Special Issue
Creating Social Justice in Early Childhood Education: A Case Study in Equity and Context

Dana E. Christman
New Mexico State University

This case study presents a picture of an Early Childhood Education program at a large, research university located in the southwestern United States. This program was selected as it is known for its dedication to social justice issues. The study examines how such issues are purposefully woven into the program and cast against a framework for preparing socially-just pre-service educational administrators. This framework is made up of four essential components: (a) selection of students, (b) critical consciousness in teaching and learning, (c) proactive systems of support and inclusive structures, and (d) induction/praxis. Introduced as well is the context for the program at the university. Findings indicate that the program should (a) carefully examine whether students have a predisposition towards social justice before they actually enter the program, (b) create a critical consciousness involves introducing students to the language of critique and the language of possibility, (c) intentionally hire faculty who are committed to social justice is essential, and (d) purposefully structure the program so that students are exposed to a very broad concept of community. Although pockets of resistance were uncovered in both the larger department and the college in which the program resides, the program itself remains solidly committed to social justice. Staying connected to scholarship, to the children, to context, and to social justice remains essential to the goals of this program, and recognizing the program's areas for improvement is vital to the language of critique that the program uses. Recommendations include: (a) regularly revisiting social justice issues as they exist and emerge, (b) investigating the induction and praxis of new teachers, and (c) mentoring new graduates so that the experience is meaningful and infused with social justice.

Becoming prepared to teach and to lead is a task fraught with importance. Surely that task increases in intensity when we are responsible for the education of the youngest children. And surely that task becomes even greater when we must learn to teach those persons, who are so susceptible to our influence, with equity and justice. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, or

NESCO (1997), recognizes the magnitude of this task:

> This early stage in life is not only crucial to a child's future development—it can also be a time for children to discover differences in a positive light, learning to live, to play and to learn together. These "first steps" are extremely important in facilitating inclusion throughout schooling.

This article presents a case study of the Early Childhood Education Program at State University of the Southwest (pseudonyms). Covered first in this article will be the framework on which assessment of this Early Childhood Education program is based, then the methodology employed to study the program, context of the program, an assessment of the program vis-à-vis the framework, resistance issues in the program as well as recommendations and implications that this study has for educational leadership preparation programs interested in enhancing their ability to inculcate social justice in their students.

Framework for Assessing Socially Just Educational Leadership Programs

Much discussion has occurred regarding educational leadership preparation programs and how pre-service administrators are often not prepared to deal with the immense number of issues, especially those involving inequities in the educational system (Anderson, 1990; Brown, 2004; Frattura & Capper, 2007; Herrity &

Glasman, 1999; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Capper, Dantley, Gonzalez, Cambron-McCabe, & Scheurich, 2008; Riester, Pursch, & Skrla, 2002; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). Recently, some scholars (McKenzie et al., 2008) attempted to portray what ideal educational leadership programs that dealt with issues of social justice might look like. The authors indicate that current educational leadership preparation programs must include certain components if they are to prepare today's educational leaders to actually lead for social justice. These components, or in its entirety, the framework, must be present for social justice to emerge in our schools. The framework for social justice in educational leadership programs is made up of four essential components: (a) selection of students, (b) critical consciousness in teaching and learning, (c) proactive systems of support and inclusive structures, and (d) induction/praxis.

Selection of Students. Despite opinions to the contrary, the authors (McKenzie et al., 2008) of this framework recommend that students selected for educational leadership preparation programs come to our programs with social justice inclinations. Although some might recommend that open access to our programs is, in itself, an act of social justice, the work needed for equitable leadership in our schools is too important to leave it to the hope that students will gain a social justice lens while in educational leadership preparation programs. Thus candidates

must enter our programs with a critical lens that will allow them to be aware of others' prejudices and biases as well as their own; furthermore, because instructional leadership is such an integral part of successful principalship, we must look for candidates who are strong teachers as well (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). We cannot help struggling teachers prepare for instructional leadership while they are attempting to master basic pedagogical skills. Additionally, the framework recommends that candidates selected for entry into educational leadership programs also have some experience, no matter how informal, as leaders themselves. There is a growing amount of emphasis and literature supporting teacher-leaders (Darling-Hammond, French, & Garcia-Lopez, 2002; Scribner, 1999). Such teacher-leaders will come to the demanding position of principal with a broader experiential base.

Critical Consciousness in Teaching and Learning. Critical consciousness in teaching and learning makes up the second component of the framework and illuminates the knowledge and content of a leadership preparation program. Although not new to leadership preparation programs, developing a critical consciousness still requires continuity and consistency. Too often, developing a critical consciousness in our students is sporadic among their coursework and often depends on who teaches which course. The authors of framework argue that developing a critical consciousness is too important to leave to serendipity; principals who graduate from our programs cannot just use a critical

consciousness now and again, but must use it consistently. They must continually ask themselves if their practices are equitable (La Celle-Peterson & Rivera, 1994; Lawrence & Tatum, 1997; Salvato, 2006) and who benefits from such practices (Blackmore, 2006; Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2004; Kellner, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

Furthermore, our programs are enhanced when critical consciousness becomes embedded in our students' practice so that through their instructional leadership, they can assist teachers in developing their own equitable pedagogy. And through our practice of social justice, we are able to provide assignments that are reflective of real practice in our schools, rather than expecting a plethora of discursive attempts to cover a range of textbook skills.

Proactive Systems of Support and Inclusive Structures. We posit that proactive systems of support and inclusive structures are necessary for successful, socially-just educational leadership programs. Our students must be able to discern the types of structures that bar elementary/secondary students from learning and progressing in our schools. We must also help them learn how to promote structures and resources that provide for diverse experiences; furthermore, our graduate students must be able to articulate the need for supportive practices that reach *all* children and develop scaffolds so that their students can learn appropriately and without penalty. Professional development programs for our graduate students, teachers, and

staff must not only be meaningful, but must provide them with skills and tools they can use in a timely manner.

Induction/Praxis. The final component of the framework focuses on the type of induction/praxis educational leadership preparation programs use for their pre-service administrators. Generally speaking, most programs provide only short-term induction for their students once they are practicing in the field. The time for support and renewal must be longer and must provide for a feedback loop between the program faculty and the student. This framework suggests that induction be lengthened to two to five years. During that time, students receive and provide continuous feedback, take additional coursework, and develop a network of other principals with whom they can seek advice and critique.

