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<td>H.B.</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCEEP</td>
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</tr>
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<td>IEP</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Individualized Family Service Plan</td>
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<td>NEC*TAS</td>
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<td>NGA</td>
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<td>OEO</td>
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<td>OERI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.A.</td>
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</tr>
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<td>PARC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
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</tr>
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<td>SEA</td>
<td>State Education Agency</td>
</tr>
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<td>Section</td>
</tr>
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<td>START</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subd.</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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GLOSSARY

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

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

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

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

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

Children At Environmental Risk: Children who were biologically sound at birth but whose early life experiences and environment threaten their physical and developmental well-being. Examples of environmental factors which have a strong probability of adversely affecting a young child include lack of stimulation, poor nutrition, inadequate health care, parental substance dependence, and parental history of child abuse or neglect (Tjossem, 1976).
Children At Established Risk: Children whose early appearing and aberrant development is related to diagnosed medical disorders of known etiology bearing relatively well-known expectancies for developmental outcome within specified ranges of developmental delay. An example of children at established risk are those with Down Syndrome. The condition is known to produce certain abnormalities such as mental retardation (Tjossem, 1976).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP): A plan written for each family of a handicapped infant or toddler that contains the following: 1) a statement of the infant's or toddler's present levels of physical development, cognitive development, language and speech development, psycho-social development, and self-help skills, based on acceptable objective criteria; 2) a statement of the family's strengths and needs relating to enhancing the development of the family's handicapped infant or toddler; 3) a statement of the major outcomes expected to be achieved for the infant or toddler and the family, and the criteria, procedures, and timelines used to determine the degree to which progress toward achieving the outcomes are being made and whether modifications or revisions of the outcomes or services are necessary; 4) a statement of specific early intervention services necessary to meet the unique needs of the infant or toddler and the family, including the frequency, intensity, and the method of delivering services; 5) the projected dates for initiation of services and the anticipated duration of such services; 6) the name of the case manager from the profession most immediately relevant to the infant's or toddler's or family's needs who will be responsible for the implementation of the plan and coordination with other agencies and persons; and 7) the steps to be taken supporting the transition of the handicapped toddler to services provided under part B (of PL 99-457) to the extent such services are considered appropriate (PL 99-457, 1986).
Interagency Coordinating Council: A council composed of 15 members (at least 3 parents of handicapped children aged birth through 6, inclusive; at least 3 public or private providers of early intervention services; at least one representative from the state legislature; at least one person involved in personnel preparation; and other members representing each of the appropriate agencies involved in the provision of or payment for early intervention services to handicapped infants and toddlers and their families; and others selected by the state's governor). Among its functions as stipulated in Sec. 682 of 20 USC 1482, the Council advises and assists the lead agency in the identification of the sources of fiscal and other support for services for early intervention programs, assigning financial responsibility to the appropriate agency, and promoting interagency agreements (PL 99-457, 1986).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION

Since *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) was released, many national organizations and groups have recommended a number of reforms to improve our educational system. Many of these reforms call for increased standards for students at all levels and higher expectations for educational personnel. There appears to be support for these reforms from the general public and many educational stakeholders. Yet there is a growing recognition that many school reform efforts intended to achieve excellence may bypass thousands of students -- students for whom traditional modes of education often have failed. They are at risk of academic failure and not entering into productive lives of employment (Willis, 1986).

Who are these students? They are frequently labeled the "educationally disadvantaged." They are children who "cannot take advantage of available educational opportunities or . . . the educational resources available to them are inherently unequal" (Committee for Economic Development [CED], 1987 p. 5). Levin (1985) reported that in 1982, as much as 30% of the school population was educationally disadvantaged and that this proportion was rapidly increasing.

The Committee for Economic Development (CED, 1987) discussed five major issues surrounding the educationally disadvantaged: 1) children and poverty; 2) single-parent families; 3) children of children; 4) demographics; and 5) equal educational opportunity.
The first issue was children and poverty. While some children born into poverty have positive role models, family support, and the determination to succeed in school despite their disadvantages, others fall victim to the many conditions associated with their low economic status -- gross malnutrition, recurrent and untreated health problems, psychological and physical stress, child abuse, and learning disabilities. Those who survive infancy are three times more likely to become school dropouts than are children from more economically advantaged homes (CED, 1987).

Children as a group are now the poorest segment of the nation's population. In fact, they are almost seven times as likely to be poor as those over 65 years of age (Moynihan, 1986). Of all the children under age 18, 20% live in families whose incomes fall below the poverty line, and 25% of all children under 6 years of age are now living in poverty. Forty-three percent of black children and 40% of Hispanic children live in poverty even though two-thirds of all poor children are white (U.S. Congress, House, 1987). Duncan and Rodgers (1985) contend that the average black child will spend five of the first 15 years of childhood in an impoverished home and that black children as a group are nearly three times as likely to live in poverty as white children.

Single-parent families was the second issue addressed by CED. Poverty is greatest among those children living in single-parent homes headed by women. According to Moynihan (1986), children of single parents tend to do worse in school than children living with two parents, and their dropout rate is nearly twice as high. In 1985, almost 50% of white children, 66% of black children, and more than 70% of Hispanic children living in female-headed households lived in poverty. While one out of every six white children lives in a single-parent home, this situation has become the norm for black children; 50% live in homes headed by unmarried women (U.S. Congress, House, 1987).
The 1980 Census projected that of every 100 children born in 1983, 59 will live with only one parent before reaching age 18. Twelve will be born out of wedlock; 40 will be born to parents who divorce before the child is 18; five will be born to parents who separate; and two will be born to parents of whom one will die before the child reaches 18. The remaining 41 will reach age 18 "normally" with two parents (Hodgkinson, 1985).

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

Demographics was the fourth issue related to the educationally disadvantaged addressed by the CED. Referencing the work of Hodgkinson (1985), the CED noted the marked increase of minorities in the U.S.:

In 1984, 36 percent of the babies born in this country were members of minorities, and by the year 2000, the proportion of minority children under 18 will be at least 38 percent.

In 1985, minorities represented about 17 percent of the total U.S. population. By the year 2020, this proportion is expected to rise more than one-third; if
current demographic trends continue, a larger proportion of this group will be children from disadvantaged homes (CED, 1987, p. 9).

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

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

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

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

Another major demographic trend noted by CED (1987) is the increasing need for child-care arrangements. In 1985, more than 25% of all impoverished mothers with children under the age of 6 were in the labor force. During the mid 1980s, nearly half of all married mothers with infants under one year of age were
employed (Yale Bush Center Infant Care Leave Project, 1984), and 50% of mothers with 1-year-olds had already returned to work (Hodgkinson, 1985). The Children's Defense Fund (1987) predicts that by 1995, two-thirds of all preschool children will have mothers in the workforce and that by 1990, more than 10 million children will require some type of child-care services as 9 out of 10 mothers, married or single, will be in the workforce (McCormick, 1986).

**Equal educational opportunity** was the fifth issue the CED discussed. Less affluent school districts routinely spend less per pupil than do wealthier districts. The CED contends that schools serving the disadvantaged need more resources, not less, because their students are in greater need. Further, it suggests that society needs to make a greater effort to provide adequate resources so that equal opportunity is not an "empty concept," especially for those "children who come to school already handicapped by their circumstances" (CED, 1987, p. 10).

In summary, the CED described disadvantaged children as usually being poor and minority. They fall victim to the correlates of poverty. They are often found in single-parent homes and are frequently children of children. They tend to be low achievers academically and experience high dropout rates. As students, they are at risk of not obtaining a high school diploma. For many, they attend schools where resources are less than adequate. And their numbers are rapidly increasing. Already, they comprise about one-third of the school population.

Citing McDonald (1986), the CED also noted that a closer examination of why children fail reveals that children may also fail in school because they arrive poorly prepared for the classroom or are not yet developmentally ready for formal education. Their parents may be indifferent to their educational needs. They may have undiagnosed learning and emotional problems, or physical handicaps. They may have language problems or come from non-English speaking homes, and they may experience racial or ethnic prejudice.
Based on the grim information regarding disadvantaged children, the changing demographics of the family in general, and working mothers in particular, it should come as no surprise that the nation as a whole has become very concerned about its children and their future. Because of this concern, many national organizations and groups such as CED (1987), the Council of Chief State School Officers (1987a, 1987b, 1987c), and the National Governors’ Association (1986, 1987a) advocate "Early Intervention/Early Childhood Education (ECE)" as the major strategy to reduce or eliminate the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children. ECE is targeted at the population of youngsters under the age of 5, who have not begun their formal schooling in kindergarten.

During the 1980s, state legislative interest in educational programs for preschool-aged children grew considerably. By 1987, 24 states and the District of Columbia had spent state money on these programs and most states had targeted at-risk children for their programs (Grub, 1987; Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988).

The National Conference of State Legislatures (Gnezda and Sonnier, 1988) reports that the increased interest in ECE developed to some extent as a response to the growing number of children in poverty and increased employment among mothers of young children. However, it notes that the most important and significant factor influencing legislative support for ECE was research (Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein, & Weikart, 1984; the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, 1978, 1981) that demonstrated short- and long-term academic and social benefits to disadvantaged 3- and 4-year-olds who were enrolled in ECE programs. Further, the studies suggested that spending on ECE can save a state from $4 to $7 for every $1 spent (Barnett, 1985).

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

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

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

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

The third function involves analyzing the options and assessing the feasibility of prospective policies and the implementation and effects of existing ones. McDonnell (1988) notes that this function is "most important to the
The primary purpose of this policy study was to identify and analyze early intervention policies for young children at risk of academic failure in selected state education agencies (SEAs) in the North Central Region of the U.S. Since
state legislatures have become very active in educational policymaking and have mandated early intervention/early childhood education programs, the policies studied include those mandated by seven SEAs and/or their corresponding state legislatures.

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

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

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

Once the status of early intervention policies and legislation was determined in terms of accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements, they were analyzed in the following manner:
1. The policies, mandates, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements were compared with what the authorities say should be components of effective ECE programs.

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

**Background and Procedure**

Due to the nature of this policy study, the researcher's previous knowledge regarding early intervention/early childhood education, and the researcher's involvement with the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) many of the steps described below were conducted somewhat simultaneously.

NCREL is one of nine regional educational laboratories funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education. Two tasks of NCREL, by contract with OERI, are to work with decisionmakers in the states it serves and to disseminate research and development information. The mission of NCREL is to bridge the gap between educational research and theory on the one hand and policy and practice on the other. The goal of the Laboratory is to improve student learning and performance. Laboratory efforts primarily focus on students in urban and rural areas who are at risk of academic failure.

The literature was surveyed first to gain a historical perspective of the field of early intervention/early childhood education. In addition, national education and government organizations and associations were contacted by letter and telephone to obtain their position and/or policy statements on early intervention/early childhood education. In a number of instances, additional
sources for information were suggested, and contact with these groups was made. A sample letter and the list of organizations and associations contacted which provided position or policy statements are found in Appendix A. Further, a number of research, policy, and advocacy organizations were also contacted which supplied background information. A list of these organizations is provided in Appendix B. Based on the literature surveyed and the information collected, the researcher provides a historical review of early intervention in the next chapter in order to place this study into proper context. The review includes pertinent educational movements, and selected theorists and researchers who provided the bases for a rationale for early intervention.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the High/Scope Foundation (High/Scope) were also contacted because of their nationally recognized expertise in the education of young children. Information from these organizations provided the components for early intervention/early childhood education programs against which SEA policies and legislative mandates were analyzed and compared.

The next step in the study was to determine which SEAs would be examined for their policies in early intervention/early childhood education. The SEAs selected were those in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Selection of these particular SEAs was based on a number of reasons.

