate) credential or associate degree in ECE or child development to teach in a preschool program, while others permit those licensed as day-care center supervisors to teach in the preschool program. Teacher preparation also varies considerably across the states. As states develop new teacher licensure requirements or increase the requirements necessary for persons to teach in a preschool program, teacher preparation programs will have to be developed and/or expanded in colleges and universities. Further, approved practice teaching sites will need to be found.

Recruitment and Retention of Teachers

State policy has additional implications for teacher recruitment and retention. If states continue to permit underqualified persons to teach preschool programs -- and pay them the same low salaries that child-care workers earn -- they may not only produce a negative impact on program quality, but also have difficulty in staffing the programs.

Unless preschool teachers are paid salaries and benefits commensurate with that provided to teachers of older children, the policies, mandates, and desires to provide preschool programs will be meaningless if no one wants to teach in them. At present, Michigan is the only North Central state that requires that preschool staff receive salaries, wages, and benefits commensurate with other K-12 district staff who have similar assignments and responsibilities and who are employed under the same contract.

Facilities

The location of preschool programs is another implication of state policy. NAEYC recommends a minimum of 35 square feet of usable indoor floor space per child for play, and a minimum of 75 square feet per child of secured outdoor space. The environment, both inside and outdoors, should be clean, safe, spacious, and attractive. Finding such space can be problematic in many areas. Many inner-city school buildings, such as those in Milwaukee and Chicago, already are overcrowded and in need of repair. Some suburban communities have sold, leased, or razed school buildings because of sharp enrollment declines. And in a number of states, many school buildings fall below current expectations for safe and healthful facilities. Policymakers may have to consider sites other than public school buildings for state-funded preschool programs.

Articulation Between Early Childhood Levels

ECE generally is considered to include children from birth to age 9. Although all states believe that programs for young children should be developmentally appropriate, four states (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio) found through the work of study groups, task forces, and commissions that many existing programs -- particularly in kindergarten through grade 3 -- place too much emphasis on early academics. Kindergarten and primary teachers and administrators need to examine curriculum, instruction, and assessment to determine whether or not all three are aligned and reflect the development of young children.

Parent Involvement

All seven states require or recommend parent involvement to enhance children's development and parents' parenting skills. However, service providers will have to be careful in the design and development of their policies and procedures so that good intentions are not seen as an invasion of parents' privacy and a usurpation of their rights as primary caregivers to their children. Confidentiality and ethics are two areas local service providers may want to consider for staff development training.

Delivery and Coordination of Services

The types of services provided, methods, and staff involved are additional implications of the states' policies. Will preschool programs be center-based or home-based? Will such services be educational only, or will they include health, social, nutrition, and day-care services as well? Iowa and Minnesota recommend comprehensive services to young children (as do NAEYC, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education), and it is obvious that interagency cooperation will be necessary to implement comprehensive services. Relationships between agency administrators will have to be developed, and mechanisms for service delivery and financing services will have to be established. LEAs will have to work in cooperation with other agencies, and they may want to consider establishing cooperation with existing school programs sponsored through Chapter I, bilingual, and the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986.

Accountability

All seven states have built accountability into their programs. The quality of program evaluations and the strategies used to communicate evaluative information to policymakers may significantly influence the amount of funds state legislatures appropriate for these programs either to maintain or expand services. Thus, it may behoove both SEAs and LEAs to require and provide training in program evaluation. Quality program evaluation could prove to be the factor that determines whether policymakers view early intervention as a passing fad or make a long-term commitment to its institutionalization within the educational system.

*****

This policy study attempted to shed some light on the status and implications of policies and programs aimed at altering the trend of academic failure for young children in the North Central Region. The development of state policy is contextual. What works in one state may not be what's best in another. Each state has different needs, different resources, and strong forces that compete for any monetary resources.

It is clear that states in the North Central Region value young children. Due to the collective efforts of policymakers, educators, parents, and other citizens, thousands of young children have been given the opportunity to improve their chances to succeed in school and life.

This is the place to start, for that is where the children are. For only a hard look at the world in which they live – a world we adults have created for them in large part by default – can convince us of the urgency of their plight and the consequences of our inaction. Then perhaps it will come to pass that, in the words of Isaiah, 'A little child shall lead them' (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, p. 165).

*****

A companion document, A Historical Review of Early Intervention (Kunesh. 1990), can be obtained from:

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue
Elmhurst, IL 60126
(708) 941-7677

Order # ECE-903; $ 4.00 (A Historical Review)

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABC	Act for Better Child Care
ASCD	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers
CEC	Council for Exceptional Children
CED	Committee for Economic Development
CSSO	Chief State School Officer
DHHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
DPI	Department of Public Instruction
ECFE	Early Childhood Family Education
ECSE	Early Childhood Special Education
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
H.B.	House Bill
IEP	Individualized Educational Plan
IFSP	Individualized Family Service Plan
ISBE	Illinois State Board of Education
LEA	Local Education Agency
NAECS/SDE	National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education
NAEYC	National Association for the Education of Young Children
NASBE	National Association of State Boards of Education
NASDSE	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
NCREL	North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
NEC*TAS	National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System
NGA	National Governors' Association
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity
OERI	Office of Educational Research and Improvement
P.A.	Public Act
PL	Public Law
SEA	State Education Agency
Sec.	Section
START	State Technical Assistance Resource Team
Subd.	Subdivision

GLOSSARY

Adoption Grant: A grant provided by the SEA to be used to establish a program developed by the school district. In Ohio, grant monies may be used for materials, inservice training for staff, and other initial program needs identified by the Department of Education (Ohio Department of Education).

At-risk Children: Children who have been subjected to certain adverse genetic, prenatal, perinatal, postnatal, or environmental conditions that are known to cause defects or substantial developmental delay or are highly correlated with the appearance of later abnormalities or learning problems. [See also Children at Established Risk, Children at Biological Risk and Children at Environmental Risk.] These at-risk conditions are not mutually exclusive. They often occur in combination, interacting to increase the probability of delayed or aberrant development in children or to increase the degree of their impairment as a result of some primary physical disability. (Peterson, 1987).

Chief State School Officer: The state superintendent of education or of public instruction. Is synonymous with State Commissioner of Education and State Director of Education (Knezevich, 1984).

Child Development Associate (CDA): Nationally recognized credential awarded through the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, a subsidiary of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, to individuals who have demonstrated criteria-based competence in working with children 3-5 years of age.

Children At Biological Risk: Children presenting a history of prenatal, perinatal, neonatal, and early development events suggestive of biological insult to the developing central nervous system and which either singly or collectively, increase the probability of later appearing abnormal behavior. Examples of children at biological risk are those 1)whose mothers had complications during pregnancy, such as injury or disease, 2) who were premature, 3) who were of low birth weight, 4) who had serious nervous infections, such as encephalitis, or 5) who had ingested toxic substances. Initially, no clear abnormalities may be detected but these indicators increase the probability that aberrant development or learning problems will appear later (Tjossem, 1976).

Children At Environmental Risk: Children who were biologically sound at birth but whose early life experiences and environment threaten their physical and developmental well-being. Examples of environmental factors which have a strong probability of adversely affecting a young child include lack of stimulation, poor nutrition, inadequate health care, parental substance dependence, and parental history of child abuse or neglect (Tjossem, 1976).

Children At Established Risk: Children whose early appearing and aberrant development is related to diagnosed medical disorders of known etiology bearing relatively well-known expectancies for developmental outcome within specified ranges of developmental delay. An example of children at established risk are those with Down Syndrome. The condition is known to produce certain abnormalities such as mental retardation (Tjossem, 1976).

Developmentally Appropriate: The term usually applied to activities and practices used with children that reflect the knowledge of human development research that indicates there are universal, predictable sequences of growth and change that occur in children during the first nine years of life. These predictable changes occur in all domains of development -- physical, emotional, social, and cognitive. Child-initiated, child-directed, and teacher-supported play is an example of a developmentally appropriate practice for young children (Bredekamp, 1987).

Developmentally Delayed: The term used to indicate that a child's growth is less than what one would normally expect for his chronological age in one or more of the following areas of development: cognitive; speech/language, physical/motor, psychosocial, and self-help skills. Significant delay is usually considered to be a 25% delay in at least one developmental area or a 6-month delay in two or more areas (Council for Exceptional Children).

Early Childhood Education (ECE): The term frequently applied to the education of young children from birth through age 8. For the purposes of this paper, ECE refers primarily to educational programs for young children prior to entrance into kindergarten. ECE also refers to the collective movements of education that serve young children from birth through kindergarten age. (See also Early Childhood Education for At-risk Children and Early Intervention.)

Early Childhood Education for At-Risk Children: Synonymous with Early Intervention. (See also Early Intervention and Early Childhood Education.)

Early Entrance Screening: A referral program for children who have developed well beyond their age levels in social maturity and critical skills and who are being offered an opportunity for possible entry into kindergarten before age 5 and into first grade before age 6 (Ohio Department of Education).

Early Identification: A process for assessing a child's level of development in one or a combination of the following areas: intellectual, social, physical, and psychological. The purpose of this procedure is to identify children who may benefit from evaluation and referral for appropriate services and opportunities (Ohio Department of Education).

Early Intervention: Services designed to meet the developmental needs of at-risk or handicapped preschoolers from birth to age 5, inclusive, in any one or more of the following areas: a) physical development; b) cognitive development; c) language development; d) psycho-social development; or e) self-help skills. Early Intervention usually includes the following: a) family training, counseling, and home visits, b) special instruction, c) speech pathology and audiology, d) occupational services, e) occupational therapy, f) psychological services, g) medical services only for diagnostic or evaluation purposes, h) case management services, and j) health services necessary to enable young children to benefit from the other early intervention services (PL99-457, 1986). Is synonymous with Early Childhood Education (ECE) for at-risk children.

Guideline: An indication or outline (as by government) of policy or conduct (Webster, 1980).

Incentive Grant: A grant to be used to provide incentives for school district boards of education to bring together local leaders of agencies that serve young children and their families for coordination of existing programs and review additional needs. Monies may be used for meetings, printing, mailings, and other purposes acceptable to the Department of Education (Ohio Department of Education).

Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP): A plan written for each family of a handicapped infant or toddler that contains the following: 1) a statement of the infant's or toddler's present levels of physical development, cognitive development, language and speech development, psycho-social development, and self-help skills, based on acceptable objective criteria; 2) a statement of the family's strengths and needs relating to enhancing the development of the family's handicapped infant or toddler; 3) a statement of the major outcomes expected to be achieved for the infant or toddler and the family, and the criteria, procedures, and timelines used to determine the degree to which progress toward achieving the outcomes are being made and whether modifications or revisions of the outcomes or services are necessary; 4) a statement of specific early intervention services necessary to meet the unique needs of the infant or toddler and the family, including the frequency, intensity, and the method of delivering services; 5) the projected dates for initiation of services and the anticipated duration of such services; 6) the name of the case manager from the profession most immediately relevant to the infant's or toddler's or family's needs who will be responsible for the implementation of the plan and coordination with other agencies and persons; and 7) the steps to be taken supporting the transition of the handicapped toddler to services provided under part B (of PL 99-457) to the extent such services are considered appropriate (PL 99-457, 1986).

Interagency Coordinating Council: A council composed of 15 members (at least 3 parents of handicapped children aged birth through 6, inclusive; at least 3 public or private providers of early intervention services; at least one representative from the state legislature; at least one person involved in personnel preparation; and other members representing each of the appropriate agencies involved in the provision of or payment for early intervention services to handicapped infants and toddlers and their families; and others selected by the state's governor). Among its functions as stipulated in Sec. 682 of 20 USC 1482, the Council advises and assists the lead agency in the identification of the sources of fiscal and other support for services for early intervention programs, assigning financial responsibility to the appropriate agency, and promoting interagency agreements (PL 99-457, 1986).

Intermediate Service Unit: A legal entity that provides services (such as special education, staff development, technical assistance) to local school districts. In Illinois, they are known as Educational Service Regions and Educational Service Centers; in Iowa, they are known as Area Education Agencies. In Michigan, they are called Intermediate School Districts. In Minnesota, they are called Educational Cooperative Service Units, and in Wisconsin, they are known as Cooperative Educational Service Agencies.

Latchkey Programs: Programs that provide for before- and after-school supervision of groups of children and may extend into the summer and school vacation periods when school is not normally in session (Ohio Department of Education).

Local Education Agency (LEA): An educational agency at the local level which exists primarily to operate school or to contract for educational services (Knezevich, 1984).

Parent/Family Involvement: Family-oriented programs which are integrated into the overall early childhood education program and which provide parents and other family members with opportunities to participate in all phases of program development and implementation. Opportunities for parents and families to receive support, expand knowledge of child's development, increase parenting skills and extend children's learning at home are included (Michigan Department of Education).

Policy: A definite cause or method of action selected from among alteratives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions. A high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures, especially of a governmental body (Webster, 1980).

Policy Analysis: Research done by those interested in the process by which policies are adopted and the effects of the policies once adopted (Majchrzak, 1984).

Policy Brief: A concise description of a policy and its implementation.

Policy Research: Process of conducting research or analysis on a fundamental social problem in order to provide policymakers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem (Majchrzak, 1984).

Policymaker: One who engages in high-level elaboration of policy and especially of governmental policy (Webster, 1980).

Prekindergarten Program: For the purposes of this paper, means an early childhood education program which precedes the kindergarten experience. Is synonymous with Preschool Program.

Preschool Program: An educational program, which may include child care, for children who have not entered kindergarten and are not of compulsory school age. Is synonymous with prekindergarten program (Ohio Department of Education).

Stakeholders: Individuals or groups who either have some input into decisionmaking about a social problem, or are affected by policy decisions on that problem (Majchrzak, 1984).

State Education Agency (SEA): An educational agency at the state level mandated by a state constitution or created through legislative action (Knezevich, 1984).

ZA Endorsement: Endorsement given by Michigan colleges and universities upon completion of an 18-hour early childhood education program requirement, which is recognized by the Michigan Department of Education as fulfillment of teacher certification in prekindergarten and kindergarten (Michigan Department of Education).

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) was released, a number of reforms have been recommended by many national organizations and groups to improve education in the U.S. Few, however, have received as much support as **Early Intervention or Early Childhood Education (ECE)** for young children who are at risk of academic failure. Early intervention or ECE generally provides developmentally appropriate activities and experiences for young children and opportunities for parents to become actively involved in the development and education of their children. In addition, health, nutrition, day-care, and social services are often provided.

Targeted to youngsters before they reach kindergarten, early intervention or ECE is advocated by many diverse and influential groups as a major strategy to significantly reduce the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children. For example, in 1986, the National Governors' Association's (NGA) Task Force on Readiness recommended that states develop initiatives to help at-risk preschool children become ready for school. Specifically, the Task Force suggested that states:

- provide in-home assistance for first-time, low-income parents of high risk infants;
- develop outreach initiatives using community and religious organizations;
- provide high quality early childhood development programs for all 4-year-old at-risk children, and where feasible, 3-year-olds;
- provide all parents of preschoolers information on successful parenting;
- stress continued improvement of developmental and educational programs in existing day-care centers for preschool children through center accreditation, teacher credentialing, and staff development;
- develop state and local structures through which various public and private agencies can work together to provide appropriate programs for young children and new parents (National Governor's Association [NGA], 1986, p. 14).

Further, in 1987, NGA published a handbook of promising prevention programs for children from birth to age 5 (NGA, 1987b) and a book to guide implementation of its 1986 recommendations (NGA, 1987c).

The Committee for Economic Development (CED), an independent research and educational organization of more than 200 business executives and educators, also strongly supports early intervention, particularly for disadvantaged youngsters, as one of three investment strategies for the economic well-being of the entire nation (Committee for Economic Development [CED], 1987). Specifically, the CED notes that "It is less costly to society and to individuals to prevent early failure through efforts directed toward parents and children alike from prenatal care through age five (CED, 1987, p. 11).

The CED recommends that such efforts include the following:

- Prenatal and postnatal care for pregnant teens and other high-risk mothers and follow-up health care and developmental screening for their infants.
- Parenting education for both mothers and fathers, family health care, and nutritional guidance.
- Quality child-care arrangements for poor working parents that stress social development and school readiness.
- Quality preschool programs for all disadvantaged three- and four-year-olds (CED, 1987, p. 11).

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is another influential organization supporting early intervention. In 1987, the CCSSO adopted a policy statement, "Assuring School Success for Students at Risk" (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 1987b). Following the adoption of the policy statement by its membership, the CCSSO developed a model state statute as an example for implementing the policy statement (CCSSO, 1987c). Part II of the model state statute called for preschool child development programs to be made available to 3- and 4-year-old children who are at risk of educational failure.

Then in 1988, a study commission of the CCSSO drafted recommendations urging states to provide a wide range of services for children from birth who are at risk of school failure. Recommendations included the following:

- creation of statewide, integrated, and unified policy and action plans;
- coalitions of educators, human-service providers, business leaders, and citizens to secure resources;

- the establishment of standards and regulations to ensure appropriate developmental practices, parent involvement, and staff training;
- provisions to extend elements of high quality preschool programs into the elementary school curriculum;
- the development of multiple measures for assessing school readiness and to guard against inappropriate use of tests for placement and labeling;
- the establishment of a data collection system to help coordinate services for young children;
- the creation of a national clearinghouse to gather information on model programs and research;
- providing comprehensive early childhood services for state employees to serve as a model for other agencies and the private sector; and
- the establishment of parent education training programs for early childhood staff (Gold, 1988a).

And another major source of support for public investment in preschool programs came in October, 1988, when the National Association of State Boards of Education's (NASBE) Task Force on Early Childhood Education released its report, Right from the Start (National Association of State Boards of Education [NASBE], 1988a). The NASBE report focused on young children, ages 4 to 8, and recommended ways for public schools to teach young children, work with their parents, and collaborate with other programs that serve preschoolers and their families.

The Task Force drew upon the advice of leading experts in early childhood education and the testimony of state legislators, school teachers, principals, superintendents, Head Start and child-care center directors, teacher trainers, and parents who attended four regional hearings.

The Task Force recommended elementary schools create early childhood units for children ages 4 to 8. Specific local strategies were outlined for implementing developmentally appropriate curriculum, improved assessment, responsiveness to children's cultural and linguistic diversity, ensuring partnerships with parents, and providing training and support for staff and administrators.

In addition, the Task Force recommended that public schools develop partnerships with other early childhood programs and community agencies to build and improve services for young children and their parents. Strategies for expanding and improving child care services, improving staff quality, and ensuring comprehensive services to children and families were provided. Further, the

report recommended strategies to state policymakers in promoting the early childhood unit, collaboration in early childhood services, and financing early childhood services.

Factors Supporting Public Investment in Preschool Programs

Many factors have contributed to this diverse support for public investment in preschool programs. For example, children are now the poorest segment of the nation's population. In fact, they are seven times as likely to be poor as those over 65 years of age (Moynihan, 1986). Children born in poverty often suffer from gross malnutrition, recurrent and untreated health problems, psychological and physical stress, child abuse, and learning disabilities. Those poor children who survive infancy are three times more likely to become school dropouts than are children from more economically advantaged homes (CED, 1987).

Of all the children under age 18, 20% live in families whose incomes fall below the poverty line, and 25% of all children under 6 years of age are now living in poverty. Forty-three percent of black children and 40% of Hispanic children live in poverty even though two-thirds of all poor children are white (U.S. Congress, House, 1987). Duncan and Rodgers (1985) contend that the average black child will spend five of the first 15 years of childhood in an impoverished home and that black children as a group are nearly three times as likely to live in poverty as white children.

Poverty is greatest among those children living in single-parent homes headed by women. According to Moynihan (1986), children of single parents tend to do worse in school than children living with two parents, and their dropout rate is nearly twice as high. In 1985, almost 50% of white children, 66% of black children, and more than 70% of Hispanic children living in female-headed households lived in poverty. While one out of every six white children lives in a single-parent home, this situation has become the norm for black children; 50% live in homes headed by unmarried women (U.S. Congress, House, 1987).

The 1980 Census projected that of every 100 children born in 1983, 59 will live with only one parent before reaching age 18. Twelve will be born out of wedlock; 40 will be born to parents who divorce before the child is 18; five will be born to parents who separate; and two will be born to parents of whom one will die before the child reaches 18. The remaining 41 will reach age 18 "normally" with two parents (Hodgkinson, 1985).

The CED noted that "children from poor and single-parent households are more likely than others to be children of teenage parents and to become teenage parents themselves" (CED, 1987, p. 9). The magnitude and significance of this problem was described by Hodgkinson (1985). Fifty percent of children born outside of marriage are born to teenage mothers, and every day 40 teenage girls give birth to their third child. Further, teenage mothers tend to give birth to premature babies, primarily because of the lack of both physical examinations and proper nutrition during pregnancy. Prematurity leads to low birthweight, increasing these babies' chances of major health problems because of underdeveloped immune systems. Low birth weight has also been found to be a predictor of major learning problems when the child becomes school-aged. Of the 3.3 million babies born annually, approximately 700,000 are "almost assured of being educationally retarded or 'difficult to teach'" (Hodgkinson, 1985, p. 5).