Methodology

Giving voice to participants through qualitative research (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990) yields multifaceted findings that guide us to participants' strengths as well as relationships that may be outside the focus of the study (Nicholson, Evans, Tellier-Robinson, & Aviles, 2001; Wasonga & Christman, 2003). A qualitative research design and case-study approach were chosen to investigate the Early Childhood Education Program at State University of the Southwest. Data were collected through interviews (McCracken, 1988; Merriam, 1998) using an open-ended, semi-structured questionnaire.

The interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. The written text, together with the recording and observations taken during the discussion, aided in the triangulation and interpretation of meaning. Triangulation was also accomplished through member checks (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993) and audit trails (Creswell, 1998).

Data from the interviews were analyzed in three stages: first by open coding, then by axial coding and, finally, selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Coding involved working with data by organizing them and breaking them into controllable units, synthesizing them and looking for patterns within the data, and discerning what was important and what was to be learned (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Open coding involved breaking down, examining, comparing, categorizing, and conceptualizing the data. The process continued into axial coding, which involved sorting and defining data into categories and themes. Selective coding involved developing the story, revisiting the categories and discovering the interrelationships among categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As well, selective coding guided both interpretation and meaning, and helped to aid in explanations, conclusions, inferences and linkages, and dealing with rival explanations. The data were then cast against the *a priori* Framework for Assessing Socially Just Educational Leadership Programs (McKenzie et al., 2008).

Participants. The participants in this study were all affiliated with the Early Childhood Education Program at State University of the Southwest. Two women and a man were interviewed. They included two Latinos/as and a

European American. They ranged in age from 45 to 65 years old and they averaged 16.5 years in the academy. All had been teachers and administrators in early childhood education previously. Their ranks varied from Associate College Instructor to Professor. Interested in how the participants made meaning of their experiences in the program, I approached them to participate in the study, assuring them confidentiality and gaining their permission to audio-tape and use transcripts from the interviews.

Context of the Program. The Early Childhood Education Program (ECED) at State University of the Southwest (SUSW) is part of the larger Curriculum and Instruction department and is situated in the College of Education along with the Educational Management and Development; Counseling and Educational Psychology; Human Performance, Dance and Recreation, and Special Education and Communication Disorders departments. There are approximately 180 students in the program. Of these students, 1% are American Indian/Alaska Native; 1% are Asian/Pacific Islander; 3% are Black, non-Hispanic; 41% are Hispanic; and 52% are White/Other. These racial and ethnic demographics reflect that of the larger university. Almost all students attend full-time and come from in-state. The program is guided by five full-time faculty members, of whom two are Latinos, one is Latina, and two are White women.

According to participants, the program started a deliberate path for social justice over eight years ago when a new chair for the program was sought and charged with bringing more faculty diversity to the main campus as well as the branch campuses and a program at a Native American reservation. At that time, the larger department, Curriculum and Instruction, was attempting to hire seven faculty members in addition to a chair for the ECED program. The objective was to hire only candidates who could clearly demonstrate a commitment to social justice.

Out of hiring all the new faculty and department chair came new ideas for improvement of practices. For example, the ECED Program has a laboratory school for the children. All teachers in the lab school have a Master's degree or higher. There is diverse instruction in the program—two classrooms are for students with disabilities, one classroom is for Spanish speakers, and one is for bilingual education. Two classrooms provide for a sliding schedule for tuition based on income. Also, there is an early Head Start, which is sponsored and run by the ECED Program. The Early Head Start program is free and takes place at all seven La Clinica de Familia sites. The mission of La Clinica is to promote "the well being of all people of the state through community health and social services" (La Clinica, 2008) and has been a deeply entrenched part of the community since 1965. The larger department, Curriculum and Instruction, is also part of the preK Program Initiative which is targeted at students who go to low income schools.

Defining Social Justice. All participants were asked to provide a personal definition or concept of social

justice. A variety of responses were given: social justice was seen as being a listener to children, parents, the community, students, and others, and learning to be part of that community. While practicing social justice as a listener, one participant said, "We also need to know that real oppression takes many forms and we need to be aware of our own roles with regard to oppression and power." Part of social justice, another insisted, was having these very conversations (about social justice and what it means) in class. One respondent felt that all of the instructors would agree that they still believe they can make a difference and that they must pass this belief to their students and that this was a form of social justice, too.

Yet another participant indicated that he saw social justice as "research as praxis." That is, "using the power of dialog and democratic participation." He believed that the instructors should be conduits to bring about change, the ones to move students from rhetoric to practice. So important is the concept of research as praxis that doctoral students have the option of using it as their research method for their dissertations. He also felt that the mission of the institution, that of outreach and service to the people of the state, forces the program instructors to redefine themselves as an academic community because the separation between the community and the institution is non-existent. This situation, deliberately created, promotes, even forces, social justice to be at the forefront of all program decisions.

Student Selection. Entry into the ECED program at SUSW starts with students preparing and submitting an application portfolio. Student portfolios must include a teacher education program application; resume; official transcripts; standardized test scores; the most recently completed Teacher Candidate Dispositions forms from three faculty members who can recommend the student; a letter of philosophy/intent; recommendation(s) from an employer, school, or organization; a description of evidence of experience with and commitment to working with persons with disabilities and how it relates to being a classroom teacher; a description of evidence of experience with and commitment to other forms of cultural diversity and how it relates to being a classroom teacher, and a description of campus and volunteer activities. Students must also possess a cumulative grade point average of 2.5 or higher at the university—including a grade of "C" or better in all teacher education program prerequisite courses, complete a minimum of 55 undergraduate credit hours, and score 240 or better on the state teacher basic skills test.

All instructors in the program meet once per semester to review each portfolio and meet as a whole to decide upon selection to the program. Students selected for participation in the teacher education program then must submit to fingerprinting and a federal and state background check before they become part of the ECED Program the following semester. Typically, students matriculate individually, but branch campuses admit students once per year as a cohort. The main campus, however,

admits between 15 and 30 students each semester.