First, the SEAs are located in the states served by NCREL. Second, the researcher is an NCREL staff member who has an established working relationship with the states' SEA personnel and had access to information regarding current and pending state initiatives and legislation.

Third, preliminary investigation of SEA initiatives in the country revealed that five of the seven states had legislation directing the SEA to provide services
to young children. The researcher was aware that the other two states were studying the issue and anticipated state legislation for early intervention/early childhood education programs in the near future.

Fourth, the demographics of the North Central Region are diverse. In terms of area, it covers 379,474 square miles or 25% of the land area of the continental United States. Approximately 21.5% of the U.S. population reside in the region. More specifically, 17.5% of the nation's black population, 10.3% of native Americans, and 7.7% of Hispanics reside in the seven states (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory [NCREL], 1987).

Of the 48.7 million inhabitants of the region, three-fourths reside in metropolitan areas and one-fourth reside in non-metropolitan areas which includes 31% of the nation's farm population (NCREL, 1987).

At the start of the 1986-87 school year, the combined seven states served 3,846 school districts representing 23,521 public elementary and secondary schools. Almost 9.6 million students and more than a half million educators in instructional staff positions were served by these schools and districts (NCREL, 1987).

The educational enterprise of the region's elementary and secondary students is also diverse. Two-thirds of the students attend schools in metropolitan areas while one-third attend schools in rural areas. Some districts enroll fewer than 25 students while others have more than 100,000 students. There are schools with very strong instructional programs while others are on the verge of "academic bankruptcy" (NCREL, 1987, p. 2).

The final reason that prompted the researcher to select the seven states in particular was that the descriptive data produced by this study could generate policy issues that state and local decisionmakers may want to consider as they propose and implement early intervention/early childhood education programs.
NCREL plans to summarize the information in a policy brief and distribute it to state and local policymakers in the North Central Region.

Following the selection of the SEAs, the researcher contacted the SEA personnel via letter and telephone in order to gather the necessary documents pertaining to early intervention/early childhood education policies and legislation. Through these contacts, additional people responsible for early intervention/early childhood education in each SEA were identified for further information. A sample letter and a list of names and addresses of the individuals contacted and who supplied documents for examination and analysis are found in Appendix C.

The collection of data for this study was facilitated by a number of events. Through the course of contacting SEAs and national organizations, the researcher learned that the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) had created a National Task Force on Early Childhood Education in November, 1987. The purpose of the Task Force was to design a policy agenda to promote the education and development of young children ages 4-8. One of two key areas to be addressed by the Task Force focused on preschool-aged children:

Finding new ways for public schools to complement and supplement the efforts of early childhood programs and other community agencies in serving preschool children and their families (National Association of State Boards of Education [NASBE], 1988a).

During the spring of 1988, the Task Force sponsored four regional hearings: March 1-2 in Boston, April 11-12 in Atlanta, May 2-3 in Chicago, and May 23-24 in Burlington, CA. Each hearing included open testimony on a list of issues provided by NASBE as well as a panel discussion on a topic selected by NASBE. The researcher attended the hearing in Chicago. Five of the presenters provided testimony on SEA early childhood initiatives: Audrey Witzman, Illinois State Board of Education; Carolyn Logan, Michigan Department of Education; Joan
Murray, Indiana State Department of Education; Jane Weichel, Ohio Department of Education; and Karen Goodenow, Iowa State Board of Education.

It was through attendance at this hearing that the researcher was able to strengthen contacts already made with three personnel of the SEAs and to initiate contacts with personnel in two SEAs. A written copy of each state presenter's testimony and supportive material were received by the researcher as a result of attending the hearing. Following the hearing, the researcher received a copy of Michigan's legislation, SEA policy statement, and the description of early childhood education programs in Michigan as well as a complete summary of the hearing provided by Tom Schultz, staff member of NASBE. The researcher received the final Task Force Report, *Right from the Start* (NASBE, 1988b), in the course of preparing this dissertation.

The second event which facilitated the collection of data for this study occurred June 12-17, 1988, in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. At that time, the researcher attended the Frank Porter Graham Intensive Summer Institute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The focus of the institute was on early childhood education for at-risk and handicapped preschoolers, ages birth to 5. The specific strand attended by the researcher explored the basic issues involved in state policy development pertaining to Part H, PL 99-457, the infants and toddlers section of the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986. The seminar, led by the staff of the Carolina Policy Studies Program and directed by James J. Gallagher, provided the researcher with numerous resources for this paper.

While attending the Frank Porter Graham Summer Institute, the researcher also met with Pascal Trohanis, the director of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System (NEC*TAS). In 1987, the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center at the University of North Carolina and their
collaborators had been selected by the Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Education, as the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center for the country. The mission of NEC*TAS is to assist states (including SEAs) in the development and provision of multidisciplinary, comprehensive, and coordinated services for children with special needs (birth through age 8) and their families. Dr. Trohanis provided the researcher with numerous materials concerning NEC*TAS and a resource packet on Head Start.

The third event which facilitated collection of data for this study occurred August 17-19, 1988, in Chicago, Illinois, when NCREL hosted its second annual conference -- Success for At-Risk Students: A Continuing Priority. The focus of the conference was on students at risk of academic failure. The researcher attended sessions that described recent legislation for at-risk students and received information and documents from Iowa Senator Charles Bruner and Dennis Jackson, Manager of Indiana's At-Risk Student Program.

The next step in this study consisted of constructing a chronology of major activities that contributed to the development of SEA policies and state legislation for states where this information was available. A description of the processes undertaken by the states and a description of the actual policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements are provided in Chapter III.

Chapter IV presents the components of effective early childhood programs recommended by High/Scope and NAEYC. Further, the researcher's comparative analysis of the SEA policies, legislative mandates, rules, guidelines, and requirements with the recommended components of effective ECE programs is also presented in Chapter IV.
And finally, the implications of the SEAs' policies, legislative mandates, rules, guidelines, and requirements pertaining to early intervention/early childhood education in the seven selected states are presented in Chapter V.

Limitations

Most studies have limitations and this study is no exception. First of all, while the study concentrated on a very populous and vast geographic region of the country, it examined policies in just seven states, all of which have different needs, limited resources, and strong forces which compete for any monetary resources.

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

And finally, the issue of early intervention/early childhood education continues to be a "hot topic" and one that is presently in flux. Two events best illustrate the fluidity of the topic.

First, more than 100 child-care bills were introduced during the 100th Congress. While none of the bills were passed into law in 1988, there is strong speculation that at least one bill, either Senator Kennedy's Smart Start or the Act
for Better Child Care, or a version that combines elements of the two bills will be enacted into law within the next six months. Results of this federal legislation could have a significant impact on SEAs and state legislatures.

Second, NASBE's Task Force Report on Early Childhood Education was released on October 28, 1988, and recommends sweeping changes for public schools and needed services for young children and their families. The influence of this report on SEAs and local policymakers may begin even before this study is completed.

Three problems were encountered during the course of this study. While they did not limit the study, they deserve mention should anyone else decide to undertake similar work.

First, the legislative cycles of states differ. This delayed the data collection process to such a degree that current information was still being collected as parts of this paper were written. Further, the rules and guidelines to accompany SEA policies and legislation are, in some cases, still being written. Thus, the policies and legislative mandates and any accompanying rules or guidelines described in this study include those which were developed prior to October, 1988.

The second problem encountered in this study was related to the legislative and SEA documents. Rarely were the documents dated. Thus, the researcher found it necessary to review the chronology of events with appropriate SEA personnel, primarily program managers and legislative analysts, to determine when certain events occurred. Further, the language of some of the legislative documents, in particular, were difficult to understand. Personnel in the SEAs and Iowa Senator Charles Bruner were extremely helpful in assisting the researcher in this matter.

The third problem encountered is that not all programs serving young children are housed within the same divisions or departments of the SEA nor
within the SEA at all, even though the SEA may have partial or full responsibility for administering the programs. For example, the legislation in Iowa requires the Department of Education and the Department of Human Rights to share administration of a new grant program, part of the Child Development Assistance Act. Thus, researchers must be sure they have all pertinent information and copies of legislation and SEA documents before analyzing their data.

***

This chapter discussed a significant educational and social problem in our country. Increasing numbers of children are at risk of academic failure and not entering into productive lives of employment. However, early intervention/early childhood education for at-risk preschoolers can alter this trend.

This chapter also presented the purpose of this study, the study's procedures, and the study's limitations. Before an analysis of the SEAs' policies and legislative mandates can be undertaken, a historical review of early intervention must be presented in order to set these policies and mandates into proper context. The next chapter presents a historical review of early intervention.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF EARLY INTERVENTION

Three separate yet related fields of education have formed the roots of early intervention: a) early childhood education; b) compensatory education; and c) early childhood special education. All three fields were influenced by theory and research and contributed to forming a rationale for early intervention.

This chapter traces the history of early intervention. The first section historically reviews the four movements in early childhood education: the kindergarten movement, the Montessori movement, the nursery school movement, and the day-care movement. Section two reviews the history of compensatory education pertinent to young children. Early childhood special education (ECSE) is historically reviewed in section three. Section four, the last segment of this chapter, reviews the contributions of selected theorists and researchers who provided the bases for a rationale for early intervention and influenced these three fields of education relating to young children.

Collectively, achievements in these three fields and the contributions of theorists and researchers paved the way for what is now considered a "Zeitgeist", that is, the spirit of the age, the trend of thought and feeling that early intervention is indeed a viable strategy to reduce or eliminate the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children.
Early Childhood Education

Early Childhood Education (ECE) is the term frequently applied to the education of young children from birth to age 8. For the purposes of this historical review, concentration centers on programs that were established to serve the needs of young children prior to and including kindergarten. Specifically, the writer has chronologically reviewed the historical development of the kindergarten movement, the Montessori movement, the nursery school movement, and the day-care movement. ECE has its historical beginnings primarily in Germany, Italy, England, and the U.S.

The Kindergarten Movement

During the early 1800s, Froebel established the first kindergarten (meaning a garden for children) in Germany. Considered the first truly "solidified approach to the direct instruction of young children" (Peterson, 1987, p. 111), Froebel's philosophy emphasized several basic principles:

(a) Education should be passive in the sense that it is primarily protecting and nurturing the child, but not prescriptive or controlling;

(b) Play is natural to children and should constitute the heart of the curriculum;

(c) Play is the means by which children gain insights, and it is the means for mental development; and

(d) Play should be free play, not something to be interfered with by adult supervision (Peterson, 1987, p. 112).

In Froebel's kindergarten emphasis was placed on training children, 3-6 years of age, in habits of cleanliness, neatness, punctuality, courtesy, deference toward others, language, numbers, forms, and eye-hand coordination. Lazerson (1972) described Froebel's program as such:
his proposals synthesized religion, missionary zeal, and educational needs. . . .

After the age of three, the child should enter a 'children's garden' where he
would take his place among his peers, adjust to their companionship, and be
integrated into the institutions of the larger society. In the kindergarten a
trained teacher nourished healthy and weeded out destructive tendencies (p.
37).

Lazerson (1972) also contended that Froebel's greatest innovation was that
of play and that it in essence

involved the channeling of spontaneous energies into orderly behavior. It
allowed the child to express his physical needs but, properly guided through
the use of Froebel's requirements, it adjusted him to peer and adult
requirements. The child learned the rules of the game and naturally
responded to order and harmony as he grew older (p. 37).

As Froebel's ideas proliferated around Germany, the need for trained teachers
increased and he became involved in teacher training (Peterson, 1987).