Changes in demographics have also contributed to the increased attention on early childhood education for young children. Referencing the work of Hodgkinson (1985), the CED noted the marked increase of minorities in the U.S.:

> In 1984, 36 percent of the babies born in this country were members of minorities, and by the year 2000, the proportion of minority children under 18 will be at least 38 percent.
>
> In 1985, minorities represented about 17 percent of the total U.S. population. By the year 2020, this proportion is expected to rise more than one-third; if current demographic trends continue, a larger proportion of this group will be children from disadvantaged homes (CED, 1987, p. 9).

What is the cause of this marked increase in minorities? According to Hodgkinson (1985), three major factors are involved: 1) differential fertility (that is, the average number of births per female in various groups), 2) the average age of the groups, and 3) immigration.

Whites, on the average, produce 1.7 children per female. In contrast, blacks produce 2.4 children per female, and Hispanics produce 2.9 children per female. Thus, the proportion of whites will decrease, and the proportion of blacks and Hispanics will increase, since on the average, minorities are producing more children than whites (Hodgkinson, 1985).

The average age of the groups adds additional information in determining the cause for the increasing number of minorities. According to the 1980 Census, the average white in the U.S. was 31 years old, the average black was 25, and the average Hispanic 22. Thus, "age produces population momentum for minorities, as the typical Hispanic female is just moving into the peak childbearing years, while the average white female is moving out of them" (Hodgkinson, 1985, p. 3).

Blacks and Hispanics are not the only minorities whose numbers are increasing in the U.S. Hodgkinson (1985) noted that the third fastest growing non-white sector of the nation is Asian-American, representing 44% of all immigrants admitted to the U.S. While their diversity is great, the language problems of most Indochinese has been and will continue to be characteristic of this group and represent a sizeable proportion of disadvantaged children.

The dramatic increase in the need for child-care arrangements also has contributed to a national focus on young children. During the mid-1980s, 50% of mothers with 1-year-olds had already returned to work and more than 25% of all impoverished mothers with children under the age of 6 were in the labor force (Hodgkinson, 1985). The Children's Defense Fund (1987) predicts that by 1995, two-thirds of all preschool children will have mothers in the work force.

State Legislative Interest in Preschool Programs

During the 1980s, state legislative interest in educational programs for preschool-aged children grew considerably. By 1987, 24 states and the District of Columbia had spent state money on educational programs for preschool-aged children, and most states had targeted these programs for at-risk children (Grub, 1987; Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988). According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988), the most significant factor influencing legislative support for ECE was research that demonstrated short- and long-term academic and social benefits to disadvantaged 3- and 4-year-olds who were enrolled in ECE programs.

Children enrolled in ECE programs:

- had higher academic performance,
- required less special education,
- had better school attendance and graduation rates,
- pursued more post-secondary education and training,
- had higher levels of employment and less unemployment, and
- had fewer contacts with the criminal justice system (Berrueta-Clement, Schweinert, Barnett,

Epstein, & Weikart, 1984).

Barnett (1985) found that **for every $1 spent on ECE, $4 to $7 for later, more costly remedial and social programs was saved.**

The National Conference of State Legislatures (1989) also reported that during the 1989 legislative session 33 state legislatures would consider initiating and/or expanding ECE programs as a major strategy to offset "the risks faced by disadvantaged children, putting them on the road to success at an early age."

Federal Interest in Preschool Programs

There also appears to be strong public support for federal involvement in the care and education of young children. More than 100 child-care bills were introduced during the 100th Congress. Although none became law in 1988 nor in 1989, supporters of federal child-care legislation are hopeful that the House and Senate will reach a settlement on a compromise child-care bill in 1990. There is also optimism that Congress will increase funds for Head Start in 1990 so that more than the current 16% of the 2.5 million eligible children can be served in Head Start programs (Department of Health and Human Services, 1986).

Research-based Information for Policymakers

Although the volume of applied social science research has increased over the past 20 years, policymakers have strongly voiced concern that research tends to yield worthless information (McDonnell, 1988). The fact that research on ECE influenced legislative support is significant.

What prompted legislatures to acknowledge the research in ECE? McDonnell (1988) contends that three major incentives came together to create strong pressures for state governments to take a more active policymaking role in education. First, the business community (e.g., the Committee for Economic Development [CED]) demanded change. Second, state funding for public education has grown. And third, student performance has become a broad-based electoral issue. The research on ECE (its academic, social, and cost-effective benefits) complemented the incentives and provided leverage for public policy despite the fact that the Perry Preschool Project, the major study cited by legislatures, was funded at a higher level than most preschool programs sponsored by state and local governments.

McDonnell (1988) also suggests that research-based information can most effectively serve three major functions for policymakers. The first is "enlightenment" -- providing a general framework for thinking about a particular policy and sensitizing policymakers to a different set of factors. Enlightenment provides general insight throughout the policymaking process.

The second function is defining the problem. This function is difficult as it requires researchers "'be in the right place at the right time' to help define a problem and identify appropriate policy solutions" (McDonnell, 1988, p. 94). Further, it is considered "most important when policymakers are considering major changes in policy direction or about to increase their level of policy activity" (McDonnell, 1988, p. 94).

The third function involves analyzing the options and assessing the feasibility of prospective policies and the implementation and effects of existing ones. McDonnell (1988) notes that this function is "most important to the policymaking process after policy solutions have been proposed and during the implementation process" (p. 95). This last function promotes enlightenment and aids in problem definition and the search for more effective new policies.

Additional support for this type of policy research is provided by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development's (ASCD) Panel on State Policy Initiatives. In its 1986 report, School Reform Policy: A Call for Reason, the Panel suggested that new policies designed to address problems in American education should be evaluated objectively. A five-step procedure for analyzing any state-level policy was provided in the report. The procedures recommended by the Panel, in brief, include: 1) identification of the problem; 2) identification of the policy designed to address the problem; 3) identification of the assumptions about the problems and the solution; 4) a review of what is known about the specific problem and the specific policy solution under study; and 5) identification of other ways of looking at the problem and the solution designed to address the problem (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD], 1986).

The focus of this study was on McDonnell's third function of research-based information for policymakers -- the analysis of current policies and their implications for decisionmakers. The procedures for analyzing state-level policy provided by ASCD were also kept in mind.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this policy study was to identify and analyze early intervention policies for young children at risk of academic failure in selected state education agencies (SEAs) in the North Central Region of the U.S. Since state legislatures have become very active in educational policymaking and have mandated early intervention or ECE programs, the policies studied include those mandated by seven SEAs and/or their corresponding state legislatures.

Legislation often requires state agencies to promulgate rules to amplify or clarify the law. Further, SEAs frequently develop guidelines and/or requirements for implementation of policies and legislation. Thus, rules, guidelines, and requirements pertaining to early intervention for at-risk preschoolers developed by the SEAs were examined in order to determine the current status of policies and legislation.

A secondary purpose of this study was to document the processes by which states developed their policies or legislation pertinent to early intervention for at-risk preschoolers. This purpose grew out of requests made by some of the SEA personnel who were contacted for information about their state policies. Specifically, they indicated it would be helpful to them to know what kinds of studies or activities were undertaken prior to a state's development of policies or legislation Thus, a brief description of the processes undertaken by states is provided where information was available.

The study was guided by the following question: **What SEA policies and legislative mandates for early intervention/early childhood education programs for preschoolers at risk of academic failure were in place as of the 1988-89 school year?**

The next chapter reviews the processes by which the selected states developed their early intervention policies and mandates and describes the policies, mandates, and accompanying provisions designed to address the needs of young children at risk of academic failure.

CHAPTER II

EARLY INTERVENTION IN THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION: STATES' POLICIES AND LEGISLATION

All seven states in the study (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) had provisions for early childhood education (ECE) programs by the beginning of the 1988-89 school year. This chapter reviews the processes by which the selected states developed their early intervention policies and mandates and describes the policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements for preschool programs for at-risk youngsters.

Programs for young children prior to entrance into kindergarten have many labels. Some states call these programs "early childhood education (ECE)" programs, others call them "preschool" programs, and some states use the term "prekindergarten" programs. All of these terms refer to an educational program for young children prior to entrance into kindergarten. For the benefit of the reader and to minimize confusion, the author has taken the liberty to use "preschool" as the term to describe these programs. However, the other terms are used, as appropriate, when states' policies or legislation are referenced or quoted.

Illinois

Early Childhood Education Policy Study

Illinois' interest in early childhood education (ECE) was formalized in April, 1983, when the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) directed its staff to conduct an Early Childhood Education Policy Study. Four factors influenced the need for such a study:

- legislative proposals from past General Assembly sessions regarding entry age into kindergarten;
- the encouragement of "latchkey" programs in public schools;
- the funding of full-day kindergarten; and

- the Board's own mandate studies directing further study of preschool programs for limited-English-proficient children and an examination of the compulsory attendance age of 7 (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE], 1985a).

Underlying these issues was also the recognition that the experiences young children have at an early age influence their intellectual growth and their future academic success. The Board was also cognizant of the increased number of single-parent families, the prevalence of two parents working outside the home, and other sociological changes. Therefore, the Board saw the need to examine these changing demographics of the family (ISBE, 1985a).

The Board's directive stated that:

> While there are numerous reasons for further investigation of the potential benefits of pre-kindergarten education for handicapped and non-English-proficient children, a study should include potential benefits, as well as any disadvantages, of pre-kindergarten education for all children. The study would be conducted with the intent of discerning whether any benefits of early childhood education would be sufficient to cause the state to either support or require the provision of such services (ISBE, 1985a, p. 1).

The focus of the study was on non-handicapped children between birth and the time such children enter first grade. Handicapped children were excluded because Illinois already had a requirement for services to these children from the age of 3. Further, the Board had approved seeking an extension of this requirement to include services to handicapped children, from birth to age 3 (ISBE, 1985a).

Five basic categories of ECE programs were included in the study: day care, preschool services, kindergartens, latchkey programs in schools, and transitional grades through third grade (ISBE, 1985a).

The ISBE staff collected information from a variety of sources. Nationally known early childhood educators, directors of programs in other state and local child-care centers and preschools, directors of school-based programs, staff in other state agencies, instructors of child-care providers, and those who criticized involvement in such programs were consulted (ISBE, 1985a).

On-site visits to programs in Chicago and Champaign-Urbana were also made so that ISBE

staff could observe children directly. Further, it provided the staff with a "constant and personal frame of reference and a reminder of the responsibility entailed in the debates on issues" (ISBE, 1985a, p. 3).

Surveys of Principals and ECE Specialists in SEAs

Two surveys were also conducted as part of the study. The first survey was begun in September, 1984, and was sent to all Illinois public and non-public elementary school principals. The purpose of the survey was to obtain baseline data regarding ECE programs in public and nonpublic schools and to assess the opinions of principals in these schools regarding ECE issues. Responses were obtained from almost 94% of the public school principals and from 80% of the nonpublic school principals, for a total response rate of 90% (ISBE, 1985a).

The second survey was conducted in November, 1984, with all ECE specialists in all SEAs. These specialists were contacted and interviewed in order to obtain up-to-date information concerning the status of kindergarten and other ECE proposals. Additional information was also collected by contacting staff in governors' offices or legislative bureaus in some instances (ISBE, 1985a).

ECE Background Reports

ISBE staff also developed background reports which analyzed and synthesized available research on ECE. The Policy Report was written based on these background reports and included the following:

- *Brief History of Early Childhood Education in America;*
- *Kindergarten Schedules: Status of Patterns in Illinois and a Review of the Research;*
- *The Kindergarten Curriculum: Current Issues;*
- *Entry Criteria for Kindergarten;*
- *Class Sizes for Kindergarten and Primary Grades: A Review of the Research;*
- *Status of Early Childhood Education in Other States;*
- *Estimates of Eligible Illinois Children Served and Not Served by Head Start;*
- *Estimates of Preschool Experiences and Childcare Arrangements of Illinois Children;*

- *Status of Illinois State Board of Education Efforts in Early Childhood Education;*
- *Selected Preschool Screening and Diagnostic Instruments: A Technical Review;*
- *Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education Programs: A Review of the Research;*
- *Problems of Young Children Adjusting to School; and*
- *Review of Research on the Special Educational Needs of:*
  - *Children of Teenage Parents,*
  - *Limited-English-Proficient Children, and*
  - *Children from Poverty or Low-Income Homes (ISBE, 1985a, pp. 3-4).*

The following major questions pertinent to pre-kindergarten programs were addressed in the Illinois Early Childhood Education Policy Study:

- What pre-kindergarten programs and services are provided in Illinois and how many children are served by them?
- What is the effectiveness of these pre-kindergarten programs and services?
- Who else could benefit from pre-kindergarten programs and services? (ISBE, 1985a, p. 7).

Findings of the ECE Policy Study

Eight major findings resulted from the Policy Study:

- There are a variety of early childhood programs being offered in response to increased expectations of children, increased demand by parents, and recognition of the greater range of differences among children entering school.
- The number of children who could benefit from early childhood programs far exceeds those currently being served. This is particularly true for those who are most at risk of school failure: children from low-income families, limited-English-proficient children, and children of teenage parents.
- Research has indicated that early childhood programs can be successful in meeting desirable educational and social objectives. Economic analyses show a seven-to-one return on an investment in a high-quality preschool program.
- The expectations previously held for first-grade students are now being expected of kindergarten students. This is due to the large incidence of children already having had preschool experiences and the demand for acquiring basic skills as soon as possible. This is a source of controversy.

- Conditions which established the lower compulsory age as age 7 have changed significantly. There seems to be no reason for a difference between the age at which a child may attend school and the age at which a child must attend school.

- Changing the date at which children may enter school does not address the range of differences among children.

- The full-day, everyday kindergarten has superior academic benefits to the half-day, everyday and full-day, alternate day programs.

- The training and experience of elementary school principals typically has not encompassed the needs of young children. Most of the principals had teaching experiences limited to intermediate and upper grades. (ISBE, 1985a, p. 39).

State Board Policy

In March, 1985, the Overview Report of the Early Childhood Education Policy Study was presented to the Illinois State Board of Education. Recommendations were made to the Board in April, 1985, and approved by the Board in May, 1985, at which time the Board also adopted a policy statement on ECE (ISBE, 1985a).

The policy statement focused on the developmental needs of young children prior to the time they enter first grade and was based on a number of premises:

A) Positive, nurturing experiences in the early years of life are essential in helping children develop intellectually, socially, and emotionally, and future academic success in school is strongly influenced by the character of early experiences.

B) Children identified as being at risk of academic failure can dramatically improve their chances for success through participation in early childhood education programs.

C) Significant developmental differences exist among children, and particular attention should be given to such individual differences in the development of early education programs and services.

D) Meeting the education, health, welfare, and safety needs of young children requires collaboration among various childcare providers.

E) The quality of instructional staff and leadership are especially critical elements in effective early childhood education programs (ISBE, 1985b, p. 2).

The section of the policy statement pertaining to preschool-aged children directed the SEA to seek legislation to require school districts to:

1) develop screening procedures by January, 1986, for the purpose of identifying children at risk of academic failure;
2) identify and screen all children who would be 4 years old by December 1, 1986; and
3) provide full-day prekindergarten programs for all children who had been identified as being at risk of academic failure (ISBE, 1985b).

Further, the policy statement identified ISBE as taking a leadership role in cooperation with other state agencies in developing an intra-state data bank of registered, licensed, or approved child-care, day-care, or preschool providers and making this information available to the public. ISBE explained that its cooperation with other state agencies interested in the welfare of young children would also help to assure consistency of policies and regulations regarding the educational component of programs for young children (ISBE, 1985b).

State Legislation

Based on the work conducted through the Policy Study, the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation shortly after the Board adopted its policy statement on early childhood education. The legislation authorized ISBE to implement and administer a grant program for public school districts to conduct preschool educational programs for children, ages 3 to 5, "who because of their home and community environment are subject to such language, cultural, economic and like disadvantages that they have been determined as a result of screening procedures to be at risk of academic failure" (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2 & 3.48 [b]).

The law further stipulated that:

1) screening procedures would be based on criteria established by ISBE;
2) a parent education component would be included in each educational program provided;
3) public school districts receiving grants could subcontract with a private school, not-for-profit corporation, or other governmental agency to conduct the preschool programs:

4) teachers of the programs must hold either early childhood teaching certificates issued under Article 21 or Section 34-83 of the School Code of Illinois or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended;
5) ISBE would provide the primary source of funding through appropriations for the grant program;
6) ISBE would provide evaluation tools, including tests, that school districts could use to evaluate children for school readiness prior to the age of 5;
7) ISBE would require school districts obtain parental consent before any evaluations were conducted;
8) ISBE would encourage school districts to evaluate their preschool population and provide programs where appropriate;
9) beginning on July 1, 1989, and every three years thereafter, ISBE would report the results and progress of students enrolled in the programs to the General Assembly. And further, ISBE would report on the assessment of which programs had been most successful in promoting academic excellence and alleviating academic failure; and
10) ISBE would develop procedures for the collection of longitudinal data regarding the academic progress of all students who had been enrolled in the preschool programs (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2-3.48).

In 1985, the Illinois General Assembly also amended the School Code of Illinois, authorizing a change in the early childhood teaching certificate. As of July 1, 1988, the new certificate is valid for four years for teaching young children, birth through third grade. Subject to provisions of the Code, the ECE certificate is awarded:

> to persons who had graduated from a recognized institution of higher education with a bachelor's degree and with not fewer than 120 semester hours including professional education or human development or early childhood education instruction and practical experience involving supervised work with children under the age of 6 or, beginning July 1, 1988, with children through grade 3 (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 21-2.1).

State Appropriations

In FY86, $9 million was appropriated for the first half year of operation of the grant program, including $3.1 million for initial eligibility screening. Estimates projected that 112,000 at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds lived in Illinois at the time screening began in January, 1986. More than 24,000 3- and 4-year-olds were screened, and approximately 8,000 children were identified as being at risk of academic failure and eligible for services. Of that group, more than 5,000 children were served in 100 programs established throughout the state. Funds were not available to serve the remainder of those children identified, and consequently they were placed on waiting lists (ISBE, n.d.).

In FY87, the Illinois General Assembly appropriated $12.7 million for the grant program. Approximately 7,400 children were served in 93 programs. Early childhood consultants were hired by ISBE and conducted on-site evaluations of each of the programs during the 1986-87 school year. The programs were evaluated on their educational components, screening process, parent educational components, and their own evaluation procedures (ISBE, n.d.).

ISBE (n.d.) reported that approximately 50% of the programs were found to be of high quality, 30% were considered average, and the remaining 20% needed improvement in at least two of the four areas. Technical assistance was provided to these programs to improve areas of weakness.

Also during the 1986-87 school year, development of a data base for the grant program continued. The data base includes facts about family background, reasons for placement in the preschool programs, and student progress through the early grades of elementary school. ISBE indicated it will use the data collected in determining what kinds of early childhood programs are most effective (ISBE, n.d.).

The Illinois General Assembly appropriated another $12.7 million in FY88. Although ISBE requested $45.8 million for FY89, $23.9 million was appropriated, resulting in less than was requested but an increase of 88.2% over the 1988 General Assembly appropriation (Sanders, 1988). This increase in appropriation also resulted in nearly 4,000 additional children being served. According to Chalmer Moore, Educational Consultant in Remediation and Intervention, ISBE, approximately 11,173 3- and 4-year olds were served in 135 projects representing 276 school districts during the 1988-89 school year (C. Moore, personal communication, January 18, 1989).

The ISBE policy statement directed the SEA to seek legislation requiring school districts to provide full-day programs for their at-risk preschoolers. However, neither the legislation nor the ISBE specifications for submitting a proposal for the at-risk preschool programs stipulated any time requirements (ISBE 1985c, 1986, 1987, 1988a).

Currently, at-risk preschoolers are served in a variety of ways as determined by each local district that was awarded a grant. Some programs provide services to children entirely in their homes (home-based), while others provide services in a setting outside of children's homes (center-based). Some center-based programs meet two or two and one-half hours per day, two days per week, while others meet two or two and one-half hours per day for three, four or five days per week. According to Chalmer Moore, all programs provide home-visits, that is, opportunities for teachers to meet with the children's parents in their homes to extend program goals. Parents and teachers also discuss the child's individualized educational program (C. Moore, personal communication, January 18, 1989).