Knowledge and Content of the ECED Program Both the mission and the curriculum drive the knowledge and content of the program. Since the ECED Program is a part of the larger Curriculum and Instruction department, it adopts their mission statement. The mission statement includes a description of the type of student the department wishes to promote: "an ethical thinker and actor who uses the discourses of curriculum and instruction to address problems creatively in diverse socio-cultural contexts" (Curriculum and Instruction, 2007); furthermore, the department provides a conceptual framework for the students, faculty, and other constituencies:

> The conceptual framework revolves around the dispositions we attempt to engender in our teacher education, MA and doctoral students, and in ourselves as a faculty and staff, through how we teach, to what we dedicate our physical and intellectual labor power, and the scholarly, discursive and applied contexts we co-create and share. The five dispositions we seek to foster, and attempt to philosophically and pedagogically live by, are: caring, equitable, professional, responsible, and socially just. (Pruyn, personal communication, September 27, 2007)

Further explanation of these dispositions may be found in Appendix A.

Mission of the ECED Program. Decided collectively by the faculty in the program, the mission statement of the program is collectively reviewed each year, sometimes as often as once per semester. The mission of the ECED Program is to

- provide optimal professional teaching and learning experiences at the bachelors, masters, and doctoral level;
- provide quality care, education, and family support programs for children and families of SUSW and the county community college students, faculty and staff, and
- provide opportunities for faculty and graduate students for research, teaching, and service. (SUSW ECED, 2007)
-

Curriculum of the ECED Program. As expected, the curriculum for the ECED Program is dependent on the classification of the student. The course requirements for the bachelor's, master's, and doctorate differ in number, scope, and depth. Students in the Teacher Education program, that is, the bachelor's program, must take credit hours in five general areas: English and Communication Arts (13 credit hours), Mathematics (6 credit hours), Laboratory Sciences (12 credit hours), Social/Behavioral Sciences (6 credit hours), and Humanities and Fine Arts (18 credit hours). Additionally, students

must take six credit hours of "Viewing a Wider World," which are elective courses that must be taken in a college other than the College of Education. Students must complete 33 credit hours in the College of Education and complete 12 credit hours of student teaching. The program also requires an additional 37 credit hours in the Early Childhood Education concentration.

The Master of Arts degree with a Specialization in ECED requires that students take a total of 36 credit hours. Of those credit hours, 15 must be in the Curriculum and Instruction core, 12 in ECE graduate courses, and 9 of ECE electives in a focus area. Both the Ed.D. and Ph.D. are offered at the doctoral level and the number of credit hours required varies considerably, depending on the student's prior degrees and education. It is possible that a doctoral student might have to complete 15 credit hours of prerequisite courses before beginning the doctoral program. The student's doctoral committee works with the student to determine a program of study suited to the goals of the student and the requirements of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. For example, students choose a minor in either Bilingual Education or Early Literacy and must take 12 credit hours in one of these areas. They must also take a research block of approximately 15 credit hours and core courses in curriculum and instruction for 12 credit hours. Students are also required to take 15-19 credit hours in the ECED specialization plus 18 dissertation credit hours. All degree requirements are explained in more detail in Appendix B.

According to the chair of the program, there are formal, specific areas of emphasis at the doctoral level. An area of specialization in either Bilingual Education or Early Literacy is required; however, the chair asserts all programs "are infused with diversity throughout." Indeed, "we build the curriculum from where the child is at. That means taking into consideration all thoughts of diversity—socio-cultural and economic issues, language issues, sexual orientation, race, gender, religion, class, ability and so on."

Pedagogy. Thus the pedagogy found in the ECED program reflects the faculty's strong beliefs and adherence to social justice. One faculty member stated simply, "Look at our research and publications. All of it reflects social justice." The chair of the program emphasized again that hiring of faculty and staff must be done intentionally, that is, with a commitment to social justice and looking for a strong commitment to social justice among those who interview for positions.

New faculty must go beyond merely teaching about social justice; social justice has to "permeate their scholarship and mindset." As for this department, Cochran-Smith (2001) would likely say that program faculty teach "against the grain." She characterizes such pedagogy as critiquing and challenging common practices and engaging into inquiry that is intended to alter the life chances of children. According to Sloan Cannella (1997), child-centered education is rarely discussed in Western or dominant pedagogical discourse. Teachers must be prepared to teach for social justice as

well as for change in societies in which standardization and prescription are often mistakenly accepted as higher standards (Cochran-Smith, 2001).

With regard to student experiences with social justice in the program, the chair of the program reminded me that students are required to have had formal social justice experience in the field before being admitted to the teacher education program. Such experience is submitted as part of their application portfolio. As well, students become further involved in social justice issues by becoming involved in the local Community Action Center. Throughout the program, then, faculty members assess and evaluate students for social justice beliefs and behaviors, both formally and informally, using observation and NCATE dispositions.

*Faculty development.*Professional development for faculty is much easier in this department than in most educational departments. Since the program considers social justice as part of every aspect of the department, the emphasis starts with the intentional hiring of faculty. The position description describes and explains social justice as the essential faculty hiring requirement that is established in the "hiring policy of the program." The policy, she stated, is more than the written record. It is the basis for the program. Vigilance about giving social justice only lip service is still a concern though. In agreement with other authors (Shepherd et al.), the program chair seems to also feel that "we must ensure we resist behaviour and political

rhetoric that refuses to take children's issues seriously."

While focusing so strongly on social justice is considered an imperative for the program, it does not mean that there are not struggles along the way, both within the program and within the larger Curriculum and Instruction department. Resistance to social justice, the chair explained, is occasionally felt in the larger department; however, she ruminated, "We still need to listen to their voices." Somehow the program manages to find a balance between the department's goals and the need to hear all voices, even those of dissent.

The program maintains a multicultural research and study group for faculty and doctoral students. The chair feels that the momentum for social justice is maintained because all program faculty members see social justice "as our field." Likely they agree with Fisher (2001) that by teaching against the grain (Cochran-Smith, 2001), these faculty help bring unknown needs and desires into awareness. By interrupting political dialogue and decision making, consciousness is raised, and we begin and learn to heed inter-relationships, particularly those relationships that result in unequal power.

