Early Childhood Development and Education: Integrating Research and Policy Perspectives

Semester I: HUDK 6013.001
Semester II: EDPA 6013.001

Course Syllabus for Fall, 2013 and Spring, 2014

Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, Ph.D.
Department of Human Development

and

Sharon L. Kagan, Ed.D.
Department of Education Policy and Social Analysis

Teachers College
Columbia University

RATIONALE:

   Historically, work related to young children and the policies that impact them has been rooted in three quite distinct perspectives: developmental theory, as manifest in the discipline of child development; pedagogical theory, as manifest in the discipline of curriculum and teaching; and policy theory, as manifest in the discipline of political and policy science. Those who approached scholarship from the developmental perspective adopted a lens through which young children were seen to proceed through a logical, sequenced, and fairly predictable pattern of growth. Issues focused on the child's development. In contrast, those who approached young children from the pedagogical perspective concerned themselves with how children are taught, and how and what they learn. Learning, rather than development, was the focus. Finally, a limited few addressed young children from the policy perspective, examining the structures and laws that impact development and education. All three perspectives, however, have changed a great deal recently, with the disciplines of sociology, anthropology, demography, public health, and economics gaining currency. Today, developmental, pedagogical, and policy scholars alike are concerned with the contexts in which development and learning take place, the intersection of family and community, and the disparities in school readiness among different groups of children. Moreover, scholars are increasingly concerned about generating and using research that is relevant to policy.

   Although our ideas about young children and their development and learning have undergone tremendous shifts, the nature of our course offerings has not. Some courses are taught in and from the human development perspective; others stress a pedagogical orientation to early childhood development; and still a few others are taught from the policy perspective. Few systematically address the formulation of research that is likely to impact practice and policy, focusing on dissemination mechanisms that must be established to make child and family knowledge optimally usable. The National Center for Children and Families at Teachers College, Columbia University (www.policyforchildren.org) is designed to be a home for this kind of cross fertilization, successfully producing scholars who are "switch hitters" in the worlds of development, learning, and policy. Yet, many of our students, along with others at the College, have been interested in being engaged in a formal series of courses that would evoke rigorous debate, thinking, and scholarship around these diverse and changing perspectives. Moreover, they are interested in systematically examining the most pressing social issues that challenge the advancement of early childhood development, nationally and internationally.

   To that end, Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan are jointly teaching a ***two-semester course with students required to participate for both semesters. There will be absolutely no exceptions to the two-semester requirement.*** Created as an intellectual sequence, the two-semester course will be offered for six credits, three each semester. The first semester, for which students will register as HUDK 6013.001, will focus on diverse perspectives and major research framing the field. . Building on this background, the second semester, for which students will register as EDPA 6013.001, will address critical issues for which we have empirical data to support policy changes. By design, then, the first semester will present the empirical basis for the policy changes covered in the second semester.

   In total, the course is designed to help students overcome the historical and disciplinary dichotomies among development, education, and policy so that all three are regarded as forming

an essential triad for enhancing the lives of young children and preparing them for school. A secondary purpose of this course, often verbalized but infrequently realized, is to prepare students to think critically and prospectively about the application of child development and pedagogical research to practice and policy. Indeed, perhaps as in no other field has this nexus been the pivot on which recent American and global child policy has turned; our goal is to guide students to use contemporary issues as the springboard for their future research. In this way, we intend for the course to have a living legacy in the research that our scholars conduct and in the policies they will influence.

Open to a maximum of 16 Ph.D., Ed.D., and M.Ed. students from Teachers College and others from Columbia Graduate Schools with instructors' permission, all students are expected to enroll for both semesters. Held in 3-hour blocks of time, each course session affords the opportunity for thorough discussions of the issues presented in the readings, often coupled with a set of interactive assignments. Given this orientation and these goals, the course expects to draw advanced students primarily from the Departments of Education Policy and Social Analysis, Human Development, and Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College. In addition, we expect that there will be some students from the Departments of Organization and Leadership, and International and Transcultural Studies. More specifically, we expect that we will attract students from programs including Early Childhood Education, Developmental Psychology, Sociology and Education, Economics and Education, Education Policy Studies, Cognitive Studies in Education, Education Leadership, and Comparative and International Education. It is likely that this course series will also appeal to students from the Columbia Graduate Schools of Law, Social Work, Public Health, and International and Public Affairs.

COURSE SERIES GOALS:

- *To provide graduate students with an up-to-date research-to-policy course that arms them with the theoretical and practical knowledge they will need to assume leadership positions in child and family policy.*

- *To provide an integrated course for Teachers College and Columbia graduate students who focus on the development and education of young children.*

- *To provide graduate students a blueprint of how knowledge about young children can be translated into policy and how policy issues are framed.*

- *To foster the leadership development of Teachers College and Columbia graduate students who expect to shape policies impacting young children and their families.*

- *To provide a working model of how Teachers College faculty with different training and research skills can pursue policy goals together.*

SEMESTER I: HUDK 6013.001

USING RESEARCH TO ADDRESS CHALLENGING ISSUES IN CONTEMPORARY EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

FOR THIS SEMESTER, ALL CLASSES WILL TAKE PLACE FROM 2:00 TO 5:00 PM ON THE INDICATED DATES

Please Note:

All readings are required, except those that are recommended/optional and are marked with an asterisk (*). Written assignments should be double-spaced with one-inch margins on all sides and be prepared in 12-point Times New Roman type. Late assignments will be down-graded.