Several individuals were particularly responsible for the growth of Froebel's
kindergarten in the United States. Margarethe Schurz, one of Froebel's former
students, established the first kindergarten for German-speaking children in
Watertown, Wisconsin, in 1856. Elizabeth Peabody established the first English-
speaking kindergarten in Boston in 1860 (Peterson, 1987).

Influenced by Peabody, William Harris, the school superintendent of the St.
Louis Public Schools, began the first experimental kindergarten in the public
schools in 1872. However, the concept of the kindergarten as part of the public
school system was formalized due to the efforts of Susan Blow, the director of the
first public school kindergarten in St. Louis. Blow became the champion of
Froebelism during the time progressive education was advocated by G. Stanley
Hall and John Dewey (Peterson, 1987; Lazerson, 1972; Evans, 1971).

During the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th
century, various private agencies, mothers' clubs, and philanthropic groups
continued to promote and sponsor kindergartens in the U.S. in attempt to solve the
problems caused by industrialization and urbanization that affected young children. The kindergarten's goals were a mixture of child socialization to middle-class norms and broader social reform. The kindergarten also attempted to change family life in the slums through the education of parents. Those who worked in kindergartens visited children's homes and instructed parents in the physical and emotional care of their children (Lazerson, 1972; Peterson, 1987).

Professionalization of ECE also grew during this time period. Established in 1892, the International Kindergarten Union was composed of kindergarten teachers, directors of kindergarten training schools, and supervisors of kindergartens in public schools. By 1918, its membership had grown to 18,000 making it the third largest educational organization in the world (Lazerson, 1972).

Growth also occurred in the number of kindergarten departments in normal schools and colleges, and a number of teacher training institutions combined kindergarten and primary school preparation into a single course of study (Weber, 1969).

Growth in the profession, however, also produced controversy. The relationship of symbolism to realism in the early childhood classroom, the extent of free play versus teacher direction, and the nature of creative activity were major areas of contention. While Froebel claimed to begin with the child, self-styled progressive critics argued that his pedagogy drew too much upon adult needs. They called for activities drawn from daily experiences and the surrounding community, and sought to substitute more freedom and individual choice for excessive imposition of order (Lazerson, 1972).

Anna Bryan was one of the first dissenters to question rigid adherence to Froebel's principles. Patty Smith Hall, Bryan's first student, carried the reform movement forward. In 1913, her "Report for the Committee of Twelve" to the International Kindergarten Union presented three key arguments:
I. Kindergarten curriculum should be related to the child's present circumstances rather than to the needs of children from another culture and another generation.

2. Children's personal experiences should be used as the vehicle for helping children gain insight and knowledge about their world.

3. Children should be allowed the freedom to engage in concrete, child-oriented play experiences based upon the natural activities of childhood (Peterson, 1987, p. 114).

According to Spodek (1978) the liberal reform advocated by Hall and others was a simple attempt to retain the general Froebelian philosophy but without the formalism that dominated the curriculum and teaching methodology.

G. Stanley Hall and John Dewey were two additional individuals who made significant contributions to the progressivism of the kindergarten reform movement. Both are considered instrumental in linking research and scientific thinking in psychology with education, including ECE.

Hall was credited with being the "father of child psychology" and introduced techniques of data collection, anecdotal records, and the analysis of children's products. Further, he believed kindergarten practices should evolve from empirical, objective observations of the child (Peterson, 1987).

Dewey, one of Hall's students, applied the theory of progressivism to American education and the kindergarten. Believing that education should involve active learning and problem solving, social interaction, and learning by doing things that were of interest to the child, Dewey established a laboratory school at the University of Chicago that included a classroom for 4- to 5-year-olds. Anna Bryan became the director of this kindergarten. Dewey argued that education should be integrated with life and be socially practical for the child, rather than preparation for an abstract, remote future (Weber, 1969; Braun and Edwards, 1972; Lazerson, 1972; Peterson, 1987).
According to Peterson (1987), the kindergarten reform continued into the 1920s and 1930s, and debates between the traditionalists and the progressivists continued and was fueled by the growing body of research from child research centers and laboratory schools.

Four critical events since the 1930s added to the changes in the kindergarten structure. First, the poor economic conditions of the 1930s and 1940s resulted in a decrease of kindergartens supported in the public schools. Second, there was a decline of the rigid formalism of education and a new awareness of social and emotional development due to the mental health movement. Third, the American people began to look critically at school curricula and the preparation students were getting after the Russians launched Sputnik in the 1950s. And fourth, since the 1960s, research on the effects of early experiences for young children, in particular those considered to have had stimulation deprivation, provided supporting evidence for the importance of early education and early experiences in young children (Peterson, 1987, Spodek, 1978).

While kindergarten today is viewed as a standard part of most public school systems (Peterson, 1987), the criteria for entrance and placement and the curricula taught are strongly criticized by educators and their professional associations (e.g., National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education [NAECS/SDE], 1987; Bredekamp, 1987; Connell, 1987; Hill, 1987).
The Montessori Movement

While Dewey’s philosophy began to affect early childhood education during the early 1900s, proponents were challenged by another European -- Maria Montessori. Having been trained as a medical doctor and influenced by the work of Itard and Seguin, Montessori began her educational work with mentally retarded children in Italy. Successes with the retarded prompted her to focus her attention on the urban poor. In 1907, she opened a Casa de Bambini (a children’s house) for young poor children, ages 3 to 7. It was initially supported by the owners of a new housing development in the poorest and most crime-stricken area of Rome to minimize vandalism from children in the area. However, her successes far surpassed the expectations of her sponsors and drew attention worldwide. Not only was vandalism prevented, many children learned basic academic skills, such as reading, counting, and writing before they were 5 years old (Lillard, 1972; Lazerson, 1972; Weber, 1969; Peterson, 1987).

Montessori’s classroom emphasized personal hygiene, good manners, and the use of manipulatives for problem solving. Individualized learning rather than group activities was the primary characteristic of the classroom environment. The Montessori method offered freedom within a carefully prepared environment (Montessori, 1964; Cohen, 1968).

According to Evans (1971), a number of key instructional and learning principles were central to the Montessori method:

- heterogeneous grouping of children by age;
- active involvement;
- self-selection and pacing in the use of materials;
- the use of self-correctional materials;
- learning activities arranged in graduated sequence;
the use of one sense modality at a time;
- provision of extraneous cues to facilitate fine discriminations;
- repetition and practice; and
- the contiguity principle, that is, the association between a stimulus pattern and a response.

Word of Montessori's work spread rapidly, and people from all over the world traveled to observe the activities in the Montessori schools that were in operation in Italy and Switzerland. Some of the schools continued to serve young children from the slums, and one school was opened in 1908 in Rome to serve children of well-to-do parents. Montessori's methods were also used in the orphan asylums and children's homes of Italian Switzerland. In 1909, she published the first comprehensive account of her work (Lillard, 1972).

Montessori's first trip to the U.S. was made in 1912 when she toured the country to lecture on her method. An American Montessori Association was formed with the wife of Alexander Graham Bell as president and the daughter of President Woodrow Wilson as secretary. Montessori schools were quickly established throughout the country, and many articles on Montessori education appeared in the popular press and education journals (Lillard, 1972).

The initial burst of enthusiasm for Montessori's methods, however, was gradually quelled by a great deal of criticism by some of the most highly respected members of the educational elite. One leading critic, William Kilpatrick, did the most damage to Montessori's popularity in the U.S. A popular and respected professor at Teacher's College, Columbia University, Kilpatrick wrote The Montessori System Examined in 1914, in which he dismissed Montessori's techniques as outdated. He questioned her assumptions about the transfer of learning, the lack of social cooperation in her methods, and criticized her instructional materials. Kilpatrick also utilized the forums of the
International Kindergarten Union and the Kindergarten Department of the National Education Association and published numerous articles in the *Kindergarten Review* criticizing Montessori's methods (Lillard, 1972; Peterson, 1987).

By 1916, interest in Montessori and her methods had virtually died. Her ideas regained attention by a few lay citizens in the 1920s but most of the schools that were established disappeared during the 1930s and 1940s. Interest in Montessori revived again in the 1960s, and many private schools were established. The number of Montessori schools and programs continues to grow today. However, there is great variability in their adherence to the original system created by Montessori (Peterson, 1987).

The Nursery School Movement

While Montessori developed schools for young children in Italy and trained teachers in her method, Rachel and Margaret MacMillan established the first nursery school in London, England. Created as a health clinic for British slum children in 1910 called the Deptford Schools Treatment Center (Whitbread, 1972), the clinic soon evolved into an open-air school aimed at preventing children's mental and physical illnesses. The MacMillan sisters coined the term "nursery school" for their center (Peterson, 1987).

The philosophy of the nursery school was based on the nurturance and concern for the whole child and emphasized the social, emotional, physical, and intellectual aspects of children's well-being. Teaching methods were inspired by Sequin, the French educator who worked with mentally retarded children. The curriculum was based on social concerns and values which was in contrast to Froebel's approach of religious values. Classroom activities focused on self-help
skills (e.g., washing and dressing), learning responsibility, sensory education, language, activities to teach form and color, and pre-reading, writing, math, and science (Peterson, 1987).

In the U.S., the nursery school movement began slowly. Influenced by the MacMillan sisters, Abigail Eliot and Edna Noble White independently established nursery schools in 1922. Eliot established the Ruggles Street Nursery School in Boston; White established a nursery program at the Merrill-Palmer School in Detroit (Peterson, 1987).

Eliot, a social worker, and White, a home economist, added new dimensions to the nursery school philosophy, that of parent involvement and interdisciplinary involvement of professionals. While the kindergartens tended to focus on school "readiness," the nursery schools focused on the nurturance of children and their satisfaction with exploration (Osborn, 1975).

The establishment of model nursery school programs by several University Centers for Child Study further contributed to establishing the nursery school as an American institution. Founded in departments of home economics or departments of human development and family life, these child development laboratories trained teachers, conducted research, and provided services to children. Examples of these laboratories include the Gesell Child Guidance Nursery founded by Arnold Gesell in 1926 at Yale University, the Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit, Teachers College at Columbia University, and the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station at the University of Iowa. By the early 1930s approximately 200 nursery schools were in existence, nearly half associated with colleges and universities, approximately one-third owned by private schools, and one-fifth operated by child welfare agencies (Peterson, 1987).

Another contributing factor to the establishment of nursery schools occurred in 1925. Patty Smith Hall invited 25 early educators to meet at Columbia
Teachers College. This group became the nucleus of the National Committee on Nursery Schools in 1926, the forerunner of the National Association for Nursery Education. In 1964, that name was changed again to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the major national professional organization concerned with early childhood education (Peterson, 1987; Braun & Edwards, 1972).

The Depression of the 1930s and World War II also significantly influenced the development of nursery school programs in the U.S. When centers could no longer pay teachers' salaries, they were left unemployed. In 1933, the federal government through the Federal Emergency Relief Act (FERA) and later under the Works Projects Administration (WPA) funded nursery schools operated through the public schools. Both the FERA and the WPA provided educational services for young children and stimulated teacher training programs to help teachers acquire the skills necessary to operate the programs (Braun & Edwards, 1972; Peterson, 1987).

The WPA nursery schools ended with the Depression, but the need for women to work for the war industry and to fill vacancies left by men who were called into the armed services during World War II brought the need again for education and child-care services for young children. According to Osborn (1975) and Spodek (1978) nearly one-third of the female population began working in defense plants and factories. Federal funds to establish educational and care services for young children were provided through the Lanham Act from 1940 to 1946. Those programs that continued to operate after federal funds were removed were operated under the sponsorship of local governmental agencies and philanthropic organizations (Peterson, 1987).