Developing a Critical Consciousness. Research has repeatedly demonstrated the importance of dealing with diversity in early childhood education (Alloway, 1995; Glover, 1991; MacNaughton, 2000; Robinson, 2002; Robinson & Jones-Diaz, 2000). The ECED program works strongly toward developing a critical consciousness

among its faculty and students. Faculty meet regularly for reflection on the program and to ensure that the direction they are heading is actually where they want and need to be going. Although developing a critical consciousness is a goal for all courses, some courses tend to do a better job at it than others; for example, the Multicultural Education course lends itself very well to such development, but the Health, Safety, and Nutrition course takes a great deal more work in developing a critical consciousness. The faculty also keep in mind that the National Council for Accreditation of Teachers (NCATE) links accreditation to dispositions of students, among other things. According to an ECED faculty member, though, as a program, the faculty find it very important "to look and see if students live up to behaviors, not just thoughts." Although the dispositions help some in developing critical consciousness, some faculty are still resistant to evaluating students for dispositions.

The program faculty maintain that the process for developing a critical consciousness is continuous. As one member stated, "It starts in Multicultural Education [the course] and continues in every course from there." Still, when queried about how the program addresses issues of racism, sexism, classicism, homophobia, biases and prejudices because of home culture or language, (dis)abilities, and other issues, each member of the faculty assert that these issues are covered on each of their classes, so the process is continuous. The program is held accountable to the teacher competencies

for the state and such competencies include most of these issues; however, one faculty member quipped, "We would be looking for these kind of competencies from students whether it was mandated or not."

How Social Justice is Revealed and Renewed. To become a program exemplar for social justice takes lots of planning, dedication, reflection and hard work. According to program faculty, social justice is a journey and no program ever quite "gets there." In the following section of this case study, I will discuss ways the program works with traditionally marginalized groups of people in increasing student achievement, with the influence of biases, and with inclusion of ELL and disabled students as part of their social justice efforts.

With regard to working to increase the presence of traditionally marginalized groups and student achievement, the program faces a challenge to include more men in a program that is traditionally overrepresented by women; furthermore, the program has worked very hard on articulation issues, so that students, often traditionally marginalized ones, can transition from community colleges to a large, public university fairly easily. The program has lobbied the state legislature rather extensively over time and has been instrumental in getting the legislature to pass a statute mandating that all ECED courses must transfer from two to four-year institutions within the state. Thus, articulation of courses, the program personnel feel, is paramount to social justice.

Like increasing the student achievement, especially among traditionally marginalized groups, the program has a vested interest in reducing the biases that can occur in teaching and learning, and instructional leadership. The chair of the program explained that reducing such biases takes considerable effort and time and a program needs faculty members who are dedicated and willing to work through these biases. Here is where, they explained, intentional hiring procedures for faculty members work quite well. The program faculty set out to intentionally craft position descriptions that are reflective of and interesting to potential faculty members whose interests lie in addressing social justice issues. Through intentional hiring and an understanding among any new faculty members, social justice issues become woven into the very fabric of the program. Intentional hiring often leads to increasing the diversity of faculty in the program and, thus, diversity of thinking within the program.

As well as intentional hiring, program faculty also work with a number of grants, contracts, and other projects which are directed toward social justice; for example, the program faculty work with Paseo del Norte Begin at Birth and the SUSW Parent Education Network as well as Proyecto Avanzar and Prior Learning Assessment Center for Early Care, Education and Family Support (P.L.A.C.E.), and La Vida Institute.

Furthermore, the faculty reflect regularly on how well they are doing at all levels of inclusion, especially with a focus on ELL students and students with disabilities. In their lab school, the program has inclusion classrooms for disabled students, ELL, and students requiring any special education services. Since the conception of the program, faculty have inculcated ethics into the curriculum, so students expect to confront new and sometimes difficult issues throughout their studies. To aid in developing ethical, socially-just students, the program faculty start with a course called Professionalism taken early in the bachelor's degree program. Students are prepared to assume instructional leadership roles even as beginning teachers by serving as advocates for children, families, and themselves. They learn to be aware of their own role in social justice. Also, students view allocation of scarce resources through a political and social justice lens and, so, must understand the state's funding system for education. At the master's and doctoral level, students delve into this topic much further. And although students work with accountability and other data, they find that data-driven decisions must be made in conjunction with an emphasis on children in their own context.

Students also view data for decision-making in context. At the bachelor's level they have two courses in assessment and they use diagnostic tools. The faculty members emphasize that the focus remains on the child in context. Nodding seriously, one member said, "Always."

Internships and Practica. Bachelor's students take a minimum of five practica. One practicum must be with children with special needs.

Presently, actual student teaching is one semester long. Students are evaluated with regard to their focus on social justice by both the supervising faculty and department faculty during and after student teaching. Following student teaching, the state mandates an induction period of three years. Called the Mentoring Teacher Program, it is directed in full by the local school district. The department faculty have no real involvement in the mentoring program following graduation. The chair of the department indicated that following up for social justice in the induction period is "a good point, though"; however, the faculty really feel that their students know "we are there for them," as many of their former students call just to "check-in" or for help in situations they are encountering.

Program Evaluation. The faculty of the ECED program reflect about the effectiveness of their program regularly. The faculty uses typical measures in assessing effectiveness of the program of course. Testing throughout coursework as well as scores from the state teacher basic skills test are data that inform faculty about how students are learning. Because social justice is inextricably linked with all coursework, such data reflect how students are internalizing a critical consciousness for social justice as well. Yet, such measures, although informative, are not as tangible as the faculty would like. Thus, using a far more indirect "measure", program faculty feel that students are really "getting it" with regard to social justice and developing a critical consciousness when students feel free to disagree with faculty or ask

"uncomfortable" questions. One faculty member said, "We know [that students are internalizing social justice] when they begin to push against some of the ideas. We know then that they have become advocates for themselves. We know then that they can be advocates for others."

Resistance. It would be inappropriate to say that the program personnel have not encountered resistance in their efforts to infuse social justice throughout the program. A member of a larger department, program personnel feel that they stand far more in front of the push for social justice than the other programs. They do encounter problems with personnel in other departments, especially when they all meet together for faculty meetings. These instructors are quick to bring up social justice issues and to insist that all decisions be made with regard to equity. Some other faculty members in the department perceive them as "troublesome", according to one ECED instructor. To be known as "troublemakers" in this respect, though, is not really demeaning according to all participants interviewed. One faculty member summed up the situation by saying that "it is almost, *almost*, a source of pride because we know that it is really difficult for some people to change. It means we are asking the right questions."

