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To the Reader:

State boards of education across the country are greatly indebted to the individuals who served on the NASBE Early Childhood Education Task Force. They committed themselves to a challenging year-long process. They engaged in extensive exploration of the needs of our youngest children with eagerness, thoughtfulness, and sensitivity.

The association is particularly grateful to Richard Owens, 1988 President of NASBE, who challenged us to focus our energies on early childhood education and chaired the Task Force through its deliberations.

Additionally, we offer our genuine gratitude to Dr. Tom Schultz, chief staff to the Task Force and co-author of this report. The final document reflects his unique creativity, and commitment to quality education for our nation's children.

NASBE and state boards of education welcome this report. Our members will respond with openness to the Task Force suggestions, for we know the quality of life for our children and the preservation of our society depend on how well we meet the challenges you have laid before us. We at NASBE will use all the resources available to us to help states and communities meet these challenges.

Gene Wilhoit
Executive Director
National Association of State Boards
of Education
Preface

The preschool and early school years are crucial for children and parents. When children experience success in responsive, high quality programs, they learn essential skills and knowledge, and their parents learn to be confident partners with teachers and administrators. However, when children lack the benefit of successful early education, they often fall behind their peers in achievement and suffer low self esteem - and parents may feel they lack the ability to work with professionals in support of their child’s education.

We know how to mount programs that help children develop successfully and ensure effective partnerships with parents. We know these programs produce long-term benefits and significant cost savings by reducing referrals to special education, retention in grade, school dropouts, delinquency, and substance abuse. Our challenge is to muster the resources, provide the leadership and design supportive policies so all families get the best from early childhood education.

This report from NASBE’s National Early Childhood Education Task Force provides a new policy agenda to promote the development of all young children ages 4-8. Aimed at public school leaders and state policymakers, our recommendations spell out new ways for the public schools to teach young children, work with their parents, and collaborate with other programs that serve preschoolers and their families.

The Task Force brought together leaders from the public schools, early childhood education, and state policymaking. This rich blend of experience and perspectives served us well as we addressed two key aims:

- Developing more successful models for teaching in the early grades of elementary school based on our knowledge of child development and the lessons of successful preschool programs.
- Finding new ways for public schools to complement and supplement the efforts of other early childhood programs in serving preschool children and their families.

We drew on many sources of advice and evidence for our work. We were briefed by leading experts, and
we reviewed position statements and papers on key issues. We conducted four regional hearings, which included visits to 14 exemplary early childhood programs and testimony from 165 witnesses. We listened to state legislators, school principals and superintendents, teachers, Head Start and child care center directors, teacher trainers, and parents.

Our recommendations are motivated by a sense of acute need and the potential of exemplary programs to fill that need. We alternated between alarm, despair, excitement and optimism as we moved through our activities.

We heard disturbing testimony about the harmful effects of increased testing on young children, about class sizes of 33 children in kindergarten programs, and about the difficulties Head Start parents encounter as they seek to continue active involvement in their child's education in the public schools. We were equally concerned about reports of low salaries for early childhood teachers, staff turnover rates averaging 40% nationally in child care centers, and limited, uneven public funding for early childhood services.

On the other hand, we visited some wonderful classrooms in public schools, Head Start centers and community-based programs. We were moved by testimony of committed professionals and involved parents who are excited about their successes with young children. And we were impressed with the ingenuity of state and local policymakers who have designed and funded a wide range of innovative early childhood programs.

We hope this report will stimulate reflection, debate, and positive changes in schools and communities. State boards of education are only one of many groups that need to work together to assess our recommendations, review current programs and policies, and plan for improvements. NASBE stands ready to work with our members and other groups on this agenda in the next year.

Richard Owens
President, National Association of State Boards of Education
Chair, National Early Childhood Education Task Force
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Executive Summary

Our nation is in the midst of a major education reform movement and a major effort to build a new system for serving preschool children and their parents. Our public education system is searching for models and strategies to improve the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms, and to enhance the contribution of education to our economic growth and social welfare. At the same time, the early childhood community has developed a comprehensive vision of the components of effective services for young children and their families. They are working to construct a funding and delivery system to carry out this vision.

Both efforts are aimed at enhancing school success and overall development of children. Both efforts will require major changes in public schools, new public investments, and strong leadership from state policymakers, the private sector, and local communities. However, the two movements have largely separate origins and leadership. NASBE’s Early Childhood Task Force provided the first opportunity for national leaders from both communities to work on a common agenda for action. Together, we have developed a new vision for early childhood education that combines a restructured approach to schooling for 4-8 year-olds with a call for new partnerships among schools, parents, and other early childhood programs to serve young children and their families. At the heart of this vision are two recommendations:

We recommend that early childhood units be established in elementary schools, to provide a new pedagogy for working with children ages 4-8 and a focal point for enhanced services to preschool children and their parents.

Our knowledge of child development supports teaching, testing, and curriculum that are responsive to how young children learn and to cultural and linguistic diversity. We also believe elementary schools would be improved by adopting other features from high quality programs for young children, such as active parental involvement, family support services, and comprehensive services for children. Implementing the early childhood unit will help schools to do a better job when they serve prekindergarten children. It will also help children and parents to sustain
the benefits of good preschool programs during their early years in public schools.

We recommend that public schools develop partnerships with other early childhood programs and community agencies to build and improve services for young children and their parents.

We recognize that healthy child development begins during the pre-natal period and that education begins at birth. We need to create a comprehensive system of early childhood services including parent education and family support programs; child care; and health, social, and mental health services. We believe public schools and other early childhood programs need to work together to build this system through joint planning, advocacy, and partnerships in sponsoring services. Just as public schools have developed partnerships with businesses and higher education institutions that accept their graduates, public schools and the early childhood community need to work together.

These two major recommendations will help public schools and other community early childhood agencies to serve more children, to make better use of public funds, and to improve the quality of programs.

Thus, this report complements other recent proposals for school improvement and new early childhood programs. In contrast to other school reform reports, we have focused on the crucial early years of education, when children gain the essential skills, knowledge and dispositions critical to later school success. Compared to other recent early childhood reports, we have limited our charge to influencing public school programs and policies, but we have broadened the agenda to include improvements in both kindergarten and the early school years.

Our recommendations will require changes in classroom and school practice, in local policies and organizational relationships, and in state-level regulations and resources. Parents, classroom staff, local administrators and boards, early childhood programs, and state policymakers will need to exert leadership and work together to give our young children optimum support on their road to success.
1 The Rationale For Change

Good early childhood education is much, much more than a school readiness program for four year-olds. It reflects a comprehensive vision of support for child development, encompassing teaching practice, relationships with parents, and connections with other community agencies and institutions. This report seeks to use that vision to stimulate the present debate about how to improve public schools and enrich public understanding of needed new services for young children and their families.

We have a strong consensus of professional opinion and research to support the following characteristics of high quality early childhood programs:

- A curriculum and classroom environment that responds to learning patterns of children within a given age range, to individual differences among children, and to cultural and linguistic diversity among children.

- A program that actively involves and supports parents as partners in the development of their children.