I.1   September 17, 2013
        Week 1: General Introduction (Led by Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan)

GOALS:

- To acquaint students with the course rationale, goals, and content

- To set the tone and context for the course

- To explicate the syllabus and discuss grading and assignments

I.2   October 1, 2013
        Week 2: Historical Perspectives (Led by Professor Kagan)

GOALS:

- To provide a review of the evolution of American early childhood and family policy

- To impart the role that historical events have played in shaping the nature and evolution of contemporary services for young children

- To provide an overview of the roots of the contemporary challenges facing American Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Early Childhood Development (ECD)

- To have students develop a systemic perspective on American ECE

READINGS:

Cahan, E. (1989). *Past caring: A history of U.S. preschool care and education for the poor, 1820-1965*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty. [pp. 1-50].

Fuller, B. (2007). *Standardized childhood: The political and cultural struggle over early education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [pp.32-71]

Grubb, W. N. & Lazerson, M. (1982). *Broken promises: How American's fail their children*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers. [pp. 11-66].

Lombardi, J. (2003). *Time to care: Redesigning child care to promote education, support families, and build communities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. [pp. 29-53].

Steiner, G. Y. (1981). *The futility of family policy*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. [Chapters 1, 2, and 7, pp. 3-46, pp. 193-215].

ASSIGNMENT:

Taking the five readings assigned for Session I.2, students will prepare a two-page reaction paper that delineates the readings' common and discordant themes. This is to be an analytic essay, not a summary of the articles. Students should be prepared to present the ideas discussed in their papers orally in class. Written papers are due ***Friday, September 27, 2013 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.3   ***October 8, 2013***
         Week 3: Developmental Perspectives (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To highlight the role that context plays in child development

- To highlight the roles that vulnerability and resilience play in child development

- To highlight the interaction of environment and biology in child development

- To provide a brief overview of work on the inter-relatedness of emotional and cognitive development

READINGS:

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22*, 723-742.

Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). The neighborhoods where young children grow up. In S. L. Kagan & K. Tarrant (Eds.), *Transitions for young children: Creating connections across early childhood systems* (pp. 211-225). Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Collins, W. A., Maccoby, E. A., Steinberg, L., Hetherington, M. E., & Bornstein, M. H. (2000). Contemporary research on parenting: The case for nature and nurture. *American Psychologist, 55*(2), 218-232.

Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review, 102*, 458-489.

Masten, A. S., & Gewirtz, A. H. (2006). Vulnerability and resilience in early child development. In K. McCartney & D. Phillips (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of early childhood development* (pp. 22-43). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2003). Does quality of child care affect child outcomes at age 4½ ? *Developmental Psychology*, *39,* 451-469.

*The NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (Ed.). (2005). *Child care and child development: Results from the NICHD study of early child care and youth development*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

*Sameroff, A. J., & Rosenblum, K. L. (2007). Psychosocial constraints on the development of resilience. *Annals of the New York Academy of the Sciences, 1094,* 116-124.

*Shonkoff, J., Boyce W., & McEwen, B. (2009). Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the childhood roots of health disparities: Building a new framework for health promotion and disease prevention. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 301*, 2252-2259.

*Turkheimer, E., Haley, A., D'Onofrio, B., Waldron, M & Gottesman, I. I. (2003). Socioeconomic status modifies heritability of IQ in young children. *Psychological Science, 14*, 623-628.

ASSIGNMENT:

Each student will write a three-page essay using the four types of interventions outlined by Masten and Gewirtz (asset-focused, risk-focused, protection-focused, and vulnerability-focused intervention strategies). For each type of intervention strategy, the student will describe an early childhood EDUCATION program that would be indicative of that strategy. Please note that each intervention must be an early childhood education program (in the article, Masten and Gewirtz use examples from a wide spectrum of programs—health, welfare, education, child protective

services, home visiting services). Written papers are due *Friday, October 4, 2013 at 5:00 PM* by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.4   *October 22, 2013*
          Week 4: Equity Perspectives (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To understand how more and less affluent families are becoming less similar over time

- To understand inequities in receipt of ECE services

- To understand inequities in the quality of care received by more and less affluent families

- To understand how current policies help reduce inequities in receipt of and in the quality of ECE services (subsidized care and quality initiatives)

READINGS:

Burchinal, M., Nelson, L., Carlson, M., Brooks-Gunn, J. (2008). Neighborhood characteristics and child care type and quality. *Early Education & Development, 19*(5), 702 – 725.

*Forry, N. (2008). The impact of child care subsidies on low-income single parents: An examination of child care expenditures and family finances. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 30*(1), 43-54.

Heclo, H. H. (1997). Values underpinning poverty programs for children. *Future of Children, 7*(2), 141-148.

Magnuson, K. A., & Waldfogel, J. (2005). Early childhood education and care: Effects on ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness. *Future of Children, 15,* 169-196.