Additionally, the program faculty see themselves as part of a larger entity. They have tried diligently to establish a state-wide network between all higher education ECED programs. They have tried to present a united front to institutional presidents, legislators, the

state Department of Education, and other policy-influencers. Such a method has not always worked well. When an English-only movement started in the state, one of the faculty members, with support from the others, wrote a letter to all the ECED instructors in the state asking them to actively resist the movement. One of the instructors wrote him back, saying that they needed to stay out of "politics." This participant explained, "I am gonna have to tackle her and engage her in discussion. Even if she does nothing, she—and others—should realize that they are guilty by saying nothing."

When speaking about the program's involvement with the state, one participant indicated the resistance he felt. He believes that some of the legislators do not take the problems and concerns of ECED seriously. He wonders on occasion whether it is because the profession of ECED is made up and headed mostly by women. "Early childhood ed in this state is so patriarchal," he stated. As well, he inferred, the most legislators do not like to have their current practices critiqued.

One of the instructors also insists on her students learning to critique current practices. She illustrated an example:

> I create a lot of tension on purpose, especially initially. Most of the resistance seems to come from students who identify as strong Christians. These students have a really hard time with not being homophobic. They're OK with SES, although I think they

would like to think we live in a classless society.

In learning the language of critique, they learn to critique policy, she explained. And after learning the language of critique, "students co-learn the language of possibility." Following this stage, students can then begin to prepare for becoming leaders in their classrooms.

Implications and Recommendations for Socially Just Educational Leadership Programs

Previously, the framework (McKenzie et al., 2008) for educational leadership programs was discussed. Several components—student selection, critical consciousness in teaching and learning, proactive systems of support and inclusive structures, and induction/praxis—were deemed essential for educational leadership programs to have a focus on social justice. In casting the ECED program at State University of the Southwest against the framework for socially just educational leadership programs, there were certain areas that overlapped, a few that intersected, and some that stood alone. Some of these are discussed as recommendations below. Following the recommendations are implications for such programs.

Recommendations. With regard to student selection for our programs, the instructors in the ECED program felt similarly to those who wrote about the social justice framework in leadership preparation programs (McKenzie et al., 2008). They recommend that students who are accepted into our programs

119

have a predisposition toward social justice before they actually enter the programs. Data toward this end can be gathered by having students write about and discuss their beliefs, ethics, goals, and objectives about their field of study. These data can be cast against departmental conceptual frameworks, missions, NCATE dispositions, or other forms that encapsulate social justice. Faculty must also agree about the value and weight of social justice in selecting students.

Critical consciousness in teaching and learning was also covered by the participants in the ECED program. Participants talked about ways in which they challenged students to stretch beyond their initial comfort zones in viewing diverse issues and in looking into their own concerns and shortcomings with regard to equity issues. By introducing students to the language of critique, they learn to question current practice. Questioning current practice creates tension in the students, but it also causes the students to consider whether change is necessary. Doing so moves the student toward the language of possibility, which then courses towards teacher leadership. The process evolves again, creating a critical consciousness which is maintained throughout the students' coursework.

The faculty in the ECED program further believe in the importance of intentionally hiring faculty who are already committed to social justice through activism and scholarship. They believe that doing so increases the critical consciousness not only of their students, but also that of the faculty members themselves. Additionally, the

faculty add to the level of critical consciousness by ensuring that their own scholarship deals with social justice issues.

Proactive systems of support and inclusive structures was another component in the framework. Such systems were in place in the ECED program studied here. Yet the structure of the program was somewhat different than it would be for traditional educational leadership preparation programs. In this case study, the structure purposely included the community and the state as well as the institution. The concept of community for the program was broader. For instance, part of the requirements for the degree involves student practica at the local Community Action Center. The program faculty strongly believe that purposefully structuring the program so that students are involved in more than the institution enables the student to look beyond him or herself. And in doing so, the student learns about inequities, thus furthering the potential for the infusion of social justice.

The faculty themselves also try to structure their work through being active at the state level and among their peers. They have built their program around a thorough commitment in teaching, research, and service to social justice. New faculty enter the ECED ranks knowing the program's commitment to social justice in advance and knowing that the structure under which they will be working is blanketed by social justice. Because of their experience prior to working in the program, faculty know which structures exist that enable inequities and which

can serve as scaffolds to promote a student's learning and progressing toward social justice.

The practices associated with induction and praxis in this program are probably similar to many other ECED programs. While faculty members help supervise the students in the five practica they take while studying for the bachelor's degree, the program faculty no longer serve as real guides during post-degree professional development. That responsibility is headed up by the local school district. While the local school district serves as the facilitator of professional development for new ECED teachers, the focus of the district is more on collecting data and finding ways to raise test scores for the No Child Left Behind Act (H.R. 1, 107th Cong., 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2002) requirements and in locating sufficient funds to keep the personnel and operations of the district functioning. To be fair, focus is placed on "children first," but induction for ECED first-year teachers (as well as the next few years) is not a high priority, given the high number of competing priorities in the district.

The faculty of the ECED program at State University of the Southwest recommend retaining more control of the induction and praxis of first- and subsequent-year teachers. While this represents a significant increase in the responsibilities of the program faculty, the participants in this study believe that induction and praxis are too important to leave to the chance that professional development activities and mentoring new teachers will be meaningful to new teachers and infused

with social justice. The university program faculty must collaborate effectively with school district personnel in not only providing professional development activities for new ECED teachers, but also in mentoring them.

Implications. What we learn from this case study and its recommendations are manifold. Perhaps one of the most important ones is how closely—in many respects—this ECED program's beliefs and values are aligned with those of the framework developed in the McKenzie et al. (2008) piece. For instance, we find strong overlap in the framework's depiction of student selection. Selection of students is quite intentional with faculty looking for students with previous experience in dealing with social justice issues. The implications from such intentional selection indicate that students chosen for the program are pre-disposed toward being socially just. If they indeed are, then the years spent at the university and in practica help the student to develop a richer, more mature social justice perspective. Such students would become teachers better prepared to deal with the needs of diverse children, their families, and communities.