After World War II, nursery schools or preschool programs (as they are now commonly called) continued to grow, although slowly. The original eclectic
philosophy allowed for considerable fluctuation and diversity in the approaches used without serious disagreements and conflicts among its leaders (Spodek, 1978; Peterson, 1987).

Peterson (1987) noted a number of important changes, however, that occurred in the preschool movement since World War II. First, nursery school or preschool education gradually became a program for the affluent rather than for the poor. Problems in funding partly account for this change. As government funding was lost, parents bore the brunt for financially supporting the programs. Thus, many poor families were unable to participate.

Second, due to the improved conditions after World War II, health aspects of the nursery school were deemphasized. However, Head Start renewed concerns for health and nutrition in 1965. Third, programs were shortened to half days, and often two- and three-day programs replaced five-day programs.

And fourth, curriculum expanded from a primary concern of "training the senses" to that of a broader educational program. Changes that arose in kindergarten reforms also provided impetus for change in the nursery school curriculum. More attention was placed on emotional development and social learning.

Today, the nursery school or preschool movement is characterized by expanding growth toward professionalization, strong emphasis on developmentally appropriate practices for young children, and strong support by many national organizations and groups advocating preschool education for all young children, particularly those who are disadvantaged or considered to be at risk of school failure.

Led by its professional association, NAEYC, the field of nursery school education has expanded to include practitioners and professionals from higher
education, nursery schools, preschools, compensatory education, early childhood special education, and day care.

Preschool programs have also experienced tremendous growth. Since 1965, the enrollment rate for 3- and 4-year-olds has more than tripled from 11% to 39%. And these enrollments are expected to increase throughout the next decade as both population and participation rates of preschool-aged children grow (Day & Thomas, 1988).

Who are these children? Citing statistics from the Children’s Defense Fund (1987), Warger (1988) explains that 67% of 4-year-olds enrolled in preschool programs come from families with incomes over $35,000. In contrast, less than 33% of this same age group come from families with incomes under $10,000. The same disparity is seen in 3-year-old preschool participants. Nearly 54% of the 3-year-olds enrolled in preschool programs are from families with incomes over $35,000; only 17% are from families with incomes under $10,000 (Day & Thomas, 1988).

The majority of all preschool participants attend private programs. Considering the fact that some programs can cost as much as $3,000 per year, it should come as no surprise that the expense for preschool is well beyond the means of low-income families (Day & Thomas, 1988). Head Start, the federally-supported program for disadvantaged 3- to 5-year-olds, currently serves only 16% of the 2.5 million eligible children (Department of Health and Human Services, 1986). Thus hundreds of thousands of eligible children needing services are going unserved.

As mentioned in Chapter I, state legislative interest in educational programs for preschool-aged children increased dramatically in the 1980s. By 1987, 24 states and the District of Columbia spent state money on preschool programs and most states had targeted at-risk children for their programs (Grub, 1987; Gnezda
& Sonnier, 1988). However, there is great variation in the size and scope of states’ programs. An examination of seven states’ programs is presented in Chapter III.

Support for increased public investment in preschool programs for young children has come from many diverse and influential organizations. Three major sources of support are discussed here.

In 1986, the National Governors’ Association’s (NGA) Task Force on Readiness recommended that states develop initiatives to help at-risk preschool children become ready for school. Specifically, the Task Force suggested that states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, the Task Force recommends public schools develop partnerships with other early childhood programs and community agencies to build and improve services for young children and their parents. Strategies for expanding and improving child care services, improving staff quality, and ensuring comprehensive services to children and families are provided. Further, the report recommends strategies to state policymakers in promoting the early childhood unit, collaboration in early childhood services, and financing early childhood services.

The Day-Care Movement

The history of the day-care movement in the U.S. can be divided into four major periods: pre-1920, 1920-1949, 1950-1969, and 1970 to the present (Steinfels, 1973; Peterson, 1987). The first period prior to the 1920s saw rapid growth of day-care centers or child-care centers in the U.S. due to rapid industrial growth.
These centers were seen as necessary in order for women to work outside the home.

The second period encompassed the years from the early 1920s through the 1940s. Services provided for young children were primarily a result of the Depression and World War II, which were discussed earlier. However, Peterson (1987) noted some significant changes that began to occur in the character of day-care centers during the second period.

First, the obvious fact is that both the nursery school movement and the day-care movement served the same age group of children and tended to be influenced by each other. For example, educationally-oriented activities from the nursery school were incorporated into a number of day-care centers. Second, day-care centers began to limit entrance into their programs based on children's ages and certain entry requirements such as self-feeding and being toilet-trained.

The third period in the day-care history according to Steinfels (1973) came in the 1960s and was primarily fueled by the Economic Opportunity Act. This federal law focused on the special needs of disadvantaged youngsters and once again, day-care centers and nursery school programs began to flourish.

Then in the 1970s, the beginning of the fourth period, new social forces came into play that greatly affected programs for young children. The rise in inflation and economic growth sent many women back into the workforce and others into colleges and universities. Day care suddenly became an important and acceptable institution for the average working American family and not just a service for the poor. Several factors contributed to attitudinal changes which influenced the acceptance of day care:

the women's movement and the changing status of women in our society, increased urbanization and shifts from the nuclear family, new knowledge about child development, and research suggesting that quality child care and early education do not have a negative effect on children (Peterson, 1987, pp. 122-123).
Peterson (1987) also noted that no significant leaders became associated with the growth of day-care services as was seen in the growth of other programs for young children. Rather, day-care programs developed from economic needs and emergency governmental actions. In the past, day-care programs had been less definitive about their purpose beyond basic care of children. Further, programs serving child-care needs have not always clearly articulated their philosophy about what constitutes quality child care and curriculum.

This situation, however, has changed as many educationally-oriented personnel crossed over into day care and as professionals from both fields work together to address programmatic and curricular issues. Today, NAEYC serves as a strong professional voice for both day-care and other early childhood professionals, particularly in the areas of accreditation standards, developmentally appropriate curriculum, and the need for affordable, available, and high quality child care.

Further, the demographic trends previously discussed in Chapter I (e.g., the growth of the numbers of children under the age of 6 with mothers in the work force) have brought child-care needs to national attention. In 1988, more than 100 child-care bills were introduced by the 100th Congress (Spencer, 1988). Of these, the most prominent and controversial was the Act for Better Child Care, or ABC, sponsored by Senator Christopher Dodd of Connecticut and Representative Dale Kildee of Michigan (NAEYC, 1988a).

ABC was originally supported by the Alliance for Better Child Care, a coalition of more than 100 national organizations including education and child welfare associations, religious groups, unions, women's groups, and public policy and advocacy organizations. More affordable child care, more available child care, and better quality child care were the key provisions of the bill (NAEYC, 1988b).
In final form, the bill was combined with the Parental and Medical Leave Act. According to Gold (1988b), competing interest groups and pre-election political maneuvering derailed the bill. Major issues included church-state separation, fear that subsidized day-care vouchers would open the door to a voucher program that would undermine the public schools, concern over federal day-care standards, and strong opposition to parental leave.

While the bill was not passed by the 100th Congress, there is strong optimism that prospects for federal child-care legislation will improve in 1989 (Gold, 1988b).

Day care has also become a major issue of commercial developers. In an interview conducted by Kerch (1989), Robert Shallenberger, vice-president of the Prudential Property Company, cited national demographic trends and said:

"We are convinced that child care will be one of the crucial issues of the 1990s. Child care gives employers a competitive edge. Providing child care near the office can expand a firm's existing labor force, can limit additional commuting trips by employees, and can complement a company's existing amenity plan. That gives them an edge on the competition (Kerch, 1989)."

Thus, firms like the Prudential Property Company are including day-care facilities in their plans for multi-million dollar office complexes as incentives to corporate lessees.

...

Since the first kindergartens were established in the U.S. in an attempt to solve the problems caused by industrialization and urbanization that affected young children, ECE has always focused on social reform. Over the years, programmatic emphasis has been placed on a number of elements that are central to intervening early in a young child's life: development of the whole child, emphasizing the social, emotional, physical, and intellectual aspects of the child; working with parents; and interdisciplinary involvement of professionals.
The next section looks at compensatory education and its contributions to early intervention.

Compensatory Education

Compensatory education, as the term implies, refers to educational programs designed to compensate for real or perceived deficits in the early experiences and education of disadvantaged children. These programs targeted children of low socioeconomic status, and many served children from racial-ethnic minority groups (Peterson, 1987). The next section of this paper historically reviews four major projects within compensatory education that have influenced the concept of early intervention.

Project Head Start

As part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty, Project Head Start began in 1965 with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, PL 88-452. Head Start began as an 8-week summer program designed to help break the cycle of poverty affecting disadvantaged children across the country. It was initially developed as a pilot program for youngsters, age 3 through compulsory school attendance, in 2,600 communities and was managed through the Office of Economic Opportunity (Peterson, 1987; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 1986). A comprehensive early history of Head Start can be found in Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty (Zigler & Valentine, 1979).

According to Zigler and Valentine (1979), Project Head Start was built on three major premises. First, successful entrance of disadvantaged children into regular school programs would be facilitated by prekindergarten or pre-first grade
education. Second, early experience and the quality of care determines the quality of intellectual development in young children. And third, achievement and intellectual growth in young children are impeded by impoverished environments which contain elements such as poor health care and nutrition, lack of educational opportunity, lack of stimulation, and an atmosphere of defeatism.

Head Start was designed to be a comprehensive intervention program to meet all elements of young children's early development. This effort of focusing on the whole child was relatively new and incorporated an interdisciplinary approach utilizing three fields of effort -- social services, health, and education (Peterson, 1987).

Peterson (1987) noted that while Project Head Start had much in common with movements in ECE, it contained four unique features. First, it was not merely an education or day-care program. Rather, it was a comprehensive, multidisciplinary intervention approach. In addition to providing education, medical-dental services, nutrition services, social services, psychological services, parent education and involvement, and a volunteer program, the project also trained staff to prepare low-income parents for jobs within the centers and helped low-income adults progress out of their poverty status through a career ladder approach.

Second, programs were established under Community Action Agencies and not administered through traditional public school administrative structures. The Community Action Agencies directly operated Head Start centers or they contracted with other community organizations to operate the program.

Third, the role of the parent was greatly emphasized in the program, much more so than was generally seen in nursery schools. "The intent was to bring parents into full partnership in the intervention with their child and in the operation of a social action program in their own community" (Peterson, 1987, p.
Parents could serve as members of the Parent Advisory Committees, serve as volunteers for various program functions, or be employed as paraprofessionals with subsequent training. Parents were also taught about their children's needs and educational activities that could be carried out at home.

Shortly after the program began, it became apparent that a longer program was needed. Thus, Head Start became a full year program (Peterson, 1987). Then in 1967, Parent and Child Centers were added to address the needs of children under the age of 3. In 1969, Head Start was delegated from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Child Development in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System [NEC*TAS] and State Technical Assistance Resource Team [START], 1988).

Head Start was reauthorized under the Head Start Act of 1981, PL 97-35, and in 1982 an amendment to the Head Start Act required that no less than 10% of the total number of enrollment opportunities in Head Start programs in each state must be available for young children with handicaps. The full range of Head Start services are provided to handicapped children and their families in addition to special education and related services as needed. Head Start thus became one of the first major programs nationwide to service handicapped and non-handicapped children in an integrated setting (NEC*TAS & START, 1988).