Components of the At-Risk Preschool Programs

Components of the Illinois at-risk preschool education program include the following:

- Eligibility criteria developed by local programs based upon screening procedures that address at least the needs in the areas of vocabulary, visual-motor integration, language and speech development, fine and gross motor skills, and social skills;
- Screening and educational components based on sound theories of child development;
- An individualized assessment profile for each student and an educational program for that student in accord with the profile as a result of initial screening and continued assessment;
- A student progress plan for each student to ensure that the program meets the student's needs;
- Parent education and involvement including parent permission for screening and parent awareness of student's progress;
- Requirement that teachers hold either early childhood teaching certificates -- Type 02, birth to age 6 or Type 04, birth through grade 3 -- issued under Article 21 of The School Code of Illinois or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended;

- Cooperation with other child-care providers concerned with the education, welfare, health, and safety needs of young children;
- A statement of goals and objectives of the program and timelines for completion;
- A staff/child ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20;
- Longitudinal data collection to determine the effect of the preschool program on children as they progress through the primary grades; and
- Provision for local school districts to operate their own program or enter into a subcontract with a private school, not-for-profit corporation, or other governmental agency to implement the program (ISBE, 1988a).

***

Summary

In summary, Illinois' interest in ECE was formalized in 1983 when the State Board of Education directed its staff to conduct a policy study in ECE. Since that time, a policy statement has been adopted by the Board, and the General Assembly passed legislation in 1985 authorizing ISBE to implement a grant program for public school districts to conduct preschool screening procedures and educational programs for 3- and 4-year-olds who are at risk of academic failure. Approximately $58.3 million has been appropriated for the program.

Indiana

State Legislation

Funds were provided for preschool programs for at-risk children in Indiana as part of the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students which was legislated in 1987. The law required the Indiana Department of Education:

> to develop a formula for allocating funds among school corporations [school districts] based on percentage of families with children below the poverty level; percentage of children in single-parent households; and percentage of the population in the school corporation 19 years old and over that has not graduated from high school (Indiana H.B. 1360, 1987, Sec. 26).

In order to receive funds under the program, school corporations applied for grants to fund eligible programs from their pre-determined allocation.

The law further stipulated that eligible programs included preschool programs, full-day kindergarten, parental and community involvement programs, transitional programs, tutoring, remediation, expanded utilization of school counselors, individualized programs, and alternative programs for students at risk of withdrawing from school (Indiana H.B. 1360, 1987, Sec. 26). School corporations could choose the type of program appropriate to their communities' needs.

The legislation became effective July 1, 1987, however, the $20 million in program funds were not available to school corporations until the 1988-89 school year (Indiana H.B. 1360, 1987, Sec. 26).

Administrative Guidelines

The administrative guidelines prepared by the Indiana Department of Education to implement the program indicated that:

- each school corporation define its own at-risk population to be served;
- programs must be new or expanded; funds from this program cannot be used to replace local program dollars;
- programs are not limited to the nine programs listed in the law;
- program money may be used to contract for services; (for example, a school corporation may enter into an agreement with a community program to provide preschool experiences for at-risk children);
- programs may be sponsored by two or more school corporations;
- program evaluation will be tied to the objectives of the program;
- there is no requirement in the law that private school students be included;
- students who had not been determined to be at risk may be included if their inclusion will benefit the at-risk students and can be justified; and

- students already receiving categorical services, such as Chapter I or Special Education, may be served with program money if they also fit the identification criteria for at-risk students (Indiana Department of Education, n.d.[a]).

In January 1988, the Indiana State Board of Education proposed additional funding for the Educational Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students, specifically for 42 half-day preschool classrooms. The Board noted that

> most educators agree children from low socioeconomic backgrounds often miss the experiences available to their more affluent peers and are at a disadvantage when they enter school. Without early intervention, these students may remain at a disadvantage throughout their educational careers. The benefits of developmentally appropriate preschool programs for these children have been well documented (Indiana Department of Education, 1988, p. 2).

Further, the Board suggested that these additional programs would offer an incentive to school corporations to expand their services beyond grades K-12. The General Assembly denied the Board's request, and no additional funds were appropriated (Speech by Jackson, 1988).

Financing the Preschool Programs

Of the 775 proposals for new or expanded at-risk programs approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the 1988-89 school year, 20 preschool programs received $542,839 in state funds. Local districts contributed $24,633. The 20 preschool programs served 2,108 at-risk youngsters and 2,281 non-at-risk children (C. D'Amico, personal communication, March, 1989).

Preschool Guidelines

The Department of Education also developed additional guidelines for each of the nine programs enumerated in the legislation to help set initial directions for local program coordinators. Utilizing the recommendations of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, the Indiana "Elements to Consider in Program Planning" for preschool programs included the following:

- A ratio of teaching staff to children of no more than one to 10 with maximum classroom size of 20;

- A validated, developmentally appropriate curriculum model (such as NAEYC) implemented by qualified early childhood teachers;
- Appropriate support systems to maintain the curriculum model such as administrative leadership in instruction and inservice training in the curriculum model;
- Teacher preparation in curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation;
- Collaboration between teaching staff and parents as partners in the education and development of children including face-to-face communication at least monthly; and
- A program of reasonable length, at least 20 hours per week for approximately eight months per year (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b], p.7).

***

Summary

In summary, Indiana has no formal State Board of Education policy on ECE. The General Assembly passed legislation for at-risk children in 1987 and authorized $20 million for the 1988-89 school year for grants to fund eligible programs. Nine types of programs were listed in the law; however, school corporations are not limited to those programs. Of the 775 proposals for new or expanded at-risk programs approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the 1988-89 school year, 20 preschool programs received funding -- 95% from state funds and 5% from local districts. The Department of Education developed guidelines for all at-risk programs and suggested that school corporations consider certain elements when planning preschool programs.

Iowa

Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force

In 1986, the Iowa State Board of Education adopted a five-year plan composed of 59 activities listed under seven goals. One of the activities was the creation of a Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force composed of 15 early childhood experts and interested community residents. The purposes of the Task Force were to: 1) design a plan for establishing appropriate prekindergarten (preschool) programs, and 2) strengthen existing kindergarten learning experiences (Goodenow, 1988).

The Task Force utilized the position statements on developmentally appropriate programs in early childhood education developed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and other research to develop a philosophical base. Based on oral and written testimony of experts and organizations, the Task Force developed a report which included a rationale statement, a position statement, guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in preschool and kindergarten programs, guidelines for a model for delivery of preschool programs, and references (Goodenow, 1988).

Guidelines for Developmentally Appropriate Practices

A brief description of the guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten follows:

1. Personnel: Prekindergarten teachers in public school programs must have the state endorsement for prekindergarten/kindergarten (#53). Prekindergarten teachers in these programs should have previous experience in teaching this age group and will be placed on the district's existing salary schedule and will receive benefits. Aides in prekindergarten programs must meet the same qualifications as elementary aides and will be paid according to district policy. Administrators of prekindergarten programs are encouraged to obtain and maintain current knowledge of child development and its application to ECE practice. Prekindergarten consultants from the Area Education Agencies and the Department of Education must have state endorsement for prekindergarten/kindergarten (#53) and prior experience in teaching this age group.

2. Eligibility and Placement: All children who are 4 on or before September 15 are eligible for prekindergarten programs regardless of developmental level. Children should not be denied access to the program based on the results of screening or other arbitrary determinations of their readiness. The prekindergarten program must be in compliance with Department of Education guidelines for ethnic and minority group enrollments and will provide for identification of young children with special needs, handicaps, and/or who are at risk.

3. Program Structure: Prekindergarten programs should be in operation a minimum of two and one-half hours, four days per week for two semesters in conjunction with the LEA calendar. A minimum of one-half day a week per half-day program must be set aside for conducting parent contacts, involvement, and participation opportunities. Maximum class size is 20 with two adults to enable individualized and age-appropriate programming. Special education aides assigned to individual children must not be included in the adult/child ratio. LEAs are encouraged to consider multi-age grouping for their prekindergarten programs.

4. Facilities and Equipment: Physical facilities and equipment must meet the needs of chudren in the prekindergarten program. Both indoor and outdoor facilities and equipment must be child-size and age-appropriate. There must be a minimum of 35 square feet per child of usable floor space and a minimum of 75 square feet per child of secured outdoor play space. One functioning toilet and one lavatory must be provided at a minimum for every 15 children, or fraction thereof.

5. Curriculum: The curriculum must be developmentally appropriate for prekindergarten children and planned for the age span of the children within the group. Further, it must be implemented with attention to the different needs, interests, and developmental levels of those individual children. The plan must develop children's self-esteem and a positive attitude toward learning. A developmentally appropriate curriculum provides experiences that meet children's needs and stimulate learning in physical, social, e notional, and intellectual developmental areas through an integrated approach. The teacher's knowledge of child development, observations, and recordings of each child's needs, interests, and developmental progress are the bases upon which appropriate curriculum is planned. Learning is an interactive process. Therefore, the curriculum is designed to provide for children's exploration and manipulation of the environment through meaningful interaction with adults, other children, and materials. Opportunities for children's active involvement with materials that are concrete, real, and/or representational, and relevant to young children are provided. There should be a balance of quiet and active experiences with daily outdoor experiences.

6. Adult-Child Interaction: Children's needs, desires, and messages are responded to by adults in a way that respects their individual characteristics and abilities. Children are provided opportunities to communicate in many ways. Adults facilitate the development of self-esteem by expressing acceptance, respect, and comfort for the child, regardless of the child's race, religion, gender, language, cultural or socioeconomic background, or handicap.

7. Teaching Strategies: There is a balance of child-initiated and teacher-directed activities. Teachers prepare the environment to enable children to learn through active exploration and interaction with other children, adults, and materials. Opportunities are provided for children to develop language skills; inner discipline and self-control; concepts and understandings about themselves, others, and the world around them; gross and fine motor skills; and to engage in esthetic expression and appreciation.

8. Assessment of Children: Assessment is ongoing and addresses growth in physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development. It is considered essential for planning and implementing developmentally appropriate programs. Written anecdotal records, observations, and parent information are all considered relevant data used in the assessment process. More than one source of information is used when making program placement decisions and curricular decisions. Assessment results are used to 1) plan and adapt curriculum to match the developmental needs of children, 2) facilitate the sharing of information among teachers, other professionals, and family members, 3) identify children who have special needs and/or are at risk, and 4) evaluate the program's effectiveness.

9. Home and Program Partnership: Teachers and families work together to build mutual understanding and greater consistency. Teachers establish and maintain frequent contact with families utilizing formal and informal oral and written communication. Parents are encouraged to observe and participate in their child's education. Parents have both the right and the responsibility to share in decisions about their child's care and education, and

to participate in the program. Information regarding child development knowledge, insights, and resources are shared between parents and teachers through regular communication, conferences, and planned meetings (Iowa Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force, 1987).

Prekindergarten Delivery Model

A brief description of the guidelines for a model for delivery of prekindergarten programs follows:

1. Responsibilities for the Department of Education: to a) set and enforce standards; b) provide technical assistance for planning and implementation; c) approve programs; and d) monitor and evaluate programs.

2. Responsibilities for LEAs: to a) establish a Prekindergarten/ Kindergarten Advisory Council; b) notify Department of Human Services-licensed programs regarding subcontracting opportunities; c) coordinate proposal applications; d) deliver services to children and families; e) provide staff development and inservice; f) coordinate parent education and involvement; and g) monitor and evaluate programs.

3. Responsibilities of Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Consultants from the Area Education Agencies (AEAs): upon request, provide a) technical assistance for planning; b) program coordination and implementation; c) identification of materials and resources; d) program and evaluation models; e) liaison to advisory council; and f) staff development and inservice.

4. Responsibilities of Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Advisory Councils: advise on a) application process; b) program planning and implementation; c) program evaluation; and d) program monitoring. These councils should be composed of parents, a principal, a prekindergarten teacher, a kindergarten teacher, an AEA representative, a community representative, a support agency representative, and a college or university representative.

5. Funding: will be provided through an entitlement application process. Department of Education selection criteria of programs for funding will include evidence of a) compliance with Iowa's "Guidelines for Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Classes" (Guidelines); b) collaborative efforts across agencies, including Department of Human Services-licensed prekindergarten programs; c) the establishment of a local prekindergarten/kindergarten advisory council. Upon approval and subsequent program implementation, enrolled 4-year-olds will be counted to receive district monies allocated on a per pupil formula presently in use for 5- to 18-year-olds.

6. Facilities: LEAs may subcontract prekindergarten facilities and equipment with area preschools and early childhood centers.

7. Program Evaluation: Ongoing program review and a written report regarding compliance with Iowa's Guidelines must be submitted by program staff to the LEA. The LEA must annually conduct a minimum of two on-site observations of the program. The LEA and the Advisory Council must review program reports to determine compliance with the Guidelines. The LEA's program evaluation reports must be submitted to the Department of Education as requested, and the Department will review the written reports to determine compliance with the Guidelines (Iowa Prekindergarten/ Kindergarten Task Force, 1987).

Department of Education Standards

In response to a legislative request in the spring of 1987, the Iowa Department of Education developed new standards including one that dealt with preschool. The standard stipulated that school districts would be required to offer preschool programs for 4-year-olds beginning July 1, 1992. However, due to financial constraints in Iowa, the State Board of Education voted to remove the proposed preschool standard at its January, 1988 meeting (Goodenow, 1988).

Goodenow further noted that the Iowa Department of Education strongly supported the concept of preschool programs and the initiation of pilot programs and planned to include preschool programs in future standards. In addition, the Department of Education said that the State Board of Education, the Administrative Rules Review Committee, and Governor Branstad would have to

approve the currently proposed standards, including the proposed standard for full-day, everyday kindergarten to begin in every school district in Iowa on July 1, 1992, before new standards could go into effect. This standard for full-day, everyday kindergarten was approved by the legislature in 1988 (Goodenow, 1988).

Child Development Assistance Act

In the fall of 1987, the Iowa General Assembly was awarded a grant for technical assistance from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the Carnegie Foundation regarding child care and early childhood education in the context of welfare reform. The General Assembly used the grant to bring experts to appear before its leadership to present the effects of early childhood education programs for at-risk children and to provide information on two other states' responses to the High/Scope research results (Bruner, 1988).

According to Senator Bruner (1988), the result of the technical assistance provided by NCSL and the Carnegie Foundation grant was the enactment of Senate File 2192, The Child Development Assistance Act, in 1988.

The Child Development Assistance Act created a Child Development Coordinating Council to promote the provision of child development services to at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds. Members of the Council include the following:

- the administrator or designee of the Iowa Division of Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Human Rights;
- the director or designee of the Iowa Department of Education;
- the commissioner or designee of the Department of Human Services;
- the director or designee of the Department of Public Health;
- an early childhood specialist of an Area Education Agency;
- the dean or designee of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences, Iowa State University;
- the dean or designee of the College of Education, University of Northern Iowa;
- the chairperson or designee of the Department of Pediatrics, University of Iowa; and
- an Iowa parent of a child who is or has been served by a federal Head Start program (Iowa Senate File 2192, 1988).

The law also stipulated that the Council:

- develop a definition of at-risk children which includes income, family structure, the child's level of development, and availability or accessibility for the child of a Head Start or other day-care program as criteria;
- establish minimum guidelines for comprehensive early childhood development services for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds, reflecting current research findings on the necessary components for cost-effective child development services;
- develop an inventory of child development services provided to at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds, at least biennially. Further, the Council will identify: a) the number of children receiving and not receiving these services; b) the types of programs under which the services are received; c) the degree to which each program meets the Council's minimum guidelines for a comprehensive program; and d) the reasons why children are not being served;
- recommend to the Department of Education and the General Assembly appropriate curricula and staff qualifications and training for early elementary education and the coordination of the curricula with early childhood development programs;
- award grants, subject to availability of funds, for programs that provide new or additional child development services to at-risk children;
- encourage all potential providers of child development services to submit grant requests and to be flexible in evaluating grants, recognizing that different types of programs may be suitable for different locations in the state;
- encourage the establishment of regional councils designed to facilitate the development of programs for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds on a regional basis; and
- annually submit recommendations to the governor and the General Assembly on the need for investment in child development services in the state (Iowa Senate File 2192, 1988).

The Department of Education and the Division of Children, Youth, and Families of the Department of Human Rights share ownership and administration of the program with the Department of Education serving as the lead agency. According to Bruner (1988), this was done to avoid potential turf battles between agencies. Further, Bruner noted that the Child Development Grants Program is:

> expected to be very similar to Head Start [however] state administration provides greater flexibility than merely adding money to the federal Head Start program. The flexibility can afford the opportunity to program for sparsely populated areas, where classroom programs may create major transportation concerns, and to approve school districts as well as private and Head Start agencies as program sponsors (Bruner, 1988, p. 1).

State Appropriations

The legislative appropriation for the Child Development Grants Program was approximately $1.2 million. The number of Head Start eligible children is expected to increase from the current 19% of qualifying children to nearly 25% of qualifying children (Bruner, 1988). According to Senator Bruner (personal communication, January 18, 1989) approximately one-third of the grants were awarded to school districts, one-third were awarded to Head Start projects, and one-third were awarded to day-care centers.

Senator Bruner (1988) also indicated that Senate File 2192 has been described as a key to Iowa's future economic viability:

> The support of the Iowa Business Community (composed of leaders of many of the state's largest corporations) and other business groups was enlisted in pressing for the legislation. The Iowa Business Council responded by setting 'welfare reform' as its priority for study and support in 1988. Business support helped 'legitimize' the issue as a sound investment in the future, and provided broader support for the services (p. 1).

Components of the Child Development Grants Program

Key programmatic elements of the Child Development Grants Program include:

- Developmentally appropriate early childhood education curriculum;
- Parent involvement and training, including home visits, optional parent instruction on parenting and tutoring skills, and experiential education;
- Staff qualified in early childhood education or who have experience in child development services;
- Integration of program services with existing community resources and incorporation of health, medical, dental, and nutrition services;
- Low staff/child ratio, with not less than one staff member per eight children;

- Provision for child care in addition to child development services for families needing full-day child care;
- Provision for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of program goals;
- Provision of transportation or other auxiliary services to participating families; and
- Staff training and development and staff compensation "sufficient to assure continuity" (Iowa Senate File 2192, p. 4).

Additional Legislation

The Iowa General Assembly passed a second piece of legislation in 1988 that was pertinent, in part, to early intervention for at-risk children and had implications for the SEA. Senate File 2295, an Act Relating to the Development of Programs for the Identification, Educational Methods, and Staff Qualifications for At-risk Children, provided three new responsibilities for the Director of the Department of Education.

The first responsibility required the Director to develop criteria and procedures to identify at-risk children and their developmental needs. The second responsibility required the Director, in conjunction with the Child Development Coordinating Council created in Senate File 2192 or another similar agency, to develop staff/child ratio recommendations and standards for at-risk programs based on national literature, national test results, and longitudinal test results of Iowa students. The third responsibility required the Director to develop programs, in conjunction with the Center for Early Development Education, to be made available to school districts to assist them in the identification of at-risk children and their developmental needs (Iowa Senate File 2295, 1988).

Another provision of Senate File 2295 required the Board of Regents to develop a Center for Early Development Education at either the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State University, or the University of Iowa. The Center's program will be conducted in a laboratory school setting to serve as a model for early childhood education and must include, but is not limited to, programs designed to accommodate the needs of at-risk children (Iowa Senate File 2295, 1988). According to C. Phillips, early childhood specialist for the Iowa Department of Education, the Center was established at the University of Northern Iowa.

The mandate also requires the Center's program to take a holistic approach and the teacher education programs at all three state universities to cooperate in developing the Center and its programs. Further, the Center and its programs must be developed in consultation with representatives from the following agencies, institutions, and groups: the three state universities; the Division of Children, Youth, and Families of the Department of Human Rights; the Department of Education; the Department of Health; the Child Development Coordinating Council; an early childhood development specialist from an Area Education Agency; and a parent of a child in a Head Start program (Iowa Senate File 2295, 1988).

***

Summary

In summary, Iowa has an implied State Board of Education policy on ECE based on the work of the Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force created in 1986. The Task Force recommended guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten and kindergarten classes, as well as guidelines for a model for delivery of prekindergarten programs. Strong support of the business community was considered instrumental in facilitating the welfare reform legislation in 1988 that created a Child Development Coordinating Council to promote the provision of child development services to at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds. The legislature also appropriated approximately $1.2 million for the Child Development Grants Program. The Center for Early Development Education was also created in 1988 through the enactment of another piece of legislation.

Michigan

"Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds"

In July, 1985, the Michigan State Board of Education appointed a 22-member Early Childhood Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to develop "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" as recognition of "the value and need for preschool education programs for four-year olds" (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986, p. 3). Members of the Committee included parents and representatives of organizations concerned with the education and welfare of young children and representation from higher education, the private sector, and the Departments of Mental Health, Public Health, and Social Services (Logan, 1988).

