



Early Childhood Policy In Institutions of Higher Education

*An Initiative Funded by the Heising-Simons Foundation
and the Buffett Early Childhood Fund*

Created originally as a prototypical syllabus by the Early Childhood Policy in Institutions of Higher Education (ECPIHE) initiative, this document has been modified for use by (*insert university name*) for use in its (*insert program name*). This document supports ECPIHE's foundational intent to create and support a cadre of scholars who address early childhood policy. Moreover, it acknowledges ECPIHE's purposeful creation of comprehensive and adaptive materials that are designed to be modified to reflect the instructional goals and needs of diverse contexts and users. For more information about ECPIHE and/or to learn about additional coursework related to the initiative, please visit <http://policyforchildren.org/ecpihe/>

COURSE SYLLABUS II

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE TODAY: EXAMINING PRACTICES, POLICIES, AND KEY ISSUES

Course II of IV

Course Semester

Course Meeting Dates, Times, and Place

Professor Name

Professor Title

Professor Office

Professor Phone

Professor Email

Office Hours

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

With increasing attention accorded to the practices and policies affecting young children and their families, this course provides an in-depth understanding of the forces that shape and the issues that confront contemporary early childhood education and care (ECEC) in the United States. Designed for those interested in advancing their general knowledge of the status of ECEC, the course addresses contextual and historical variables that have affected its evolution in

the United States. Within this framework, the course sits at the intersection of adapted theory and applied science, and provides a thorough overview of the pedagogy, practices, policies, and issues framing the design and delivery of contemporary ECEC. Central to such formulations, the role of parents and families is addressed as a critical contouring variable. Designed in three units, the course addresses: (i) understanding early childhood education and care practice and policy in the US; (ii) identifying critical policy challenges; and (iii) addressing critical policy challenges.

GENERAL COURSE DESCRIPTION AND CONTENT

Throughout its 12 two-hour sessions, the course focuses on the practice of ECEC, as well as the role of families and policymakers in altering practices and policies. Beginning with sessions that are designed to provide rich background, the course offers an analysis of the critical forces that shaped contemporary ECEC. Following this, current services and policies are examined, as are inventive theories about how to organize such services to achieve optimal quality, equity, sustainability, and efficiency. With this background in mind, sessions turn to more detailed examination of the diverse challenges that characterize the field. Positioned to be both realistic and optimistic, the sessions confront the issues and unveil some of the thinking and efforts to redress them. In so doing, the course focuses on quality and diverse efforts to achieve it; the lack of equity; the need for more effective approaches to the workforce, funding, and governance; and the importance of parental voice. By its conclusion, participants will have familiarity with the nature of contemporary ECEC, as well as its challenges and potential solutions. Students will be given diverse opportunities to apply their learnings through a series of individual and group projects. The organization of the course sessions is as follows:

Unit I: Understanding ECEC Practice and Policy in the US

- I.1 The Policy Zeitgeist: A Story of Inequity and Fragmentation
- I.2 Systems Thinking/Systemic Strategies
- I.3 Contemporary Federal Policies: Head Start, CCDBG, IDEA, ESSA, FMLA, and Subsidies

Unit II: Identifying Critical Policy Challenges

- II.1 The Quest for Quality
- II.2 The Quest for Effective Curriculum, Curriculum Theories, and Curricular Policy
- II.3 The Quest for Quality Improvement: Standards, Regulations, and QRIS
- II.4 The Quest for an Effective Workforce
- II.5 The Quest for Equity
- II.6 The Quest for Adequate Funding and Effective Governance
- II.7 The Quest for Family Voice and Authenticity
- II.8 The Quest for Linkages: Continuity, Two-generation, and Allied/Comprehensive Services

Unit III: Addressing Critical Policy Challenges

III.1 Policy Issue Presentations

COURSE GOALS

Upon completion of the course, students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the major theoretical approaches to early childhood pedagogy;
2. Explicate the major challenges facing contemporary early childhood educators and policymakers;
3. Understand the need for and approaches to a systems orientation to guide practice and policy;
4. Understand the important and diverse roles that families play in the development, care, and education of their children, and the services that impact them both; and
5. Understand the framing policy zeitgeist and the major policies affecting young children in the United States today.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

All written work should be submitted by email to the professor by 5 PM on the indicated dates. All papers should be double-spaced with 1-inch margins and in 12-point Times New Roman type. Papers must follow APA style, 6th edition. All late submissions will be downgraded.