- A program that responds to the comprehensive needs of children for health, nutrition, child care, social and emotional support, and language development as well as cognitive development.

- A program that draws on the resources and expertise of all agencies and informal networks in the community to provide continuity for children in their daily schedules and as they grow and develop.

A theme that unites these ideas is the need to see young children in context rather than simply as "students" in a specific program. Our policies need to reflect sensitivity to how a part-day preschool program fits into the full waking hours of a four-year-old; how
the costs of child care impact on family budgets and decisionmaking; how the language and rules for interaction in a kindergarten classroom compare to the home environment; and how early childhood experiences relate to the world of public schools for children and parents.

In order to apply these principles to programs for all young children, our report calls for action in two key areas:

- Developing early childhood units in public schools to serve children ages 4-8 and their parents.
- Building partnerships between public schools and other early childhood programs.

This chapter will explain the evidence and thought that led the Task Force to these recommendations.

The Need for An Early Childhood Unit

The early childhood unit will provide an organizational structure for collaboration among teachers, administrators, and parents to promote learning and development in young children. Professional preparation and development of staff and administrators will be oriented to the unique needs of this age group. Classroom and outdoor space, materials, assessment and grouping practices, curriculum standards and staffing arrangements will be designed in light of the distinctive characteristics of young learners.

Our proposal for an early childhood unit rests on a critical assessment of recent policy efforts to reform public education and a growing base of knowledge about how young children learn and develop.

The publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983 has led to substantial policy changes for the public education system. A major emphasis in these reforms has been an effort to “tighten up” the functioning of schools through a combination of higher standards, more uniform requirements, increased accountability, and new incentives to force students and staff to work harder. States have increased curriculum requirements, added resources and increased salaries, improved public knowledge about student and school achievements, and added time to the school day and days to the school
year. However, from the perspective of the needs of children 4-8, there are three problems with these reforms:

- They represent generic analysis and prescription for all levels of education. As a consequence, policies have been adopted that, while perhaps appropriate for improving high schools, may be less helpful for elementary schools and very young children. For example, it may well be the case that making high school students work harder is an appropriate formulation. However, lack of effort is not the problem for kindergarten students. Similarly, developing greater specialized content knowledge in teacher preparation programs may be highly desirable for improving high school teaching, but not for early elementary grades where a focus on solid understanding of child development is a more urgent need.

- The legitimate concern about the link between our economic future and the quality of schooling has fostered a competitive mentality for our educational enterprise, with unfortunate consequences for early segments of schooling. If education is seen as a contest that pits children against their peers, or a race against our foreign competitors, we risk teaching very young children the wrong academic tasks in an inappropriate fashion before they are ready, and we stimulate fears and pressure among parents.

- In an effort to assess programs and staff, and inform the public about school outcomes, the school reform movement has greatly increased the use of standardized tests for children. More children at every grade level are taking tests on every kind of subject and skill. In many instances these tests lead to labeling children as failures at earlier and earlier ages, rather than finding and building upon their strengths.

In response to these reforms, preschool, kindergarten and primary grade teachers report an increasing use of standardized tests, worksheets and workbooks, ability grouping, retention and other practices that focus on academic skills too early and in inappropriate ways.
How do these trends fit with our latest knowledge about how young children develop and learn? Not well at all.

For example, it is true that research shows that children can be taught successfully in the early school years to count, learn phonics and complete other academic tasks, and that such instruction will result in short-term improvements on standardized test scores. However, there is also evidence that introduction of basic skills before a child is ready may undermine a child's disposition to use these skills over the long term. In addition, when academic work is introduced too early, some children will inevitably "fail" due to high variability of rates of development, and feel incompetent and distrustful of their ability to cope with a school setting. Other research has examined and questioned the effectiveness of ability grouping and the use of tests of academic performance to retain children early in their school career. The findings have generated considerable support for alternative policies and approaches.

We have a double-edged message about academics for young children. We are expecting too much, but also not enough of 4-8 year-olds. We are expecting too much in the sense that we are raising standards, imposing tests, and moving curricula and teaching practices downward from upper to lower grades in ways that are inappropriate for the optimal development of young children. These heavy-handed efforts to accelerate academic achievement are counterproductive. They seem to exemplify an obsession with producing short-term, trivial results rather than developing long-term intellectual and social capacity. To make matters worse, many of the "academic" curricula and materials are shockingly unstimulating to young children and fail to extend their thinking. We are expecting too little in that, using more appropriate methods and materials, children can deal with richer and more sophisticated learning tasks than those dictated by worksheets and drill-and-practice pedagogy.

While current research emphasizes the variability of individual development, we can identify some general characteristics of children ages 4-8 that are crucial to designing curriculum, classroom environments, and teaching strategies:
Thinking in young children is directly tied to their interactions with people and materials. Young children learn best and most by actively exploring their environment, using hands-on materials and building upon their natural curiosity and desire to make sense of the world around them.

Children are highly dependent on parental approval of and involvement in their learning.

Children learn best when their relationships with adults are consistent over time, emotionally rewarding, and supportive of self-esteem.

The Task Force was excited to encounter experts and practitioners who are using these ideas for improving primary grade schooling. For example, experts in mathematics and science learning argue for concrete, experiential approaches to teaching their subjects. Exciting new programs in writing and reading instruction are exposing children to a rich array of high quality books and stories and using children’s own experiences and natural curiosity to create reading and writing activities in preschools and kindergartens.

The early childhood unit will supply the element missing in the school reform equation—a focus on how children learn and develop. We are using metaphors of hospitals, corporations, and law firms to redesign schools as more professional environments for teachers. We are experimenting with voucher and public choice plans to empower parents as consumers. We are planning schools from every perspective except that of the students. This report suggests that the next phase of school reform should support new classroom and teaching models from a basis of the characteristics of children at different stages of development.

The Need for Partnerships Between Schools and Other Early Childhood Programs

Schools need to form partnerships with preschool programs to expand high quality services to young children and their parents. We have a diverse, underfunded, and uncoordinated system for delivering programs to young children. Public education leaders can be a powerful and constructive force for strengthening
this system. If they act in partnership with other early childhood programs, our chances for increasing and maximizing resources and quality in all settings that serve young children will be greatly improved.

The 1980s have seen a dramatic resurgence of interest in early intervention programs of remarkable diversity. Some twenty-eight states have added funding and programs for preschool services, especially within the last five years. The most common public investment has been in part-day classroom programs for at-risk four-year olds through public schools or expansion of Head Start programs. At the same time there has been substantial interest in interventions that more directly focus on educating and supporting parents as the prime factor in their child’s development. Programs such as the Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education Program, Missouri's Parents as Teachers Program, and the Ounce of Prevention Fund and Family Focus, Inc. in the Chicago area work with parents prior to and at the birth of their children and during the first three years of life. A third type of program is child care. Growing proportions of families in which parents work have created a demand for child care for the full working day and work year schedule.