The Department of Social Services also reviewed the Committee's draft document to assure that the information and direction fit within the framework of Michigan Public Act 116, the licensing regulations for all child-care programs. According to the Michigan State Board of Education (1986), "Special consideration was given to this issue because Public Act 574 of 1978 requires child-care centers, established by local or intermediate school districts, to comply with Act 116 of 1973, as amended" (p. 3).

The committee agreed on a set of nine critical elements for which standards were established and approved by the Board of Education in November, 1986. These elements included philosophy, population/access, curriculum, learning environment and equipment, advisory council and community involvement, parent and family involvement, funding, administrative and supervisory personnel, and instructional staff personnel. The State Board of Education offered these standards as measures for identifying and comparing the qualitative and quantitative value of a preschool program. Further, the Board said the standards articulated "what is expected or considered 'appropriate' and adequate for quality programming and are suggested as a model for emulation" (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986, p. 3).

According to the philosophy statement, it was the intent of the Michigan State Board of Education "to propose and support early childhood programs that recognize each child as a whole person whose growth occurs in developmental stages that are sequential and continuous" (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986, p. 7).

Definitions, criterion, and quality indicators were provided for each standard to assist local education agencies (LEAs) in the assessment of any preschool program, regardless of funding source, and the design of new preschool programs to meet the unique needs of young children.

Components and a brief description of each of the Michigan "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" follow:

1) Philosophy: A statement must be developed with input from early childhood staff, administrators, parents, and community representatives which identifies the rationale of the program, is reviewed and approved by the local board of education, and is applied to all components and facets of the program.

2) Population/access: All preschoolers must be eligible to participate, and programs cannot exclude or limit participation on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, handicapping condition, or socioeconomic status. Further, support services must be provided to meet the needs of the population served.

3) Curriculum: Developmentally appropriate practices must be utilized to enhance children's social-emotional, physical, cognitive, aesthetic, language, and sensory development. Further, the curriculum must be designed to address the unique needs of the young child, include experiences related to multicultural awareness, and individualized to account for varying abilities of children in the group.

4) Learning environment and equipment: Facilities, space, equipment, supplies, and materials must be safe, secure, and comply with the legal requirements of the appropriate licensing or accrediting local or state agency.

5) Advisory council-community involvement: An advisory council must be organized for the purpose of advising, recommending, and assisting school personnel concerned with the preschool program. The council must have membership representative of the community, operate within established goals and objectives of the program, establish roles and responsibilities, actively support the program through public relations efforts, and assist in identifying community resources available to the program.

6) Parent/family involvement: Parents and families are to be encouraged to be involved in their child's program, and support services are provided when needed. Further, family-staff interaction must occur frequently and should be facilitated by such things as home visits, phone calls, written communication, conferences, parent participation in classroom activities, and staff participation in parent-child events and family activities. Parents and other family members must have access to information, resources, and materials which improve the quality of family life and/or support children's learning and development.

7) Funding: Funds must be provided for resources to implement the program reflective of state and local program philosophy, standards, and guidelines. Adequate funds must be provided for salaries, wages, and benefits for all program staff and must be commensurate with other K-12 district staff with similar assignments and responsibilities and who are employed under the same contract. Funds must also be available to purchase instructional resources for staff development and to support parent involvement and family activities.

8) Administrative/supervisory personnel: The program must have a qualified administrator who implements, evaluates, and manages the program and budget, coordinates the organization and utilization of the advisory council, and serves as a link between the program and the district's central administration and the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies. Further, the administrator must have educational preparation in the developmental approach to early childhood education. The program must be supervised by an early childhood specialist qualified to supervise, manage, evaluate, and direct the program and staff development.

9) Instructional staff/personnel: Programs must be staffed by individuals with different levels of education and experience. Instructional staff have responsibilities commensurate with their backgrounds, and educational training. An early childhood teacher must have a bachelor's degree in early childhood/preschool education or child development, OR an early childhood (ZA) endorsement given by Michigan colleges and universities upon completion of an 18-hour early childhood education program requirement, OR equivalent continuing education experience as approved by the State Board of Education, OR

equivalent experiences as a certified elementary teacher of children, birth through age 6. Beginning September 1, 1993, all teachers must have the early childhood (ZA) endorsement to teach in preschool programs. Early childhood support staff, paraprofessionals, associate teachers, teacher aides, and teacher assistants must be trained to implement program activities and assist in the care and education of the children served under the supervision of the early childhood teacher. Non-paid personnel, such as parents and volunteers, must be used in the program to enhance program goals. All instructional staff must participate in ongoing professional development and must be supported by administrative and supervisory personnel. Class size and teacher/student ratio must be 1:8 (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

State Appropriations

One million dollars of the Department of Education's budget for FY 86 and FY 87 were appropriated for pilot preschool programs for 4-year-olds. Fifty percent of these funds were distributed through competitive application for pilot projects to serve children at risk. The remaining allocation was distributed equally for collaborative models and teacher training models. A 30% local match was required.

Appropriations of $300,000 for FY 88 and $3 million for FY 89 were appropriated in the Department of Education budget for preschool programs beginning September, 1988. The funds were made available to public and private non-profit agencies through competitive grant awards.

These programs were targeted for children who were at risk of becoming educationally disadvantaged and who may have had extraordinary need of special assistance. Children must be at least 4, but less than 5 years old as of December 1 of the enrollment year. Programs must operate four days per week for a minimum of two and one-half hours of teacher/child interaction or contact time per day, plus one day per week for parent involvement and staff planning or training, for a minimum of 30 weeks. Other program requirements included a maximum class size of 18, an adult/child ratio of 1:8, trained and qualified teachers and support staff, a parent involvement component, a curriculum committee, collaboration with other local early childhood programs and other components as identified in the "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" (D. Van Looy, personal communication, July 28, 1989).

Provisions for similar programs were made in the Michigan State School Aid Act. Appropriations of $2 million and $12 million were approved in FY 88 and FY 89 respectively for preschool programs beginning September, 1988. Local and intermediate school districts identified by formula as having a high concentration of children at risk of becoming educationally disadvantaged and who may have extraordinary need of special assistance, were funded to provide preschool programs for these children (Michigan P.A. 220, 1987; Michigan P.A. 318, 1988)

Local and intermediate school districts implementing these preschool programs must establish an advisory committee to the program. The committee should include staff representatives from the Departments of Social Services, Mental Health and Public Health, as well as other pertinent social services agencies.

Section 37 of Michigan P.A. 318 of 1988 stipulates that a district is eligible for an allocation providing that the district:

1) complies with the Michigan State Board of Education's "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds";
2) provides for active and continuous parent or guardian participation in the program;
3) describes the district's participation plan as part of the application;
4) employs only teachers possessing proper training in early childhood development, including (ZA) endorsement and/or child development associate, and trained support staff;
5) identifies in its application all early childhood development programs operating in the community and all collaborative activities between the district and other operators of early childhood programs;
6) submits for approval a program budget that includes only those costs that are not reimbursed or reimbursable by federal funding, are clearly and directly attributable to the preschool readiness program, and would not be incurred if the program were not being offered;
7) establishes a committee on early childhood education curriculum -- consisting of, at least, classroom teachers for prekindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade, a parent of a prekindergarten child, and the district curriculum director or equivalent administrator, and if feasible, a school psychologist, school social worker, or school counselor -- to ensure ongoing articulation between the district's preschool, kindergarten, and first grade programs and review all referrals of children for participation in the preschool programs and recommend children for placement;

8) submits for Departmental approval a plan to conduct and report annual preschool program evaluations using criteria approved by the Department. At a minimum, the evaluations must include assessment of preschool participant gains in educational readiness and progress through first grade; and
9) establishes a community advisory committee that must be involved in the planning and evaluation of the program and has provided for collaboration with and the involvement of appropriate community, volunteer, social service agencies and organizations, and parents in addressing all aspects of educational disadvantages (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

The legislation also indicated that eligible school districts were allowed to use the available state funds in conjunction with whatever federal funds are available under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Head Start Act. Further, children other than those determined to be educationally disadvantaged may also participate in the preschool program. However, state reimbursement for the preschool program was limited to the portion of approved costs attributable to educationally disadvantaged children. The law also stipulated a formula for the allocation of funds (Shields, 1988b).

***

Summary

In summary, the Michigan State Board of Education approved "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" in 1986 based on the work of a 22-member Early Childhood Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. Nine critical elements were included in the Standards. Between FY85 and FY89, the Michigan Legislature appropriated $19.3 million for ECE programs for educationally disadvantaged 4-year-olds

Minnesota

Early Childhood Family Education

Minnesota's involvement with preschool-aged children has a 14-year history. In 1974, the Minnesota legislature authorized a bill sponsored by Senator Jerome Hughes to begin six pilot Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) programs. The ECFE program is designed for all children from birth to kindergarten enrollment age and their parents. Its primary purposes are to strengthen families by supporting and enhancing parents' ability to provide for their children's learning and development, and to provide young children opportunities to develop socially, emotionally, physically, and intellectually (Engstrom, 1988).

The ECFE program is based on two premises:

1) All parents have strengths and want to do what's best for their children.

2) The early years of life are a critical stage in the total life cycle and encompass specific developmental tasks that must be accomplished if a child is to move successfully to subsequent tasks (Engstrom, 1988, p. 16).

During its pilot phase, the program was guided under the auspices of the Council on Quality Education which represented a variety of interests and services, including health, child care, higher education, social services, minorities, and the handicapped. In 1984, ECFE was brought from pilot status to permanent, institutionalized status through additional legislation which directed the Minnesota Department of Education to develop a mechanism to finance the program statewide (Engstrom, 1988; Hausman & Weiss, 1988). Currently, the program is funded with state aid, local tax levies, and in most cases, participant fees (Early Childhood Family Education [ECFE] Aid, 1987; ECFE Programs, 1987; Engstrom, 1988). In FY88, the ECFE program had an $18.3 million budget -- $7.5 million supported by state aid and $10.7 million provided by local tax levies (Hausman & Weiss, 1988).

The enabling legislation selected Community Education as the delivery system "because of its reputation for involving the community in program design and decisionmaking, and its history of cooperating with other community resources to facilitate new efforts and prevent duplication of services" (Engstrom, 1988, p. 16). According to the legislation, any district that provides a

Community Education program is allowed to establish an ECFE program. Further, two or more districts, each of which provides a Community Education program, may cooperate to jointly provide an ECFE program (ECFE Programs, 1987).

According to Engstrom (1988), the ECFE legislation provides clear program parameters and flexibility. Programs may include the following:

1) programs to educate parents about the physical, mental, and emotional development of children;

2) programs to enhance the skills of parents in providing for their children's learning and development;

3) learning experiences for children and parents;

4) activities designed to detect children's physical, mental, emotional, or behavioral problems that may cause learning problems;

5) educational materials which may be borrowed for home use;

6) information on related community resources; or

7) other programs or activities (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2).

The legislation also stipulates that the programs be reviewed periodically to assure that the instruction and materials are free of racial, cultural, and sexual bias. Further, requirements for "substantial parent involvement" are described:

a) parents must be physically present much of the time in classes with their children or be in concurrent classes;

b) parenting education or family education must be an integral part of every early childhood family education program;

c) early childhood family education appropriations must not be used for traditional day care or nursery school, or similar programs; and

d) the form of parent involvement common to kindergarten, elementary school, or early childhood special education programs such as parent conferences, newsletters, and notes to parents do not qualify a program under subdivision 2 [Program characteristics] (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2a).

The legislation for the ECFE Programs also explains that:

1) districts must maintain separate accounts within the Community Education fund for money for the ECFE programs;
2) districts may charge a reasonable participant fee but it must be waived for a participant who is unable to pay;
3) districts may receive funds from any government agency or private source;
4) districts are encouraged to coordinate the ECFE program with special education and vocational education as well as with related services provided by other government and nonprofit agencies;
5) the school board of each participating district must appoint an advisory council from the area in which the program is provided; parents in the program must compose the majority of the council; the council must assist the school board in developing, planning, and monitoring the programs; and the council must report to the school board and the Community Education advisory council;
6) the school board of each participating district must employ qualified teachers for the ECFE program;
7) the Minnesota Department of Education must provide assistance to districts with ECFE programs; and
8) the Minnesota State Board of Education may adopt rules about program facilities, staff, services, and procedures (ECFE Programs, 1987).

The Minnesota State Board of Education is, in fact, adopting rules for the ECFE programs. The rules pertain to categorical aid funding, tax levies, finances, responsibilities of coordinators, directors and administrators of ECFE programs, contracted services, facilities, and annual reporting procedures. In addition, the Board has included a requirement for the completion of a one-credit workshop entitled "Introduction to Early Childhood Family Education." This requirement pertains to all instructional and administrative staff who receive any part of their salary from the ECFE program funds (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

The Board also adopted rules pertaining to teacher licensure. Effective July 1, 1989, teachers who teach parents and/or parent-child interaction must hold one of the following three licenses: 1)

the full-time adult vocational parent educator license issued by the Minnesota Vocational Technical Board; 2) the parent educator license issued by the Minnesota State Board of Teaching; or 3) the early childhood family educator license is[illegible] by the Minnesota State Board of Teaching. Board rules also stipulate that effective July 1, 1989, teachers who teach young children and/or parent-child interaction must hold one of the following four licenses: 1) nursery school; 2) prekindergarten; 3) early childhood special education; or 4) early childhood family educator (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

According to Engstrom (1988), the ECFE programs throughout Minnesota differ from one district to another, just as all communities differ in their needs and resources. For the most part, parents and young children participate together in "classes" at a school or neighborhood site for one and one-half to two hours, once a week. Although groups tend to be age-specific according to the children's ages, mixed-age and special-interest groups are also offered. Parents and children interact in developmentally appropriate activities for part of the time. The rest of the time children work with the early childhood teacher while parents participate in discussion groups facilitated by a licensed parent educator. Parent discussions focus on child development, family relationships, parents' roles and needs, as well as other topics selected by the parents.

Group sessions are scheduled during weekday mornings, early or late afternoons, on Saturday mornings or afternoons, and even during the supper hour or early evenings. Parent availability and preferences determines when "classes" are scheduled (Engstrom, 1988).

Included among the meeting sites are elementary schools, community centers, churches, day-care centers, public libraries, hospitals, low-income housing complexes, trailer parks, Women-Infant-Children (WIC) Nutrition Program Sites, Head Start sites, early childhood special education classrooms, and high school classrooms where teen parents participate in the program as part of their regular school day. In some communities, meetings are even held in "backyard centers" where three or more families meet (Engstrom, 1988).

In addition to parent-child classes, family activities, such as field trips and parties, are provided in some ECFE programs. Some programs also provide toy- and book-lending libraries, parent education resource centers, working-family resource centers in downtown skyways, "family schools" co-sponsored by human services to provide for more intensive participation by families with multiple stress problems, or even parent discussion topics presented on cable TV. Home visits by ECFE program staff and/or public health staff are also conducted. Referrals to the ECFE

program are made by medical personnel, human service agencies, and friends and neighbors of program participants. ECFE program staff also refer families in the program to appropriate community agencies and resources as needed (Engstrom, 1988).

The focus of each ECFE program and the services it provides are determined by input from its Advisory Council. While parents in the ECFE program compose the majority of council membership, other members may represent day-care providers, the medical profession, the clergy, elementary principals, kindergarten teachers, Head Start, human services, law enforcement, and other early childhood education providers, both public and private (Engstrom, 1988).

Statewide interagency cooperation is considered the key to the success of the program (Engstrom, 1988). The Minnesota Early Childhood Health and Development Screening Program provides basic screening services. The Vocational Consumer and Family Education Network co-sponsors a parent educator newsletter, contributes to curriculum development and parent educator salary reimbursements, and provides inservice education opportunities. The Minnesota Extension Service provides educational materials and resource people. Early Childhood Special Education program staff collaborate with ECFE programs to meet the needs of families of children with handicaps. Colleges and universities have developed two new teacher license programs to meet the needs of the ECFE program. And the Minnesota Community Education Association has supported ECFE legislative initiatives, developed an ECFE program review process, and established a standing committee that focuses on professional development and program evaluation (Engstrom, 1988).

Further, in 1984, a statewide regional inservice network was established providing easily accessible inservice education and an ongoing networking capability. The network, staffed by volunteer professionals from local programs, compiles resources for statewide dissemination and develops evaluation strategies. According to Engstrom (1988), the network has greatly expanded the leadership base for Early Childhood Family Education.

The Minnesota ECFE was the first and is still the largest, state-sponsored parent education and family support program developed in the U.S. (For a discussion of the other state-sponsored programs, see Hausman & Weiss, 1988.) The ECFE program is open to all families with young children and is not targeted to just at-risk families, although many do participate. Several reasons account for this:

> . . . First, all parents need support and education especially during the first years of parenting. Second, it is important to recruit a heterogeneous group of families to maximize the modeling and learning of child-rearing strategies that occur during interaction. Programs that would limit eligibility to at-risk families would be less beneficial because these families would lose the opportunity to observe the child-rearing strategies common to 'normal' families. Although program directors are the first to acknowledge that recruitment of at-risk families is sometimes more difficult from the schools, they are nevertheless convinced that only a universal access system will expose participants to a broader set of values and practices. Third, targeted programs stigmatize and label parents and children, putting them into at-risk categories and ensuring alienation and nonparticipation (Hausman & Weiss, 1988, pp. 13-14).

Grants for Developmental Preschool Program

The ECFE program was recently joined by a new initiative for young children, adopted by the 1988 Minnesota Legislature. According to the Minnesota Department of Education (1988), $500,000 was made available for grants for the 1988-89 school year for developmental programs for children, age 3 to kindergarten enrollment, "who have a significant developmental delay and whose family economics is at or below the poverty level" (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988, p. 4). Eligible recipients of the grants include Head Start agencies, school districts, groups of districts, and nonprofit organizations. Program criteria included:

a) adequate assessment procedures;
b) conforming to federal Head Start guidelines where applicable;
c) substantial involvement and education of the parents;
d) coordination with local resources;
e) a local advisory board and an evaluation plan (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988, p. 4).

The Minnesota State Board of Education established criteria and procedures to select recipients of the grants.

***

Summary

In summary, Minnesota has a 14-year history of providing services to young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, through the Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program. In FY88, the ECFE program had an $18.3 million budget, $7.5 million supported by state aid and

$10.7 million provided by local tax levies. Delivered through Community Education, the program requires substantial parent involvement and utilizes statewide interagency cooperation. In 1988, a $500,000 grant program was made available through legislation which provided opportunities for eligible recipients of the grants to develop programs for children, age 3 to kindergarten enrollment age, who are poor or significantly developmentally delayed.

Ohio

Early Childhood Commission

In the early fall of 1983, the Ohio Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed an Early Childhood Task Force to review different aspects of early childhood education. The original Task Force was composed of Ohio Department of Education staff and school district representatives. Based on the findings of the Department's research staff and the Task Force, the State Board of Education passed a resolution in October, 1983, making the Early Childhood Task Force a Commission with an expanded membership. The 24-member Commission included parents of young children as well as representatives from public schools, private interests, and other state agencies which serve children (Ohio Commission on Early Childhood Education [ECE], 1984).

The Commission was charged to 1) further study early childhood issues with particular emphasis on preschool, latchkey, early entrance screening, and early identification programs; 2) prepare a report to be submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for consideration and recommendations to the State Board of Education by July, 1984; 3) identify available services and those which were needed; and 4) to develop ways to encourage agencies to interact, avoid duplication of efforts, and "help young children in Ohio become as well prepared as possible for their education experience" (Ohio Commission on ECE, 1984, p. 3).

Commission members divided into four study groups and developed definitions, recommendations, and rationale statements on preschool, early identification, early entrance screening, and latchkey programs. Further, the Commission developed implementation strategies regarding these issues for the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, the Ohio General Assembly, local school districts, and parents. The Commission's Final Report was submitted on June 29, 1984 (Ohio Commission on ECE, 1984).

Recommendations of the Commission pertinent to preschool and early identification follow:

Preschool

1) Quality early childhood education programs should be available to all families in Ohio. Therefore, school districts should be allowed to spend general revenue funds for these programs in order to meet the needs of Ohio families.

2) Opportunities should be provided to allow parents to become active participants in local early childhood education programs.

3) Information concerning local early childhood education programs and how to evaluate them should be available to parents. This availability should be widely advertised.

4) Public, private, and parochial school program personnel must develop a cooperative dialogue and serve as disseminators of information about early childhood education.

5) An outline of developmental experiences for children and uniform program standards in quality early childhood education programs should be developed.

6) The State Board of Education should encourage the continued growth of existing quality programs of preparation for early childhood education providers. It should also support the development of new programs to meet anticipated needs for additional qualified professionals and paraprofessionals (Ohio Commission ECE, 1984, pp. 5-6).

Early Identification

1) School districts should provide a comprehensive early identification and referral program for every child prior to or upon entering school. This program should be established in cooperation with other community agencies.