CLASS PARTICIPATION (10%)

The course requires the active participation of all involved. Therefore, it is expected that participants will complete all assigned readings and be prepared to share their reflections of the content during discussion sessions.

REACTION PAPERS (4 @ 5% each = 20%)

Students are required to write one three-page reaction paper for Sessions I.2, II.1, II.4, and II.7. The papers should follow the following format: (i) analyze (not summarize) the similarities and differences in the stances taken by the authors read; (ii) analyze the main themes and tensions presented in the readings; and (iii) on a fourth page, present two to four short questions the readings have raised. Students should be prepared to present their questions in class. ***Papers are due by 5 PM via email to the professor on the Friday preceding the class.***

PEDAGOGY GROUP PRESENTATION (15%)

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 theorists to be covered are Pestalozzi, Froebel, Dewey, Montessori, and Malaguzzi (Reggio Emilia). *A lesson plan for the presentation that has: (i) lecture notes; (ii) students' roles therein; and (iii) a PowerPoint, if necessary, is due via email from each group to the professor two weeks in advance of the presentation date. Presentations will be made in class.*

CONTEMPORARY FEDERAL POLICY PRESENTATION (15%)

Students in the class will work in teams to understand and present the major federal ECEC policies. Each group will be assigned one of the following: Head Start, CCDF, ESSA, IDEA, FMLA, and subsidies, and will devise an interesting way to present the material so that the policy is easily and fully understood by other students in the course. The group should address: (i) the history of the policy, focusing on the problems it seeks to alleviate; (ii) who the policy covers; (iii) what the policy purports to do; and (iv) major themes or tensions the policy and its implementation evoke. Each group will have **15** minutes to present and **5** minutes to field questions from the class. *A lesson plan for the presentation that has: (i) lecture notes; (ii) students' roles therein; and (iii) a PowerPoint, if necessary, is due via email from each group to the professor two weeks in advance of the presentation date so that feedback in anticipation of the presentation may be offered by the professor. Presentations will be made in class.*

ISSUE ANALYSIS PAPER (30%)

Selecting one major issue facing the ECEC field today, each student is asked to prepare a **10-page analysis** of that issue, structured as follows:

- The **first** section should provide an overview of the issue, noting the magnitude of the problem, who is affected by it, and how it impedes the delivery of high-quality, equitably distributed, sustainable, and efficient services to young children and their families. This section should be heavily documented, and written in a way that conveys the urgency of the issue and the need for a solution.
- The **second** section of the paper should analyze the steps that have already been taken to address the problem at the federal and state levels. It should address the ways such steps have hastened quality and equity, including a discussion of the roles of parents and families in addressing the situation to date. It should also present the strengths and weaknesses of current efforts to address the issue. It should consider the factors (e.g., fiscal, economic, political) and players (e.g., ECEC advocates and organizations) that have been important in addressing the challenge.
- The **third** section of the paper should make cogent recommendations to address the problem from the student's perspective. The recommendations should directly address the causes of the problem and should be designed to optimally address the problem.
- The **fourth** section of the paper should, given the student's recommendations, address the likelihood of their being realized. This analysis should focus on the current context and

discern the conditions under which such implementation would be likely, if it is not likely in the current context.

Identification of the issue the student will address is due in writing (3-4 sentences) one month before the last class so that the professor can provide feedback on the topic. All papers are due via email to the professor one week before the last class.

ORAL TESTIMONY OF THE ISSUE ANALYSIS PAPER (10%)

Each student will be asked to present an oral presentation of his/her problem analysis. This presentation will take the form of a mock testimony, with students presenting as “senators.” The oral testimony should include a brief overview of the nature and magnitude of the problem and the recommendations presented in the paper to alleviate it. Following each student’s presentation, s/he will be asked a number of questions by the “senators” to whom s/he has presented testimony. Students will be assigned question-asking roles as senators in class when they are not presenting their own testimonies. The amount of time allocated to each testimony and Q&A period will depend on the number of students enrolled in the course. Students will be informed of the amount of time they have to present and respond to questions in advance of the presentation. ***Testimony presentations will take place during the last class.***

COURSE GRADING

• Class Participation	10%
• Reaction Papers 4 @ 5% each	20%
• Pedagogy Group Presentation	15%
• Federal Policy Presentation	15%
• Issue Analysis Paper	30%
• Oral Testimony of Issue Analysis	10%

REQUIRED TEXTS

There are no textbooks for the course; instead, required readings are presented for class sessions 1 through 11; it is expected that these readings will have been read before class. Additionally, suggested readings are indicated for some sessions. Most readings are available online.