While many states and communities have begun new services to children under 5, we found the following persistent problems and concerns:

- **The combination of state, federal, and local programs falls far short of meeting needs of at-risk children for preschool, working parents for child care, or new parents for education and support.**

  Under present arrangements, children of low-income parents (who derive the most dramatic benefits from high quality preschool experiences) are less likely to be enrolled than children from middle-and-upper income homes. (Fewer than 33% of four-year-olds whose families had incomes of less than $10,000 in 1985 were enrolled in a preschool program. In contrast, 67% of four-year-olds whose families earned $35,000 a year or more attended preschool).

- **Staff wages, staff training, and staff turnover rates in early childhood programs are a major problem, with 70% of child care workers earning only poverty-level salaries and staff turnover rates of 40% nationwide in child care centers.**
Inconsistent regulations and separate funding streams for early childhood programs undercut efforts to promote a consistent level of quality even among publicly funded programs, limit career mobility for professionals, and complicate the lives of program managers and of parents seeking services.

In summary, the present "system" for delivering early childhood services has many disconnected pieces. Different models of service, different funding and regulatory systems, different sponsoring agencies, and different mixes of program costs and quality exist in each state and community. Moreover, the varied early childhood world has few links with the public schools. While nearly all children move into public schools from an early childhood program, very few public schools have any system for learning about this experience or smoothing the transition for children entering kindergarten. To further complicate this picture, many public schools are becoming a provider of preschool programs without any system for working with other programs to gain the benefit of their experience with younger children and their parents.

Given the realities of budgets, available staff and facilities, public schools, Head Start and other publicly funded early childhood programs will not be able to expand quickly enough to serve all preschool children in the near future. The present mix of for-profit, non-profit, church-based, family day care systems, and public school programs certainly will continue. And, in fact there are real advantages to a mixed system of sponsorship, particularly in terms of providing choices for parents in the type, location, costs, and philosophy of setting they select for their children.

However, it is also the reality that public schools will receive the vast majority of "graduates" from every form of early childhood program. It is clear that high-quality program experiences pave the way for children to succeed in school and in life. Similarly, children from poor quality or unsupervised preschool settings begin school at a disadvantage and pose additional challenges for the schools.
These facts should motivate school personnel and
school boards to serve as advocates for improved
preschool services whether or not the programs are
funded or housed in public schools. Just as college
presidents and business executives are becoming
involved in efforts to strengthen public education, public
school boards and administrators should be allies and
leaders in the fight to add resources to and strengthen
the quality of all early childhood programs and
providers.
Implementing The Early Childhood Unit: Local Strategies For Success

At the heart of the educational process lies the child. No advances in policy, no acquisitions of new equipment have their desired effect unless they are in harmony with the nature of the child, unless they are fundamentally acceptable to him.

Knowledge of the manner in which children develop, therefore, is of prime importance, both in avoiding educationally harmful practices and in introducing effective ones.

(The Plowden Report, Children and Their Primary Schools, Vol. I.)

The goals of establishing an early childhood unit are to improve existing programs for children preschool to grade 3, and to plan for new high-quality preschool programs. The establishment of these units reflects the Task Force’s belief in sound child development principles: that learning occurs best when there is a focus on the whole child; that learning for children and adults is interactive; that young children learn from concrete work and play, much of which is child-initiated; and that young children are profoundly influenced by their families and the surrounding community. Based on these principles, the central characteristics of the early childhood unit described in this section are:

- Developmentally appropriate curriculum.
- Improved assessment.
- Responsiveness to cultural and linguistic diversity.
- Partnerships with parents.
- Training and support for staff and administrators.

The potential of the early childhood unit lies in understanding and implementing these program characteristics. We attach no particular magic to any specific span of grades or organizational structure. In
our view, there are several different models for an early childhood unit:

- One version would be a separate facility that would concentrate efforts of the principal, teachers, other staff, and community groups on implementing an approach to schooling based on the unique developmental needs of young children.

- A second model would be to designate a separate early childhood unit director with specialized training in early childhood development, responsible to the school principal, and with substantial authority to develop and support teachers and program.

- A third version would consist of a staffing team with one or more lead teachers and a focal point of staff development activities for teachers of children 4-8 years of age.

Naturally, just as children and families are different, no one type of program will be effective for every community. The way in which each element is implemented will depend on the nature of the community and the relationship between the school and existing agencies outside the school. In larger measure, it will also depend on the degree to which early childhood leaders, teachers, administrators, parents, and policymakers are willing to commit the necessary time, energy and resources over a sustained period to make the early childhood unit a reality.

This chapter will describe each of the program components listed above, together with strategies for local school administrators and local boards of education.

**Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum**

We believe that curriculum and teaching in the early childhood unit should be “developmentally appropriate”, that is, based on a knowledge of the typical development of children within a particular age range and at the same time sensitive to individual differences among the children served.

We need to develop appropriate goals for early childhood programs that will: (a) provide children with
a wide range of experiences, (b) attend to all key aspects of child development, and (c) support effective and appropriate teaching and classroom environments. The objectives set by the California School Readiness Task Force for children finishing first grade illustrate the range of expectations we believe are appropriate for early childhood units. These expectations include the abilities to:

- use language for complex communication,
- recognize and use opportunities for learning through language, reading and the arts,
- use problem solving strategies,
- solve meaningful mathematical problems,
- play individually and with peers and function as a member of a group,
- demonstrate self control and self discipline,
- sustain interest in an activity and listen to adults and peers,
- be intrinsically motivated (curious about and challenged by the world) and
- develop fine and gross motor skills and coordination.

(The Task Force recognizes that these expectations are for children finishing first grade, and that similar expectations would need to be developed for those completing grade 3.)

We agree with the developmentally appropriate curriculum approach defined by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). In such a program children select from among activities the teacher has prepared and those initiated by the children themselves. Children spend most of their time working individually or in small groups. Children are allowed to move at their own pace to acquire important skills. Because children will be at various levels of skill acquisition, the classroom contains materials and activities for a wide range of developmental interests and abilities. As the teacher moves among the groups and individuals, he/she facilitates learning by asking questions, offering suggestions, and adding more complex materials or ideas to a situation.
Teachers recognize that learning for young children does not occur in narrowly defined subject areas. Rather, skills and knowledge such as reading and mathematics are integrated into a variety of activities such as cooking, dramatic play, art, music, science and social studies projects. The classroom arrangement encourages interaction among children and includes fewer worksheets and more concrete materials for children to explore and use to solve problems. A developmentally appropriate curriculum accommodates the growing child by providing more complex materials and activities as children move from preschool through the primary grades.

Furthermore, in a developmentally appropriate program, steps are taken to integrate children who have various special needs into the regular classroom. Isolating special needs children in segregated classrooms or pulling children out of a regular classroom are avoided, because such practices often disrupt continuity and undermine a feeling of belonging to the group.

The Task Force does not believe that a developmentally appropriate curriculum should be characterized as providing "spontaneous activity" versus "teacher-directed instructional activities." Rather, developmentally appropriate programs should provide what has been called an "intellectually stimulating environment" that helps children extend their knowledge and skills within an atmosphere that fosters a sense of belonging, self-confidence and positive dispositions for learning. The key to an appropriate curriculum is, in fact, the teacher or teaching team. We believe the teacher must be well grounded in child development and skilled in both the observation of children and the ability to interact with children in ways that extend their thinking.