McLanahan, S. (2004). Diverging destinies: How children are faring under the second demographic transition. *Demography, 41*(4), 607-627.

*NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1997). Poverty and patterns of child care. In J. Brooks-Gunn & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Consequences of Growing up Poor* (pp. 100-131). New York, NY: Russell-Sage.

Pittard, M., Zaslow, M., Lavelle, B., & Porter, T. (2006). *Investing in quality: A survey of state child care and development fund initiatives*. Washington, DC: American Public Human Services Association and Child Trends.

Waldfogel, J. (2006). *What children need* (pp. 1-10 and 83-125). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *Introduction and Chapter 3

ASSIGNMENT:

Inequities in receipt of ECE services: Why are Hispanic families less likely to have their children in ECE? There are several potential factors, including:
- Availability of ECE services in communities with large Hispanic populations
- Differences in maternal workforce participation
- Cultural influences
- Parental immigrant status
- Language barriers

Students will be assigned to each of these possibilities. Each student will research whether their factor is likely to be contributing to the take-up of ECE by Latin American families. Each student will prepare a three-page essay and present the content of their work for three to five minutes. Students may prepare a one- to two-page handout for the class, if they wish. Written papers are due **Friday, October 18, 2013 at 5:00 PM** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.5   October 29, 2013
**   Week 5: Quality Perspectives** (Led by Professor Kagan)

GOALS:

- To understand what constitutes quality in early education and development services

- To understand the contributors to quality

- To understand the quality of contemporary services

- To understand the inequitable distribution of quality

READINGS:

Kagan, S. L. (2009). *American early childhood education: Preventing or perpetuating inequity*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Campaign for Educational Equity.

Myers, R. G. (2006). *Quality in program of early childhood care and education (ECCE)*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, & Duncan, G. J. (2003). Modeling the impacts of child care quality on children's preschool cognitive development. *Child Development, 74*, 1454 – 1475.

*Phillips, D., & Adams, G. (2001). Child care and our youngest children. *Future of Children, 11,* 35-52.

*Vandell, D., & Wolfe, B. (2000). *Child care quality: Does it matter and does it need to be improved?* Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.

ASSIGNMENT:

Taking the three required readings assigned for Session I.5, students will prepare a two-page reaction paper that delineates their common and discordant themes. This is to be an analytic essay, not a summary of the articles. Students should be prepared to present the ideas discussed in their papers orally in class. Written papers are due ***Friday, October 25, 2013 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.6 *November 5, 2013*
Week 6: The Research Base (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To understand what research data bases are necessary to understand early childhood development and education

- To understand the value of nationally representative data bases

- To learn about the value of secondary data analysis of national data bases

- To gain knowledge about some of the most relevant data bases for early childhood education

- To provide examples of the use of national data bases to address some current policy issues in early childhood education

READINGS:

Brooks-Gunn, J., Berlin, L. J., Leventhal, T., & Fuligni, A. (2000). Depending on the kindness of strangers: Current national data initiatives and developmental research. *Child Development, 71*, 257-267.

*Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Mott, F. L., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Phillips, D. (1991). Children of the NLSY: A unique research opportunity. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 918-931.

Fuligni, A. S., McCabe, L., McLanahan, S., & Roth, J. (2003). Four new national longitudinal surveys on children. In J. Brooks-Gunn, A. S. Fuligni, & L. J. Berlin (Eds.), *Early child development in the 21st Century: Profiles of current research initiatives* (pp. 326-359). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Gyamfi, P., Cabrera, N., &, Roth, J. (2003). Early child care initiatives: Part II. In J. Brooks-Gunn, A. S. Fuligni, & L. J. Berlin (Eds.), *Early child development in the 21st Century: Profiles of current research initiatives* (pp. 201-224). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2003). Early childcare initiatives: Part I. In J. Brooks-Gunn, A. S. Fuligni, & L. J. Berlin (Eds.), *Early child development in the 21st Century: Profiles of current research initiatives* (pp. 182-200). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

ASSIGNMENT:

Each student will write a three-page essay discussing the benefits and limitations of the non-experimental studies. Each student will list four benefits and four limitations. In addition, each student will choose the study which he/she believes has the most potential to address questions related to ECE and the study which he/she believes has the least potential. Remember to give rationale for your choices. The studies include the PSID-CDS, the NLSY-CS, the NICHD Early Child Care Research Study, the ECLS-K, the ECLS-B, and the Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study. Written papers are due ***Friday, November 1, 2013 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.7   November 12, 2013
Week 7: ECE and Child Well-being: The Experimental Approaches (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To understand the strengths and liabilities of experimental research

- To familiarize students with the extensive literature on the efficacy of early childhood education

- To understand the differences between short-term and long-term impacts

- To learn about cost-benefit analyses used in ECE

READINGS:

*Barnett, W. S. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on cognitive and school outcomes. *The Future of Children, 5*, 25-50.

Barnett, W. S. (2011). Effectiveness of educational intervention. *Science, 333*(6045), 975-978.