Since 1965, Head Start has served over 9.6 million children and their families. Each year it serves over 452,000 children (including 54,474 handicapped preschoolers) and their families in urban and rural areas in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Territories. However, only 16% of the eligible 2.5 million children are currently being served (DHHS, 1986; Children's Defense Fund, 1987; NEC*TAS & START, 1988).

Cognizant that Head Start staff may need assistance in meeting the needs of young children with disabilities, the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services funded a network of projects called Resource Access Projects. The purpose of the Resource Access Projects was to provide training and technical assistance to Head Start grantees. In 1987, the Resource Access Projects were designated as liaisons between Head Start and SEAs through a signed agreement between the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families and the Office of Special Education in the U.S. Department of Education (NEC*TAS & START, 1988).

Considerable debate and conflicting reports of successes and failures have surrounded the effectiveness of Project Head Start. Datta (1979) reviewed the historical research on the outcomes of Head Start and noted that interpretations of Head Start's effectiveness shifted three times since 1965. The research data from 1965 to 1968 were interpreted as evidence that the program had at least immediate and possibly long-term benefits for young children. Then in 1969, the highly publicized Westinghouse Research Report (Westinghouse Learning Corporation, 1969) concluded that full year programs appeared marginally effective in producing gains in cognitive development through grade 3 when viewed from an overall group analysis; however, the program appeared to have a positive effect on parents.
The Westinghouse Research Report made a number of recommendations including the following which provided the rationale for intervention strategies that were later initiated:

1. Programs need to be year long if intervention is to be most effective;
2. Intervention should begin in infancy and continue into the primary grades;
3. Curriculum should be focused on deficits in such areas as language and math and on skills and concepts needed in the primary grades, and more refined and intensive intervention strategies should be applied; and
4. Parents should be trained to help their own children at home (Peterson, 1987).

As a result of the Westinghouse study, many people said Head Start had failed its mission while others argued that expectations for the program were unrealistic and that it wasn't meant to be a "cure-all" (Datta, 1979). Further, Datta (1979) pointed out that the negative publicity of the Westinghouse Report overshadowed the many parallel studies that showed positive outcomes. These outcomes included the following:

1. impact on communities including the modification of health services and practices for low-income families and increasing parent participation in decision-making (Kirschner Associates, 1970; MIDCO Education Associates, 1972; O'Keaf (1979);
2. impact on children's personal-social development including short-term gains in task orientation, social adjustment, achievement orientation, and ability to form close friendships with other children (Dunteman, 1972; Coulson, 1972; Emmerich, 1971);
3. significant gains in school readiness and a modest effect upon IQ test performance (Dunteman, 1972; Coulson, 1972; Stanford Research Institute, 1971a, 1971b, 1971c); and

4. impact on students' school achievement after Head Start including keeping pace with class peers, being placed less frequently in special education, and less likely to be held back in a grade (Datta, 1979; Shipman, 1972a, 1972b; Abelson, Zigler, & DeBlasi; 1974; Royster, 1977; and Weisberg & Haney, 1977).

In 1975, a third shift occurred regarding interpretation of Head Start's effectiveness. Richmond, Stipek, and Zigler (1979) reported that while all Head Start children did not maintain cognitive gains, many did continue to show cognitive gains over their non-Head Start peers well into the elementary grades. A longitudinal study from Yale University (Zigler & Yale Research Group, 1976) revealed that Head Start children demonstrated significant gains over non-Head Start children in fifth grade on three of five measures of academic achievement.

Other Federally-Supported Compensatory Education Programs

Project Head Start was not the only compensatory education program that the federal government created to intervene in the early lives of children considered at risk of academic failure or at risk of developmental delay. Other programs were also created during the 1960s and 1970s for disadvantaged preschoolers.

Parent and Child Centers were initiated in 1967 and targeted to children from birth to age 3 before they entered Head Start. The purpose of the Parent and Child Centers was to intervene through medical services and enrichment activities in order to head off potentially damaging effects in poor homes.
Stimulation activities for children and activities for parents were additional components of the programs (Peterson, 1987).

**Early Periodic Screening and Developmental Testing (EPSDT)** was a program created in 1967 as part of Medicaid (Title XIX of the Social Security Act) and the Maternal and Child Health Program (Title V). EPSDT worked in collaboration with Head Start beginning in 1974 to assist parents in accessing services for their children. All children enrolled in Medicaid had to be screened regularly during their infant and preschool years to assess their health status. Appropriate referral for medical care and treatment was provided as necessary (Peterson, 1987).

**Home Start** was created in 1972 and provided the same child development services available in Head Start centers to children and their families within their homes. The program utilized a trained community resident known as a "home visitor" to work with low-income parents, teaching them how to provide stimulation to their infants and educational activities to their preschool-aged youngsters at home (Peterson, 1987).

***

Compensatory education played a significant role in turning the attention of American society to the concept of early intervention. Never before had so many individuals -- politicians, professionals, parents -- joined forces with local, state, and federal agencies in a nationwide effort to plan and implement social-educational programs aimed at intervening into the lives of young children and their families. More importantly, these efforts focused on children before they normally reached school age. And further, compensatory education demonstrated that effective intervention is a continuous process (Peterson, 1987).

Compensatory education programs also helped to establish that no one educational approach is necessarily the right or best one for all children.
Alternative approaches should be created and encouraged. And finally, compensatory education facilitated a major shift away from traditional ECE practices. Previous practices focused on ECE as serving a socialization/mental health function. ECE could now focus on the intellectual and cognitive development of young children. However, greater accountability for intellectual and cognitive outcomes within educational programs would also be required (Peterson, 1987).

**Early Childhood Special Education**

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) is a relatively new field in education, serving the needs of young children from birth to age 5 who have or are at risk of developing disabilities. ECSE grew out of three parent fields -- early childhood education, compensatory education, and special education. The first two sections of this chapter historically reviewed early childhood education and compensatory education. This next section briefly reviews the history of special education and in more depth, the history and the issues pertinent to special education for young children. For a comprehensive review of special education, the reader is referred to Hewett and Forness (1977), Jordan (1976), and Peterson (1987).

Special education services for handicapped children slowly and gradually expanded from the 1800s to post-World War II. During this time, institutions and residential schools were established for the deaf, blind, and mentally retarded. By the 1920s, over two-thirds of the large cities in the U.S. had special class programs but they served only a small number of children. While the programs continued to expand until 1930, large-scale institutionalization and segregation of the handicapped replaced most of the special public school classes in the 1930s.
and 1940s. The residential schools and institutions became terribly overcrowded
and understaffed and focused primarily on custodial care rather than training as
was originally intended. Given the poor economic conditions of the time and the
prevailing philosophy that intelligence was fixed by heredity and thus
unchangeable, education for the handicapped, and in particular the retarded, was
considered to be of very little value (Peterson, 1987). This attitude, however,
shifted as the effects of World War II were realized.

Tens of thousands of young men and women were screened and tested for
military service, but a large number of them were found to be physically,
mentally, or behaviorally handicapped. This alarming reality concerned
government officials and the general public. When the war ended and thousands
returned disabled, many Americans became more accepting of handicapped people
and more sensitive to their predicament (Peterson, 1987).

Parents of handicapped children also became more vocal, and many formed
national parent organizations, such as the National Association for Retarded
Children, United Cerebral Palsy Association, and the American Foundation for
the Blind. As a united front, the parents began to pressure state and local
agencies to respond to the needs of their handicapped children. They organized
early intervention programs for infants and preschoolers, sheltered workshops for
older adolescents, community programs for unserved groups of moderately and
severely impaired students, and worked to improve substandard conditions in state
institutions (Peterson, 1987).

Then in 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Brown v. Board of Education
that racial segregation in the public schools violated the Fourteenth Amendment.
In addition, the court ruled that separate but equal educational facilities were
inherently unequal. Speaking about education as the most important function of
state and local governments, the court said "Such an opportunity [education],
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where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be available to all on equal terms" (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954).

Soon after this decision, a letter was sent to the editor of Children Limited, a newsletter of the National Association for Retarded Children. Its author stated there was a relationship and importance of the Brown decision for handicapped children: "You will recognize, I am sure, that this statement of equal opportunity applies to the handicapped as it does to the minorities" (Zettel & Ballard, 1979, p. 27).

Sixteen years, however, passed before the concept of equal educational opportunity was judicially applied to handicapped children. In 1971, the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) brought a class action suit against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, alleging its failure to provide a publicly supported education for all its school-aged retarded children (PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1971).

The PARC case was resolved by consent agreement and specified that:

the state could not apply any law that would postpone, terminate, or deny mentally retarded children access to a publicly supported education, including a public school program, tuition or tuition maintenance, and homebound instruction (PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania).

The state was required to locate and identify all school-aged retarded children excluded from the public school and to place them in a "free public program of education and training appropriate to (their) capacity" (PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania). Further, the agreement specified that local districts that provided preschool programs for nonhandicapped children were required to provide preschool programs for mentally retarded children as well.

Over the next three and one-half years, 47 similar right-to-education cases took place in 28 different states and the District of Columbia (Abeson, 1972).
From a judicial perspective, the right of a handicapped child to participate in a publicly supported educational program was no longer to be questioned. By 1975, this principle had been irrefutably established by case law in an overwhelming majority of the states (Zettel & Ballard, 1979).

Shortly after the Brown decision, parents of handicapped children joined forces with professionals and through extensive publicity and political activism, further solidified the handicapped child's right to an education. Coupled with the judicial precedents previously discussed, these activities prompted a variety of state statutes and regulations. By 1972, it was reported that nearly 70% of the states had adopted mandatory legislation requiring the provision of a publicly supported education for all of their handicapped children as defined in their state policies (Abeson, 1972). By 1975, all but two state legislatures had adopted some type of statutory provision calling for the education of at least the majority of their handicapped children (U.S. Congress, Senate, 1975).

The federal government had also been providing financial assistance for the education of the handicapped. In 1965, PL 89-313 amended Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) establishing grants to state agencies responsible for providing free public education for handicapped children. This new legislation was designed to assist children in state-operated or supported schools serving handicapped children who were not eligible for funds under the original act (LaVor, 1976).

Amendments to ESEA in 1966 and 1967 provided funds to the states to expand directly or through the LEAs, programs and projects to meet the special educational and related needs of handicapped children, established the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, and established deaf/blind centers and regional resource centers to provide testing to determine special educational needs of handicapped children (LaVor, 1976).
Then in 1968 the early intervention movement for young handicapped children officially began when the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act (HCEEA), PL 90-538, became law. HCEEA was designed to establish experimental preschool and early education programs for young handicapped children that could serve as models for state and local educational agencies. Congress allocated monies to develop demonstration projects that would design strategies for training staff, evaluating children's progress, and assessing the outcomes (LaVor, 1976; DeWeerd & Cole, 1976; and Peterson, 1987).

According to Peterson (1987), HCEEA was significant for several reasons. First, it was considered a landmark piece of legislation in that it dealt exclusively with education of handicapped children without being attached to another legislative bill. Second, it provided funds to stimulate and improve upon programs for young handicapped children and their parents. Third, HCEEA initiated the development of exemplary model programs for early intervention with handicapped preschoolers and their parents. And fourth, it initiated nationwide demonstration, training, and dissemination activities.

Unlike Head Start that established wide-scale service programs, the purpose of HCEEA was to experiment with procedures for working with young handicapped children, identify the most effective procedures, and then devise innovative models that could be replicated in other communities. Three-year grants were awarded to projects across the country to develop "First Chance" or "HCEEP (Handicapped Children's Early Education Program) Demonstration Projects". Since 1968, over 500 HCEEP models have been developed, several of which have been validated as successful programs by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the National Diffusion Network. Programs or models that receive this distinction must present evidence of their effectiveness in terms of
context, procedures, and child gains (Peterson, 1987; Sopris West & National Dissemination Study Group, 1988).