There are a variety of successful models for grouping children and deploying staff in carrying out this approach. Multi-age grouping and team teaching offer certain advantages, as does the practice of assigning a group of staff and children to work together over several years during the early years of schooling.
Local Strategies to Implement Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum

1. Review the educational program currently provided to 4-8-year-olds. This review should include participation by local board of education members, administrators, teachers, parents, experts in early childhood education and representatives of other community preschool programs. Assess the quality and effectiveness of present classroom environments for young children and their consistency with exemplary early childhood practice.

2. Develop a statement of philosophy, objectives, and principles for early childhood programs at the district and school level to provide an overall framework for specific policies in curriculum, materials, assessment, staff development, and teacher evaluation.

3. Assign district leadership responsibility for the early childhood program to an administrator with training in child development and early childhood curriculum and teaching. Provide authority for this leader to shape district policy and support implementation efforts of teachers, principals, and parents.

4. Review the need for additional resources necessary to support developmentally appropriate early childhood programs, e.g., limiting the group size (for 3 and 4 year olds, no more than 20 children with 2 adults, for 5-8 year olds, no more than 25 children with 2 adults or 15-18 children with one teacher).

5. Provide adequate time for teachers to plan and work with each other and to observe individual children.

6. Provide support for and evaluation of early childhood unit programs that experiment with varied curriculum, schedule, staffing patterns, and grouping of children.
7. Inform and educate parents on the school's philosophy and practices in early childhood education and on developmentally appropriate practice.

**Improved Assessment**

The Task Force agrees with the concern over the increased use of standardized tests with young children expressed by The National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education, The National Black Child Development Institute (NBCDI), and NAEYC. Many schools routinely administer some form of developmental readiness test to children before admittance to kindergarten or a standardized achievement test before promotion to first grade. Similarly, throughout the primary grades, schools often assess achievement using tests that do not reflect current theory and practice of how children learn. Because young children are not experienced test takers, paper and pencil tests administered to large groups and under stressful conditions rarely yield valid and meaningful results. Teachers waste valuable time “teaching for the test” rather than focusing on the developmental needs of children, and this has a serious, detrimental effect on the curriculum.

We believe that assessment practices for young children should reflect the developmental principles of the curriculum. The Task Force agrees with NAEYC that the most important consideration in evaluating and using standardized tests is the “utility criterion” — that is, the purpose of testing must be to improve services for children and ensure that children benefit from their educational experiences.

We recommend that young children be assessed through observation and recording of their developmental progress. Periodic samples of writing and drawings, oral tapes of reading, and videotapes or observations of social interaction and problem solving become examples in a portfolio for each child. This information should then be used to adapt the curriculum, plan activities to meet the needs of the children, and provide feedback to parents. This type of assessment should take place informally on a daily basis for program planning rather than for placement purposes.
Developmental or readiness tests should not be used to determine placement in what may be perceived as homogeneous groups. We think that early childhood classrooms should contain a heterogeneous mix of children with various levels of skills and abilities. Furthermore, because the program is designed to serve the needs of children, rather than to fit them into a predetermined group, children should not “fail” and retention should be avoided.

We are not suggesting abandoning the effort to assess appropriately the progress of students and the effectiveness of programs. We still need to hold schools, programs and professionals accountable and develop better ways of informing the public about the results of educational programs. Our concern is to find new ways to do this that do not stigmatize children and create a sense of failure at a young age.

Local Strategies to Implement Improved Assessment

1. Develop new approaches to documenting and reporting the development of young children across a full range of desirable abilities over time. These assessments should help teachers plan more effective ways to work with individual children and enable them to inform parents meaningfully about their child’s work.

2. Allow teachers sufficient time to observe and record children’s behavior.

3. Review the use of standardized tests to ensure that:
   - All standardized tests used in early childhood programs are reliable and valid according to the technical standards of test development and are used only for the purposes for which the tests are designed. Ensure that test administration is sensitive to the developmental needs of young children.
   - Decisions that have a major impact on children are not based on a single test score. Tests are not used for placement of children in homogeneous groups, to retain children in grade or to determine eligibility for enrollment.
• Selection of standardized tests to assess achievement or evaluate a program is based on how well a given test matches the locally determined philosophy and objectives of the early childhood program.

• Testing of young children recognizes and is sensitive to individual and cultural diversity.

4. Provide training to administrators and teachers on the selection, administration, and interpretation of standardized tests in a developmentally appropriate program.

Responsiveness to Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

In their landmark report, Children In Need, Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged, The Committee for Economic Development noted that in 1984, 36 percent of the babies born in this country were members of minorities, and by the year 2000, the proportion of minority children under 18 will be at least 38 percent. In 1985, minorities represented about 17 percent of the total U.S. population; yet by the year 2020, this proportion is expected to rise to more than one-third.

This increase in the number of children from diverse backgrounds has important implications for all education programs but particularly for early childhood programs. Young children come to school closely tied to the language and culture of their home. The self concept of a young child cannot be supported or enhanced in an atmosphere that denies the home culture and language. Cultural and linguistic responsiveness means establishing relationships between school and home in ways that value the unique characteristics that children bring to the school environment from their families. Moreover, cultural and linguistic diversity is seen as an attribute which enriches everyone in the school.

As was pointed out to the Task Force, staff in schools and other early childhood programs often misunderstand the behavior of minority children. Thus, the behavioral patterns children learn at home may put them at odds with their teachers. Believing that minority children lack ability and preparation for school, teachers
may lower their expectations and offer them an education that is neither stimulating nor suitable for children who need enrichment, not compensation.

On the other hand, cultural and linguistic responsiveness increases communication between parents and teachers in order to gain a greater understanding and appreciation of each other. Such reciprocity of knowledge and expectations helps facilitate cultural continuity and adapts the curriculum to the needs of the children. Cultural and linguistic responsiveness also means encouraging the continuation of the culture and language of the home, while providing skills and conceptual development that will allow children to succeed in the larger society. In this way the unity of the family is maintained, which in itself will help support the child’s learning environment.

Positive acknowledgement of the home culture can be achieved in part through the use of materials and activities that reflect the family’s culture and language. However, cultural and linguistic responsiveness is more than a collection of artifacts, ethnic meals and holidays that may, by themselves, encourage stereotypes of particular ethnic groups.

We agree with NBCDI that early childhood programs should be staffed with people who are representative of the surrounding community. Understanding and planning for diversity also calls for everyone involved in the early childhood unit to study and learn more about the cultural learning styles of minority children. It also calls for teachers who are willing to confront and question their own response to diversity and the effect this may have on young children and families.

Many young children arrive at school without any knowledge of English. The California School Readiness Task Force noted that one in four children in the state comes from a home where a language other than English is spoken. It recommends that the schools provide many opportunities for language interaction and that they should value and (when possible) use the home language to help teach basic skills while the child acquires English. The goal is academic success and proficiency in English without losing proficiency in the home language.

A developmentally appropriate classroom environment offers greater opportunities for responsiveness to
cultural and linguistic diversity. By providing a wider range of materials, more chances for children to select and invent activities, and more social interchange and conversation among children and adults, the developmentally appropriate early childhood unit is generally more responsive to individual differences in children, including culturally-based aspects of development. Parent involvement is also a key support for success in this component. Dialogue and activities with parents and other family members can be helpful in identifying problems and developing improved programs and materials.