*Belfield, C. (2007). The promise of early childhood education intervention. In C. R. Belfield & H. M. Levin (Eds.), *The price we pay* (pp. 200-224). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Camilli, G., Vargas, S., Ryan, S., & Barnett, W. S. (2010). Meta-analysis of the effects of early education interventions on cognitive and social development. *Teachers College Record, 112.*

*Campbell, F., Ramey, C., Pungello, E., Sparling, J., & Miller-Johnson, S. (2002) Early childhood education: Young adult outcomes from the Abecedarian Project. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(1), 42-57.

*Currie, J. (2001). Early childhood education programs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *15*(2), 213–238.

Duncan, G.J., Magnuson, K. (2013). Investing in Preschool Programs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 27*, 109-132.

Heckman, J. J. (2006). Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science, 312,* 1900-1902.

*Heckman, J. Moon, S., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P., Yavitz, A. (2010). The rate of return to the High Scope Perry Preschool Program. *Journal of Public Economics, 94*(1-2), 114-128.

Karoly, L., Kilburn, R. Cannon, J. Bigelow, J. & Christina, R. (2005). Many happy returns: Early childhood programs entail costs, but the paybacks could be substantial. *RAND Review, 29*(3), 10-17.

Waldfogel, J. (2008). Economic Dimensions of Social Policy. In J. Midgely, et al. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Policies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

ASSIGNMENT:

Each student will write a three-page essay comparing the Perry Preschool and Abecedarian Program's short-term and long-term results. How do the results differ and why do you think they do? Which program would you implement nationwide and why? Why would you not implement the other one? Written papers are due ***Friday, November 8, 2013 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.8   ***November 19, 2013***
         Week 8: ECE and Child Well-being: The Non-experimental Studies (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To understand the use of large-scale longitudinal studies in ECE

- To understand the limits of these studies

- To highlight the findings, and debate, about negative influences of ECE on behavior

- To consider the role of families versus ECE on school readiness

READINGS:

Chetty, R., Friedman, J.N., Hilger, N., Saez, E., Whitmore Schanzenbach, D., Yagan, D. (2011). How does your kindergarten classroom affect your earnings? Evidence from Project Star*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 126*, 1593-1669.

*Crockenberg, S. (2003) Rescuing the baby from the bathwater: How gender and temperament (may) influence how child care affects child development. *Child Development, 74*, 1034-1038.

Gormley, W.T., Gayer, T., Phillips, D., & Dawson, B. (2005). The effects of universal Pre-K on cognitive development. *Developmental Psychology, 41,* 872-884.

Hill, C., Gormley, W., & Adelstein, S. (2012). Do the short-term effects of a strong preschool program persist? Georgetown University Center for Research on Children in the United States Working Paper # 18.

Love, J. M., Harrison, L., Sagi, A., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Ross, C., Ungerer, J., Raikes, H., Brady-Smith, C., Boller, K., Brooks-Gunn, J., Constantine, J., Kisker, E., Paulsell, D., & Chazan-Cohen, R. (2003). Child care quality matters: How conclusions may vary with context. *Child Development, 74*, 1021-1033.

Magnuson, K., Ruhm, C. & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Does pre-kindergarten improve school preparation and performance? *Economics of Education Review, 26*(1), 33-51.

McCartney,K., Burchinal, M., Clarke-Stewart, A., Bub, K., Owen, M., Belsky, J., & NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2010). Testing a Series of Causal Propositions Relating Time in Child Care to Children's Externalizing Behavior. *Developmental Psychology, 46* (1), 1-17.

*NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2003). Does amount of time spent in child care predict socioemotional adjustment during the transition to kindergarten? *Child Development, 74,* 976–1005.

*NICHD Early Child Care Research Network & Duncan, G. J. (2003). Modeling the impacts of child care quality on children's preschool cognitive development. *Child Development, 74*, 1454-1475.

*NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (Ed.). (2005). *Child care and child development: Results from the NICHD study of early child care and youth development*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

*Vandell, D., Belsky, J., Burchinal, M., Steinberg, L., Vandergrift, N., and the NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2010). Do Effects of Early Child Care Extend to Age 15 Years? Results from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development. *Child Development, 81* (3), 737-756.

*Watamura, S., Donzella, B., Alwin, J. & Gunnar, M. (2003). Morning-to-afternoon increases in cortisol concentrations for infants and toddlers at child care. *Child Development, 74*, 1006-1020.

Weiland, C., & Yoshikawa, H. (2013). Impacts of a prekindergarten program on children's mathematics, language, literacy, executive function, and emotional skills. *Child Development,* 1-19.