COURSE TOPICS AND READINGS

UNIT I: UNDERSTANDING ECEC PRACTICE AND POLICY IN THE US

Session I.1 The Policy Zeitgeist: A Story of Inequity and Fragmentation

THEMES: Setting the context for this course, the first session reviews the evolution of services for children and families in the United States, highlighting the entwined policy legacies of

inequity and fragmentation. Couched in ambivalence and episodic support, contemporary ECEC policy is framed by these legacies, which occasion diverse and sometimes dire challenges. The session aims to set the contextual stage by presenting the backdrop and key issues that will be elaborated upon in subsequent sessions.

GOALS:

- To understand the history and contemporary context for the development of ECEC policies
- To understand the comparative impact of diverse influencers on ECEC policy
- To become familiar with the historical and contemporary policy contexts and the challenges they evoke

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].

Harkness, S., Super, C., Mavridis, C., Barry, O., & Zeitlin, M. (2013). Culture and early childhood development: Implications for policy and practice. In P. Britto, P. Engle, & C. Super (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood development research and its impact on global policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [pp. 143-160]

Penn, H. (2016). Social and political landscapes of childhood. In A. Farrell, S. L. Kagan, & E. K. M. Tisdall (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of early childhood research*. London: SAGE Publications. [pp. 469-484]

ASSIGNMENT

There is no class assignment for this week.

Session I.2 – Systems Thinking/Systemic Strategies

THEMES: To address the inequities and fragmentation presented in Session I.1, this session provides an overview of the move from programmatic to systemic thinking; it also addresses the rationale for systems work and the different approaches that are being taken to advance a more holistic and integrated approach to ECEC. Diverse perspectives on systems theory and systems practice will be examined and discussed.

GOALS:

- To understand the divided service delivery structure of American ECEC
- To understand different perspectives and visions of ECEC systems, including an international perspective on systems and system-building

READINGS:

Early Childhood Systems Working Group. (2014). Comprehensive early childhood system building: A tool to inform discussions on collaborative, cross-sector planning. Build Initiative. Retrieved from

http://www.buildinitiative.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/ECSWG%20Systems%20Planning%20Tool_2014.pdf

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

Kagan, S. L., & Roth, J. L. (2017). Transforming early childhood systems for future generations: Obligations and opportunities. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, (49)2, 137-154.

Paulsell, D., Porter, T., Kirby, G. (2010). *Supporting quality in home-based child care: Final brief*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research. Retrieved from <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/supporting-quality-in-homebased-child-care>

Tonyan, H. A., Paulsell, D., & Shivers, E. M. (2017). Understanding and incorporating home-based child care into early education and development systems. *Early Education and Development*, (28)6, 633-639.

ASSIGNMENT:

Reaction Paper 1: Taking the required readings assigned for Session I.1 and Session I.2, students will prepare a three-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. ***Papers are due by 5 PM via email to the professor on the Friday preceding the class.***

Session I.3 Contemporary Federal Policies: Head Start, CCDBG, IDEA, ESSA, FMLA, and Subsidies

THEMES: This session focuses on contemporary federal and state policies related to young children, providing time for exploration of their goals, purposes, successes, and challenges. This session will amplify the themes of inequity and fragmentation and will focus on current policy attempts to redress these circumstances. The policies will be examined individually and reviewed for the collective themes they evoke. Policies affecting children in homes (e.g., family child care and kith/kin care) as well as diverse center-based services will be discussed. Through the assignment, there will be an opportunity to become deeply familiar with the relationship between federal, state, and local policies, as well as one major federal policy.

GOALS:

- To understand the content of diverse policies that affect children and families in the United States today
- To understand the history, limitations, and polemics associated with diverse policies
- To develop an in-depth understanding of one policy
- To refine presentation skills and respond to questions related to one policy
- To discern similarities and differences in major federal, state and local policies

READINGS:

Cohen, N. L. (2013, April). Why America never had universal child care. *The New Republic*. Retrieved from <https://newrepublic.com/article/113009/child-care-america-was-very-close-universal-day-care>

First Five Years Fund. (2016). Summary and analysis of the early learning provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Washington, DC: First Five Years Fund. Retrieved from https://ffyf.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/ESSA_ECE_ProvisionsNarrativeSummaryAnalysis_020316.pdf

Karch, A. (2013). *Early start: Preschool politics in the United States*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. [pp. 1-15 and 33-58]. Retrieved from www.oopen.org/download?type=document&docid=625245