Local Strategies to Respond to Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

1. Ensure that public school early childhood staff includes teachers and administrators who are from the community and are racially and ethnically representative of the children served.

2. Provide inservice training to teachers and administrators on cultural and linguistic responsiveness.

3. Provide curriculum material, resources and parent materials that reflect the cultural and linguistic diversity of the children.

Partnerships With Parents

Early childhood programs have a long history of parent involvement. We have strong evidence that such involvement by parents is critical to high-quality early childhood programs. The Task Force heard extensive testimony pointing to the importance of the family in the lives of young children. Two themes regarding parents and the schools emerged. First there was a consensus that the schools have not gone far enough in reaching out to parents, and therefore need to increase parent involvement. This is true particularly as they begin to serve younger children, but also extends to the children currently served in grades K-3. Second, programs for young children should also support the strengths and needs of families.

The Task Force recognizes that partnerships with parents are multilateral relationships in which both
parents and professionals exchange information. In order to establish this partnership, there must be a recognition that information sharing is a reciprocal process. Only through a sincere respect for the parental role can teachers begin to see parents as a source of support for their work and will some parents overcome the suspicion and resistance to approaching educators they may have developed from their own school experiences. The Task Force believes programs that serve children preschool-grade 3 should:

- promote an environment in which parents are valued as primary influences in their children’s lives and are essential partners in the education of their children.

- recognize that the self-esteem of parents is integral to the development of the child and should be enhanced by the parents’ positive interaction with the school.

- include parents in decisionmaking about their own child and on the overall early childhood program.

- assure opportunities and access for parents to observe and volunteer in classrooms.

- promote exchange of information and ideas between parents and teachers which will benefit the child.

- provide a gradual and supportive transition process from home to school for those young children entering school for the first time.

Beyond these essential practices, we believe that schools, in cooperation with other community agencies, should begin to provide family support and education services. The general goal of these services is to promote the family conditions and parental competencies that contribute to positive family and child development. Family support includes discussion groups on child development and issues of concern to parents (budget management, legal issues, housing); parent support groups; and linkages to community agencies for health care, social services, training for employment, child care and other similar services. Model family support programs may begin working with parents as early as the prenatal period or immediately following birth. Staff members may work through home visits, group

"It all comes back to respect, communication and a non-adversarial stance by both parents and school personnel..."
Airetta Ramsey
Head Start Parent
Chicago Regional Hearing
meetings, and through the provision of materials which parents can use at home.

Successful family support programs are being provided directly through the schools, by Head Start agencies, and through human service and other community-based agencies. Schools offer certain strengths as sponsors of these programs and gain benefits in terms of healthier, more competent children and close, positive ties with parents. However, these programs also pose a challenge to school routines and resources and may constitute services that stretch beyond what schools can accomplish in some communities. There are a number of alternative ways to organize and deliver these services in collaboration with other community agencies. This issue is addressed further in the section on collaboration.

Local Strategies to Ensure Partnerships with Parents

1. Develop both a school district and a local school action plan for parent involvement in the early childhood unit, and for parental outreach and family support efforts by public schools. The plan should include the following elements:

   - involvement of parents in decisionmaking regarding curriculum, evaluation and program policy;
   - communication between school and parents;
   - assistance and encouragement for parents to reinforce school work and child development at home;
   - opportunities for parents to observe and volunteer in classrooms; and
   - provisions for young children to make an incremental transition from home to school when entering for the first time.

2. Assure opportunities and access for parents to observe and volunteer in their child's program and provide training to support their involvement in the classroom.
3. Provide inservice training to teachers and administrators on parent involvement and family support.

4. Provide time for teachers to plan and conduct parent conferences and home visits.

5. Provide parents with materials and incentives to work with children at home.

6. Encourage local businesses to provide release time for parents to volunteer in classrooms and participate in parent-teacher conferences.

7. Provide leadership in the development of family support programs serving families prenatal through grade 3. Such programs should be designed in collaboration with existing community services.

8. Ensure that family support programs sponsored by the schools are an integral part of the school and have sufficient staff and sustained resources. Provide time for the teaching staff, administrators and family support staff to work together.

Training and Support for Staff and Administrators.

The Task Force considered three critical issues regarding the staff of public school early childhood programs: qualifications, training and support, and compensation.

An essential ingredient of quality early childhood programs is a well-trained staff that is supported by knowledgeable and sensitive administrators. This is the overwhelming consensus of educators, based on decades of research. Adults simply do a better job of providing early childhood services when they have specialized training in early childhood/child development. More recent research also points to the need for continuity in the staff working with young children. Children suffer serious disruption in care when they experience high levels of staff turnover.

Public schools traditionally have relied on certification as the entry level requirement for teachers. The Task Force found that many state certification
requirements are not appropriate to early childhood teaching. This is especially true when certified elementary teachers who have no experience or training with pre-K and kindergarten children are allowed to teach this age group. The Task Force believes that state certification requirements should be revised to require more appropriate training for teachers of younger children (see Chapter IV).

The Task Force agrees with NAEYC that staff should meet the following qualifications:

- Early childhood teachers should have college-level specialized preparation in early childhood education/child development.

- Teachers in early childhood programs, regardless of credentials, should be encouraged to maintain current knowledge of child development and its application to early childhood education practice.

- Early childhood teachers should have practical experience teaching the age group. Therefore, regardless of credentials, teachers who have not previously taught young children should have supervised experience with this age group before they are put in charge of a class.

We recognize that in some communities it may be difficult to hire teachers who meet school certification requirements and also have experience with the age group, particularly for classrooms serving preschool children. We recommend that where teachers lack this experience, they should be supervised and supported by a qualified master teacher with appropriate experience. An alternative source of staff for preschool programs could be those with the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential. For such staff, supervision and support should also be provided by a qualified master teacher and opportunities made available for further career development.

The Task Force believes there is no one way of staffing early childhood classrooms in public schools, yet we do encourage a multi-level concept of staffing with progressive levels of training. All early childhood programs should be supervised by principals or specialists with extensive experience in early childhood education. We believe that well-trained principals and specialists are key ingredients to successful early childhood programs.
Teaching in early childhood programs is a demanding professional job that requires considerable support on the job and ongoing professional development opportunities. All too often substantial sums are spent by schools and other early childhood programs in a series of disconnected workshops led by outside experts. We believe more effective staff development programs are characterized by a long-term plan developed with substantial staff involvement. Staff development should also provide ongoing feedback to teachers based on extensive observation of classroom practice by persons well-trained in early childhood.

We support providing ongoing career development opportunities for teachers, including rewards for teachers who stay in the classroom. Often teachers must shift to administrative or supervisory roles in order to gain increased salaries and status. We suggest developing ways to reward excellence in the classroom and new roles that draw on the experience of skilled staff in observing, diagnosing and crafting alternative approaches for teaching children who are not served well by standard classroom environments. Teachers should also be involved in the key decisions that affect their classrooms.