ASSIGNMENT:

Two groups will be formed to debate the findings on possible links between early childhood education and aggressive behavior. The first group will argue that this link is important and an issue for ECE. The second group will argue just the opposite. Each group will be limited to 4 Powerpoint slides. Each group will want to do additional reading to support their side of the debate. Powerpoint slides are due ***Friday, November 15, 2013 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

I.9   *December 3, 2013*
         Week 9: Student Oral Presentations (Led by Kagan and Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To demonstrate an understanding of how research does and does not influence policy

- To communicate research effectively

- To learn from student colleagues about the diverse range of research that can impact social policy

ASSIGNMENT:

Paper on Using Research to Inform Policy
Taking one of the primary research topics presented during the semester, each student will develop a ten-page paper that demonstrates how research has been used to impact a policy related to early education and development. The paper will present the research fully, discussing its strengths and limitations. It will delineate how the research was disseminated and used to inform policy; describe the nature of the policy the research informed; and discuss the overall social utility of the research. The paper will also discuss how the research could have been more effective in the policy process. Written papers are due ***Friday, November 29, 2013 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

Oral Presentation on Using Research to Inform Policy
Each student will present his/her paper from the above assignment. The presentation time should incorporate three minutes of questions from peers. ***These presentations will take place in class on December 3, 2013.***

SEMESTER I – GRADING

- ***Paper on Using Research to Inform Policy***
  [Due on Friday, November 29, 2013]   *30%*

- ***Oral Presentation on Contemporary Policy Analysis***
  [Presented in Class I.9 on December 3, 2013]   *10%*

- ***Two Reaction Papers @ 5% each***   *10%*
  [For classes I.2 and I.5/

- ***Four Essays and One PowerPoint @ 8% each***   *40%*
  [For classes I.3, I.4, I.6, and I.7, students are expected to write three-page essays according to the specific assignment described for each session. For session I.8 students are expected to prepare and present a PowerPoint.]

- ***Class Discussion Participation***   *10%*
  [Individually graded based on amount and nature of participation throughout the semester]

SEMESTER II:

INTEGRATING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES
ON EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

FOR THIS SEMESTER, ALL CLASSES WILL TAKE PLACE
FROM 11:00 AM TO 2:00 PM ON THE INDICATED DATES

Please Note:

All readings are required, except those that are recommended/optional and are marked with an asterisk (*). Written assignments should be double-spaced with one-inch margins on all sides and be prepared in 12-point Times New Roman type. Late assignments will be down-graded.

II.1   January 21, 2014
Week 1: ECE and Child Well-being: Two Federal Evaluations of Head Start and Early Head Start (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To familiarize students with the two large-scale evaluations of federal programs in the ECE field—Early Head Start and Head Start

- To obtain experience in reading federal reports of evaluations and understand how such results are interpreted

- To see how different groups might interpret the results differently

- To provide an example of how policy researchers doing evaluation research present their results

READINGS:

Deming, D. (2009). Early childhood intervention and the life-cycle sill development: Evidence from Head Start. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 1,* 111-134.

Love, J. M., Chazan-Cohen, R., Raikes, H., & Brooks-Gunn, J.. (2013). *What makes a difference? Early Head Start Evaluation findings in a longitudinal context.* Monograph from the Society for Research in Child Development .

*Love, J. M., Kisker, E., Ross, C., Raikes, H., Constantine, J., Boller, K., Brooks-Gunn, J., Chazan-Cohen, R., Tarullo, L. B., Schochet, P. Z., Brady-Smith, C., Fuligni, A. S., Paulsell, D. & Vogel, C. (2005). The effectiveness of Early Head Start for 3-year old children and their parents: Lessons for policy and programs. *Development Psychology, 41,* 885-901.

Ludwig, J. & Miller, D.L. (2007). Does Head Start improve children's life chances? Evidence from a regression discontinuity design," <u>*The Quarterly Journal of Economics*</u>, *122*,159-208.

Ludwig, J. & Phillips, D. (2008). Long-term effects of Head Start on low-income children. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 257–268.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2010). *Head Start impact study: Final report, January 2010*. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

*U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2010). *Head Start impact study: First year findings, June 2005*. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

Zhai, F., Waldfogel, J., Lee, R., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2013). Effects from the Head Start Impact Study depending on alternative child care arrangements. Manuscript submitted for publication.

ASSIGNMENT:

One-half of the students will be assigned to either the Head Start Impact Study or the Early Head Start Evaluation Study. For the Head Start Impact Study, one-half of the students will be asked to argue that Head Start is not particularly effective. The other team will argue the opposite. Teams will be assigned one week before class. Each team will have 10 minutes for presentation, and 5 minutes for discussion and rebuttal. Each group may present no more than 5 PowerPoint slides. For those students assigned to examine Early Head Start, the same procedure will be used. Groups should check relevant policy websites for discussions of the findings of these two evaluations. Debates on the results of the two evaluations are ongoing in D.C. Possible websites include: Child Trends, Brookings Institution, Center for the Developing Child, National Center for Children in Poverty, RAND, and CLASP.

II.2   January 28, 2014
          Week 2: Pedagogical Perspective (Led by Professor Kagan)

GOALS:

- To familiarize students with diverse approaches to early childhood pedagogy and to be able to distinguish their differences

- To have students understand one pedagogical approach in depth

- To have students reflect on the different intentions and outcomes of different approaches to pedagogy

READINGS:

Bowman, B. T., Donovan, M. S., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2001). *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. [pp. 182-232].

Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S. (2008). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children. [pp. 1-50].

Kagan, S. L., & Hallmark, L. (2002). The pendulum of early childhood curriculum: A story of changing contexts and ideologies. In. V. Sollars (Ed.), *Curricula, policies, and practices in early childhood education*. Malta: P.E.G. Ltd. [pp. 14-22].