2) The Ohio Department of Education should provide a forum for departments which provide services to young children, and examine the early childhood service system in order to determine if needs are being met and to identify gaps in service.

3) The Ohio Department of Education should identify existing model programs and encourage the development of new ones that assess the intellectual, social, physical, and psychological needs of young children.

4) The local school district should become a clearinghouse for information about services for young children and their families (Ohio Commission on ECE, 1984, pp. 7-8).

State Legislation

Based on the Commission's recommendations, the State Board of Education recommended four legislative initiatives for the FY86 and FY87 biennium, three of which pertained to preschool education. The first initiative recommended that local school boards be granted the authority to spend general revenue funds on preschool programs. It did not pass the General Assembly at that time (Ohio Department of Education, 1987).

The second initiative recommended funding for selected local school districts to develop model programs in preschool, latchkey, and early identification. Nine development grants of $20,000 each were authorized by the legislature to produce model programs for rural, suburban, and urban areas for the 1985-86 school year. Thirty additional districts adopted these models in 1986-87 and received $6,000 each as authorized by the legislature (Ohio Department of Education, 1987; Ohio House Bill [H.B.] 238, 1985).

The third legislative initiative recommended by the State Board of Education was for money to fund county boards of education to initiate interagency coordination for projects which serve young children and their families in order to improve services, identify gaps and needs for services, and disseminate information to families. The legislature also passed this initiative and authorized the Department of Education to award up to 35 incentive grants of $2,000 each. These grants were awarded to 35 counties in 1985-86, and another 35 grants were awarded for 1986-87 (Ohio Department of Education, 1987; Ohio H.B. 238, 1985).

Ohio H.B. 238 (1985) also authorized $25,000 in FY86 and $35,000 in FY87 for the Department of Education to contract with Kent State University to perform a comprehensive analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Akron-Summit Community Action Agency's Head Start program.

Longitudinal Study of Preschool and Kindergarten

In light of the fact that the Ohio General Assembly did not grant local school boards the authority to spend general revenue funds on preschool programs nor did they mandate all-day, everyday kindergarten in all Ohio school districts (the Board's fourth initiative), the State Board of Education began discussions on preschool education and kindergarten scheduling options. In the fall of 1985, the Board authorized a longitudinal study of the effects of preschool and/or several options for kindergarten in order to produce "additional information and data . . . helpful to policymakers in the future" (Ohio Department of Education, 1987, p. 2).

The Early Childhood Section of the Division of Educational Services, Ohio Department of Education, formed an internal committee to meet with experts and consider a design for the longitudinal study. A 28-member advisory committee was formed to oversee the study.

The advisory committee developed research objectives for the longitudinal study. and four separate studies were specified as follows:

1) Provide a description of the current 'state of the art' of kindergarten in Ohio and children's preschool experience -- Study #1.

2) Describe the current decision-making process used by Ohio school districts to plan and operate various preschool and kindergarten options -- Study #1.

3) Using existing data from first, second, and third graders, determine the impact of various kindergarten and preschool options on children's performance in a sample of schools -- Study #2.

4) Using a large sample of appropriately matched school districts, determine the impact of various preschool and kindergarten options on children's performance -- Study #3.

5) Using a small sample of school districts (if available), employ an experimental random assignment design to determine the causal impact of the various options on performance -- Study #4 (Ohio Department of Education, 1987, p. 2).

In the spring of 1986, the Department of Education initiated a four-year longitudinal study of preschool and kindergarten in the state, utilizing the input of the advisory committee (Ohio Department of Education, 1987).

Rules for Operating Preschool Programs

In 1987, Substitute H.B. 253 was passed. The main objective of the bill was to develop rules for the operation of preschool programs in a public school and chartered nonpublic schools and to exempt those programs from the Ohio Department of Human Services licensure for day care programs.

Among its many provisions, Substitute H.B. 253 (1987) outlined requirements for persons hired to direct a preschool and required that minimum standards for eligible preschools would be developed jointly by the State Board of Education and the Director of Human Services no later than July 1, 1988. Further, the law stipulated facility requirements and supervision and evaluations of staff according to planned sequences of observations and evaluation conferences, and prescribed

maximum staff/child ratios and maximum group size for each of the following age ranges: birth to less than 12 months; 12 months to less than 18 months; 18 months to less than 30 months; 30 months to less than 3 years; 3-year-olds; and 4- and 5-year-olds.

Included among the rules for preschool programs promulgated by the State Board of Education under the Revised Code were the following:

1) requirements for written philosophy and goal statements;
2) provisions to encourage parent involvement;
3) procedures for reporting child progress;
4) certification and coursework requirements;
5) maximum staff/child ratios and maximum group sizes;
6) written policies and procedures regarding staff; cumulative student records; health and safety; attendance and discipline; management of communicable diseases; and developmentally appropriate program planning, selection and use of materials, equipment, and resources that meet the child's intellectual, physical, social, and emotional needs;
7) requirements concerning cumulative records;
8) requirements regarding the facility, space, equipment, and supplies;
9) procedures for evaluation and monitoring of the program; and
10) requirements for school food services (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

In 1988, the Ohio General Assembly passed House Bill 67 which revised the Revised Code and:

1) permitted boards of education to receive Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid to establish preschool programs and use school funds in support of the program;
2) permitted boards of education to establish fees or tuition, graduated to family income, for participation in the preschool program; however, boards were required to waive the fees or tuition in cases where payment would create a hardship for the child's parent or guardian;
3) permitted boards of education providing preschool programs to provide transportation for children participating in the programs; and
4) permitted districts to contract with a Head Start program to provide a preschool program or set up agreements for other related program services (Ohio H.B. 67, 1987).

FY88-89 Biennium Appropriations

The budget bill that was passed in the FY88-89 biennium appropriated $246,000 for the Department of Education to award 41 $6,000 adoptive grants for preschool, early identification, and latchkey programs in FY88. The budget bill also appropriated $252,000 for FY89 for the Department of Education to award 42 $6,000 adoptive grants (Ohio H.B. 171, 1987).

According to Jane Weichel, Assistant Director of the Division of Educational Services, Early Childhood Education Section, Ohio Department of Education, 44 early identification programs, 31 preschool programs, and 48 latchkey programs were funded by the Department of Education since the 1985-86 school year (Weichel, 1988).

According to the Ohio Department of Education (1988), the early identification and preschool programs were created specifically to focus on the needs of at-risk children. The early identification programs are targeted to address three of 14 contributing factors which singly or collectively contribute to the likelihood that children will not successfully complete school and acquire skills necessary for higher education and/or employment. These three factors are:

1) cyclical poverty: includes students who are raised in an environment where poverty is the recognized standard of living;

2) handicapping conditions: includes students who have physical, mental, or emotional impairments; and

3) inadequate readiness skill/developmental delay: includes students who are not developmentally ready to proceed to a higher level of instruction (Ohio Department of Education, 1988, pp. 3-4).

The preschool programs are also targeted to cyclical poverty and inadequate readiness skills/developmental delay. Further, Ohio's preschools are targeted to address another factor which places them at risk of school failure and not entering into productive lives of employment -- family structure. The Ohio Department of Education defines this factor as including "students who are raised in an unstable environment and do not receive sufficient nurturing and positive modeling" (Ohio Department of Education, 1988, p. 3). For a complete description of the 14 factors that may place a child or youth at risk of successfully completing school and acquiring skills necessary for higher education and/or employment, see Ohio's Formula for Educational Success (Ohio Department of Education, 1988).

Summary

In summary, the State Board of Education's Commission on Early Childhood Education and a 28-member advisory committee have assisted in the development of Ohio's programs for young children. The Ohio Department of Education has promulgated rules to accompany the provisions under the Revised Code. A four-year longitudinal study of preschool and kindergarten in the state was begun in the spring of 1986 to produce information and data which may be helpful to policymakers.

Ohio provides services to preschool children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, through adoption grants which were legislated in 1986 following the development of model programs for rural, suburban, and urban areas in 1985. Adoption grants were also available for latchkey and early identification programs, and 70 counties have received incentive grants to initiate interagency coordination for projects serving young children and their families. Rules for the operation of preschool programs in public schools and eligible chartered nonpublic schools were developed and approved for adoption in 1988. Due to the passage of H.B. 57, school districts that are eligible for Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid have been allowed to use general revenue for those programs. A process was established to study and formulate solutions for the at-risk population.

Wisconsin

Four-Year-Old Kindergarten

In 1985, the Wisconsin legislature amended the Wisconsin School Code to re-establish the 4-year-old kindergarten (preschool) program which permitted school districts to provide kindergarten programs for 4-year-olds and to receive per pupil reimbursement based on class membership count in the state aid formula. According to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), this amendment was in response to statewide recognition of the importance of early childhood education, particularly for those children who are disadvantaged, and the need to demonstrate state-level support (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction [DPI], 1988a).

According to Jim McCoy, Early Childhood Consultant, Wisconsin DPI, 30 of Wisconsin's 430 school districts served 5,200 of the eligible 70,000 4-year-olds in the 1988-89 school year in the

4-year-old kindergarten programs, and most of these programs served at-risk children. The average local contribution to the 4-year-old kindergarten program was approximately 60% in FY88, and more than $5 million in state aid was spent. No participation fees were charged (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988).

Preschool to Grade 5 (P-5) Program

The Wisconsin legislature also passed a bill in 1985 which targeted state resources to elementary schools in the Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit school districts that have high concentrations of students from low-income families (Wisconsin DPI, 1988a). Known as the Preschool to Grade 5 or P-5 Program, the legislation stipulated that grants would be available to the school boards of these districts to supplement existing elementary school programs and not to supplant or replace funds otherwise available for such programs providing that the schools or private service providers certified by the school board complied with the following:

- provided structured educational experiences for 4-year-olds that focused on the needs of low-income children and included activities that encouraged early skill development;
- beginning in the 1987-88 school year, annually tested the children enrolled in preschool programs and in grades 1 through 3 in reading, language arts, and math using tests approved by the DPI;
- beginning in the 1987-88 school year, annually tested the children in grades 4 and 5 in reading, language arts, math, science, and social studies using tests approved by the DPI;
- implemented a multidisciplinary team approach to the identification and remediation of problems of children with significant needs;
- restricted class size in all grades below the sixth grade to no more than 25 students per teacher;
- annually prepared a written performance evaluation of each staff member providing services in this program;
- required inservice training for all administrative and instructional staff in the elementary grades that focuses on educational practices and policies identified by the DPI as effective in improving student achievement;

- established a council composed of teachers, parents of students enrolled in the school district, school board members, and community leaders to monitor and make recommendations to the school board concerning the school's educational programs; and
- developed plans to encourage and increase parental involvement in efforts to improve the quality of education (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.45).

The legislation further stipulated that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction would appoint a council to review applications for grants submitted by the school boards and make recommendations to the State Superintendent regarding the schools to be selected and the amounts of the grants to be awarded. Approximately $2.8 million was available for grants for the Milwaukee Public Schools for the 1985-86 school year. The legislation also stipulated that beginning in the 1986-87 school year, the Kenosha School District was eligible to receive grants under the statute in an amount not to exceed $250,000 each school year. Further, beginning in the 1987-88 school year, the Beloit School District was eligible to receive grants under this statute in an amount not to exceed $30,000 each school year (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.45, 1985).

In 1987, the State Superintendent requested a $2.8 million increase for the P-5 program in each year of the 1987-89 biennium in order to permit greater participation on the part of Milwaukee's elementary schools. The governor denied the request; however, the legislature increased the funding for the P-5 program by $60,000 annually, with $30,000 reserved for Beloit and $30,000 reserved for Milwaukee (Wisconsin DPI, 1987). During the 1988-89 school year, $3.11 million were available for the P-5 program (Wisconsin Assembly Bill 850, 1987).

State-Supported Day Care

A third piece of legislation that has affected young children was also passed in 1987. Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 119.72 (1987) requires the school board of Milwaukee Public Schools to contract with private, non-profit, non-sectarian day-care centers located in the city to provide early childhood education to 4- and 5-year-olds who are residents of the city. Day-care centers with whom the board contracts must:

- be licensed under state statute (section 48.65) or certified under section 48.651;
- offer developmental child day care and early childhood education through age 6 at least 10 hours each day for at least 260 days each year;

- employ or utilize only persons appropriately licensed by the State Superintendent under section 115.28 (7) for children in the program or ensure that only such persons supervise the individuals providing instruction and support services to the children in the program;
- maintain a staff/child ratio of no more that 1:12;
- offer opportunities for parent participation in the program including 1) direct involvement in decisionmaking in program planning and analysis, 2) participation in classroom and program activities, and 3) participation in training sessions on child growth and development;
- record and periodically report to the board student attendance data and parent involvement activities;
- provide activities that support and enhance the parents' role as the principal influence in their child's education and development;
- ensure that at least 50% of the children participating in each day-care center s program fall into one or more of the following categories:
  - children with a parent in need of child-care services as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 46.98 (4) (a) 1 to 3;
  - children with a parent in need of child-care services as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 46.98 (4) (a) 4;
  - children with a parent who is a school age parent, as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.91 (1); and
  - children who have language, psychomotor development, social, behavioral, or educational problems that warrant intervention, as determined by the board other than children with exceptional educational needs, as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.76 (3).
- pay each contracting day-care center, for each full-time equivalent child served by the center under the contract, an amount equal to at least 80% of the average per student cost for kindergarten children enrolled in the school district, adjusted to a full-time equivalent basis; and
- evaluate the success of the program through the use of standardized basic educational skills tests and the collection of data on the appropriate placements for students at the end of the first grade (Wisconsin Statutes, Section 119.72, 1987).

The statute further stipulated a formula for determining how much state aid the district would receive and indicated that the additional appropriation amount could not exceed $600,000 annually.

Early Childhood Consultation

In 1987, the State Superintendent also requested funding for an early childhood consultant to provide consultation and technical assistance to school districts in early childhood education programs. In 1988, the governor and legislature concurred with this request (Wisconsin DPI, 1988a).

According to Jim McCoy, Early Childhood Consultant, Wisconsin DPI, (personal communication, November 10, 1988) stipulations in state statutes and the 1981 curricular guidelines for kindergarten programs were the only requirements for the 4-year-old kindergarten program as of the 1988-89 school year. However, a new Early Childhood Education Resource and Planning Guide is being developed by the DPI that will help bridge the different types of programs in early childhood education and develop consensus around developmentally appropriate practice for 3- to 8-year-olds.

Early Childhood Certification

On August 11, 1988, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction amended requirements for teaching licenses and teacher preparatory programs in early childhood education leading to licensure in Wisconsin. The rules, authorized by the State Superintendent, were drafted by a committee appointed by him to make recommendations on early childhood licenses and programs and were reviewed by the State Superintendent's Advisory Council on Teacher Licenses. The rules will be effective for any person who completes an approved program after July 1, 1992 (Wisconsin DPI, 1988b).

***

Summary

In summary, Wisconsin's school districts have been permitted to provide kindergarten programs for 4-year-olds since 1898 and receive per pupil reimbursement based on class membership count in the state aid formula since 1985. Most of the 30 school districts that provide 4-year-old kindergarten programs serve at-risk children. The P-5 program targets additional state

resources to elementary schools in Milwaukee, Beloit, and Kenosha. Between FY85 and FY89, $6.19 million has been appropriated for the P-5 program. The Milwaukee school board is also required by legislation to contract with private, non-profit, non-sectarian day-care centers to provide ECE to 4- and 5-year-olds. Requirements for a new teaching license and teacher preparatory program in ECE will go into effect July 1, 1992.

Summary

This chapter described the purposes of this policy study and presented a discussion of seven selected states' policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements for early childhood programs for young children at risk of academic failure. What are the components of effective ECE programs that are recommended by the experts? How do the seven states' programs compare to those recommended by the experts? The next chapter answers these two questions.

CHAPTER III

EARLY INTERVENTION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Early intervention/early childhood education (ECE) is advocated as the major strategy to reduce or eliminate the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children (e.g., the Committee for Economic Development, 1987; the Council of Chief State School Officers, 1987a, 1987b, 1987c; the National Governors' Association, 1986, 1987a; The National Association of State Boards of Education, 1988). ECE is targeted at the population of youngsters under the age of 5 who have not begun their formal schooling in kindergarten.

By 1987, 24 states and the District of Columbia had spent state money on these programs (Grub, 1987; Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988), and most states had targeted at-risk children for their programs. The National Conference of State Legislatures reports that research on ECE was the most significant factor influencing legislative support for ECE (Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988).

The previous chapter discussed seven states' initiatives pertaining to preschool programs for at-risk children. Did these states consider the research-based recommendations for effective ECE programs as policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements for their programs were developed? This chapter reviews the components of effective ECE programs advocated by two expert organizations and then presents a comparative analysis of the experts' recommended components with those identified by the selected states.

Components of Effective Early Childhood Programs

In a review of the literature and the position and policy statements of numerous national organizations and groups (see Appendix B), two organizations stand out as the ones considered to be the foremost experts in the area of early childhood education: the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation (High/Scope) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

The following describes their views regarding characteristics or components of effective ECE programs.

The High/Scope Foundation

According to the High/Scope Foundation, its definition of high quality ECE is based on the collective wisdom of colleagues in the field and its 23 years of experience in ECE in "developing curricula, training supervisors and staff, evaluating programs, and demonstrating the long-term benefits of high quality programs to participants and to society" (Epstein, 1985, p. 7). High/Scope's definition of quality has three major components:

1. A developmentally based curriculum grounded in theory, research, and practice. This type of curriculum is in harmony with the unique developmental needs of toddlers and preschoolers, and is not a scaled-down version of the techniques used in elementary school. A developmentally based curriculum allows for diversity, and any relative emphases on academic, socioemotional, and cultural components are all handled in ways appropriate for young children.

2. Staff training and supervision that reflect knowledge about child development and implementation of curriculum to enhance the child's development. Training is ongoing and supervision insures that what is learned in training is practiced in the classroom with young children.

3. Ongoing evaluation that is accountable to the children and families served and tied to the goals and objectives of the program. Evaluation may also include qualitative and quantitative strategies, depending upon the program's interests and resources, but should definitely extend beyond fiscal monitoring (Epstein, 1985).

In addition to quality, High/Scope recommends the following program components to promote healthy child development, especially for poor children or those who are at risk of academic failure:

- a ratio of teaching staff to children of no more that 1 to 10 and a classroom group size of no more than 20; and
- collaboration between teaching staff and parents as partners in the education and development of children, including substantive face-to-face communication at least monthly (Schweinhart, 1987, pp. 17-18).

National Association for the Education of Young Children

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) believes that:

> a high quality early childhood program provides a safe and nurturing environment that promotes the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of young children while responding to the needs of families. Although the quality of an early childhood program may be affected by many factors, a major determinant of program quality is the extent to which knowledge of child development is applied in program practices -- the degree to which the program is 'developmentally appropriate'. . . . [and that] developmentally appropriate programs should be available to all children and their families (Bredekamp, 1987, pp. 1-2).

According to NAEYC, the concept of 'developmental appropriateness' has two dimensions -- age appropriateness and individual appropriateness. Age appropriateness refers to the fit between learning experiences and the environment in which they are provided and the natural, universal, predictable sequences of human development and change that occur in children during the first nine years of life. Further, these changes occur in all domains of development: physical, emotional, social, and cognitive (Bredekamp, 1987).

Individual appropriateness refers to the unique needs and abilities of each child. Thus, activities for children and interactions between adults and children must be responsive to children's individual differences (Bredekamp, 1987).

In its expanded edition of Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children From Birth Through Age 8 (Bredekamp, 1987), NAEYC describes research-based developmentally appropriate practices for children in the following age categories: infants and

toddlers from birth to age 3; 3-year-olds; 4- and 5-year-olds; and those in the primary grades serving 5- through 8-year-olds. Since all of the states in this study have addressed programs for 4-year-olds or include 4-year-olds in their multi-age programs, the author presents in brief, NAEYC's recommendations for 13 areas of developmentally appropriate practice for this age group.

1. Curriculum Goals: The experiences provided to children meet their unique needs and stimulate learning in physical, social, emotional, and intellectual developmental areas. The curriculum used and the interactions adults have with children are responsive to their individual differences in regard to ability and interests. Further, activities and adult interactions are designed to develop children's self-esteem and positive feelings toward learning.

2. Teaching Strategies: The classroom is characterized by child-initiated activities in contrast to teacher-directed activities. Teachers serve as facilitators in that they prepare the environment so that children may choose their activities, are physically and mentally active, may work individually or in small, informal groups, and have concrete learning activities with people and materials that are relevant to their own life experiences.

3. Guidance of Social-Emotional Development: Positive guidance techniques (such as modeling and encouraging expected behavior, setting clear limits, and redirecting inappropriate behavior) are used by teachers to facilitate the development of young children's self-control. Further, teachers' expectations match and respect the developing child. Opportunities are also provided for children to problem-solve and develop social skills.