National Head Start Association. (2017). *2017 National Head Start profile*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.nhsa.org/files/resources/2017-fact-sheet_national.pdf

Office of Child Care. (2016). *Office of child care fact sheet*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/assets/2016factsheets_occ.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2017a). *About IDEA*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/about-idea/>

U.S. Department of Education. (2017b). *Every Student Succeeds Act*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from www.ed.gov/essa?src=rn

Suggested Readings on CCDF:

Johnson-Staub, C., & Sethi, S. (2019). *From opportunity to change: State experiences implementing CCDBG*. Washington, DC: CLASP. <https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2019/03/Opportunity%20to%20Change%20Main%20Body.pdf>

Lynch, K. (2016). *Child care entitlement to states*. Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://greenbookwaysandmeans.house.gov/sites/greenbook.waysandmeans.house.gov/files/IF10511%20-%20Child%20Care%20Entitlement%20to%20States.pdf>

Minton, S., & Durham, C. (2013). *Low-income families and the cost of child care: State child care subsidies, out-of-pocket expenses, and the cliff effect*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/412982-Low-Income-Families-and-the-Cost-of-Child-Care.PDF>

Rohacek, M. (2012). *A summary of research on how CCDF policies affect providers*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/policies_providers_0.pdf

Schulman, K. (2019). *The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014: Update on state implementation of key policies*. Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center. Retrieved from <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/NWLC-update-on-state-implementation-of-CCDBG-reauthorization-final.pdf>

Suggested Readings on Subsidies

Johnson, A. D., Ryan, R. M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2012). Child-care subsidies: Do they impact the quality of care children experience? *Child Development*, 83(4), 1444-1461.

Tekin, E. (2014). *Childcare subsidy policy: What it can and cannot accomplish*. Washington, DC: IZA World of Labor. Retrieved from <http://wol.iza.org/articles/childcare-subsidy-policy-what-it-can-and-cannot-accomplish.pdf>

Tran, V., Minton, S., Haldar, S., & Giannarelli, L. (2018). *Child care subsidies under the CCDF program*. OPRE Report 2018-02. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/ccdfdatabase2016policysummary_b508.pdf

Suggested Readings on Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA):

Bornfreund, L., Dichter, H., Calderon, M., & Garcia, A. (2017). *Unlocking ESSA's potential to support early learning*. BUILD Initiative. Retrieved from <http://buildinitiative.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Issues/Early%20Learning/UnlockingESSAPotential.pdf>

Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2017). *Policy Brief: The state of early learning in ESSA: Plans and opportunities for*

implementation. Retrieved from <https://ccsso.org/resource-library/policy-brief-state-early-learning-essa-plans-and-opportunities-implementation>

Education Trust. (2016). *The Every Student Succeeds Act: What's in it? What does it mean for equity?* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://edtrust.org/resource/the-every-student-succeeds-act-whats-in-it-what-does-it-mean-for-equity/>

First Five Years Fund. (2018). *Early learning in state ESSA plans - Implementation snapshot: How states are using the law.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.ffyf.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Early-Learning-in-State-ESSA-Plans.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Non-regulatory guidance early learning in the Every Student Succeeds Act: Expanding opportunities to support our youngest learners.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essaelguidance10202016.pdf?utm_content=&utm_medium=email&utm_name=&utm_source=govdelivery&utm_term

Suggested Readings on IDEA:

Halfon, N., Houtrow, K., Larson, K., & Newacheck, P. W. (2012). The changing landscape of disability in childhood. *The Future of Children*, 22(1), 13-42.

Hebbeler, K., Spiker, D., & Kahn, L. (2012). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act's early childhood programs: Powerful vision and pesky details. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 31(4), 199-207.

McKenna, L. (2017). How a new Supreme Court ruling could affect special education. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/03/how-a-new-supreme-court-ruling-could-affect-special-education/520662/>

Russell, J. L., & Bray, L. E. (2013). Crafting coherence from complex policy messages: Educators' perceptions of special education and standards-based accountability policies. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21(12). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/epaa/article/download/1044/1051>

Suggested Readings on Head Start:

Love, J. M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). Getting the most out of Early Head Start: What has been accomplished and what needs to be done. In R. Haskins & W.S. Barnett (Eds.), *Investing in young children: New directions in federal preschool and early childhood policy* (pp. 29-37). Center on Children and Families at Brookings & National Institute for Early Education Research.

Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/1013_investing_in_young_children_haskins_ch2.pdf

Raikes, H., Chazen-Cohen, R., & Love, J. M. (2011). What should come before preschool: Lessons from Early Head Start. In E. Zigler, W. S. Gilliam, & W. S. Barnett (Eds.), *The Pre-k debates: Current controversies and issues* (pp. 163-169). Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Ramey, C. T., & Ramey, S. (2010). Head Start: Strategies to improve outcomes for children living in poverty. In R. Haskins & W. S. Barnett (Eds.), *Investing in young children: New directions in federal preschool and early education policy*, (pp. 60-67). NIEER and the Brookings Center on Children and Families. Retrieved from http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/10/Investing_in_Young_Children.pdf

Suggested Readings on FMLA:

AEI-Brookings Working Group on Paid Family Leave. (2017). *Paid family and medical leave: An issue whose time has come*. Washington, DC: AEI and Brookings. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/paid-family-and-medical-leave-an-issue-whose-time-has-come/>

Center for Law and Social Policy. (2017). *Trump's parental leave plan: Pitting the unemployed against working families*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2017/08/Trumps-Parental-Leave-Plan.pdf>

Lenhoff, D. R., & Bell, L. (2002). *Government support for working families and for communities: Family and medical leave as a case study*. Washington, DC: National Partnership for Women. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalpartnership.org/our-work/resources/workplace/fmla/fmla-case-study-lenhoff-bell.pdf>

ASSIGNMENT

Preparation and Federal Policy Presentation

UNIT II: IDENTIFYING CRITICAL POLICY CHALLENGES

Session II.1 – The Quest for Quality

THEMES: Arguably the most important and illusive element of contemporary ECEC, the nature of quality has long been debated. This session focuses on diverse definitions and conceptions of quality, with an eye toward understanding modernist and post-modernists approaches to it. The

degree to which quality can be measured and the degree to which it exists are discussed. Taking conventional definitions of quality into account, the degree to which quality is equitably dispersed among the population of young children is also presented.

GOALS:

- To understand what constitutes quality in early education and development services
- To understand diverse conceptions of quality, including those that reject single or “one best” definitions of quality
- To understand what contributes 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: Campaign for Educational Equity, Teachers College. Retrieved from http://www.centerforeducationalequity.org/events-page/equity-in-education-forum-series/past-events/american-early-childhood-preventing-or-perpetuating-inequity/9833_EquityMatters_Kagan_Final.pdf

Moss, P. (2016). Why can't we get beyond quality? *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 17(1), 8-15.

Myers, R. G. (2006). *Quality in program of early childhood care and education (ECCE)*. Paris, France: UNESCO. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000147473>

Souto-Manning, M., & Rabadi-Raol, A. (2018). (Re)Centering quality in early childhood: Toward intersectional justice for minoritized children. *Review of Research in Education*, 42(1), 203-225.

Tonyan, H. A. (2017). Opportunities to practice what is locally valued: An ecocultural perspective on quality in family child care homes. *Early Education and Development*, 28(6), 727–744. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2017.1303304>

Wechsler, M., Kirp, D. L., Tinubu-Ali, T., Gardner, M., Maier, A., Melnick, H., & Shields, P. M. (2016). *The road to high quality early learning: Lessons from the states*. Research brief. Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from [https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Road to High Quality Early Learning BRIEF.pdf](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Road%20to%20High%20Quality%20Early%20Learning%20BRIEF.pdf)

Vandell, D. L., & Wolfe, B. (2000). *Child care quality: Does it matter and does it need to be improved?* Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty. Retrieved from <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/sr/pdfs/sr78.pdf>

ASSIGNMENT:

Reaction Paper 2: Taking the required readings assigned for Session II.1, students will prepare a three-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. ***Papers are due by 5 PM via email to the professor on the Friday preceding the class.***

Session II.2 – The Quest for Effective Curriculum, Curriculum Theories, and Curricular Policy

THEMES: Within the frame of child-centered pedagogy, this session will examine diverse theorists and the approaches they espouse. In keeping with the theme of the last session's discussion regarding different conceptions of quality, five major early childhood theorists will be presented, enabling students to identify and experience similarities and differences in the curricular and pedagogical approaches they espouse. The relationship between curricula and pedagogy, and between learning theorists and curricula will be studied. The session will also discuss the federal government's "hands-off" policy with regard to mandating curricula.