The Task Force is concerned about the recent finding of the Public School Early Childhood Study that some early childhood staff in preschool programs in the schools continue to receive lower salaries than other staff with similar experience, training, and credentials. This is largely due to inadequate financial support for preschool programs, even when they are sponsored by the schools. This leads to high staff turnover, which in turn affects the quality of the program. The Task Force recommends that schools provide teaching staff in preschool programs and child care programs under their sponsorship with compensation equivalent to that of other school staff with comparable training, experience and credentials.

Local Strategies to Provide Training and Support for Staff and Administrators

1. Encourage the hiring of teachers (and administrators with primary responsibility for the early childhood unit) who have pre-service training, certification, or credentials in early childhood
education/child development to staff the early childhood unit.

2. Provide regular in-service training in child development research and theory, and developmentally appropriate practice for teachers and administrators.

3. Utilize in-service training techniques for teachers that are individualized, ongoing and that provide a mentor approach, with classroom observation and feedback.

4. Ensure that standards and procedures for supervision and evaluation of teachers are consistent with developmental curriculum.

5. Provide time for staff to observe children and plan together as a team.

6. Ensure that teachers in early childhood unit programs receive salaries and benefits equivalent to other teachers in the schools who have comparable experience, education and training. Those with less education and training should have opportunities to obtain such training.
3 Implementing Collaboration: Local Strategies for Success

"It is only when and if schools can change their tradition of working alone that young children at risk will be prepared for school success."

(Barbara Bowman
Presentation to the Council of Chief State School Officers Summer Institute, August, 1988)

Over the past few decades there has been an explosion of early childhood programs in communities across the country. Today, early childhood systems in communities often include Head Start, public and private part-day and full-day center-based programs, a range of home-based services and an increasing number of child care resource and referral programs. As schools begin to serve younger children and respond to the needs of working parents, they must recognize and work with these existing programs.

The Task Force believes that when collaboration among early childhood programs does not occur, programs often compete for limited resources and staff, as well as for children and families. On the other hand, collaborative efforts can facilitate joint planning for staff development, and provide continuity for children and families as they move among programs. Furthermore, collaborative networks can provide a stronger voice for increasing needed resources for early childhood programs.

We believe that schools should also do more to ensure that the comprehensive needs of children and families are met. This calls for expanded collaboration with those agencies in the community that provide such services. Schools can use their unique access to children and families to serve as a conduit for information regarding
community programs. Local education leaders can also collaborate with others to stimulate new and improved services.

The Task Force believes that to serve young children effectively, the schools need to forge new partnerships with other early childhood programs and community agencies. This chapter discusses three key areas of collaboration and provides suggested strategies for local school administrators and boards of education. The three areas of collaboration are to:

- Expand and improve child care services.
- Improve staff quality.
- Ensure comprehensive services to children and families.

Collaboration to Expand and Improve Child Care Services

The Task Force heard a wide spectrum of opinions on the "child care and the public schools" debate. Some proponents believe that child care, especially for preschool children, is incompatible with the public schools. Others believe that public schools can play a role as a peer agency in the child care delivery system (with certain safeguards) and can learn from existing programs in the community. Still others are convinced that public schools should be the focal point of child care services in the community.

We believe that in the future schools will play an increasing role in early childhood programs, including, in some cases, the provision of full day services for younger children and before- and after-school services for school-age children. In order to support both parental choice and the existing child care delivery system, the schools must join in a partnership with other community-based early childhood programs.

We believe that the degree and type of public school involvement in child care will vary depending on community needs and available resources. In some cases schools may need to directly provide or sponsor full-day services to preschoolers and/or before-and-after-school services for children in elementary grades. Where
this occurs, we caution schools to avoid the false distinction between care and education. Full-day programs should not be seen as providing a half-day of education and a half-day of child care. In other communities, schools may choose not to provide services directly, but to collaborate with existing programs. For example, schools may allow child care providers to utilize space in school facilities for programs for pre-school or school-aged children.

Child care services for children with special needs offer a new opportunity for this strategy of collaboration between public schools and child care agencies. As public schools serve preschool children with special needs under the federal legislation P.L. 99-457, they may determine that community-based child care can provide high-quality settings and opportunities for mainstreaming children with special needs. Alternatively, schools may develop specialized staff and programs that can serve these children more effectively than other agencies.

Whether the schools provide child care directly or collaborate with other programs, the Task Force believes that schools should establish relationships with existing child care resource, and referral agencies. These organizations are rapidly becoming the backbone of support to both working parents and the community child care system. They provide information and guidance to parents on assessing the quality of programs, offer training and technical assistance to providers, help build the supply of child care and collect and provide community planning data. If such programs do not exist, the Task Force recommends that the schools advocate for their establishment in the community.

The Task Force is also concerned about the lack of planning and collaboration to ensure a smooth transition for children between early childhood programs in the community and programs in the schools. Such transitions occur annually as children move between program types, and they occur daily as children move from school to child care. We believe there is greater continuity for children and parents when both types of programs are developmentally appropriate. Schools can facilitate this transition by helping to ensure such programs both in the school and the
community, by maintaining ongoing communication with community services, and by collaborative planning to prepare children and involve parents in these transitions.

**Strategies To Expand and Improve Child Care Services**

1. Participate in or initiate local mechanisms for collaboration and planning of early childhood services, including child care. Collaborate with existing early childhood programs when planning new public school early childhood initiatives.

2. Initiate and collaborate with efforts to alter funding mechanisms and program eligibility standards to create incentives for local programs to collaborate in providing services.

3. Assess the need for school-age child care in the community and work with other key agencies to provide resources to establish school-age programs in the schools or through new and existing agencies in the community.

4. Examine transportation policies to ensure that children can be transported to community-based before-and after-school programs.

5. Encourage funding for and collaborate with local child care resource and referral agencies.

6. Provide leadership in establishing procedures to ensure a smooth transition from community-based early childhood programs to public schools.

**Collaboration to Improve Staff Quality**

The Task Force is seriously concerned about the staffing of early childhood programs, including those programs not sponsored by the schools. We heard many concerns about the inadequate training requirements, lack of staff, high turnover and vacancy levels and difficulties in the recruitment and retention of staff in community-based programs. In fact, while pre-kindergarten staff in public schools may be receiving lower wages than school staff with comparable backgrounds, qualified early childhood staff in community programs often receive salaries that are half of what
public school teachers receive regardless of experience, credentials and training.

Since we know that children’s experiences before and after school hours, and in the years before they enter school, can have a profound effect on educational success, we believe the schools should help to improve staff quality in child care and other early childhood services in the community. Because of their position in the community and/or state, school administrators and policymakers can play an important role in improving the training and compensation of early childhood staff.

In addition, we have an overall concern with the lack of a well-defined and consistent career ladder for early childhood staff across program sponsors. In community-based early childhood programs, there may be several roles, from director to education director or head teacher down to lead teacher, teacher, associate teacher, and finally to assistants or aides. The definition and requirements for each of these roles varies tremendously within and across communities and states. On the other hand, schools traditionally have relied on certified teachers and, in some cases, aides.