4. Language Development and Literacy: Numerous opportunities are provided for children to develop oral language as well as other skills necessary prior to formal reading and writing, such as listening to and dictating stories, participating in dramatic play, taking field trips, etc. Opportunities are provided for children to experiment with writing by drawing, copying, and making up their own spelling system.

5. Cognitive Development: Play is acknowledged as the way children explore their world and learn from it. Concrete experiences are provided to assist in children's intellectual development. Further, these experiences are integrated and provided in meaningful activities, thus helping children develop an understanding of concepts about themselves, others, and the world around them.

6. Physical Development: Opportunities are provided daily through play for children to develop both small and large muscles.

7. Aesthetic Development: Opportunities are provided daily for children to express themselves through art and music.

8. Motivation: The natural curiosity of children and their desire to make sense of their world are used to encourage them to get involved in learning activities.

9. Parent-Teacher Relations: Parents and teachers work as partners and communicate regularly to build mutual understanding and greater consistency for children.

10. Assessment of Children: Teachers' and parents' observations are considered valuable tools to assist in the assessment of children's progress and achievement. Teachers' assessments are used to plan curriculum, identify special needs, and evaluate the program's effectiveness. This information is shared with parents. Parents also provide information regarding their children's abilities and needs to teachers. Psychometric tests are not used as the sole criterion for prohibiting entrance to the program nor to recommend that children be retained or placed in remedial classrooms.

11. Program Entry: All children are eligible for the program, regardless of their developmental level. This should be especially true in public school programs. Children should not be denied access to a program on the basis of screening or other arbitrary determinations of their lack of readiness. Programs adjust to children's needs and abilities, rather than expecting children to adjust to an inappropriate system.

12. Teacher Qualifications: Teachers have college-level preparation in early childhood education or child development and prior supervised experience with young children.

13. Staffing: Group size and teacher/child ratios are limited to provide individualized and age-appropriate programming. Maximum group size for 4-year-olds is 20 with two adults (Bredekamp, 1987).

NAEYC also recommends the following policies that are considered essential in order to implement developmentally appropriate early childhood programs:

A. Early childhood teachers should have college-level specialized preparation in early childhood education/child development. Teachers in early childhood programs, regardless of credentialed status, should be encouraged and supported to obtain and maintain current knowledge of child development and its application to early childhood educational practice.

B. Early childhood teachers should have practical experience teaching the age group. Therefore, regardless of credentialed status, teachers who have not previously taught young children should have supervised experience with young children before they can be in charge of a group.

C. Implementation of developmentally appropriate early childhood programs requires limiting the size of the group and providing sufficient numbers of adults to provide individualized and age-appropriate care and education (Bredekamp, 1987, p. 14).

***

In summary, the High/Scope Foundation and NAEYC identify five components in common as necessary for effective ECE programs. Since NAEYC's first eight components relate to developmentally appropriate curriculum and teaching practices, the researcher has taken the liberty to group them as one. The five components recommended by both High/Scope and NAEYC for 4-year-olds are:

- The use of developmentally appropriate curriculum and teaching practices based on theory, research, and practice;
- Staff and supervisors who are trained in early childhood education and child development and who receive ongoing training;
- Teacher/student ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20 (NAEYC recommends lower ratios and smaller class sizes for younger children);
- Strong parent involvement; and

- Ongoing assessment of the program to ensure it is meeting its stated goals and objectives and is accountable to the children and families serve

NAEYC also recommends that ECE programs not deny access to children based on screening or other arbitrary determination of children's readiness. High/Scope indicates that its recommended components are especially necessary for children who are poor or at risk of academic failure. Since the focus of this study was on preschool programs for at-risk children, the researcher utilizes "eligibility" as one of the components in the analysis in the next section of this chapter.

How do the policies, legislation, and provisions for preschool programs for at-risk children from the selected states compare to the six components for effective early childhood programs recommended by High/Scope and NAEYC? The next and final section of this chapter provides a comparative analysis of the experts' recommended components with those identified by the selected states.

Analysis of States' Early Intervention Programs

The researcher has taken the liberty to shorten the descriptions of the High/Scope and NAEYC components to facilitate discussion in the following analysis.

Developmentally Appropriate Practice

For the purpose of the following discussion, developmentally appropriate practice refers to developmentally appropriate curriculum and teaching practices based on theory, research, and practice.

All seven states (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) either specifically mention developmentally appropriate practice or imply that such practice should be used in their preschool programs.

Illinois requires educational components to be based on sound theories of child development (ISBE, 1988a). Indiana recommends the use of a validated, developmentally appropriate curriculum model and even refers to the one recommended by NAEYC (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b]). A developmentally appropriate ECE curriculum is mandated in Iowa's legislation for Child Development Grants Program (Iowa Senate File 2192). One of Michigan's nine "Standards of

Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" outlines developmentally appropriate practices (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program implies developmentally appropriate practice in that the legislation identifies that programs should "educate parents about the physical, mental, and emotional development of children" (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2). Further, Engstrom (1988) refers to parents and children interacting in developmentally appropriate activities. The researcher was unable to make a definitive determination for this component for the new Minnesota initiative that made available grants for developmental programs for young children as no rules, guidelines, or requirements were available from the Department of Education at the time this paper was written.

The Ohio Department of Education promulgated rules for early childhood programs, one of which pertained to written policies and procedures regarding developmentally appropriate program planning, selection, and use of materials, equipment, and resources that meet the child's intellectual, physical, social, and emotional needs (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

There is no specific mention of developmentally appropriate practice in Wisconsin. However, Jim McCoy, Early Childhood Consultant, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), indicated that the DPI was in the process of developing an Early Childhood Education Resource and Planning Guide that will address this issue. Further, technical assistance is being delivered to local school districts by the DPI regarding developmentally appropriate practice (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988).

Staff Training and Supervision

Staff training and supervision means that staff and supervisors are trained in ECE and child development and that teachers and supervisors receive ongoing training.

Illinois' legislation stipulates that teachers of the at-risk preschool program must hold either early childhood teaching certificates as designated in the School Code of Illinois for birth to age 6 (Type 02) or birth through grade 3 (Type 04) or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2 & 3.48 [b]; ISBE, 1988a). There is no indication in legislation, policies, rules, guidelines, or requirements that teachers or supervisors must receive ongoing training. However, one of the findings in the Early Childhood Education Policy Study addressed the fact that the training and experience of

elementary school principals typically had not encompassed the needs of young children. Further, it was noted that most of the principals had teaching experience limited to intermediate and upper grades (ISBE, 1985a). Since 1986, ECE consultants have been hired by ISBE to conduct on-site evaluations of each of the programs and provide technical assistance to improve areas of weakness (ISBE, n.d.).

Indiana's guidelines recommend that teachers be prepared in curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation, and that appropriate support systems, such as administrative leadership in instruction, be available to maintain the curriculum model. Indiana's guidelines also recommend inservice training in the curriculum model (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b]). No additional specifications or requirements are identified by Departmental rules or guidelines.

Iowa's Child Development Assistance Act of 1988 requires staff to be qualified in ECE or have experience in child development services. Further, the law stipulates that staff training, development, and compensation must be "sufficient to assure continuity" (Iowa Senate File 2192, p. 4). The researcher was unable to determine if any additional guidelines developed by the Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force in 1987 relating to personnel in prekindergarten classes are required in the implementation of the Child Development Assistance Act of 1988.

Two separate "Standards" address staff training and supervision in Michigan: "Instructional Staff/Personnel" and "Administrative/Supervisory Personnel."

Instructional staff are required to have responsibilities commensurate with their backgrounds and educational training. An ECE teacher must have a bachelor's degree in ECE or child development, OR an early childhood (ZA) endorsement given by Michigan colleges and universities upon completion of an 18-hour ECE program requirement, OR equivalent continuing education experience as approved by the State Board of Education, OR equivalent experiences as a certified elementary teacher of children, birth through age 6. Beginning September 1, 1993, all teachers must have the early childhood (ZA) endorsement to teach in preschool programs (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Training is provided to all early childhood support staff, paraprofessionals, associate teachers, teacher aides, and teacher assistants. All instructional staff participate in ongoing professional development and are supported by administrative and supervisory personnel (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Administrators who implement, evaluate, and manage the preschool program and budget must have educational preparation in the developmental approach to ECE. Further, early childhood specialists supervise the preschool programs and must be qualified to supervise, manage, evaluate, and direct the program and staff development (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Effective July 1, 1989, all instructional and administrative staff who receive any part of their salary from the Minnesota ECFE program funds must complete a one-credit workshop entitled "Introduction to Early Childhood Family Education" (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

The Minnesota State Board of Education also adopted rules pertaining to teacher licensure. Effective July 1, 1989, teachers who teach parents and/or parent-child interaction must hold one of the following three licenses: 1) the full-time adult vocational parent educator license issued by the Minnesota Vocational Technical Board; 2) the parent educator license issued by the Minnesota State Board of Teaching; or 3) the early childhood family educator license issued by the Minnesota State Board of Teaching (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

Board rules also stipulate that effective July 1, 1989, teachers who teach young children and/or parent-child interaction must hold one of the following four licenses: 1) nursery school; 2) prekindergarten; 3) early childhood special education; or 4) early childhood family educator (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

Inservice education opportunities and a statewide inservice network are available to staff in the ECFE program (Engstrom, 1988).

No specific mention of staff training and supervision was provided in the new legislation for developmental grants for young children who are developmentally delayed and whose family economics are at or below the poverty level (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988).

Ohio requires that the staff and director of preschool programs be assigned responsibilities commensurate with their certification and requirements. New rules have been developed for Ohio's preschool teachers employed on or after July 1, 1993. A person may be employed as a head teacher or a teacher in a preschool program providing that one of the following is held:

1) a valid pre-kindergarten teaching certificate; or
2) a valid pre-kindergarten associate certificate; or
3) a valid kindergarten-primary teaching certificate and completion of at least four courses in child development or ECE from an accredited college, university, or technical college; or

4) a degree in ECE or child development from an accredited college, university, or technical college; or
5) evidence of completion of a training program approved by the Department of Education (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

A person employed as a head teacher or a teacher in a preschool program operated by an eligible non-tax-supported, nonpublic school must hold a valid teaching certificate issued in accordance with specific sections of the revised Ohio School Code (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

The director of a public school preschool program must hold either a valid pre-kindergarten teaching certificate or a valid elementary principal's certificate and have completed at least four courses in child development or ECE from an accredited college, university, or technical college. A director employed prior to July 1, 1988, by a LEA or an eligible nonpublic school to direct a preschool program must hold a valid kindergarten-primary certificate (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

A director who is employed to direct a program operated by an eligible, non-tax-supported, nonpublic school must hold a valid teaching certificate issued in accordance with specific sections of the revised Ohio School Code (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

The Ohio Department of Education also developed standards for pre-kindergarten associate certification and provisional pre-kindergarten certification (Ohio Department of Education, 1987b, 1987c).

The Ohio Department of Education also requires that preschool staff members annually complete 15 hours of inservice training in child development or ECE, child abuse recognition and prevention, first aid, and/or in the prevention, recognition, and management of communicable diseases, until a total of 45 hours has been completed. Persons who hold either 1) an associate or higher degree in child development of ECE from an accredited college, university, or technical college; or 2) a pre-kindergarten associate certificate issued by the state board of teaching; or 3) a pre-kindergarten teaching certificate are exempt from this inservice requirement. However, all preschool staff members, no matter what level of education or training, must annually complete at least four-tenths of one continuing education unit of training in child care, child development, ECE, or other child care-related subjects (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

In Wisconsin, current practice allows a person who holds a K-6 or a K-9 teaching license to teach 4-year-old kindergarten, even though the person may not have completed course work or a student teaching experience at the preschool level. New requirements that go into effect July 1, 1992, establish an early childhood level license which will permit a person to teach preschool through grade 3 and requires completion of a minor in an early childhood education program. A person who wants to extend an elementary (1-6) license to include early childhood must complete an early childhood program in addition to the elementary program. This early childhood program may be completed as the minor which is required in the elementary program. A person who wants to extend an elementary/middle school license to include early childhood must complete the early childhood program in addition to the minor required in the elementary/middle school program (Wisconsin DPI, 1988b).

According to the Wisconsin DPI (1988b), these Amending Rules will ensure that all persons who hold a license to teach kindergarten or preschool will have completed a program which includes developmentally appropriate educational theory and practice for children from birth through age 8. Specifically, the rules require at least 22 semester credits of professional education including the following:

- study of the principles and theories of child growth and development and learning theory appropriate to children, birth through age 8;
- study of the characteristics of play and its contribution to the cognitive, social, and emotional development and learning of children, birth through age 8;
- study of theories and principles of classroom organization and management based upon child development and learning theory for children, birth through age 8;
- study and evaluation of early childhood curriculum models;
- study and experience in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation based upon child development and learning theory and educational research and practice in the areas of children's literature, creative arts, environmental education, math, motor development, physical and mental health, science, and social science;
- study and experience designed to develop skills in promoting parent education and family involvement in the early childhood program;

- study of professionalism, program and staff development, supervision and evaluation of support staff, advisory groups, community agencies and resources, and pupil services personnel as related to early childhood programs;
- study to develop knowledge of and the abilities to apply developmentally appropriate assessment tools with children, birth through age 8;
- study designed to develop knowledge and skills to identify and teach children, birth through age 8, with exceptional educational needs and talents; and
- study of program, curriculum, and instructional approaches which contribute to the preparation of students for work including career exploration, practical application of the basic skills, and employability skills and attitudes (Wisconsin DPI, 1988b).

Teacher/Student Ratio

Both High/Scope and NAEYC recommend a teacher/student ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20 for programs that serve 4-year-olds. NAEYC recommends fewer students per teacher and smaller class sizes for programs that serve younger children.

Illinois' and Indiana's preschool programs for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds, and Michigan's preschool programs for 4-year-olds require a staff/child ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20 (ISBE, 1988a; Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b]; Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Iowa's legislation that created the Child Development Grants Program mandates a lower staff/child ratio than was recommended by High/Scope and NAEYC. The legislation requires not less than one staff member per eight children (Iowa Senate File 2192). Class size limit is not addressed in the legislation.

The legislation that created the ECFE program in Minnesota requires that parents be physically present much of the time in classes with their children. Thus, when parents are present, adult/child ratio is definitely lower than that recommended by High/Scope and NAEYC. No requirements are stipulated for class size or teacher/student ratio for the ECFE program when teachers are alone with the children. Likewise, there are no class size or teacher/student ratio requirements for the new grant program mandated by the legislature in 1988 for developmental programs for children age 3 to kindergarten enrollment age (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2a; Minnesota Department of Education, 1988).

Substitute House Bill 253 revised the Ohio School Code in 1987 and prescribed the following staff/child ratio and maximum group size for each of the following age ranges:

- birth to less than 12 months: 1:5 or 2:12 if two staff members are in the room with a maximum group size of 12;
- 12 months to less than 18 months: 1:6 with a maximum group size of 12;
- 18 months to less than 30 months: 1:7 with a maximum group size of 14;
- 30 months to less than 3 years: 1:8 with a maximum group size of 16;
- 3-year-olds: 1:12 with a maximum group size of 24;
- 4- and 5-year-olds: 1:14 with a maximum group size of 28 (Ohio Substitute House Bill 253, 1987).

Ohio regulations also require that at least two responsible adults be readily available at all times when seven or more children are present in a program. Further, when age groups are combined, the maximum number of children per staff member is determined by the age of the youngest child in the group. Additional regulations are stipulated for groups that have only one child, 30 months of age to less than 3 years of age, in a group of 3-year-olds, as well as maximum staff/child ratios in a room where children are napping (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

Wisconsin legislation does not stipulate teacher/child ratios nor maximum class sizes for the preschool programs or the P-5 programs. However, Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 119.72 (1987) require the day-care centers with whom the Milwaukee school board contracts for day-care services to 4- and 5-year-olds to maintain a staff/child ratio of no more than 1:12.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement refers to services provided to parents so that they can be more effective supporters of their children and develop themselves as parents.

Illinois' legislation requires that a parent education component be included in each educational program provided (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2 & 3.48 [b]). Indiana's guidelines suggest "collaboration between teaching staff and parents as partners in the education and development of children including face-to-face communication at least monthly" (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b], p. 7).

Parent involvement and training, including home visits, optional parent instruction on parenting and tutoring skills, and "experiential education" are required in Iowa's preschool programs (Iowa Senate File 2192, 1988).

Michigan's requirements for parent involvement are specified in its "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986). The standard on "Parent/Family Involvement" stipulates that parents and families are encouraged to be involved in their child's program and support services are provided when needed. Further, family-staff interaction occurs frequently and is facilitated by such things as home visits, phone calls, written communication, conferences, parent participation in classroom activities, and staff participation in parent-child events and family activities. Parents and other family members have access to information, resources, and materials which improve the quality of family life and/or support children's learning and development.

Minnesota's ECFE program requires "substantial parent involvement" (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2a) which includes that parents be physically present much of the time in classes with their children or be in concurrent classes. Further, parenting education or family education must be an integral part of every ECFE program. The ECFE program also specifies that the type of parent involvement common to kindergarten, elementary school, or early childhood special education programs, such as parent conferences, newsletters, and notes to parents do not qualify as parent involvement in an ECFE program.

The Minnesota legislature also stipulates "substantial involvement and education of the parents" (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988, p. 4) as program criteria in the new grant program for children, age 3 to kindergarten enrollment age, who are developmentally delayed and whose family economics are at or below the poverty level.

Included among the rules promulgated by the Ohio State Board of Education under the revised School Code was a provision for a written plan given to each parent to encourage parent involvement and participation and to keep parents informed about the program and its services (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

Wisconsin's P-5 program requires the school boards of Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit to develop plans to encourage and increase parent involvement in efforts to improve the quality of education (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.45, 1985). Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 119.72 (1987), also require day-care centers with whom the Milwaukee board of education contracts to offer

opportunities for parent participation in the day-care program including 1) direct involvement in decision-making in program planning and analysis; 2) participation in classroom and program activities; and 3) participation in training sessions on child growth and development.

According to Jim McCoy, Wisconsin DPI Early Childhood Consultant, school districts that provide 4-year-old preschool programs are encouraged to include parent involvement in their programs; however, there is no requirement for parent involvement at the present time. This issue will be addressed in the Early Childhood Education Resource and Planning Guide that is in the process of development (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988).

Assessment

Both High/Scope and NAEYC recommend ongoing evaluation or assessment of the ECE program to ensure that it is meeting its stated goals and objectives. Further, they contend that assessment should go beyond fiscal monitoring and address accountability to the children and families served. Since High/Scope did not address individual child assessment in its components for effective ECE programs, this section only deals with program assessment. Individual child assessment is discussed in the next component on eligibility where appropriate.

All seven states have some type of accountability built into their programs. The Illinois General Assembly requires ISBE to report the results and progress of students enrolled in the preschool programs to its membership every three years, beginning July 1, 1989. The legislation also requires ISBE to report which programs have been most successful in promoting excellence and alleviating academic failure. Procedures have been developed by ISBE for the collection of longitudinal data regarding the academic progress of all students enrolled in the preschool programs as specified in the legislation (The School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2-3.48).

Each preschool program must also develop written goals and objectives and establish timelines for completion. Further, an individualized assessment profile, based on initial screening and continued assessment, must be maintained for each child, and an educational program for each student in accord with the assessment profile must be developed. A student progress plan must also be maintained for each student to ensure that the program meets the student's needs (ISBE, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988a).

The administrative guidelines prepared by the Indiana Department of Education to implement the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students specifies that program evaluation would be tied to the objectives of the program (Indiana Department of Education, n.d.[a]).

Iowa's Child Development Grants Program stipulates that grant recipients must provide ongoing monitoring and evaluation of program goals (Iowa Senate File 2192, 1988).

Michigan's preschool programs must establish goals and objectives, and administrators and supervisors must evaluate the programs (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Minnesota's local boards of education that have ECFE programs must appoint an advisory council from the area in which the program is provided to assist the school board in monitoring the program (ECFE Programs, 1987). The Minnesota State Board of Education has also adopted rules regarding annual reporting procedures for the ECFE programs (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

"Adequate assessment procedures . . . and an evaluation plan" (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988, p. 4) are included in the program criteria for the new Minnesota grant program for developmental programs for young children who are developmentally delayed and whose family economics are at or below the poverty level.

The Ohio State Board of Education developed procedures for evaluating and monitoring the preschool programs as part of its rules promulgated under the revised School Code. In brief, these procedures include that:

- the LEA superintendent or designee will monitor monthly the administration of the program, facilities, funding, and record keeping;
- information from monthly evaluations will be aggregated and submitted to the Department of Education in an annual report;
- each LEA superintendent or designee will receive training provided by the Department of Education in evaluating programs;
- the program will be evaluated by the Department of Education to determine if it is in compliance with the rules promulgated by the Department. This evaluation will take place at least once every five years. A written report of the results of the evaluation will be mailed to the LEA superintendent, the preschool program director, and the president of the school board. The evaluation will specify any deficiencies and dates by which corrections will be required. Parents are to be invited to a meeting to discuss the program evaluation.