Around the same time that HCEEA was signed into law, SEAs began to define certification requirements and guidelines for teachers of young handicapped children and undergraduate and graduate training programs for ECSE in colleges and universities were created (Hirshoren & Umansky, 1977; Peterson, 1987). The U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped also began awarding grants to university departments of special education to support teacher training in ECSE. In 1974, ECSE became one of the Bureau's top funding priorities. These federal funds made it possible for the creation of separate training programs that focused specifically on the education of infant and preschool-aged handicapped youngsters (Peterson, 1987).

Another boost to ECSE came in 1972 when the Economic Opportunity Amendments, PL 92-424, mandated that Head Start services be made available to handicapped children from low-income families. This enhanced the growth of ECSE in a number of ways. First, Head Start's national attention brought visibility to the needs of young handicapped children. Second, Head Start's philosophy of comprehensive services to young children and their families brought multidisciplinary professional efforts together on behalf of special needs children. Third, Head Start was a well recognized advocate for early intervention with young handicapped children. And fourth, a significant amount of financial resources from Head Start went into its programmatic efforts for handicapped children and their parents (Peterson, 1987).

A professional organization for ECSE was also established in the early 1970s. In 1973, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) created the Division for Early Childhood (DEC). This division was the first formal organization for professionals and parents concerned with issues pertaining to young handicapped
children. In 1977, DEC produced its own professional journal, the *Journal of the Division for Early Childhood* whose exclusive attention was devoted to topics of this new field (Peterson, 1987).

The early 1970s also saw the federal government create State Implementation Grants. These grants provided incentives for state and local community officials to begin systematic planning and program development in ECSE. Since handicapped preschoolers were below the age of normal school-age admission, responsibility for these programs was not automatically given to nor accepted by SEAs or LEAs (Peterson, 1987).

The next major event that affected handicapped children in general, and young handicapped children in particular, was the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, PL 94-142. This mandate became a matter of precise national policy, combining an educational bill of rights for handicapped children with a promise of increased federal financial assistance (Zettel & Ballard, 1979).

Because of PL 94-142, handicapped children won more than the right to a free public education. They also won the right to non-discriminatory testing, evaluation, and placement procedures; the right to be educated in the least restrictive environment; the right to procedural due process of law; and the right to an appropriate education (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

For young handicapped children and the field of ECSE, PL 94-142 significantly enhanced both. The law gave formal endorsement to programs for handicapped youngsters under the age of 5 by permitting states to serve the 3- to 5-year-old population and receive federal funds for these programs providing that state law did not prohibit the use of public funds for handicapped children in this age group. The law also established the LEAs as the authorized agencies for serving preschool populations and encouraged states and local school districts to
provide services to young handicapped children by offering incentive monies (Preschool Incentive Grants) to those states that elected to do so (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975).

Additional support for ECSE occurred in 1983 when the Amendments to PL 94-142 were passed under PL 98-199. This law created State Planning Grants for states to develop and implement comprehensive plans for ECSE for all handicapped children from birth to age 5. Further, it allowed states to use funds received under the Preschool Incentive Grants for services for infants and toddlers, from birth to age 3 (Weintraub & Ramirez, 1985).

The most significant piece of federal legislation that has affected young handicapped children was the 1986 enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments, PL 99-457. In part, the law requires that by the 1990-91 school year, all states applying for PL 94-142 funds will have to assure that they are providing a free appropriate public education to all handicapped children ages 3 through 5. Further, PL 99-457 establishes a new state grant program for handicapped infants and toddlers. The legislation defines the eligible population as all children from birth through age 2 who are developmentally delayed (criteria to be determined by each state), or with conditions that typically result in delay, or, at state discretion, are at risk of developing substantial developmental delay (Council for Exceptional Children [CEC], 1986).

The law also stipulates that federal funds under the program may be used for the planning, development, and implementation of statewide systems for providing early intervention services as well as for general expansion and improvement of services. Federal funds, however, are not to be used if there are other appropriate resources, thus emphasizing the law's intent of interagency participation and cooperation (CEC, 1986).
PL 99-457 also reauthorizes experimental, demonstration, and outreach programs (HCEEP), early childhood research institutes to carry out sustained research to generate and disseminate new information on early education, and authorizes a technical assistance developmental system to provide support to the HCEEP projects and to the SEAs (CEC, 1986).

The significance of PL 99-457 cannot be overstated. While all states had previously participated in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, PL 94-142, and received federal funds for their school-aged special education students, not all states have specific legislation requiring programs for handicapped 3- to 5-year-olds. Many states permit LEAs to develop ECSE programs for their 3- to 5-year-old handicapped children. Under the provisions of PL 99-457, states who choose to not provide a free appropriate public education to all handicapped 3- to 5-year-olds will lose all monies generated under the larger PL 94-142 formula by the 3- to 5-year-old population served, all grants and contracts related to preschool special education, and the new Preschool Grant (CEC, 1986).

An example best illustrates this point. Indiana, as with 36 other states, does not require school districts to provide services to handicapped 3- to 5-year-olds. Rather, school districts are permitted to do so (L.A. Bond, personal communication, September 13, 1988). As of June, 1988, approximately 230 Indiana children, ages 3 and 4, were served in public school special education programs. Based on Indiana Department of Education child count and funding projections for the 1990-91 school year, Indiana could lose $9.6 million in federal funds should it not pass legislation mandating ECSE programs for 3- to 5-year-olds (P. Ash, Indiana Department of Education internal memorandum, June 10, 1988, supplied by L. Bond).
According to the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), the incentive provided by PL 99-457 to encourage states to serve their 3- to 5-year-old handicapped population may result in an additional 30,665 youngsters receiving needed special educational services in the first year of implementation (1987-88). These results, along with estimates of an additional 23,000 children to be served for 1988-89, "demonstrate clearly the importance states place on preschool education, and the willingness and readiness of states and local school systems to expand services to meet the needs of 3- to 5-year-old children with handicaps" (National Association of State Directors of Special Education [NASDSE], 1988, p. 2).

Additional significant elements of PL 99-457 are found in its provisions in Part H, the infants and toddlers section. First, the law encourages states to include at-risk children in addition to those identified as handicapped or developmentally delayed. As of May, 1988, 14 states had decided that infants and toddlers who are at risk will be served while several others reported that services to at-risk children will be provided on a pilot basis in order to determine future state policy (NASDSE, 1988).

Second, the act stipulates that the governor of each state participating in the new grant program must designate a lead agency for overall administration of the program and establish an Interagency Coordinating Council composed of relevant agencies, consumers, and providers.

While the states have an opportunity to embark on a new and challenging interagency collaborative effort to provide comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary early intervention services for handicapped and at-risk infants and toddlers and their families, the effort is not without problems. Financing services to be provided, that is, which agency should be responsible for a given service and under what circumstances should private funds be included in the
system, has already developed as a major problematic issue. In addition, confidentiality and the release of information among agencies has become a major problem for some states (NASDSE, 1988). NASDSE recommends that assistance in both of these areas, financing and confidentiality, could be provided by the new Federal Interagency Coordinating Council authorized by PL 99-457.

The third significant element in Part H of PL 99-457 is the requirement for a written Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) developed by a multidisciplinary team and the parents. Similar to the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP), the IFSP, in part, must contain a statement of the child's present levels of development and the criteria, procedures, and timelines for determining progress. The major differences between the two plans is that the IFSP must include a statement of the family's strengths and needs relating to enhancing the child's development, a statement of major outcomes expected to be achieved for the child and family, and the specific early intervention services necessary to meet the unique needs of the child and family (CEC, 1986).

Clearly, emphasis on family involvement is intended. However, ethics and confidentiality may be two issues service-providers may have to deal with as they provide services to handicapped and at-risk infants and toddlers and their families.

***

To summarize, special education has had a long and gradual development since the first class for the deaf was established in 1869 (Peterson, 1987). But the field of early childhood special education has literally mushroomed in the last 20 years due to the collective efforts of parents, professionals, and politicians all working together to enact sweeping reforms to change the lives of young children with special needs.
Early childhood special education also contributed a great deal to the concept of early intervention:

- the inclusion of parents as primary sources about their children's needs and abilities and as partners in the delivery of service;
- multidisciplinary assessments and services for children and their families;
- interagency coordination of services;
- frequent evaluation of progress made by children and their families; and
- alternative approaches to intervention.

As was the case for early childhood education and compensatory education, early childhood special education benefitted from theory, empirical research, expert opinion, and our societal values regarding early intervention. The next and final section of this chapter reviews the contributions of selected theorists, researchers, and experts who laid the groundwork for a rationale for early intervention.

The Rationale for Early Intervention

Contributions from theory, research, expert opinion, and societal values have all contributed to forming a rationale for early intervention (Peterson, 1987). For example, theories about learning and the importance of development in the early years offer one source of support. Research on human growth and development and the factors that either facilitate or inhibit cognitive functioning provide another source of support. Expert opinion, the positions taken by recognized authorities, are usually based on research or theoretical evidence and often reflect logical analyses of societal needs or issues and alternative strategies for resolving them. This is a third source of support. And finally, the values held by society
or an influential subgroup concerning our nation's obligations to the educational welfare of its children are a final source of support for early intervention (Peterson, 1987).

Contributions from societal values have already been covered throughout previous sections of this chapter. This next section discusses selected contributions from theory, research, and expert opinion in forming a rationale for early intervention. Contributions are presented according to Peterson's (1987) eight major premises for early intervention.

Premise 1. *During the early years the initial patterns of learning and behavior that set the pace for and influence the nature of all subsequent development are established* (Peterson, 1987, p. 5).

The early years of life are extremely important to the overall growth and development of children. Summarizing 1,000 research studies that were conducted over 50 years that examined child development, Bloom (1964) concluded that the studies:

make it clear that intelligence is a developing function and that the stability of measured intelligence increased with age. Both types of data suggest that in terms of intelligence measured at age 17, from conception to age 4 the individual develops 50% of his mature intelligence, from ages 4-8 he develops another 30%, and from ages 8-17 the remaining 20% (p. 88).

Additional researchers who have contributed to this concept of the importance of the early years include Gesell (1923), Piaget (1960, 1963), Jensen (1967), and White (1979).

Further, it has been found that the importance of early learning as a foundation for subsequent learning is especially significant for those children considered to be at risk, disadvantaged, or handicapped. With deprived or inadequate experience, a lack of prerequisite skills, and less knowledge, deficiencies tend to increase and become compounded as the child grows older.
Important researchers who have contributed to this body of knowledge around "progressive or cumulative achievement decrements" include Jensen (1966), Bereiter and Englemen (1966), Sameroff (1975), Bricker and Iacino (1977), Hayden and McGinnis (1977), Palmer and Siegel (1977), Ramey and Baker-Ward (1982), and Levin (1987). All of these researchers note that for children who fall behind their peers in certain areas, learning must be accelerated to a faster than normal rate if they are ever to catch up.

**Premise 2.** Research suggests the presence of certain critical periods, particularly during the early years, when a child is most susceptible and responsive to learning experiences (Peterson, 1987, pp. 5-6).

Critical periods, according to Horwitz and Paden (1973), are the times when certain stimuli must be presented or special experiences must occur for a particular pattern of responses to develop. Development is occurring very rapidly and children are especially vulnerable to the effects of depriving or optimal environments (Peterson, 1987). Research on the importance of critical periods and their relationship to intelligence, personality, language, and a sense of self includes, among others, the works of Caldwell (1962), Denenberg (1964), Mussen, Conger, Kagan and Huston (1984), Ainsworth (1969), Bloom (1964), Bowlby (1969), Erickson (1963), Piaget (1960, 1963), White (1975), Hayden and McGinnis (1977), and Jensen (1966).