Wien, C. A. (2008). *Emergent curriculum in the primary classroom: Interpreting the Reggio Emilia approach in schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. [pp. 5-16; 144-161].

Wolfe, J. (2002). *Learning from the past: Historical voices in early childhood education*. Alberta, Canada: Piney Branch Press. [pp. 51-135; 165-247].

ASSIGNMENT:

Students will be divided into five teams. Each team will be assigned one pedagogical theorist, study that approach, and present a mock "preschool lesson" using that theorist's orientation in class. Teams will also reflect on their theorist, discern the similarities and differences to the other theorists studied, and discuss the theorist's foundational role in shaping contemporary early childhood pedagogical practices. The five to be covered include Pestalozzi, Froebel, Dewey, Montessori, and Malaguzzi (Reggio Emilia).

II.3 **February 11, 2014**
  Week 3: Structural/Systemic Perspectives (Led by Professor Kagan).

GOALS:

- To understand the divided service delivery structure of American early childhood education

- To understand different perspectives and visions of an early childhood system, including an international perspective on systems and system-building

- To design a functional early childhood system

READINGS:

Goffin, S., & Washington, V. (2007). *Ready or not: Leadership choices in early care and education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. [pp.6-58].

Kagan, S. L. & Neville. P. (1993). *Integrating services for children and families: Understanding the past to shape the future*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. [pp. 3-79].

Kagan, S. L., & Cohen, N. (1997). *Not by chance: Creating an early care and education system for America's children* (abridged version). New Haven, CT: Yale University Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy.

Kagan, S.L. & Kauerz, K. (2012). *Early childhood systems: Transforming early learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. [pp. 137-200]

Sugarman, J. (1991). *Building early childhood systems*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America. [Chapters 3 and 4, pp. 37-68].

ASSIGNMENT:

Taking all the readings assigned for Session II.3, students will prepare a two-page reaction paper that delineates their common and discordant themes. This is to be an analytic essay, not a summary of the articles. Students should be prepared to present the ideas discussed in their papers orally in class. Written papers are due ***Friday, February 7, 2014 by 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

II.4   February 25, 2014
        Week 4: Critical Research Topics: The Illusive Workforce (Led by Professor Kagan)

GOALS:

- To understand the current composition and nature of the early childhood workforce

- To understand the nature of the research regarding the current workforce

- To understand contemporary strategies being implemented to improve the data base on the early childhood workforce

- To consider long-term options for workforce improvement

READINGS:

Bassok, D., Fizpatrick, M., Loeb, S., & Paglayan, A.S., (2012). *The early childhood care and education workforce in the United States: Understanding changes from 1990 through 2010.* Paper presented at Association for Education Finance and Policy, 2012.

Fukkink, R.G. & Lont, A. (2007). Does training matter: A meta-analysis and review of caregiver training studies. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly 22*(1), 294-311.

Kagan, S. L., & Bowman, B. T. (Eds.). (1997). *Leadership in early care and education.* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children. [Chapter 1, pp. 3-8, and Chapter 7, pp. 59-66].

Kagan, S. L., Kauerz, K., & Tarrant, K. (2007). *The early care and education teaching workforce at the fulcrum*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. [Chapters 3-5, pp. 23-75; Chapter 9, pp. 131-146.]

Tout, K., Zaslow, M., & Berry, D. (2006). Quality and qualifications: Links between professional development and quality in early care and education settings. In M. Zaslow & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.), *Critical issues in early childhood professional development* (pp. 77-110). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Zigler, E., Gilliam, W.S., & Barnett, W.S. (2011). *The pre-k debates: Current controversies and issues*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Company. [pp. 48-83]

 ASSIGNMENT:

Each student will prepare a 500 word op-ed piece suitable for publication in a newspaper. The op-ed piece should state the nature of the workforce problem, citing reasons for its existence. It should take a clear stance on the issue and make recommendations for the stance taken. Keep in mind that this must be suitable for publication so, while the points need to be well grounded in solid scholarship, the piece does not need citations. In class, each student will share the written op-ed piece, and the group will be divided according to stances taken to debate the issue Written op-eds are due ***Friday, February 21, 2014 by 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

II.5   *March 11, 2014*
             Week 5: Schoolification and Accountability (Led by Professor Kagan)

GOALS:
 - To understand the seminal issues that are undergirding contemporary ECE schoolification efforts

 - To understand the adequacy of the research base to influence such shifts in practice and policy

 - To understand the pros and cons of standards and assessments, and of the schoolification of the EC curriculum

 - To formulate a cogent debate on the issues, with both sides presented

- To discuss the role of research in inspiring controversy

READINGS:

Schoolification Readings:

Kagan, S.L. (2013). David, Goliath, and the ephemeral parachute: The relationship from a United States perspective. In P. Moss (Ed.), *Early childhood and compulsory education: Reconceptualizing the relationship.* Oxford, England: Routledge.