A plan to correct any deficiencies must be prepared and submitted to the Department. Timelines may be extended as approved by the Department. Failure to comply with the rules promulgated by the Department concerning the preschool program may be cause for initiating proceedings for withholding of funds (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

Since the 1987-88 school year, Wisconsin's P-5 program has required annual testing of students enrolled in the preschool programs and in grades 1 through 3 in reading, language arts, and math using tests approved by the DPI. Students in grades 4 and 5 have been and will continue to be annually tested in reading, language arts, math, science, and social studies using tests approved by the DPI. The purpose of this testing is to determine the short- and long-term effects of the P-5 program (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.45, 1985).

According to Jim McCoy, Wisconsin DPI Early Childhood Consultant, no formal assessment requirements are currently stipulated for the 4-year-old preschool programs. However, this issue will be addressed in the DPI's Early Childhood Education Resource and Planning Guide that is currently under development (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988).

Eligibility

Eligibility refers to who has access to programs. High/Scope reports that the evidence for preschool programs "is most extensive and persuasive with respect to children who are poor or otherwise at risk of scholastic failure" (Schweinhart, 1985, p. 18) and therefore, quality preschool programs should be made available, at least, to these children. NAEYC contends that all children should have access to preschool programs, regardless of their developmental levels, especially in public school programs.

This last section examines eligibility and how the seven states define their populations to be served in preschool programs.

Illinois' legislation requires ISBE to establish criteria for screening procedures to identify children, ages 3-5, "who because of their home and community environment are subject to such language, cultural, economic and like disadvantages that they have been determined to be at risk of academic failure" (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2 & 3.48 [b]) based on these screening procedures.

According to the Requests for Proposals (RFPs) developed by ISBE (1985c, 1986, 1987, 1988a) eligibility criteria is developed by local programs based upon screening procedures that address at least the needs in the areas of vocabulary, visual-motor integration, language and speech development, fine and gross motor skills, and social skills The RFPs do not stipulate that cognitive development be evaluated.

The Indiana Department of Education's administrative guidelines also indicate that each school corporation (school district) define its own at-risk population to be served. The guidelines also stipulate that students who had not been determined to be at risk could also be included if their inclusion would benefit the at-risk students and could be justified (Indiana Department of Education, n.d.[a]).

Iowa's Child Development Assistance Act specifically addresses at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds and requires the Child Development Coordinating Council to develop a definition of at-risk children which includes income, family structure, the child's level of development, and availability or accessibility for the child of a Head Start or other day-care program as criteria (Iowa Senate File 2192, 1988).

Michigan's "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" stipulate that all 4-year-olds are eligible to participate in preschool programs. Further, the Standards specify that programs cannot exclude or limit participation on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, handicapping condition, or socioeconomic status. Support services must be provided to meet the needs of the population served (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

Michigan Public Act 220, Sec. 36 (1987) and Michigan Public Act 318, Sec. 36 (1988) appropriated monies to enable LEAs to develop or expand comprehensive compensatory education programs for 4-year-old educationally disadvantaged children, as defined by the Department of Education, who are not already receiving special education. The laws also specified that children other than those determined to be educationally disadvantaged could participate in the preschool program. However, state reimbursement for the program is limited to the portion of approved costs attributable to educationally disadvantaged children.

In Minnesota, the ECFE program is open to all families with young children and is not targeted only to families with children who are at risk of academic failure (Engstrom, 1988; Hausmann &

Weiss, 1988). The Minnesota developmental program for young children who are significantly developmentally delayed and whose families' economics are at or below the poverty level is targeted to a specific at-risk population (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988).

Ohio's preschool programs are open to all young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age. However, the Department of Education noted that the early identification and preschool programs were created specifically to focus on the needs of at-risk children (Ohio Department of Education, 1988). The Department of Education has also promulgated rules that specify procedures for reporting children's progress (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

Wisconsin's preschool programs are open to all 4-year-olds, however, most programs serve at-risk children (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988). The P-5 programs in Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit are targeted specifically to the needs of economically disadvantaged children (Wisconsin DPI, 1988a).

The Milwaukee school board must ensure that at least 50% of the 4- and 5-year-olds participating in day-care centers fall into one or more of the following catagories:

- children with a parent in need of child-care services as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 46.98 (4) (a) 1 to 3; or
- children with a parent in need of child-care services as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 46.98 (4) (a) 4; or
- children with a parent who is a school-aged parent, as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.91 (1); or
- children, other than those with special education needs as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.76 (3), who have language, psychomotor development, social, behavioral, or educational problems that warrant intervention, as determined by the board (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 119.72, 1987).

Summary

The High/Scope Foundation and NAEYC recommend five components -- developmentally appropriate practice, staff training and supervision, teacher/student ratio, parent involvement, and assessment -- as necessary for effective ECE programs. This chapter discussed the effective components recommended by the experts and presented a comparative analysis of the seven states' programs with the recommended components. An additional component, eligibility, was also included in the analysis.

All seven states in the study (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) either specifically mention or imply developmentally appropriate practice.

Training in ECE or child development is required in Illinois and Michigan, while Iowa requires training or experience in ECE or child development. New teacher certification standards for teachers of preschoolers went into effect in Illinois in 1988, in Minnesota in 1989, and will go into effect in Wisconsin in 1992, and in Michigan and Ohio in 1993. Indiana does not require training in ECE or child development for teachers who teach preschoolers.

Inservice training for staff in preschool programs is required in Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio, and recommended in Indiana. Inservice education opportunities are available statewide in Minnesota. Neither ongoing training nor staff development is specifically stipulated in legislation, rules, guidelines, or requirements in Illinois or Wisconsin.

Illinois utilizes ECE consultants to provide technical assistance to the preschool programs. Only Michigan and Ohio require administrators who supervise the programs to have training in ECE or child development.

Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan require a maximum teacher/student ratio of 1:10 for 4-year-olds which is commensurate with High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations. Ohio's teacher/student ratio is greater: 1:14, while Iowa's is smaller: 1:8. Neither Minnesota nor Wisconsin stipulate teacher/student ratio in their educational preschool programs, although Wisconsin requires a maximum ratio of 1:12 for the Milwaukee day-care programs.

All seven states either require or recommend parent involvement, and all states have accountability built into their programs.

All children may participate in preschool programs in Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin; however, Michigan and Wisconsin identify specific programs for 4-year-olds. Legislation in all seven states has created programs specifically for children at risk of academic failure. LEAs in Illinois and Indiana must define their own criteria for eligibility.

***

This chapter reviewed the components of effective ECE programs advocated by High/Scope and NAEYC and presented a comparative analysis of the seven states' programs with the recommended components.

What are the implications of the states' policies, legislative mandates, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements reg rding early intervention for at-risk children? The next and final chapter of this study examines policy implications.

CHAPTER IV

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF EARLY INTERVENTION

All seven states in this study -- Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin -- have implemented initiatives to provide early intervention services to young children who are at risk of academic failure. These initiatives resulted from policies adopted by each state's state education agency (SEA) and/or from legislative mandates. In some states, rules, guidelines, and requirements have also been developed to amplify or clarify the policies and legislative mandates.

In each case, the states indicated that their policies and legislation were intended to increase the likelihood that young children experience academic success, rather than academic failure. As services for young children are proposed, implemented, and expanded, state and local decisionmakers may want to consider the implications of their state policies. This final chapter examines some of the major implications of the seven states' policies and legislative mandates for early intervention. Most of these implications are interrelated, not mutually exclusive. Further, many of these implications will require additional funds for implementation.

The remainder of this chapter is divided into the following sections: **Quality** (**Staff Qualifications, Recruitment and Retention of Teachers, Facilities, Articulation Between Early Childhood Levels, and Parent Involvement**); **Delivery and Coordination of Services**; and **Accountability**.

Quality

In the past, legislatures focused primarily on the allocation of fiscal resources to schools. But more recently, legislatures have enacted "policies that directly affect the substance of education -- what is taught and who teaches it" (McDonnell, 1988, p. 92). This is definitely the case for early intervention in the North Central Region. All seven of the states in the study either mandate or recommend that curriculum and teaching practices be developmentally appropriate to ensure quality. Further, some states such as Iowa and Michigan outline very specific guidelines that must be followed in order to ensure that curriculum and teaching practices are developmentally appropriate. While the states cannot guarantee that every preschool classroom will reflect developmentally appropriate practice, the policies and legislative mandates, and their accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements increase the likelihood that curriculum and teaching practices are appropriate for young children.

The content of curriculum, how that content is taught, and by whom are all policy implications that may be addressed at both the local and state level.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) recommends three major policies as essential for achieving developmentally appropriate early childhood programs:

1) ECE teachers must have college-level specialized preparation in ECE or child development and should be supported and encouraged to obtain and maintain current knowledge about child development and its application to ECE practice;

2) ECE teachers must have practical, supervised experience teaching young children prior to being in charge of a group; and

3) Teacher/child ratios must be appropriate for the ages of the children in the program, and maximum class size must be limited to ensure individualized and appropriate care and education (Bredekamp, 1987)

Staff Qualifications

As was discussed in the previous two chapters, all of the states except Indiana currently require, or will require within the next four years, that teachers have training or experience in ECE or child development. This does not mean that six of the seven states require a baccalaureate degree with a major in ECE or child development. Some states permit persons with a CDA credential or associate degree in ECE or child development to teach in a preschool program, while others permit those licensed as day-care center supervisors to teach in the preschool program. Teacher preparation varies considerably. An example best illustrates the significance of the problem.

In a policy paper prepared for the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), it was noted that a review of the data from LEAs regarding the preschool programs for at-risk children revealed that nearly 60% of the teachers serving in these programs were qualified as day-care center supervisors, not as early childhood teachers (ISBE, 1988b). Illinois law requires that teachers of the preschool programs for at-risk children must hold either early childhood teaching certificates (Type 02, birth to age 6 or Type 04, birth through grade 3) or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended.

Individuals may qualify as day-care supervisors in the following ways:

- Two years of college credit with 18 hours of coursework in child care and/or child development; or
- Two years of child development experience in a school or day-care setting plus 10 hours of college coursework in child care/child development, with proof of intent to complete two years of college; or
- Current credential as a Child Development Associate plus 12 hours of college coursework in child care/child development and two years of child development experience in a school or day care setting; or
- completion of a Montessori teacher training program as a substitute for the college coursework requirement (ISBE, 1988b, p. 4).

The policy paper stated:

> . . . it is apparent that allowing persons who do not hold an early childhood certificate to teach in this critical program area was envisioned by the legislature to be a stop-gap measure, for use only while the state was gearing up for program expansion (ISBE, 1988b, p. 5).

The policy paper also noted that the Illinois General Assembly was aware that the limited number of public school ECE programs in existence in 1985, when the legislation was enacted, had produced a low demand for trained professionals in the field. Consequently, institutions of higher education were training fewer teachers than would be needed if programs were expanded to serve large numbers of young children (ISBE, 1988b).

Since 1985, the Illinois State Board of Education has prescribed by policy and regulation the minimum requirements necessary for teaching in ECE programs. Concern over the present options for qualifying as an ECE teacher in the state-supported program for at-risk children has prompted ISBE to study the situation and possibly recommend changes in the current legislation regarding the ways persons may qualify to teach in the programs (ISBE, 1988b).

As states develop new teacher licensure requirements or increase the requirements necessary for persons to teach in a preschool program, teacher preparation programs will need to be developed and/or expanded in colleges and universities. Teacher-trainers will also need to be hired to teach undergraduate students as well as teachers wishing to complete additional coursework so that they meet the new requirements.

NAEYC recommends that supervisors and consultants should be trained in ECE or child development. If states concur with the NAEYC recommendations, additional training needs will be evident.

Recruitment and Retention of Teachers

Recruitment and retention of teachers are additional implications of the states' policies. If states continue to permit underqualified persons to teach in the preschool programs (and pay them salaries commensurate with those paid to traditional child-care workers), they could be facing not only a situation that may produce a negative impact on quality; they may find it difficult to staff the programs.

Child-care workers have traditionally been paid low wages. Acco ding to Galinsky (1986), child-care workers are in the lowest 5% of all wage earners in the U.S. Further, there is a staff turnover rate of 42% nationwide. In some states the rate may be as high as 57%. Galinsky also noted that there is a shrinking pool from which to draw new employees. "The number of young adults in the prime caregiving age group -- 18 to 24 -- has dropped from 30 million in 1980 to an anticipated 25 million by 1990" (Galinsky, 1986, p. 11).

Unless preschool teachers are paid salaries and benefits commensurate with that provided to teachers of older children, states could have policies for preschool programs, LEAs may want to provide preschool programs, but no one may want to teach in the preschool programs. Michigan is the only state in the study that currently requires that preschool staff receive salaries, wages, and benefits commensurate with other K-12 district staff who have similar assignments and responsibilities and who are employed under the same contract.

Facilities

According to NAEYC, a high quality early childhood program provides a safe and nurturing environment that promotes physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development of young children. Further, this environment, both indoors and outside, should be safe, clean, attractive, and spacious. A minimum of 35 square feet per child of usable indoor floor space for play and a minimum of 75 square feet per child of secured outdoor space should be provided (Bredekamp, 1987).

While none of the states in the study specified the nature of facilities in their policies or legislation, many of the states (e.g., Illinois, Ohio, and Michigan) addressed this issue in rules, guidelines, or requirements. The location of preschool programs could have major implications for local service providers.

Many inner-city schools, such as those in Milwaukee and Chicago, are already overcrowded with every available space used to capacity. Further, many of these buildings are in dire need of repair. Other communities, especially in suburban areas, have experienced dramatic enrollment declines resulting in many school districts selling or leasing surplus school buildings or razing older school buildings (J. Hixson, personal communication, January 9, 1989).

In Wisconsin, the issue is not only crowded school buildings. The major concern is old, unsafe school buildings. Many of Wisconsin's schools were constructed prior to 1930. Wisconsin Statutes require that schools need only meet the building codes in effect at the time they were constructed. Thus, many buildings fall below current expectations for safe and healthful facilities.

> A combination of financial and procedural hurdles has produced a situation where only 1% of Wisconsin's 2000+ school buildings have been replaced in the last four years. This replacement rate corresponds to a building life expectancy of 400 years, clearly unrealistic (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1988c, p. 69).

While Wisconsin's State Superintendent of Public Instruction is seeking legislative support to rectify the problems of unsafe school facilities, the current situation is that many LEAs could not house preschool programs in their own buildings even if they wanted to do so. Policymakers may have to consider sites other than public school buildings for state-funded preschool programs.

Articulation Between Early Childhood Levels

While this study focused on ECE for young children prior to kindergarten age, ECE is generally considered to include children from birth to age 9. The criteria for kindergarten entrance and the curriculum taught in this program are strongly criticized by many educators and their professional associations (e.g., Connell, 1987; Hill, 1987; Elkind, 1986; Bredekamp, 1987; National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education, 1987). Further, the National Association of State Boards of Education (1988b) recommends major changes in the ways schools teach young children and calls for the creation of early childhood units for children, ages 4 to 8, in elementary schools so that developmentally appropriate practice will not be left at the kindergarten door.

All of the states concur with NAEYC and High/Scope that programs for young children should be developmentally appropriate. Further, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio created study groups, task forces, or commissions to examine the issues pertaining to ECE. Results of their work revealed that many existing programs, particularly in kindergarten through grade 3, focus too much on early academics and expect children to adjust to the demands of an inappropriate program.

The emphasis on developmentally appropriate practice may indeed be felt throughout elementary schools, especially in the early grades. Kindergarten and primary teachers and administrators may need to look critically at curriculum, instruction, and assessment to determine whether or not all three are aligned and reflect the development of young children.

As Carolyn Logan, Early Childhood Education Program Specialist, Michigan Department of Education, pointed out at the NASBE Early Education Task Force hearing:

> Kindergarten is, of course, the next logical step. However, we approach this and other challenges in early childhood education with much less anxiety because we feel that we have already done much of the basic homework necessary to enable us to manage and hopefully resolve the critical issues of entry and placement practices. It is our immediate plan to use the framework we now have in place to facilitate the development of the state level policy needed to guide the implementation of high quality early education programs (Logan, 1988).

In addition, teachers of older students may need to examine the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment and determine whether programs meet the needs and development of children or if current expectations are inappropriate.

Parent Involvement

All seven of the states in the study mandate or recommend parent involvement to enhance children's development and assist parents in developing parenting skills. Unless carefully designed policies and procedures are developed by local service providers, well-intentioned strategies for involving parents in the education and development of their children could be viewed as intruding upon parents' privacy and their rights as their child's primary caregiver.

The type of information requested by professionals and the way in which this information is obtained could pose significant problems. Further, this issue becomes compounded when multiple professionals from different agencies work with a child and his/her family. Thus, service providers may wish to develop additional policies and procedures to minimize the likelihood that their good intentions are not mistaken as violating families' rights to privacy. Further, confidentiality and ethics are two areas service providers may want to consider for staff development training.

Another issue related to parent involvement concerns teachers' schedules. Policymakers should consider the implications of requiring teachers to work with parents and conduct home visits without adjusting their schedules or compensating them for additional time beyond the school day. Iowa's and Michigan's policies may offer some insight. Their provisions allow devoting part or all of a school day each week to conducting parent involvement activities including home visits. State and local service providers may also want to consider flexible scheduling or compensation so that teachers can meet with parents during non-school hours. This is especially important in order to meet the needs of working parents.

Delivery and Coordination of Services

The North Central Region is geographically large and demographically diverse. In terms of area, it covers 379,474 square miles or 25% of the land area of the continental United States. Of the 48.7 million inhabitants of the region, three-fourths live in metropolitan areas and one-forth live in

rural areas. Two-thirds of the region's elementary and secondary students attend schools in metropolitan areas while one-third attend schools in rural areas. Each state in this region reflects similar diversity (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1987).

The types of services provided, how they are provided, by whom, and coordination of services to preschool-aged children and their families are additional implications of the seven states' policies.

Will preschool programs be home-based, that is, providing services to children and their families entirely in their homes? Or will preschool programs be center-based, in which services are provided in a group setting outside of children's homes, usually in a classroom?

Illinois, for example, allows districts to develop the type of program that meets local needs. Thus, some are home-based and others are center-based. Iowa encourages flexibility not only in terms of program, but also in terms of service provider, approving private and Head Start agencies as well as school districts as program sponsors. This flexibility was built into the program to afford the opportunity to program for sparsely populated areas where center-based programs could create major transportation problems.

Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) programs are provided in numerous sites in local communities. And Ohio's legislation permits school districts that provide preschool programs to furnish transportation for children participating in the programs.

Will these services be only educational or will they provide:

- health services, such as screening for delays, physical examinations, or other direct health services provided by a doctor, nurse, or dentist?
- social services, such as assistance with obtaining services from community or government agencies?
- nutrition services, such as meals or snacks so that children receive the major portion of their daily nutritional requirements during the hours of the preschool program?
- day-care services to address the needs of working parents?

While some of the states have addressed these issues, others may find it helpful to examine what other states have done.

NAEYC (1987), the Council of Chief State School Officers (Gold, 1988b), and NASBE (1988b) all recommend that services to young children be comprehensive. Some of the states in this study (e.g., Iowa and Minnesota) also recommend comprehensive services. It is obvious that to implement comprehensive services, interagency cooperation will be necessary.

Relationships between agency administrators will have to be developed, and mechanisms for service delivery and financing services will have to be established. Further, agencies will need to approach the tasks ahead in a spirit of cooperation, ever mindful that the goals are providing what is best for the child and family, and coordinating but not duplicating services.

Not only will LEAs need to work in cooperation with other agencies, they may also want to consider establishing cooperation with existing school programs, such as Chapter I, bilingual, and provisions under PL 99-457, the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986. Thoughtful and careful coordination may be necessary in order to maximize resources available. This will be no small task. For the past 20 years, the policy framework established has promoted categorical and fragmented programming (Kagan, 1989). While some may claim that serving all children in a holistic manner is long overdue, the time and political climate may be ripe for those who serve children to turn this trend around.

The policies and legislation in Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio may serve as examples to other states to provide preschool programs to <u>all</u> young children, no matter what their developmental levels or needs or abilities are.

Accountability

All seven of the states in this study have built accountability into their programs. Some states, such as Illinois and Ohio, are quite prescriptive in the kind of data that is required from program providers, while Indiana only mentions that program evaluation should be tied to the objectives of the program. The quality of program evaluations and the strategies used to communicate evaluative information to policymakers may, in no small measure, influence the amount of funds state legislatures appropriate for these programs either to maintain or expand services. Thus, it may behoove both SEAs and LEAs to require and provide training in rigorous program evaluation.