GOALS:

- To familiarize students with diverse approaches to early childhood pedagogy so that they are 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 diverse approaches to pedagogy

READINGS:

Bowman, B. T., Donovan, M. S., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2001). *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. [pp. 182-232]. Retrieved from http://www.orionchildreninternational.org/uploads/2/2/4/7/22473078/educating_our_preschools.pdf

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:

Pedagogical Group Presentation: Students will be divided into five teams. Each team will be assigned one pedagogical theorist, study that theorist's 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 theorists to be covered are Pestalozzi, Froebel, Dewey, Montessori, and Malaguzzi (Reggio Emilia). ***A lesson plan for the presentation that has: (i) lecture notes; (ii) students' roles therein; and (iii) a PowerPoint, if necessary, is due via email from each group to the professor two weeks in advance of the presentation date. Presentations will be made in class.***

Session II. 3 The Quest for Quality Improvement: Standards, Regulations, and QRIS

THEMES: To achieve high-quality and more potent early childhood services, significant efforts have been undertaken to align standards and regulations, and promote the development of Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS). This session examines the nature of those diverse efforts as well as the degree to which they have been successful. It contextualizes these efforts within the array of attempts to systematize early childhood education and care and to bring coherence and equity to its disparate array of services.

GOALS:

- To understand an array of quality improvement efforts
- To understand the nature of standards and how they can work to promote quality and equity of services.
- To understand the commonalities and distinctions among efforts to improve ECEC
- To discern the degree to which these quality efforts, collectively and individually, have contributed to improving ECEC
- To understand what policy changes these efforts have occasioned

READINGS:

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

Cannon, J. S., Zellman, G.L., Karoly, L.A., & Schwartz, H. L. Schwartz. (2017). *Quality rating and improvement systems for early care and education programs: Making the second generation better*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE235.html>.

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: Reconceptualising the relationship*. Oxford, England: Routledge.

National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education. (2002). *Early learning standards: Creating the conditions for success*. Retrieved from https://www.naeyc.org/sites/default/files/globally-shared/downloads/PDFs/resources/position-statements/executive_summary.pdf

UNICEF. (2016). *Evaluation report: Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) and school readiness*. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/ELDS_Final_Report_March2017.pdf

ASSIGNMENT:

There is no class assignment for this week.

Session II.4 – The Quest for an Effective Workforce

THEME: The early childhood workforce is the pulse of ECEC, yet it faces formidable challenges related to the processes of induction, deployment, professional development, and compensation. It also faces formidable challenges related to achieving quality and equity in each of these processes. This session focuses on the nature of the contemporary workforce and delineates the nature and magnitude of the diverse challenges it faces. Although the readings focus on describing the problem, solutions are also suggested and will be debated.

GOALS:

- To understand the current composition and nature of the ECEC workforce
- To understand the nature of the research regarding the current workforce
- To understand strategies being implemented to improve the database on the ECEC workforce
- To consider long-term options for workforce improvement

READINGS:

Barnett, W. S., & Riley-Ayers, S. (2015). Public policy and workforce in early childhood education. In L. J. Couse & S. L. Recchia (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood teacher education* (pp. 38-42). New York, NY: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/pdf/doi/10.4324/9781315818245.ch3>

McLean, C., Whitebook, M., & Roh, E., (2019). *From unlivable wages to just pay for early educators*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment. Retrieved from <http://csce.berkeley.edu/from-unlivable-wages-to-just-pay-for-early-educators>

NAS-IOM-NRC Committee on the Science of Children Birth to Age 8. (2015). *Transforming the workforce for children birth through age 8: A unifying foundation*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/read/19401/chapter/1>

Phillips, D., Austin, L. J., & Whitebook, M. (2016). The early care and education workforce. *The Future of Children*, 26(2), 139-158.

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

ASSIGNMENT:

Reaction Paper 3: Taking the required readings assigned for Session II.4, students will prepare a three-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. ***Papers are due by 5 PM via email to the professor on the Friday preceding the class.***

Session II.5 – The Quest for Equity

THEME: In the press to improve the quality of ECEC services over time, attention has been somewhat diverted from a focus on equity and how to achieve it. This session tackles the issue of equity from perspectives of inequitable access, inequitable service provision, and inequitable consequences. It incorporates perspectives that are historical and critical, stressing how ethnic/racial and economic inequities have been perpetuated over time, despite the claim that ECEC will redress them.