The implications stemming from developing a critical consciousness in teaching and learning are also important. Here we find that this case intersects with the framework; there are common elements between both. Both programs believe that developing a critical consciousness is essential in preparing students for their eventual praxis as professionals. Both programs believe that developing a critical

consciousness should be done purposefully, but the ECED program faculty seem to provide a more focused method of developing critical consciousness among their students. The ECED program speaks to the students and helps them learn and use the language of critique, the language of possibility and, ultimately, a language that prepares students to be socially just leaders. Students begin to see their place as one responsible for questioning practice and developing praxis. Early in their program and through careful mentoring, they find themselves responsible for their learning and their emerging skills of critique. The implications arising from this situation provide for students who are more ready than others to tackle the difficulties inherent in school reform. They have been able to advocate for others as well as themselves and they are not as daunted by a task that can seem overwhelming. Also inherent in the implications from this segment is that the framework posited by McKenzie et al. (2008) has room to grow and be strengthened by others' efforts.

As for proactive systems of support and inclusive structures, the ECED program intersects nicely with the framework. Here we note the emphasis on how the programs are structured intentionally, but the ECED program attaches seemingly more importance to maintaining a blended presence with the larger community outside the institution and with the state as well. Since faculty who join the ECED program must have social justice experience, even activism, they are able to structure such experiences for

students throughout their program. And the implications are enormous. Students who get out into the larger community earlier in their studies seem far more likely to take less time adjusting to differences when they start their teaching careers. If this is the case then these students will be more likely to include families and the larger community into their schools and do so more quickly than their colleagues who were schooled in more traditional programs. We can note that the original framework has potential to grow in this area too.

But with regard to induction and praxis, we find that the ECED program is more like traditional programs and less like the one promulgated by the framework. Once students matriculate from the program, little contact is maintained and professional development is tended to by the local school district. Such is the case in most educational administration programs as well. The implications arising from such traditional methods of induction and praxis are several. The method does not allow for reinforcement of the language of critique, the language of possibility, and leadership preparation. Without reinforcement outside the program and into actual practice, it becomes increasingly easier for new teachers to compromise the carefully built languages of critique and possibilities; without these in place, the preparation of a socially just teacher-leader becomes impossible. Professional development becomes perfunctory as does praxis. Without a line—no matter how slender—connecting the student back to the university, new teachers essentially

would be cut off from newer research and find it more difficult to deal with the ever-increasing demands of a diverse and global society. Worse yet, new teachers might begin to believe or fail to see the connection between their social justice higher education and early childhood education. They might begin to seem worlds apart.

Discussion and Conclusion

The ECED program faculty are proud of many of their accomplishments, one of which is the Southwest Institute for Early Childhood Studies, a symposium and conference held annually and one which the state legislature funds each year as a budget line item. The program faculty also find pride in the Children's Village, a lab school for infants to five-year-olds. Such a lab school provides good support for the students and staff, and the program is free of charge.

Critical to the success of this program has been the selection of students and intentional hiring of "good people with a social justice perspective." Faculty suggest that others who want to work with intentional hiring practices review faculty applicants' curriculum vitae for evidence of work with community agencies or activism work as one means of finding likely evidence of someone who has a social justice "mind bent"; further, program faculty need to meet regularly to continue the "conversation of social justice." The same faculty must also look at congruity between their mission and their program, its faculty and students. If faculty work at a land-grant institution, program faculty suggest revisiting the mission of the land-grant university so that faculty are reminded "who they are supposed to serve."

Still, there are aspects of the program which need more development. The faculty do realize the need for re-conceptualizing social justice in early childhood education. "If social justice really is a journey, then it makes sense to revisit social justice regularly," according to one faculty member. The faculty also look to programs at other universities for ideas and renewal. Looking at other programs is encouraging and it can be done through conferences as well as staying in contact with faculty authors who publish from these institutions. Staying connected to scholarship, to the children, to context, and to social justice remains essential to the goals of this program. Recognizing the program's areas for improvement is vital to the language of critique that the program uses. If the program faculty are not utilizing the language of critique, then it is entirely possible that they will miss the language of possibilities. If teaching the most vulnerable of our children is fraught with importance, then surely it must also be viewed as a system infused with possibilities for a more just and caring place for them.

References

Alloway, N. (1995). *Foundation stones: The construction of gender in early childhood*. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation.

Anderson, G. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 38-59.

Blackmore, J. (2006, August). Social justice and the study and practice of leadership in education: A feminist history. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, (*38*)2, 185-200.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 77-108.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Learning to teach against the (new) grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(1), 3-4.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curriculum and Instruction. (2007). *Handbook for Graduate Programs.* Retrieved September 12, 2008, from http://education.nmsu.edu/depart ments/academic/ci/phd.html

Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S. P. (Eds.). (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Frattura, & Capper, C. A. (2007). *Leading for social justice: Transforming school for all learners.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Glover, A. (1991, October). *Young children and race: A report of a study of two and three year olds.* Paper presented at the Communities Evolution Conference, Sydney, Australia.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, C., & Amanti, C. (2004). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households and classrooms.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Herrity, V. A., & Glasman, N. S. (1999). Training administrators for culturally and linguistically diverse school populations: Opinions of expert practitioners. *Journal of School Leadership*, *9*, 235-253.

Kellner, D. (2003). Toward a critical theory of education. Retrieved January 19, 2009, from http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/papers/edCT2003.htm

La Celle-Peterson, M. W., & Rivera, C. (1994, Spring). Is it real for all kids? A framework for equitable assessment policies for English Language Learners. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(1), 55-75.

La Clinica. (2008). LC Community Health Centers: About LC. Retrieved September 12, 2008, from http://www.lcdfnm.org/copyright.php

Ladson-Billings G. (1998, January). Just what is Critical Race Theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*, 47–68.

Lawrence, S. M., & Tatum, B. D. (1997). Teachers in transition: The impact of antiracist professional development on classroom practice. *Teachers College Record*, *99*(1), 162-178.