**Premise 3.** Intelligence and other human capacities are not fixed at birth but, rather are shaped to some extent by environmental influences and through learning (Peterson, 1987, p. 6).

At the core of every early intervention effort is the concept that intelligence and other human characteristics are not fixed at birth. Rather, they are shaped through learning and environmental influences. As was discussed in the previous section of this chapter on ECSE, this concept was not always
believed and resulted in thousands of mentally retarded children going unserved. But considerable evidence has accumulated over the past 40 years that has refuted the notion of fixed intelligence and supports intervening early in young children's lives and their environments.

Research studies conducted on IQ changes as a result of environmental factors include those by Skeels and Dye (1939), Skeels (1966), Kirk (1958, 1973, 1977), Casler (1968), Caster (1971), Ramey and Haskins (1981), and Ramey, Bryant, and Suarez (1985).

Premise 4. Handicapping conditions and other factors that render a child at risk for developmental disabilities can interfere with development and learning so that the original disabilities become more severe and secondary handicaps will appear (Peterson, 1987, p. 6).

According to Peterson (1987), children with diagnosed handicaps, such as cerebral palsy, Down Syndrome, blindness, etc., require immediate intervention as some type of impairment is clearly a reality. In contrast, children who are at risk for developmental disabilities, such as those with low birth weight, from a deprived environment, or who have mild sensory losses may show no initial handicap, per se, but may develop disabilities later.

For both groups of children, those with identified disabilities and those who are at risk of disabilities, research has shown that early intervention can have a positive impact on reducing the severity of the disabilities and may improve the chances for later successful performance and achievement (see Caldwell, 1973; Bayley, Rhodes, Gooch, & Marcus, 1971; Hayden & Haring, 1974; Koch, 1958; Jones, Wenner, Toczek, & Barrett, 1962; Downs, 1971; Northcott, 1973; Love, 1970; Francis-Williams, 1974; Guldager, 1974; and Mayer 1974a, 1974b, 1974c).

Premise 5. A child's environment and early experiences, particularly the degree to which these are nurturing or depriving, have a major effect upon development and learning; both greatly influence the degree to which a child reaches his or her full potential (Peterson, 1987, p. 6).
The environments in which children live will either help maintain their status quo or foster change. What this means is that some environments are sufficiently neutral that they do nothing more than sustain whatever developmental pattern is spontaneously evident in the child. Deprived environments fail to produce the kinds of stimulation needed to produce more rapid rates of learning. Positive environments tend to promote children's intellectual development (Peterson, 1987).

Peterson (1987) further noted that according to Bloom (1964):

- differences among children in general intelligence are related to the extent the environment provides: (a) stimulation that fosters verbal development, (b) pleasurable consequences for verbal-reasoning accomplishments, and (c) encouragement for problem solving, exploration, and skill learning (Peterson, 1987, p. 28).


Premise 6. Early intervention programs can make a significant difference in the developmental status of young children and can do so more rapidly than later remedial efforts after a child has entered elementary school (Peterson, 1987, p. 6).

Research on the effects of early intervention programs has grown considerably since Kirk's landmark study in 1949 (Kirk, 1958). For example, studies that demonstrated early intervention is successful in generating and maintaining high rates of developmental progress in Down Syndrome children include those conducted by Hayden and Dmitriev (1975) and Clunies-Ross (1979).

Other studies have documented positive outcomes from early intervention programs with deaf or hearing impaired infants and preschoolers (Simmons-Martin, 1981) and handicapped or at-risk infants (Badger, Burns, & DeBoer, 1982;
Trohanis, Cox, & Meyer, 1982). Further, two major national studies examined the outcomes of the HCEEP Model Intervention Programs for handicapped children (Stock, Wnek, Newborg, Schenck, Gabel, Spurgeon, & Ray, 1976; Reaves & Burns, 1982).

And two national reviews of early intervention research reported on child outcomes across many independent early childhood programs for disadvantaged children. One study conducted by Bronfenbrenner (1974) summarized research findings from two types of early intervention programs: (1) home-based, in which the program was conducted in the home by trained people who made home visits and worked with the child, parents, or both and (2) center-based, in which the program was conducted in group preschool settings outside the home. Bronfenbrenner found that children from both types of programs showed gains, however, declines were evident once the programs were terminated. In addition, parent involvement was found to be a critical factor relating to the success of the programs.

A group of 11 independent researchers conducted the second national review on early intervention. Known as the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (previously known as the Consortium on Developmental Continuity), the researchers collaborated by pooling their initial data and designing a common follow-up study. The original data were analyzed and all new data in the follow-up study were analyzed by an independent research group at Cornell University which had not itself designed and carried out an experimental preschool. At the time of the follow-up in 1976-77, the low-income preschool graduates were 9 to 19 years of age. Among the findings were that preschool graduates were retained less often in grade, they needed less special education in later grades, and preschool intervention made a positive contribution to later school achievement.

However, the most significant study was conducted on 123 disadvantaged preschoolers who participated in the Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, Michigan, beginning in 1962. Designed as a longitudinal study to answer the question, "Can high quality early childhood education help to improve the lives of low-income children and their families and the quality of life of the community as a whole?" (Berrueta-Clement, et al., 1984, p. xiii), four of the five phases of the study were completed by 1984. At that time, data were collected on study participants who were then 19 years of age.

The significance of the study cannot be overstated. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Perry Preschool Project is the most often quoted research that has influenced state legislative support for early intervention (Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988). Thus, its findings are summarized here.

Both short- and long-term academic and social benefits were demonstrated. Children who participated in the project performed better academically through secondary school than did children in the control group. The preschool group also had better school attendance rates and spent less time in special education classes. Further, two out of three preschool students graduated from high school in contrast to only one of two non-preschool students. Those who attended preschool were also more likely to enroll in some form of further education or vocational training after graduating from high school. Preschool also led to higher levels of employment, less unemployment, and higher earnings by age 19 for the study subjects. Preschool subjects also had fewer contacts with the criminal justice system than did the non-preschool group, including fewer arrests. Further, female study participants had fewer pregnancies and births than did non-preschool females (Berrueta-Clement et al., 1984).
An extensive cost-benefit analysis was also performed on the Perry preschool Program and its long-term effects (Barnett, 1985). Results indicated that from $4 to $7 was saved for every $1 spent. These cost savings were seen in decreased spending for special and remedial education, social welfare, and criminal justice programs. Increased tax revenue was also generated through higher earnings by the preschool group once they entered the labor market.

**Premise 7.** Parents need special assistance in establishing constructive patterns of parenting with a young handicapped or at-risk child and in providing adequate care, stimulation, and training for their child during the critical early years when basic developmental skills should be acquired (Peterson, 1987, p. 6).

Skill in parenting is not something with which an individual is born. When one adds the complications of poverty, single-parenting, parenting as a teenager, or the birth of a child with special needs or who is at risk of developing disabilities, parenting becomes more complex and problems are compounded.

Support for parent involvement and training is found in research studies including those conducted by White (1975), Gesell (1925), Brazelton, Kozlowski, and Main (1974), Bailey and Simeonsson (1984), Zigler and Valentine (1979), and Lazar (1981).

**Premise 8.** Early intervention implies some economic-social benefits in that prevention or early treatment of developmental problems in young children may reduce more serious, burdensome problems for society to cope with later, including their accompanying costs (Peterson, 1987, p. 6).

As has already been discussed, the cost-savings of early intervention are significant when one looks at the analysis of the Perry Preschool Project. Other studies that have looked at the potential economic benefits of early intervention based upon data collected from studies of various infant and preschool intervention programs include those conducted by Wood (1981) and Antley and...
DuBose (1981). No doubt, as more and more state monies are spent on early intervention/early childhood education programs, data to determine cost and benefits will also be collected.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the history of three separate yet related fields of education which formed the roots of early intervention: a) early childhood education and its movements - kindergarten, Montessori, nursery school, and daycare; b) compensatory education; and c) early childhood special education. Further it discussed the contributions of societal values regarding early intervention and selected theorists, researchers, and experts who provided the rationale for early intervention and influenced the development of these three fields of education for young children. Collectively, the events and individuals discussed here have contributed to a Zeitgeist, the trend of thought and feeling that early intervention indeed is a viable strategy to reduce or eliminate the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children.

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

EARLY INTERVENTION IN THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION

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

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

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

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

SEA documents and copies of legislation were obtained from SEA personnel and legislators. Many of the legislative documents used in this study are very current and have not yet been codified. Therefore, the researcher has referenced the legislation using bill or public act numbers as provided by the SEA personnel and state legislators. All legislative documents cited in this study may be obtained from the appropriate SEA in the state in which the legislation was enacted. See Appendix C for the names of the individuals who supplied relevant materials for review and analysis. Further, appropriate SEA personnel and Iowa Senator Charles Bruner were contacted to verify information and to clarify dates of events and legislative language.

The reasons for the selection of the seven states -- Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin -- were discussed in Chapter I. Chapter II presented a historical review of early intervention so that the following discussion could be set in its proper context.

This chapter presents a description of each state’s policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements for early childhood education (ECE) programs for preschoolers. Any plans for the development of guidelines or new state initiatives, such as changes in teacher licensure requirements, that were proposed by October, 1988, are also included in the states' descriptions. Further, brief descriptions of the processes undertaken prior to a state’s development of policies or legislation are provided where this information was available.

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

Illinois

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

- legislative proposals from past General Assembly sessions regarding entry age into kindergarten;
- the encouragement of "latchkey" programs in public schools;
- the funding of full-day kindergarten; and
- the Board's own mandate studies directing further study of preschool programs for limited-English-proficient children and an examination of the compulsory attendance age of 7 (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE], 1985a).

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

The Board's directive stated that:

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

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

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

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

On-site visits to programs in Chicago and Champaign-Urbana were also made so that ISBE staff could observe children directly. Further, it provided the staff with a "constant and personal frame of reference and a reminder of the responsibility entailed in the debates on issues" (ISBE, 1985a, p. 3).

Two surveys were also conducted as part of the study. The first survey was begun in September, 1984, and was sent to all Illinois public and non-public elementary school principals. The purpose of the survey was to obtain baseline data regarding ECE programs in public and nonpublic schools and to assess the opinions of principals in these schools regarding ECE issues. Responses were obtained from almost 94% of the public school principals and from 80% of the nonpublic school principals, for a total response rate of 90% (ISBE, 1985a).
The second survey was conducted in November, 1984, with all ECE specialists in all SEAs. These specialists were contacted and interviewed in order to obtain up-to-date information concerning the status of kindergarten and other ECE proposals. Additional information was also collected by contacting staff in governors' offices or legislative bureaus in some instances (ISBE, 1985a).