GOALS:

- To understand how more- and less-affluent families are becoming less similar over time
- To understand inequities in the receipt of ECEC services
- To understand inequities in the quality of ECEC received by more- and less-affluent families
- To understand how current policies help reduce inequities in the receipt of and in the quality of ECEC services (e.g., subsidized care and quality initiatives)

READINGS:

Duncan, G. J., & Magnuson, K. A. (2005). Can family socioeconomic resources account for racial and ethnic test score gaps? *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 35-54.

Magnuson, K. A., & Waldfogel, J. (2005). Early childhood education and care: Effects on ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness. *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 169-196.

Reardon, S.F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In R. Murnane & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality, schools, and children's life chances*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation Press. Retrieved from <https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/reardon%20whither%20opportunity%20-%20chapter%205.pdf>

Rouse, C., Brooks-Gunn, J., & McLanahan, S. (2005). School readiness: Closing racial and ethnic gaps – Introducing the issue. *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 5-14.

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

ASSIGNMENT:

There is no class assignment for this week.

Session II.6 The Quest for Adequate Funding and Effective Governance

THEME: Some suggest that the quest to improve quality and equity in ECEC rests on the foundational pillars of finance and governance. This session examines the reasons for that stance, and probes the major, deeply embedded challenges associated with improving the finance and governance of contemporary ECEC. It addresses issues related to historic values and diverse expectations, and explores approaches used by other nations. Also discussed are posited strategies for improvement, as well as their likelihood of implementation.

GOALS:

- To understand the rationale for improving the finance and governance of contemporary early childhood care and education.
- To understand extant approaches to financing and governing ECEC services
- To understand the challenges associated with altering finance and governance structures in the United States
- To discuss potential strategies for improving financing mechanisms and governance structures.

READINGS:

Allen, L. & Backes, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Transforming the financing of early care and education*. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Washington, DC. National Academies Press. [pp. 45-82; 135-156]. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/24984/transforming-the-financing-of-early-care-and-education>

Belfield, C. R. (2006). *Financing early childhood care and education: An international review*. Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2007. Retrieved from <http://cbese.hostcentric.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Financing-ECCE.pdf>

Kagan, S. L. & Gomez, R. (2015). *Early childhood governance: Choices and consequences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. [Chapters 1, 3, 13]

Elder, L. K., Kataoka, N., Naudeau, S., Neuman, M. J., & Valerio, A., (2011). *Investing in young children: An early childhood development guide for policy dialogue and project preparation*. Washington, DC: World Bank. [pp.79-97]

ASSIGNMENT:

There is no class assignment for this week.

Session II.7 The Quest for Family Voice and Authenticity

THEME: Although the rationale for and importance of involving families in children's early development and education is well documented, the challenge of most authentically and effectively engaging parents persists, particularly in an era of increased diversity. This session will examine the nature of that challenge, critically discerning how early childhood has and has not accorded meaningful voice to families. How the discourse regarding the role of families has changed over time will be discussed, as will the evolution and sometimes contradictory ideologies undergirding diverse conceptions of parenting education, parent engagement, parent involvement, and family support. Families will be discussed in terms of their roles as: a) their children's first teachers; b) participants in planning and engaging in early childhood programs (including home visiting and two-generation programs); c) meaningful contributors to the pedagogy and policies associated with ECEC programs; and d) active contributors to community life.

GOALS:

- To present different approaches to the critical roles that families play in supporting the well-being and development of their children
- To develop a working knowledge of home visiting, parenting education, and family support efforts
- To understand the challenges of implementing family-based programs in a policy context that honors family privacy and primacy
- To understand the different ways families can get involved in supporting their children, schools, and community institutions

READINGS:

Berger, L. M., & Font, S. A. (2015). The role of the family and family-centered programs and policies. *The Future of Children*, 25(1), 155-176.

Brooks-Gunn, J., & Markman, L. B. (2005). The contribution of parenting to ethnic and racial gaps in school readiness. *The Future of Children*, 15(1), 139-168.

Epstein, J. L. (2010). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92 (3), 81-96.

Mendez, L. J. (2010). How can parents get involved in preschool? Barriers and engagement in education by ethnic minority parents of children attending Head Start. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(1), 26-36.

Michalopoulos, C., Crowne, S. S., Portilla, X. A., Lee, H., Filene, J. H., Duggan, A., & Knox, V. (2019). *A Summary of results from the MIHOPE and MIHOPE-Strong Start studies of evidence-based home visiting*. OPRE Report 2019-09. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/mihope_summary_brief_01_16_19_508.pdf

Morin, M., Gluckman, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2016). Parenting and the home environment. In A. Farrell, S. L. Kagan, & E. K. M. Tisdall (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of early childhood research*. London: SAGE Publications. [pp. 15-35]

Vincent, C. (2017). 'The children have only got one education and you have to make sure it's a good one': Parenting and parent-school relations in a neoliberal age. *Gender and Education*, 29(5), 541-557.