MacNaughton, G. (2000). *Rethinking gender in early childhood education*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nicholson, K., Evans, J. F., Tellier-Robinson, D., & Aviles, L. (2001). Allowing the voices of parents to help shape teaching and learning. *The Educational Forum*, *65*(2). Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

No Child Left Behind Act. (2001). H.R. 1, 107th Cong. (2001).

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riester, A. F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002). Principals for social justice: Leaders of school success for children from low-income homes. *Journal of School Leadership*, *12*, 281-304.

Robinson, K. H. (2002). Making the invisible visible: Gay and lesbian issues in early childhood education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *3*(3), 415-434. Retrieved September 12, 2008, from http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2002.3.3.8

Robinson, K. H., & Jones-Diaz, C. (2000). *Diversity and difference in early childhood: An investigation into centre*

policies, staff attitudes and practices. A focus on long day care and preschool in the south west and inner west Sydney regions. Newcastle, Australia: Roger A. Baxter, OAS Engineering Pty Ltd., and the University of Newcastle Research Associates.

Salvato, N. (2006, July 7). Equitable education is possible. *The New Media Journal.us.* Retrieved January 18, 2009, from http://www.therant.us/staff/nsalvato/2007/print/2006/07072006.htm

Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leaership for equity and excellence: Creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Scribner, J. P. (1999). Teacher efficacy and teacher professional learning: Implications for school leaders. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(3), 209-34.

Shepherd, W., Child, M. and Family Study Centre, Institute of Early Childhood, Macquarie University; & Anthony Semann, Social Justice In Early Childhood Group. (2008). Children do not matter: An insight into the political landscape of New South Wales. Retrieved September 12, 2008, from http://www.socialjusticeinearlychildhood.org/articles

Sloan Cannella, G. (1997). *Deconstructing early childhood education: Social justice & revolution.* New York: Peter Lang.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

SUSW ECED. (2007). *SUSW ECED Mission Statement.* Retrieved September 12, 2008, from http://education.nmsu.edu/departments/academic/ci/programs/earlychildhood/index.html

UNESCO (in collaboration with UNICEF). (1997, September). *First steps: Stories of inclusion in early childhood education.* International Consultation on Early Childhood Education and Special Educational Needs. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Special Needs Education, Division of Basic Education. ED 97/WS/39. Retrieved September 13, 2008 from, http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001102/110238eo.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.* Washington, DC: Author, Office of the Secretary, Office of Public Affairs.

Wasonga, T., & Christman, D. E. (2003). Perception and construction of meaning of urban high school experiences among African American university students. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(2), 181-201.

Dana Christman is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Management and Development at New Mexico State University. Dr.Christman has been a member of teams of instructors who have taught a statewide regional doctoral cohort and master cohorts in educational administration. She is currently working with and teaching a cohort of American Indian students in an administrator preparation program. Her research interests include social justice and border issues and processes of change in educational administration and higher education.

Appendix A

State University of the Southwest

Curriculum and Instruction Conceptual Framework Dispositions

The Disposition of CARING…

… involves caring about and caring for. It is caring *about* others that moves an individual toward caring *for* others. When a teacher candidate cares *about* education and access for all, the candidate is moved to stand in solidarity with, and thus care for others. Care is viewed as a matter of relationships among diverse people (e.g., ability, age, ethnicity, gender, language, sexuality, socio-economic status) rather than as an inherent virtue of an individual.

The Disposition of EQUITABLE…

… reflects a commitment to ensure educational access, opportunity, and benefit for all members of society, taking into account historical and on-going unequal distribution of power based on difference.

The Disposition of PROFESSIONAL…

… is the expectation that the teacher candidate will emulate the ethics of the teaching profession. A teacher candidate will recognize the magnitude and responsibilities of the profession toward judgment of self and colleagues in accordance with ethical expectations.

The Disposition of SOCIALLY JUST…

… implies advocating and working for just causes, and working against discrimination

and exclusion or any form of oppression. In classrooms and schools it means Awareness

to promote education as a democratic practice.

Appendix B

State University of the Southwest

Early Childhood Education Curricula

Bachelor of Arts degree (B.A.)

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

2007-2008 Catalog Year (degree requirements remain in effect for 6 years)

Area I: English and Communication Arts (13 cr)

* ENGL 111G (Freshman Composition) 4

ENGL 363 3

* ENGL 211G or 311G 3

COMM 253G or 265G 3

Area II: Mathematics (6 cr)

* MATH 111 (math – elem teachers I) 3

* MATH 112G (math – elem teachers II) 3

* (or MATH 121, MATH 190 & MATH 191 – optional)

Area III: Laboratory Sciences (12 cr – Three different areas with labs, at least one must

be a G course)

ASTR 105G or 110G meet core

BIOL 101G, 110G, 111G or 211G meet core

CHEM 110G, 111 or 112 meet core 4

GEOL 111G, 212 or GEOG 111G meet core 4

PHYS 110G, 120G, 211 or 212 meet core 4

NSC 121G Integrated Natural Science

EE 110 The Science & Engineering of How Things Work (S)

ES 110G Environmental Science (F)

Area IV: Social/Behavioral Sciences (6 cr) (Choose 2 of the following in 2 different departments)

ECON 201G, 251G or 252G

GEOG 112G or 120G

GOVT 100G or 110G

SOC 101G 3

ANTH 201G 3

Area V: Humanities and Fine Arts (18 cr)

HIST 101G or **102G** 3

HIST 201G or **202G** 3

HIST Elective 3

HIST Elective 3

ART 101G, THTR 101G, MUS 101G/201G 3

THTR 360 3

Viewing a Wider World (6 cr) (Must be from 2 different colleges, not ED)

Viewing a Wider World 3

Viewing a Wider World 3

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (33 cr)

C S 110G Computer Literacy 3

C EP 110G Human Growth & Behavior 3

* EMD 101 Freshman Orientation 1

* ECED 115 Child Growth, Develpmt & Learning 3

* ECED 125 Health, Safety & Nutrition 2

* ECED 135 Family & Community Collaboration 3

* ECED 235 Introduction to Reading 3

* ECED 255 Assess of Child & Eval of Programs 3

* ECED 265 Guiding Young Children 3

* EDLT 368 Integrating Technology w/Teaching 3

* EDUC 315 Multicultural Education 3

* SPED 350 Survey of Prgms Exceptional Learner 3

STUDENT TEACHING (12 cr) (Application Deadlines - Spring: March 9 - Fall:

October 9)

* * ECED 470 Student Teaching 6

* * SPED 483 Student Teaching 6

* Courses with an (*) are pre/co-requisites for Teacher Education Program (TEP)

* * Double starred courses require admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP)

*Courses in **BOLD** are guaranteed to transfer to other state colleges/universities as part of the statewide common core.*

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS - EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

* ECED 215 Curr. Develpmt & Implementation I 3 (ECED 220 is co-requisite)

* ECED 220 Practicum I – Infant/Toddler 2 (ECED 215 is co-requisite)

ECED 225 Curr. Develpmt & Implementation II 3 (ECED 230 is co-requisite)

ECED 230 Practicum II – Pre-K/Kindergarten 2 (ECED 225 is co-requisite)

ECED 245 Professionalism 2

* SPED 450 Working with Young Children (F) 3

ECED TEP COURSES (must be admitted to TEP in order to enroll in these courses)

* * ECED 315 Resrch in Child, Grwth, Dvlmt & Lrn 3

* * ECED/ 335 Family and Comm Collaboration II 2

* * SPED 451 Assessment of Young Children (S) 3

* * ECED 420 Integrated E C Curriculum 3 (ECED 425 is co-requisite)

* * ECED 425 Practicum I - 1st-3rd grade 2 (ECED 420 is co-requisite)

* * ECED 430 Methds & Materls for Early Primary 3 (ECED 435 is co-requisite)

* * ECED 435 Practicum II – 1st-3rd grade 2 (ECED 430 is co-requisite)

* * RDG 415 Teaching Reading and Writing 3 (RDG 418 is co-requisite)

* * RDG 418 Reading and Writing 1 (RDG 415 is co-requisite)

TOTAL CREDITS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD 37 HOURS

MINIMUM CREDITS FOR DEGREE 132

MINIMUM UPPER DIVISION REQUIRED (300+) 48

The College of Education requires a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 for graduation and a minimum grade of "C" in all education, TEP pre-requisite and teaching field courses.

This degree plan is designed to meet all of the SUSW general education requirements listed in the undergraduate catalog.

Master of Arts Specialization in ECED (non-licensure)

Minimum Number of Credits: 36

*These courses also count toward licensure in the State.

Prerequisites: (Evidence of these courses/experiences must be provided to the ECED (Early Childhood Education) advisor before graduate ECED courses can be taken):

ECED 360	Introduction to Early Childhood Education	3 credits
ECED 257, 258 or 259	Field Experience	1 credit

A. Curriculum and Instruction Core		15 credits

EDUC 515	Multicultural Education	3credits
EDUC 516	Curriculum & Pedagogy I (foundations and dev.)	3credits
EDUC 518	Technology and Pedagogy	3credits
EDUC 519	Research in Curriculum and Pedagogy	3credits
EDL T 571	Action Research or	3credits
EDUC 517	Curriculum and Pedagogy II	3credits

B. Early Childhood Graduate Courses		12 credits

*ECED 479	Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	3 credits
ECED 510	Issues in Early Childhood Education	3 credits
*ECED 515	Working with Families of Young Children	3 credits
ECED 520	Seminar on Cognitive and Social Development	3 credits

*ECED 550/SPED 550	Early Childhood Special Education	3 credits
*ECED 570	Play in the Early Childhood Curriculum	3 credits

C. Early Childhood Education Elective   9 credits

Nine hours of electives in focus area; approved by ECED advisor. NOTE: Many

specialized courses are not offered every semester.

Doctorate *EdD or PhD in C & I Specialization in ECED

I. Prerequisites12 Credits

Masters degree in Curriculum and Instruction with emphasis in Early Childhood

Education, Early Childhood Development, or related field. Admission to the doctoral

program and interview with Early Childhood Education faculty.

II. Required Core Courses in Curriculum and Instruction
(to be taken as prerequisites to specialization area courses) 15 Credits

EDUC 603	Curriculum for a Diverse Society	3 Credits
EDUC 604	Pedagogy of Learning for a Diverse Society	3 Credits
ECED 612	History and Philosophy of Early Childhood	3 Credits
EDUC 613	Education	3 Credits
EDUC 576	Advanced Research Methods	3 Credits
	Qualitative Research	

III. Specialization 15-19 credits

Doctoral programs can be individualized to each student's interests and needs and will

be co-constructed with and approved by the student's chair and doctoral committee. All

doctoral students in this specialization, in consultation with their doctoral committee,

will choose courses from the following Curriculum and Instruction and specialization courses:

ECED 605 Independent Study Topics in Early Childhood Education 1-3 credits

ECED 607 Interdisciplinary Doctoral Seminar 3 credits

ECED 612 History and Philosophy of Early Childhood Education 3 credits

ECED 614 Families and Social Policy 3 credits

ECED 636 Teacher Education and Professional Development 3 credits

ECED 698 Selected Topics in Early Childhood Education 1-6 credits

and from the following additional cross-listed courses:

ECED 623 Curriculum and Instructional Leadership 3 credits

ECED 633 Praxis and Reflexivity 3 credits

EDUC 602 Internship 1-6 credits

(Selected Course Descriptions appear in Appendix A of the Doctoral Handbook)

IV. Minor 12 credits

All doctoral students in this specialization will choose a minor in either Bilingual

Education-or Early Literacy. The required courses are:

Bilingual Education	Issues in Bil Education Lang & Literacy for BIL	Early Literacy	
BIL 520	Students	RDG 511	Literacy Assessment and Evaluation
BIL 522	Acquiring Emancipatory	RDG 530	Socio-psycholinguistics of Reading
BIL 616	Discourses	RDG 612	Multiculturalism, Literature, & Inquiry
BIL 637	Social Justice Issues in Education	RDG 630	Ethnography of Reading and Writing

V. Research Block 12-15 credits

As part of the required research block outlined in the review, doctoral students in early childhood education should take ECED 606: Inquiry in Early Childhood Education.

Complete the rest of the doctoral program requirements.

NOTE: The Ph.D. program requires residency and language or computer tools sequence.