This issue is further complicated by the fact that preschool program effectiveness may not be realized for a number of years, long after the original policymakers first instituted the policies or legislation. Further, these original policymakers may no longer be in office having been replaced by a new set of players. Thus, SEA and LEA personnel may have to re-educate those in power, and perhaps the general public, that spending more now on early intervention will mean spending less later for more costly remedial and social programs.

Local service providers may want to consider the use of evaluation models, such as the CIPP Model developed by Madaus, Scriven, and Stufflebeam (1983) and adapted for improving programs for young children by Slavenas and Nowakowski (in press) as they design their evaluation systems. Information in four major evaluation categories -- Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) -- may yield important information for local program improvement and local and state accountability requirements.

Context evaluation examines goals and provides a mechanism "to document the distinguishing context variables, to analyze needs, to diagnose problems, and to judge appropriateness of objectives for needs and audience." Input evaluation examines program plans and provides a mechanism "to assess schedule, budget, selected program design, and use of resources." Process evaluation examines operations and provides a mechanism "to identify strengths and weaknesses in process, in the design and implementation of the program, and to record procedural events." Product evaluation examines outcomes and provides a mechanism "to collect descriptions and judgments of outcomes and to relate these program outcomes to objectives, plans, and operations" (Slavenas & Nowakowski, in press)

Quality program evaluation could prove to be the critical factor that determines whether policymakers view early intervention as a passing fad or make a long-term commitment to its institutionalization within the educational system.

Summary

This study has attempted to:

1) identify the early intervention policies and legislative mandates for young children at risk of academic failure in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin;
2) document the processes by which states developed their policies and mandates;
3) identify effective components for early childhood education programs;
4) comparatively analyze the states' policies and legislative mandates and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements with the recommended components; and
5) identify implications of the selected states' policies and legislative mandates that state and local decisionmakers may want to consider as they develop and/or expand programs for young children at risk of academic failure.

According to a former SEA staff member, the development of state policy is contextual. One must have intimate knowledge of the state's political environment in order to thoroughly analyze possible policy action. What is a logical policy recommendation for one state would not necessarily be logical for another (P. Tissot, personal communication, January 2, 1989).

The researcher does not claim to have comprehensive knowledge of each state's political environment. However, she hopes that what has been documented here will shed some light on the status and implications of policies and programs for young children in the North Central Region aimed at altering the trend of academic failure. Due to the collective efforts of policymakers, educators, parents, and other citizens, thousands of young children have been given the opportunity to develop physically, socially, emotionally, and intellectually, in order to improve their chances to succeed in school and in life. All citizens can take pride in these efforts.

> *This is the place to start, for that is where the children are. For only a hard look at the world in which they live -- a world we adults have created for them in large part by default -- can convince us of the urgency of their plight and the consequences of our inaction. Then perhaps it will come to pass that, in the words of Isaiah, 'A little child shall lead them'* (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, p. 165).

REFERENCE LIST

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1986). School reform policy: A call for reason. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Barnett, W. S. (1985). The Perry Preschool Program and its long-term effects: A benefit-cost analysis. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Berrueta-Clement, J. R., Schweinhart, L. J., Barnett, W. S., Epstein, A. S., & Weikart, D. P. (1984). Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool rogram on youths through age 19. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.). (1987). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1970). Two worlds of childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). A report on longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs, Volume II: Is early intervention effective? (DHEW Publication No. OHD 76 30025). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bruner, C. (1988, August 18). Iowa's 1988 legislative initiative -- assisting at-risk youth and families. Speech given at North Central Regional Educational Laboratory's conference Success for At-risk Students: A Continuing Priority, Chicago, IL.

Children's Defense Fund. (1987). Childcare: The time is now. Washington, DC: Author.

Committee for Economic Development. (1987). Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged. New York: Author, Research and Policy Committee.

Connell, D. R. (1987). The first 30 years were the fairest: Notes from kindergarten and the ungraded primary (K-12). Young Children, 42(5), 30-37.

Consortium for Longitudinal Studies. (1978). Lasting effects after preschool, final report. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Consortium for Longitudinal Studies. (1981). Persistence of preschool effects: Status, stress, and coping skills, final report. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1987a). Children at risk: The work of the states. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1987b). Assuring school success for students at risk: A council policy statement. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1987c). Elements of a model state statute to provide educational entitlements for at-risk students. Washington, DC: Author.

Department of Health and Human Services. (1986). Head Start: A child development program. Washington, DC: Author, Office of Human Development Services Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, Head Start Bureau.

Duncan, G. J. & Rodgers, W. L. (1985). The prevalence of childhood poverty. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center.

Early Childhood Family Education Programs. St. Paul, MN, Code Ann. 121-882 (1987).

Early Childhood Family Education Aid. St. Paul, MN, Code Ann. 124-2711 (1987).

Education for All Handicapped Children Act, PL 94-142. (1975). 20 U.S.C. 1401.

Elkind, D. (1986). Formal education and early childhood education: An essential difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 631-636.

Engstrom, L. (1988). The Minnesota experience with family-centered early childhood programs. Community Education Journal, 15(2), 16-18.

Epstein, A. S. (1985). Overview. In L. J. Schweinhart & D. P. Weikart (Eds.). Quality in early childhood programs: Four perspectives. (High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, No. 3). Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Galinsky, E. (1986). Investing in quality child care: A report for AT&T. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Gnezda, T., & Robinson, S. (1986). State approaches to early childhood education. (State Legislative Report, Vol. 11, No. 14). Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.

Gnezda, T., & Sonnier, C. (1988). Early childhood education: The status of state involvement (State Legislative Report, Vol. 13, No. 16). Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.

Gold, D. L. (1988, October 5). Chiefs unit sets broader approach for states on young's 'basic needs'. Education Week, p. 1.

Gold, D. L. (1988 October 19). Child-care bill, parental leave die in Congress. Education Week, p. 1.

Goodenow, K. K. (1988, May 2). Early childhood report. Written testimony presented to the National Association of State Boards of Education Task Force on Early Childhood Education, Chicago, IL.

Goodman, I. F., & Brady, J. P. (1988). The challenge of coordination: Head Start's relationship to state-funded preschool initiatives. Newton, MA: Educational Development Center.

Grub, W. N. (1987). Young children face the states: Issues and options for early childhood programs. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Hausman, B. S., & Weiss, H. B. (1988). State-sponsored family education: The case for school-based services. Community Education Journal, 15(2), 12-15.

Hill, P. S. (1987). The function of kindergarten. Young Children, 42(5), 12-19.

Hills, T. W. (1987). Children in the fast lane: Implications for early childhood policy and practice. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 2, 265-273.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education -- kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1985a). Early childhood education policy study...an overview. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1985b). Policy statement on Early Childhood Education (9000 5-1134 Br. 86 No. 309). Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1985c). Request for proposal for providing screening and educational programs to children ages 3-5 who are at risk of academic failure. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1986). Request for proposal for providing screening and educational programs to children ages 3-5 who are at risk of academic failure. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1987). Request for proposal for providing screening and educational programs to children ages 3-5 who are at risk of academic failure. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1988a). Request for proposal for providing screening and educational programs to children ages 3-5 who are at risk of academic failure. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1988b). Qualifications of teachers for three- and four-year-old children at risk of academic failure. Policy paper prepared for the State Board of Education. Springfield, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education. (n.d.) Facts about the Illinois prekindergarten at risk of academic failure program. (Available from Early Childhood Section). Springfield, IL: Author.

Indiana Department of Education. (1988). 1988 legislative program as recommended to the 1988 Indiana General Assembly. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Indiana Department of Education. (n.d.[a]). Educational opportunity for at-risk students: Administrative guidelines. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Indiana Department of Education. (n.d.[b]). Guidelines for developing an educational program for at-risk students. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Indiana House Bill 1360. (1987). Indianapolis, IN.

Iowa Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force. (1987). Iowa prekindergarten/kindergarten task force report submitted to the Iowa State Board of Education. Des Moines, IA: Author.

Iowa Senate File 2192. (1988). The Child Development Assistance Act. Des Moines, IA.

Iowa Senate File 2295. (1988). An Act Relating to the Development of Programs for the Identification, Educational Methods, and Staff Qualifications for At-Risk Children. Des Moines, IA.

Jackson, D. (1988, August 19). Indiana's educational opportunity for at-risk students legislation. Speech given at North Central Regional Educational Laboratory's conference Success for At-risk Students: A Continuing Priority, Chicago, IL.

Kagan, S. L. (1989). Early care and education: Tackling the tough issues. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 433-439.

Kerch, S. (1989, January 8). Taking care of business, kids. Chicago Tribune, p. 1, section 16.

Knezevich, S. J. (1984). Administration of public education, (4th Ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Koshel, J. (1985). State investments in human capital. Capital Ideas.

Lazar, I. (1981). Early intervention is effective. Educational Leadership, 38, 303-305.

Lazar, I., & Darlington, R. (1979). Summary report: Lasting effects after preschool. (DHEW Publication No. OHDS 80-30179). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Lazar, I., Hubbell, V. R., Murray, H., Rosche, M., & Royce, J. (1977). The persistence of preschool effects: a long-term follow-up of fourteen infant and preschool experiments. Final Report. (Grant No. 18-76-07843, for Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, DHEW Publication No. OHDS 78-30130). Washington, DC: Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Levin, H. M. (1985). The educationally disadvantaged: A national crisis (Program Report No. 85-B1). Philadelphia, PA: Center for State Youth Initiatives of Public/Private Ventures.

Levin, H. M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. Educational Leadership, 44, 19-21.

Logan, C. E. (1988, May 2). Written testimony on the Michigan Department of Education's preschool program for 4-year-olds presented to the National Association of State Boards of Education Task Force on Early Childhood Education, Chicago, IL.

Majchrzak, A. (1984). Methods for policy research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCormick, K. (1986). If early education isn't on your agenda now, it could be -- and soon. The American School Board Journal, 6, 30-34.

McDonald, J. G. (1986). Readiness for the new educational standards. Time for results: Task force on readiness. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

McDonnell, L. M. (1988). Can education research speak to state policy? Theory into practice, 27, 91-97.

Meisels, S. J. (1987, January). Uses and abuses of developmental screening and school readiness testing. Young Children, 42, 4-6, 68-73.

Michigan Department of Education. (1988). Report of MDE grants available. Lansing, MI: Author, Office of Grants Coordination and Procurement.

Michigan Public Act 220. (1987). Lansing, MI.

Michigan Public Act 318. (1988). Lansing, MI.

Michigan State Board of Education. (1986). Standard of quality and curriculum guidelines for preschool programs for four-year olds. Lansing, MI: Author.

Minnesota Department of Education. (1988). When learners are at risk: Progress toward a comprehensive state policy. St. Paul: Author, Learner Support Systems, Division of Development and Partnership.

Minnesota State Board of Education. (1986). Current guidelines, rules (proposed), Early Childhood Family Education. (Section 3530.6300). St. Paul: Author.

Moynihan, D. P. (1986). Family and nation. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). (1987). Position statement on standardized testing of young children 3 through 8 years of age. Washington DC: NAEYC.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1988a). NAEYC public policy alert. Washington, DC: Author.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1988b). ACT for better child care (brochure #560). Washington, DC: Author.

National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS/SDE). (1987). Unacceptable trends in kindergarten entry and placement. Position statement adopted by NAECS/SDE at annual meeting on November 11, 1987, Chicago, IL. Available from early childhood specialists in each state's education agency.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1988a). The NASBE early education task force. The State Board Connection -- Issues in Brief, 7(3).

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1988b). Right from the start, the report of the NASBE task force on early childhood education. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (1988). Liaison Bulletin, 14, No. 4, 1-8.

National Black Child Development Institute, Inc. (1987). Safeguards: Guidelines for establishing programs for four-year-olds in the public schools. Washington, DC: Authors.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System [NEC*TAS] and State Technical Assistance Resource Team [START]. (1988). The Head Start Program. (Resource packet) Available from CB#8040, Suite 500 NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, NC 27599.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: Author, Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

National Governors' Association. (1987a). Results in education: 1987. Washington, DC: Author, Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

National Governors' Association (1987b). The first sixty months. Washington, DC: Author, Committee on Human Resources and Center for Policy Research.

National Governors' Association. (1987c). The first sixty months: The next steps. Washington, DC: Author, Committee on Human Resources, the Center for Policy Research, and the Council of State Governments.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). (1987). Plan of Work for FY 88 and FY 89. Elmhurst, IL: Author.

Ohio Commission on Early Childhood Education. (1984). Final Report. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Ohio Department of Education. (1987a, January). An inside look at the Preschool/Kindergarten Longitudinal Research Study. Research Report.

Ohio Department of Education. (1987b). Standards: Pre-kindergarten provisional certification. Columbus, OH: Author.

Ohio Department of Education. (1987c). Standards: Pre-kindergarten associate certification. Columbus, OH: Author.

Ohio Department of Education. (1988). Ohio's Formula for Educational Success. Columbus, OH: Author.

Ohio Department of Education (n.d.). Rules to accompany early childhood legislation. Promulgated under R.C. Ch. 119, amplifies R.C. 3301.52 to 3301.57. Columbus, OH: Author.

Ohio House Bill 238. (1985). Columbus, OH.

Ohio House Bill, 67. (1987). Columbus, OH.

Ohio House Bill 171. (1987). Columbus, OH.

Ohio Substitute House Bill 253. (1987). Columbus, OH.

Sanders, T. (1988, July 6). 1988 legislative session. Memorandum to local school board presidents, educational service region superintendents, and local school district superintendents. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

School Code of Illinois. (1985). As amended by House Bill 90 (P.A. 84-18).

Schweinhart, L. J. (1985). The preschool challenge. (High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, No. 4). Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Shields, M. K. (1988, January). The 1987-88 Michigan School Aid Act compiled. Available from Michigan House Fiscal Agency, 222 Seymour Street, Roosevelt Bldg., Third Floor, Lansing, MI 48909.

Shields, M. K. (1988, August). The 1988-89 Michigan School Aid Act compiled. Available from House Fiscal Agency, 222 Seymour Street, Roosevelt Bldg, Third Floor, Lansing, MI 48909.

Slavenas, R., & Nowakowski, J. (in press). Improving programs for young children by applying a decision-based evaluation model. Early Childhood Research Quarterly.

Slavin, R. (Ed.). (1986). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis (The Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, Report No. 1). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Spencer, C. (1988). Ideology trips up child-care legislation. Report prepared for Task V Collaboration meeting on early childhood education. Washington, DC: Council for Educational Development and Research.

Tjossem, T. (1976). Early intervention: Issues and approaches. In T. Tjossem (Ed.). Intervention strategies for high risk and handicapped children. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Trohanis, P., Cox, J. O., & Meyer, R. A. (1982). A report on selected demonstration programs for infant intervention. In C. T. Ramey & P. L. Trohanis (Eds.), Finding and educating high-risk and handicapped infants. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

U.S. Congress. Senate. (1975). Education for All Handicapped Children Act S.6, 94th Congress, 1st Session, Report No. 94-168.

U.S. Congress. House. (1987). Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, U.S. children and their families. Washington DC: U.S. Govenment Printing Office.

Warger, C. (Ed.). (1988). A resource guide to public school early childhood programs. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. (1980). Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam.

Weichel, J. (1988, May 2). Testimony on the Ohio Department of Education's Early Childhood Education presented to the National Association of State Boards of Education Task Force on Early Childhood Education, Chicago, IL.

Wisconsin Assembly Bill 850. (1987). Madison, WI.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1987). 1987-89 budget request, budget in brief. Madison, WI: Author.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1988a). Educational reform in Wisconsin: 1983-88. Madison, WI: Author.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1988b). Proposed order of the state superintendent of public instruction amending rules, relating to early childhood level licenses and approved programs. Madison, WI: Author.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1988c). 1989-91 biennial budget request, summary: A children's agenda. Madison, WI: Author.

Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 111.45. (1985). Madison, WI.

Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 119.72. (1987). Madison, WI.

APPENDIX A

Agency

Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001
- Sally Pancrazio, Assistant Superintendent, Research and Statistics
- Chalmer Moore, Early Childhood Consultant
- Audrey Witzman, Early Childhood Consultant
- Edith Helmich, Research and Evaluation
- Sandra Crews, Early Childhood Special Education Consultant

Department of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798
- Carol D'Amico, Policy Analyst
- Dennis Jackson, At-Risk Program Manager
- Joan Murray, Early Childhood Consultant
- Linda Ann Bond, Policy and Planning Specialist

Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA
- Leland Tack, Chief of Planning, Research, and Development
- Gail Sullivan Fleig, Policy Analyst
- Carol Phillips, Early Childhood Task Force Member
- Karen Goodenow, President, Iowa State Board of Education

Iowa General Assembly
- Senator Charles Bruner

Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
- Dorothy VanLooy, Supervisor, Technical Assistance and Evaluation
- Carolyn Logan, Supervisor, Early Childhood Education Programs
- Kate McAuliffe, Policy Analyst

Agency

Minnesota Department of Education
Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar St.
St. Paul, MN 55101
Harold MacDermot, Technology and Curriculum
Corinna Moncada, Preschool and Kindergarten
Mary Jo Richardson, Community and Adult Education
Lois Engstrom, Early Childhood and Family Education
Ann Bettenberg, Specialist, Rules Development & Policy

Minnesota Department of Human Services
444 Lafayette Rd.
St. Paul, MN 55155-3819
Jerri Sudderth, Assistant to the Commissioner

Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Margaret Trent, Research and Communications
Jane Wiechel, Early Childhood Section

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707
Thomas Stefonek, Bureau for Achievement Testing
Dennis Van Den Heuvel, Children at Risk
James McCoy, Early Childhood Specialist

APPENDIX B

Agency	Contact
American Association of School Administrators 1801 North Moore Street Arlington, VA 22209	Gary Marx 703/528-0700
Appalachia Educational Laboratory P.O. Box 1348 Charleston, WV 25325	Policy and Planning Center
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 125 North West Street Alexandria, VA 22314-2798	
Bank Street College Center for Children's Policy 610 West 112th St. New York, NY 10025	Anne Mitchell 212/663-7200
Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center CB No. 8040, 300 NCNB Plaza Chapel Hill, NC 27599	
Center for Policy Research in Education Eagleton Institute of Politics Rutgers University New Brunswick, NJ 08901	
'enter for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools The Johns Hopkins University 3505 North Charles St. Baltimore, MD 21218	
Children's Defense Fund 122 C Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001	

Agency	Contact
Committee for Economic Development 477 Madison Ave. New York, NY 10022	212/688-2063
Council for Exceptional Children 1920 Association Drive Reston, VA 22091-1589	
Council of Chief State School Officers 400 North Capitol St., N.W. Suite 379 Washington, DC 20001	
Council of the Great City Schools 1413 K Street, N.W. Suite 400 Washington, DC 20005	202/371-0163
Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street Suite 300 Denver, CO 80296-9987	
ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education University of Illinois College of Education 805 West Pennsylvania Ave. Urbana, IL 61801-4897	Mima Spencer 217/333-1386
ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children Council for Exceptional Children 1920 Association Dr. Reston, VA 22091-1589	703/620-3660
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation 600 North River Ypsilanti, MI 48197	
National Association for the Education of Young Children 1834 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20009	

Agency	Contact
National Association of Elementary School Principals 1615 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314-3483	Pat Braxton 703/684-3345
National Association of State Boards of Education 701 North Fairfax St. Suite 340 Alexandria, VA 22314	
National Association of State Directors of Special Education 2021 K Street, N.W. Suite 315 Washington, DC 20006	
National Black Child Development Institute 1463 Rhode Island Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20005	Evelyn Moore
National Committee for Citizens in Education 10840 Little Patuxent Parkway Suite 301 Columbia, MD 21044	Carl Marburger 301/596-5300
National Community Education Association 119 North Payne St. Alexandria, VA 22314	
National Conference of State Legislatures 1050 17th St. Suite 2100 Denver, CO 80265	
National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System CB No. 8040, 500 NCNB Plaza University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, NC 27599	Pascal Trohanis 919/962-2001
National Education Association 1201 16th Street Washington, DC 20036	Carolyn Breedlove 202/822-7300

Agency	Contact
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W. Washington, DC 20036	202/822-7840
National Governors' Association Hall of the States 444 North Capitol St., N.W. Suite 250 Washington, DC 20001	
National Maternal and Child Health Resource Center College of Law Building University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242	319/335-9046
Society for Research in Child Development Washington Liaison Office 100 North Carolina Ave., S.E. Suite 1 Washington, DC 20003	Jeanette Goodstein 202/543-9582
University of Nebraska-Lincoln Center for Curriculum & Instruction 118 Henzlik Hall Lincoln, NE 68588-0355	Robert L. Egbert 402/472-3153
Wellesley College Center for Research on Women Wellesley, MA 02181	Michelle Seligson 617/431-1453