The Task Force heard testimony recommending a more consistent and dynamic approach to staffing across early childhood programs that would incorporate a progression of training levels ranging from apprentice aides to Child Development Associates and early childhood Associate degrees to Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. The Task Force recommends that schools and other early childhood programs collaborate to develop training standards and roles and responsibilities that provide some progression for early childhood professionals across program type. Such a system could provide some point, perhaps at the lead teacher level in the community early childhood programs and the teacher level in the schools, where staff training, level of responsibility and compensation are equivalent.

**Strategies to Improve Staff Quality**

1. Develop joint staff development opportunities for teachers and other staff across different early childhood programs.
2. Conduct local surveys of salaries, turnover rates, and levels of training and experience to document overall trends in compensation and status and convey results to parents and community leaders.

3. Cooperate in planning for career development opportunities across different publicly-funded early childhood programs.

4. Cooperate to improve the quality of higher education training programs for early childhood teachers.

Collaboration to Ensure Comprehensive Services to Children and Families

High quality early childhood programs support the overall well-being of children and their families. Young children simply cannot learn and develop to their fullest potential if they suffer from poor health and nutrition, inadequate housing, and other stressful family conditions.

Head Start, the national leader in providing comprehensive early childhood services, includes health screening, medical and dental treatment and follow-up, health education, mental health and nutrition services, and a wide range of social services to families. Research on Head Start indicates the positive effect these services have on the social competence of children and the positive functioning of families. Extending these services to all children and families, particularly to at-risk children, is essential to promoting optimal child growth and development.

Responsibility in the schools for existing support services for children and families typically falls to the school nurse, counselors, compensatory education staff, psychologists, and social workers. In many cases, however, these people have responsibility for so many children and families that case management and outreach to community agencies is difficult to achieve. In some schools such support services may not even exist. We have learned from successful early childhood programs that a more concentrated effort, particularly for at-risk children and their families, is needed in the early years. Fortunately, in most communities staff from health, human services, mental health, and adult literacy
agencies are working with the same families and children. The challenge is to find better ways to connect these staff with schools, other early childhood programs, and with their common clients.

The Task Force envisions the school as an ombudsman for children and their families, assuring that they receive needed support. Policies should encourage medical and dental screening and examinations. Relationships should be established with community health agencies to ensure follow-up. Health education, including the promotion of good nutritional habits, should be an integral part of the curriculum. Time and resources should be made available for staff to provide special help to children and families under stress and to children with special emotional needs.

Schools can collaborate in different ways with health, mental health and social service agencies. In some cases school space could house teams of staff from other agencies; assignments in other agencies could be organized to coincide with school attendance boundaries; or schools could serve as a focal point for screening efforts and referral to other services.

Although many schools are working towards these collaborative relationships, we believe all schools should join with other community agencies to improve support for children and families. This means becoming familiar with existing services, demonstrating a willingness to forge new relationships, joining community planning councils and coalitions and lending support and leadership in advocacy efforts to increase and improve child and family services.
Local Strategies to Ensure Comprehensive Services to Children and Families

1. Participate as active members of community coordinating bodies along with other agencies that provide support services to children and families.

2. Develop coordination and referral procedures with local health and social service agencies to increase parent's knowledge and access to services.

3. Identify appropriate staff within the school (i.e., counselors, nurse, social workers) or add new personnel who will be responsible for planning collaboration of the child and family services in the school. Provide resources and time for these staff members to work with teachers, families, and community agencies.

4. Encourage innovative family support services that build upon existing community services and linkages with public schools (e.g., transportation systems, outreach, cooperative screening, follow-up, coordinated case management).

5. In collaboration with appropriate community agencies, arrange for mental health consultants to assist teachers in planning for children with special emotional needs and/or children and families under stress.

6. In collaboration with appropriate community agencies, provide in-service training to early childhood teachers and administrators on the integration of good health and nutritional habits into the curriculum, and in the identification and reporting of child abuse and neglect.

7. Participate in federal and state nutrition programs and in efforts to expand the availability of these services.
Making It Happen: State Policy Recommendations

We have outlined a new vision of early childhood education and a large number of desirable changes in public schools. Local teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members, and early childhood leaders will implement this vision. But decisions by state policymakers are crucial for providing resources, incentives, and leadership for local initiatives. For example, chief state school officers can enhance parent involvement through new programs; governors can mandate collaboration among state agencies; legislators can vote for funding formulas which support high quality local programs, and state boards of education can pass regulations to assure appropriate staff training and class sizes necessary for developmentally appropriate teaching.

This chapter will address recommendations to state policymakers in three areas:

- Promoting the early childhood unit;
- Promoting collaboration in early childhood services; and
- Financing early childhood services.

This chapter concludes with a checklist of initial steps for working with this report. It is addressed specifically to state boards of education, but should also be useful to other state policymakers.
Promoting the Early Childhood Unit

1. Sponsor experiments to test different models of the early childhood unit.

States should support a series of pilot schools to test the early childhood unit concept, with funding for planning, training, reductions in class size, parental involvement and family support services, and development of new curricula and assessment instruments. Pilot early childhood units should test different models of staffing and classroom organization, different plans for grouping children, different approaches to implementing culturally relevant curricula, and different systems for staffing.

In addition to funding, states should offer waivers to regulations and program guidelines for pilot programs. This may be necessary because plans developed by some local communities may conflict with state requirements such as teacher evaluation procedures, regulations on curriculum and use of classroom time, or student assessment and service procedures in compensatory and bilingual education programs.

Pilot programs should be developed and evaluated over a time frame that allows them to test and refine their local strategies. We suggest that five years is the minimum time necessary to design and implement this type of comprehensive change in local school practice. We also recommend that evaluations pay as much attention to documenting the process of decisionmaking and implementation as to assessing outcomes and that outcome measures reflect a broad range of goals for children and adults.

2. Review and improve state policies related to curriculum and teaching in the early school years.

Many specific policies impinge on classroom practice. These include state curriculum requirements, school accreditation standards, teacher evaluation systems, class size provisions, staff development programs, and approval of textbooks and materials. These policies may either support or impede developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant instruction for young children. States should review their policies with the help of practicing teachers and early childhood experts, and
propose changes that are consistent with our best understanding of exemplary early childhood education.

3. Review and improve state policies related to the assessment and testing of young children.

State boards and departments of education should scrutinize existing state mandates that require testing of children in preschool and the early grades. This review should involve specific state testing programs, and assessment requirements tied to federal or state bilingual, compensatory, and special education programs. States need to review the local impact of state tests, and their interaction with different forms of testing initiated by districts and schools. States can take the lead in consulting with early childhood and measurement experts to assure that test instruments, training, and administration are consistent with appropriate purposes and uses of the tests. States should also support the development of alternatives to standardized tests for young children.

4. Review and improve state policies related to parent involvement and family support services.

States should assess requirements, programs, and policies related to parental involvement in schools, communication between parents and schools, and the provision of family support and education programs. States should consider the need for new programs to provide materials and training for school staff and administrators to assist in improving parent involvement.