ASSIGNMENT:

Reaction Paper 4: Taking the required readings assigned for Session II.5, students will prepare a three-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. ***Papers are due by 5 PM via email to the professor on the Friday preceding the class.***

Session II.8. The Quest for Linkages: Continuity, Two-generation, and Allied/Comprehensive Services

THEMES: Early childhood education and care services do not stand alone; they exist amidst an array of allied services including primary schooling and health, mental health, and nutrition services. Just as children's development is holistic, the services that support that development must be comparably comprehensive. Moreover, such services must be conceptually aligned and structurally linked. This session focuses on the diverse institutions concerned with young children's growth and development and the linkages that must be made with them. As such, it

addresses efforts to forge alignments between schools, health agencies, and other community efforts.

GOALS:

- To understand the need to create linkages with allied institutions serving young children and their families
- To understand the impact of children's health on their development
- To understand community-based approaches to providing comprehensive services
- To understand contemporary approaches to linking services (e.g., two-generation programs and P-3 efforts)

READINGS:

Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2014). Two-generation programs in the twenty-first century. *The Future of Children*, 24(1), 13-39.

Currie, J., & Reichman, N. (2015). Policies to promote child health: Introducing the issue. *The Future of Children*, 25(1), 3-9.

Ellen, I. G., & Glied, S. (2015). Housing, neighborhoods, and children's health. *The Future of Children*, 25(1), 135-153.

Hebbeler, K., & Spiker, D. (2016). Supporting young children with disabilities. *The Future of Children*, 26(2), 185-205.

Howard, K. S., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2009). The role of home-visiting programs in preventing child abuse and neglect. *The Future of Children*, 19(2), 119-146.

Kauerz, K. (2019). Pre-school through 3rd grade (P-3): Conceptual, organizational, and practical perspectives. In C. Brown, M. B. McMullen, & N. File (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood education* (pp. 591-613). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell Publishing.

Lee, R., Zhai, F., Han, W. J., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Waldfogel, J. (2013). Head Start and children's nutrition, weight, and health care receipt. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28(4), 723-733.

Leininger, L. & Levy, H. (2015). Child health and access to medical care. *The Future of Children*, 25(1), 65-90.

Sommer, T. E., Schneider, W., Chor, E., Sabol, T. J., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Brooks-Gunn, J.,

Yoshikawa, H., Morris, A., & King, C. (2019). *What are the effects of a two-generation human capital program on children's attendance & chronic absence in Head Start?* Two-Generation Programs: Policy Brief III. Washington, DC: Ascend at the Aspen Institute. Retrieved from

https://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/research-areas/child-adolescent/NU2gen/docs/cap-fls-year-1-and-2-findings_brief-i_may-2019.pdf

ASSIGNMENT:

There is no class assignment for this week.

UNIT III: ADDRESSING CRITICAL POLICY CHALLENGES

Session III.1. Policy Issue Presentations

THEMES: Students have diverse interests that will be presented and explored in the concluding session of the semester. Asked to identify a policy issue of salience to them, students will draft their policy papers, and then will present their work as a “testimony.” In the process, students will practice their individual public speaking skills and hone their ability to respond rapidly to diverse questions. All participants in turn will be exposed to the testimony of their fellow students, thereby expanding their repertoire of knowledge regarding diverse policy issues.

GOALS:

- To demonstrate an understanding of the elements of a major policy issue
- To communicate a policy issue orally, responding to questions on the topic
- To learn from student colleagues about the diverse range of policy issues related to ECEC
- To understand how such issues can be addressed, considering the role of families and policy in the design and implementation of potential solutions

READINGS:

There are no assigned readings for this week.

ASSIGNMENT:

Preparation of issue analysis paper and oral presentation of it

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
(To be modified according to university/college policies and procedures)

Accommodations for students with disabilities

The College will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities.

Incompletes

The grade of Incomplete will be assigned only when the course attendance requirement has been met but, for reasons satisfactory to the instructor, 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

All 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 email account, students are responsible for either reading email there, or, for utilizing the mail forwarding option to forward mail from their account to an email address which they will monitor.

Religious Observances

It is the policy of the University 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 classes 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 University principles of academic and professional integrity fundamental to the purpose of the College.