Zigler, E., Gilliam, W.S., & Barnett, W.S. (2011). *The pre-k debates: Current controversies and issues*. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing Company. [pp. 83-116]

Accountability Readings:

National Research Council. (2008). *Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What and How.* Committee on Developmental Outcomes and Assessments for Young Children, C.E. Snow and S.B. Van Hemel, Editors, Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Board on Testing and Assessment, Divisions of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. [pp.13-55; 341-376]

Shepard, L., Kagan, S.L.. & Wurtz, E. (1998*), Principles and recommendations for early childhood assessments.* Washington, DC: The National Education Goals Panel.

Snow, K. (2011). *Developing kindergarten readiness and other large-scale assessment systems: Necessary considerations for the assessment of young children*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

ASSIGNMENT:

Each student will each prepare a pro/con analysis for ***both*** issues—schoolification and accountability—with each analysis being no more than three pages. This written assignment is due ***Friday, March 7, 2014 by 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan. When students come to class, they will be randomly assigned to one of two groups, with each group focusing on one issue. Using the written pro/con analysis they have prepared, each group will be have 45 minutes in class to prepare a presentation that enables them to present the pros and cons of their assigned issue to the entire class. The presentation may be in the form of a structured debate, a quiz show, or any vehicle that enables both sides of the issue (and the research associated with it) to be fully presented. For the presentation, each issue group will have 45 minutes, including 15 minutes for whole group discussion.

Anticipated schedule:
11:00 – 11:45 Group assignments and team planning time
11:45 - 12:00 Break
12:00 - 12:45 Schoolification Presentation
12:45 - 12:55 Break

12:55 - 1:40   Accountability Presentation
1:40 - 1:50   Professors' Summary

II.6   *April 8, 2014*
           Week 6: Continuity and Transitions (Led by Professor Kagan)

GOALS:

- To understand the nature and sources of discontinuity in early education services

- To understand the history of transition efforts in the United States

- To understand the nature of transition efforts internationally

- To understand contemporary approaches to linking early childhood and primary efforts

READINGS:

Kagan, S.L., & Neuman, M.J. (1998). Three decades of transition research: What does it tell us? *Elementary School Journal: Special Issue on Transitions*, *98*(4), 365-380.

Kauerz, K. (2006, January). *Ladders of learning: Fighting fade-out by advancing PK-3 alignment* (Issue Brief No. 2). Washington, DC: The New America Foundation.

King, J. (2006). *Closing the achievement gap through expanded access to quality early education in grades PK-3* (Issue Brief No. 3). New York, NY: New American Foundation Early Education Initiative.

McCabe, L.A. & Sipple, J.W. (2011). Colliding worlds: Practical and political tensions of prekindergarten implementation in public schools. *Educational Policy 25(*1), e1- e26.

Neuman, M.J. (2002). The wider context: An international overview of transition issues. In H. Fabian & A. Dunlop (Eds.), *Transitions in the early years: Debating continuity and progression for young children in early education* (pp. 8-21). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Pianta, R.C., Cox M.J., & Snow, K. (2007). *School readiness and the transition to kindergarten in the era of accountability*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Ramey, C.T. and Ramey, S.L. (2010). The transition to school: Concepts, practices and needed research. In. S. L. Kagan & K. Tarrant (Eds). *Transitions for young children: Creating connections across early childhood systems* (pp. 19-32). Baltimore: Paul Brookes Publishing.

ASSIGNMENT:

Each student will prepare and present a three-slide PowerPoint. The first slide should present the research base that undergirds the need for continuity in young children's lives. Selecting either vertical or horizontal continuity, the second slide should explicate an evaluated effort to achieve it, discussing the merits of the effort/results of the evaluation. The third and final slide should focus on recommendations to address the selected type of continuity (e.g., vertical or horizontal) based on learnings from the evaluation. The PowerPoint is due *Friday, April 4, 2014 by 5:00 PM* by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

II.7 *April 22, 2014*
      Week 7: Allied Services Perspectives (Led by Professor Brooks-Gunn)

GOALS:

- To consider the role of public health in early childhood development

- To provide a brief overview of mental health services for young children

- To examine the importance of maternal health for child well-being

- To acquaint students with research on physical and mental health of young children and families

- To highlight the disparities in child health and in access to health services

READINGS:

*Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University and National Forum on Early Childhood Program Evaluation. (2009). *Maternal depression can undermine the development of young children*. Cambridge, MA: Author.

Currie, J. (2005). Health disparities and gaps in school readiness. *Future of Children, 15*, 117-138.

Currie, J., & Neidell, M. (2007). Getting inside the "black box" of Head Start quality: What matters and what doesn't. *Economics of Education Review, 26,* 83-99.

Knitzer, J., & Cohen, E. (2007). Promoting resilience in young children and families at the highest risk: The challenge for early childhood mental health. In D. Perry, R. Kaufmann, & J. Knitzer (Eds.), *Social and emotional health in early childhood: Building bridges between services and systems* (pp. 335-359). Baltimore, MD: Brooks.

*Nicholas, S. W., Jean-Louis, B., Ortiz, B., Northridge, M., Shoemaker, K., Vaughan, R., et al. (2005). Assessing the childhood asthma crisis in Harlem: The Harlem Children's Zone Asthma Initiative. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*, 245-249.