5. Review and improve policies on the training and certification of staff for early childhood programs.

State boards and departments of education need to work with teacher education institutions, the early childhood community and public school leaders to assess present standards and systems for recruiting and preparing people for careers in early childhood teaching. The content of state standards and training programs should be consistent with principles of exemplary early childhood practice. Specifically, standards for teacher certification and program approval for teacher preparation programs should include the following:
• Credentials that reflect the need for specialized training and experience with younger children.

• Credentials that recognize a range of levels of training, experience, and responsibilities, with opportunities for career development and mobility for staff under different sponsoring agencies.

• Requirements for training in child development, developmentally appropriate curriculum and assessment, culturally responsive practices, child observation, working and communicating with parents, and collaboration with other staff members and representatives of other community agencies.

• Requirements for extensive and varied field experience in high quality early childhood programs, including experiences and observations in working with parents.

• Provision for continuous professional development through in-service training.

6. Sponsor efforts to inform and educate parents and citizens on the characteristics and benefits of high quality early education.

We must find ways to help parents and the public recognize and understand quality early childhood practice. Articles in the popular media, television shows, and video tapes can be useful ways to convey clear images of good early childhood classrooms and parent support and involvement.

7. Provide additional resources for implementation of the early childhood unit.

Based on the local experiments and reviews of state policy outlined above, state leaders should assess the costs of implementing high quality practices in early childhood units. States should also assess opportunities for cost savings or more efficient uses of existing resources. For example, spending for textbooks and workbooks may be shifted to purchasing manipulative materials and a selection of children's literature for classrooms; existing staff development funds may be focused on the special concerns of early grade teachers; compensatory and special education resources may be utilized more effectively in early prevention of learning problems; and costs and time devoted to standardized
testing may be reduced. Based on this study, states should adjust funding formulas or provide new program funds to support local implementation of the early childhood unit.

**Promoting Collaboration In Early Childhood Services**

1. **Create systems for state agency collaboration in planning, standard-setting, and program development.**

State boards and departments of education should create ongoing mechanisms for collaboration with health and human service departments and other agencies sponsoring programs for young children and their families (e.g., Head Start programs). Initially, agencies should create a common core of data on needs and existing services. Standards and regulations that govern all state programs should be reviewed for (a) consistency with principles of high quality programming; (b) similarities and discrepancies in requirements; (c) coverage of all providers and settings that care for young children; and (d) quality of administrative systems such as monitoring and enforcement.

2. **Build systems to encourage early childhood programs and professionals to help each other.**

States should create mechanisms for program directors and staff to exchange successful practices and converse on difficult problems. State agencies can be helpful in identifying and disseminating innovative practices, funding staff development initiatives to serve personnel from a variety of different programs, organizing conferences to bring together staff and directors from different agencies, and supporting opportunities for staff to visit schools and centers to observe teaching and parent involvement activities.

3. **Provide funding and incentives to support local collaboration in early childhood services.**

States can support local collaboration through a variety of means: grants to defray costs of planning and data collection, support for early childhood resource and referral agencies that connect parents with early childhood programs, and funding for special collaborative programs on problems such as:
• Improving the transition for children and parents between early childhood programs and the public schools;

• Improving connections between school-aged child care programs and public schools;

• Serving groups representing a special challenge, such as young children from homeless families, children of recent immigrants, adolescent parents, and children with special needs.

We also suggest that states review funding and program guidelines to find ways to reduce unhealthy competition and promote collaboration among local agencies and programs.

4. Support recruitment efforts to increase the supply and stability of the early childhood work force.

States should publicize opportunities for employment in the field of early childhood education, encourage teacher preparation institutions to make special efforts to recruit candidates into early childhood training programs, sponsor surveys of salaries and working conditions, and support efforts to increase the compensation, status and stability of staff in early childhood programs.

**Financing Early Childhood Services**

Most recent policy reports on early childhood education have centered on arguments for increased funding for preschool programs. We believe our recommendations will dramatically strengthen the capacity of schools and early childhood programs to improve their services to children and parents. However, even if all our recommendations are implemented, we also need to improve access to early childhood services. States have led the way in recent years by increasing funding for preschool programs, but more needs to be done. To help motivate and guide state investment, we offer the following four principles for state funding policy:

1. Promote early childhood funding as an investment opportunity.
Experts on personal finance emphasize the importance of distinguishing between spending and investing as the key to family financial health. We join with groups such as the Committee on Economic Development and the National Governor’s Association in making the same argument in budget proposals for early childhood programs. We know that high quality early childhood education will provide a profitable future return on investment by reducing the future costs of special education, grade retention, school dropouts, delinquency and substance abuse, and low academic achievement. Parents who can count on consistent, affordable child care arrangements will increase their earnings and productivity on the job.

2. Understand the importance of quality in developing programs.

It is impossible to overemphasize the need to assure that new funding for early childhood programs be structured to assure that children receive the best services we know how to provide. This means adequate resources to attract and retain well-trained staff, to maintain low child/staff ratios, and to support parent involvement, comprehensive services to children, and continuing professional development for staff. State leaders should resist proposals to pack more children into a program or to fund more communities than would be consistent with optimum quality.

3. Promote equity and access to early childhood services.

The current public funding system for preschool programs serves only a small proportion of eligible children from low income families. We need to expand preschool opportunities for children placed at risk by a variety of circumstances, including limited family income. At the same time, we are concerned about economic segregation in early childhood services. In most communities, children from low-income homes do not attend the same programs as children from middle and upper income families.

We recommend that public funding recognize the priority needs of children who will benefit the most from high quality early childhood experiences. However, as stated in our next recommendation, we also recommend that publicly-funded early childhood
programs be encouraged to recruit a diverse set of children through use of a sliding fee scale for parents who can afford to contribute to the costs of services.

4. Utilize a blend of federal, state, local, and parental support.

We applaud the growing willingness of state political leaders to support increased funding for early childhood programs, and the active Congressional debate on proposals to provide additional resources for child care and early education services. We suggest that new federal and state programs include provisions for local communities to contribute additional resources (in the form of facilities, personnel, management services, volunteer time, or cash) in order to increase the ownership of local leaders in the program and to expand services to additional families. Further, we recommend that all programs allow children from middle and upper income families to enroll on a sliding fee scale basis to provide a more diverse mix of program participants.
Starting The Process - A Checklist For State Boards Of Education

1. Visit a range of high quality early childhood programs and early elementary level classrooms in different settings.

2. Join with other state agencies involved in early childhood programs; representatives of local Head Start, child care, resource and referral, parent education and support programs, teachers of young children; legislators; local board members and school administrators to assess the recommendations of this report in relation to problems and objectives of your state.

3. Develop a picture of the current needs and early childhood services in terms of funding, access, enrollment, and sponsorship of programs.

4. Establish a Study Commission to review existing state policies, mandates, and programs in terms of consistency with the aims of the early childhood unit concept and the need to improve collaboration between public schools and early childhood programs.

5. Work with other child care and preschool providers and advocates, legislators and the governor to develop long-term plans to expand early childhood programs and enhance the quality of those services.

6. Support the development of local forums for the discussion of the quality of early childhood care and education; these discussions should involve teachers, parents, and community leaders.
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