*Reichman, N. E. (2005). Low birth weight and school readiness. *Future of Children, 15*, 91-116.

*Yoshikawa, H., Schindler, H., & Caronongan, P. (2008). *The Prevention of Mental Disorders, Delinquency, and Problem Behaviors through Intervention in Infancy and Early Childhood: A 15-Year Review.*

*Zigler, E., Piotrkowski, C. S., & Collins, R. (1994). Health services in Head Start. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *15*, 511-534.

ASSIGNMENT:

No assignment, but students should be thoroughly prepared to discuss readings in class

II.8   ***April 29, 2014***
            Week 8: Policy Analysis and Policy Testimony Presentations (Led by Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan)

GOALS:

- To demonstrate an understanding of the elements of a policy analysis

- To communicate the policy analysis orally, responding to questions on the topic

- To learn from student colleagues about the diverse range of policy topics related to early education and child development

- To understand how research can influence the formation of a policy analysis

ASSIGNMENT:

Policy Analysis Paper
Taking a primary problem facing early childhood development and education, each student will write a ten-page policy analysis paper that delineates: (i) the nature of the problem (including its scope, importance, and prevalence); (ii) the major policy and programmatic strategies that have been taken to ameliorate the problem; (iii) the ways in which these steps have and have not been effective; (iv) a cogent set of recommendations to alleviate the problem in light of experience and knowledge; and (v) an analysis of the likelihood of their implementation given the current policy context. Written papers are due ***Friday, April 25, 2014 at 5:00 PM*** by email to Professors Brooks-Gunn and Kagan.

Policy Testimony Presentation
Each student will have a pre-allotted time to present his/her paper from the above assignment. The presentation will be followed by three minutes of questions from peers. ***These presentations will take place in class on April 29, 2014.***

SEMESTER II –GRADING

- *Policy Analysis Paper*
  [Due on Friday April 25, 2014]   *30%*

- *Policy Testimony Presentation*
  [Presented in Class II.8 on April 29, 2014]   *10%*

- *Head Start/Early Head Start Assignment*   *10%*
  [Class II.1 on January 21, 2014]

- *Pedagogy Group Assignment*   *15%*
  [Class II.2 on January 28, 2014]

- *Schoolification/Accountability Assignment*   *10%*
  [Class II.5 on March 11, 2014]

- *Weekly Class Assignments 3 @ 5%*   *15%*
  [For classes II.3, II.4, II.6, students are expected to complete the assignments indicated for each session. Each assignment will be graded and each assignment will be accorded 5% of the final grade.]

- *Class Discussion Participation*   *10%*
  [Students will be graded individually on the amount and nature of their overall class participation throughout the semester.]

Accommodations for students with disabilities
The college will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact the Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities for information about registration (166 Thorndike Hall). Services are available only to students who are registered and submit appropriate documentation. We are also happy to discuss specific needs with you as well.

Incompletes
The grade of Incomplete is to be assigned only when the course attendance requirement has been met but, for reasons satisfactory to the instructors, the granting of a final grade has been postponed because certain course assignments are outstanding. If the outstanding assignments are completed within one calendar year from the date of the close of term in which the grade of Incomplete was received and a final grade submitted, the final grade will be recorded on the permanent transcript, replacing the grade of Incomplete, with a transcript notation indicating the date that the grade of Incomplete was replaced by a final grade.

If the outstanding work is not completed within one calendar year from the date of the close of term in which the grade of Incomplete was received, the grade will remain as a permanent Incomplete on the transcript. In such instances, if the course is a required course or part of an approved program of study, students will be required to re-enroll in the course including repayment of all tuition and fee charges for the new registration and satisfactorily complete all course requirements. If the required course is not offered in subsequent terms, the student should speak with the faculty advisor or Program Coordinator about their options for fulfilling the degree requirement. Doctoral students with six or more credits with grades of Incomplete included on their program of study will not be allowed to sit for the certification exam.

Course Communication
Teachers College students have the responsibility for activating the Columbia University Network ID (UNI), which includes a free TC Gmail account. As official communications from the College – e.g., information on graduation, announcements of closing due to severe storm, flu epidemic, transportation disruption, etc. – will be sent to the student's TC Gmail account, students are responsible for either reading email there, or, for utilizing the mail forwarding option to forward mail from their TC Gmail account to an email address which they will monitor.

Religious Observances
It is the policy of Teachers College to respect its members' observance of their major religious holidays. Students should notify instructors at the beginning of the semester about their wishes to observe holidays on days when class sessions are scheduled. Where academic scheduling conflicts prove unavoidable, no student will be penalized for absence due to religious reasons, and alternative means will be sought for satisfying the academic requirements involved. If a suitable arrangement cannot be worked out between the student and the instructor, students and instructors should consult the appropriate department chair or director. If an additional appeal is needed, it may be taken to the Provost.

Academic Dishonesty
Students who intentionally submit work either not their own or without clear attribution to the original source, fabricate data or other information, engage in cheating, or misrepresentation of academic records may be subject to charges. Sanctions may include dismissal from the college for violation of the TC principles of academic and professional integrity fundamental to the purpose of the College.