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

- Brief History of Early Childhood Education in America;
- Kindergarten Schedules: Status of Patterns in Illinois and a Review of the Research;
- The Kindergarten Curriculum: Current Issues;
- Entry Criteria for Kindergarten;
- Class Sizes for Kindergarten and Primary Grades: A Review of the Research;
- Status of Early Childhood Education in Other States;
- Estimates of Eligible Illinois Children Served and Not Served by Head Start;
- Estimates of Preschool Experiences and Childcare Arrangements of Illinois Children;
- Status of Illinois State Board of Education Efforts in Early Childhood Education;
- Selected Preschool Screening and Diagnostic Instruments: A Technical Review;
- Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education Programs: A Review of the Research;
- Problems of Young Children Adjusting to School; and
The following major questions pertinent to pre-kindergarten programs were addressed in the Illinois Early Childhood Education Policy Study:

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

Eight major findings resulted from the Policy Study:

- There are a variety of early childhood programs being offered in response to increased expectations of children, increased demand by parents, and recognition of the greater range of differences among children entering school.
- The number of children who could benefit from early childhood programs far exceeds those currently being served. This is particularly true for those who are most at risk of school failure: children from low-income families, limited-English-proficient children, and children of teenage parents.
- Research has indicated that early childhood programs can be successful in meeting desirable educational and social objectives. Economic analyses show a seven-to-one return on an investment in a high-quality preschool program.
- The expectations previously held for first-grade students are now being expected of kindergarten students. This is due to the large incidence of children already having had preschool experiences and the demand for acquiring basic skills as soon as possible. This is a source of controversy.
- Conditions which established the lower compulsory age as age 7 have changed significantly. There seems to be no reason for a difference between the age at which a child may attend school and the age at which a child must attend school.
- Changing the date at which children may enter school does not address the range of differences among children.
- The full-day, everyday kindergarten has superior academic benefits to the half-day, everyday and full-day, alternate day programs.
- The training and experience of elementary school principals typically has not encompassed the needs of young children. Most of the principals had teaching experiences limited to intermediate and upper grades. (ISBE, 1985a, p. 39).
In March, 1985, the Overview Report of the Early Childhood Education Policy Study was presented to the Illinois State Board of Education. Recommendations were made to the Board in April, 1985, and approved by the Board in May, 1985, at which time the Board also adopted a policy statement on ECE (ISBE, 1985a).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1) develop screening procedures by January, 1986, for the purpose of identifying children at risk of academic failure;

2) identify and screen all children who would be 4 years old by December 1, 1986; and

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

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

The law further stipulated that:

1) screening procedures would be based on criteria established by ISBE;
2) a parent education component would be included in each educational program provided;
3) public school districts receiving grants could subcontract with a private school, not-for-profit corporation, or other governmental agency to conduct the preschool programs;
4) teachers of the programs must hold either early childhood teaching certificates issued under Article 21 or Section 34-83 of the School Code of Illinois or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended;
5) ISBE would provide the primary source of funding through appropriations for the grant program;

6) ISBE would provide evaluation tools, including tests, that school districts could use to evaluate children for school readiness prior to the age of 5;

7) ISBE would require school districts obtain parental consent before any evaluations were conducted;

8) ISBE would encourage school districts to evaluate their preschool population and provide programs where appropriate;

9) beginning on July 1, 1989, and every three years thereafter, ISBE would report the results and progress of students enrolled in the programs to the General Assembly. And further, ISBE would report on the assessment of which programs had been most successful in promoting academic excellence and alleviating academic failure; and

10) ISBE would develop procedures for the collection of longitudinal data regarding the academic progress of all students who had been enrolled in the preschool programs (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2-3.48).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Eligibility criteria developed by local programs based upon screening procedures that address at least the needs in the areas of vocabulary, visual-motor integration, language and speech development, fine and gross motor skills, and social skills;
- Screening and educational components based on sound theories of child development;
- An individualized assessment profile for each student and an educational program for that student in accord with the profile as a result of initial screening and continued assessment;
- A student progress plan for each student to ensure that the program meets the student's needs;
- Parent education and involvement including parent permission for screening and parent awareness of student's progress;
- Requirement that teachers hold either early childhood teaching certificates -- Type 02, preschool to age 6 or Type 04, preschool through grade 3 -- issued under Article 21 of The School Code of Illinois or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended;
- Cooperation with other child-care providers concerned with the education, welfare, health, and safety needs of young children;
- A statement of goals and objectives of the program and timelines for completion;
- A staff/child ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20;
- Longitudinal data collection to determine the effect of the preschool program on children as they progress through the primary grades; and
- Provision for local school districts to operate their own program or enter into a subcontract with a private school, not-for-profit corporation, or other governmental agency to implement the program (ISBE, 1988a).

***

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

**Indiana**

Preschool programs for at-risk children in Indiana were legislated in 1987 as part of the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students. The General Assembly required the Indiana Department of Education:

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

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

The law further stipulated that eligible programs included preschool programs, full-day kindergarten, parental and community involvement programs, transitional programs, tutoring, remediation, expanded utilization of school counselors, individualized programs, and alternative programs for students at risk of withdrawing from schools (Indiana H.B. 1360, 1987, Sec. 26).

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

- each school corporation define its own at-risk population to be served;
- programs must be new or expanded; funds from this program could not be used to replace local program dollars;
- programs were not limited to the nine programs listed in the law;
- program money could be used to contract for services; (for example, a school corporation could enter into an agreement with a community program to provide preschool experiences for at-risk children);
- programs could be sponsored by two or more school corporations;
- program evaluation would be tied to the objectives of the program;
- there was no requirement in the law that private school students be included;
- students who had not been determined to be at risk could be included if their inclusion would benefit the at-risk students and could be justified; and
- students already receiving categorical services, such as Chapter I or Special Education, could be served with program money if they also fit the identification criteria for at-risk students (Indiana Department of Education, n.d.[a]).

The legislation became effective July 1, 1987, but provided no money to fund the program for the 1987-88 school year. The legislature did, however, appropriate $20 million to be used for the 1988-89 school year (Indiana H.B. 1360, 1987, Sec. 26).

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

most educators agree children from low socioeconomic backgrounds often miss the experiences available to their more affluent peers and are at a disadvantage when they enter school. Without early intervention, these students may remain at a disadvantage throughout their educational careers. The benefits of developmentally appropriate preschool programs for these children have been well documented (Indiana Department of Education, 1988, p. 2).
Further, the Board suggested that these additional programs would offer an incentive to school corporations to expand their services beyond grades K-12. The General Assembly denied the Board's request, and no additional funds were appropriated (Speech by Jackson, 1988).

Of the 225 proposals for new or expanded at-risk programs approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the 1988-89 school year, 16 preschool programs received funding (Speech by Jackson, 1988).

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

- A ratio of teaching staff to children of no more than one to 10 with maximum classroom size of 20;
- A validated, developmentally appropriate curriculum model (such as NAEYC) implemented by qualified early childhood teachers;
- Appropriate support systems to maintain the curriculum model such as administrative leadership in instruction and inservice training in the curriculum model;
- Teacher preparation in curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation;
- Collaboration between teaching staff and parents as partners in the education and development of children including face-to-face communication at least monthly; and
- A program of reasonable length, at least 20 hours per week for approximately eight months per year (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b], p.7).

***

In summary, Indiana has no formal State Board of Education policy on ECE. The General Assembly passed legislation for at-risk children in 1987 and authorized $20 million for grants to fund eligible programs. Nine types of
programs were listed in the law; however, school corporations were not limited to those programs. Of the 225 proposals for new or expanded at-risk programs approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the 1988-89 school year, 16 preschool programs received funding. The Department of Education developed guidelines for all at-risk programs and suggested that school corporations consider certain elements when planning preschool programs.

Iowa

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

The Task Force utilized the position statements on developmentally appropriate programs in early childhood education developed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and other research to develop a philosophical base. Based on oral and written testimony of experts and organizations, the Task Force developed a report which included a rationale statement, a position statement, guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in preschool and kindergarten programs, guidelines for a model for delivery of preschool programs, and references (Goodenow, 1988). A brief description of the guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten follows:
1. **Personnel:** Prekindergarten teachers must have the state endorsement for prekindergarten/kindergarten (#53). Prekindergarten teachers in these programs should have previous experience in teaching this age group and will be placed on the district's existing salary schedule and will receive benefits. Aides in prekindergarten programs must meet the same qualifications as elementary aides and will be paid according to district policy. Administrators of prekindergarten programs are encouraged to obtain and maintain current knowledge of child development and its application to ECE practice. Prekindergarten consultants from the Area Education Agencies and the Department of Education must have state endorsement for prekindergarten/kindergarten (#53) and prior experience in teaching this age group.

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

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

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

5. **Curriculum**: The curriculum must be developmentally appropriate for prekindergarten children and planned for the age span of the children within the group. Further, it must be implemented with attention to the different needs, interests, and developmental levels of those individual children. The plan must develop children's self-esteem and a positive attitude toward learning. A developmentally appropriate curriculum provides experiences that meet children's needs and stimulate learning in physical, social, emotional, and intellectual developmental areas through an integrated approach. The teacher's knowledge of child development, observations, and recordings of each child's needs, interests, and developmental progress are the bases upon which appropriate curriculum is planned. Learning is an interactive process. Therefore, the curriculum is designed to provide for children's exploration and manipulation of the environment through meaningful interaction with adults, other children, and materials. Opportunities for children's active involvement with materials that are concrete, real, and/or representational, and relevant to young children are provided.
6. **Adult-Child Interaction:** Children's needs, desires, and messages are responded to by adults in a way that respects their individual characteristics and abilities. Children are provided opportunities to communicate in many ways. Adults facilitate the development of self-esteem by expressing acceptance, respect, and comfort for the child, regardless of the child's race, religion, gender, language, cultural or socioeconomic background, or handicap.

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

8. **Assessment of Children:** Assessment is ongoing and addresses growth in physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development. It is considered essential for planning and implementing developmentally appropriate programs. Written anecdotal records, observations, and parent information are all considered relevant data used in the assessment process. More than one source of information is used when making program placement decisions and curricular decisions. Assessment results are used to 1) plan and adapt curriculum to match the developmental needs of children, 2) facilitate the sharing of information among teachers, other professionals, and family members, 3) identify children who have special needs and/or are at risk, and 4) evaluate the program's effectiveness.
9. **Home and Program Partnership**: Teachers and families work together to build mutual understanding and greater consistency. Teachers establish and maintain frequent contact with families utilizing formal and informal oral and written communication. Parents are encouraged to observe and participate in their child's education. Parents have both the right and the responsibility to share in decisions about their child's care and education, and to participate in the program. Information regarding child development knowledge, insights, and resources are shared between parents and teachers through regular communication, conferences, and planned meetings (Iowa Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force, 1987).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goodenow further noted that the Iowa Department of Education strongly supported the concept of preschool programs and the initiation of pilot programs and planned to include preschool programs in future standards. In addition, the Department of Education said that the State Board of Education, the Administrative Rules Review Committee, and Governor Branstad would have to approve the currently proposed standards, including the proposed standard for full-day, everyday kindergarten to begin in every school district in Iowa on July 1, 1992, before new standards could go into effect. This standard for full-day, everyday kindergarten was approved by the legislature in 1988 (Goodenow, 1988).

In the fall of 1987, the Iowa General Assembly was awarded a grant for technical assistance from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the Carnegie Foundation regarding child care and early childhood education in the context of welfare reform. The General Assembly used the grant to bring experts to appear before its leadership to present the effects of early childhood education programs for at-risk children and to provide information on two other states' responses to the High/Scope research results (Bruner, 1988).
According to Senator Bruner (1988), the result of the technical assistance provided by NCSL and the Carnegie Foundation grant was the enactment of Senate File 2192, The Child Development Assistance Act, in 1988.

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

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

The law also stipulates that the Council:

- develop a definition of at-risk children which includes income, family structure, the child’s level of development, and availability or accessibility for the child of a Head Start or other day-care program as criteria;
- establish minimum guidelines for comprehensive early childhood development services for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds, reflecting current
research findings on the necessary components for cost-effective child
development services;

- develop an inventory of child development services provided to at-risk 3-
and 4-year-olds, at least biennially. Further, the Council will identify: a) the
number of children receiving and not receiving these services; b) the
types of programs under which the services are received; c) the degree to
which each program meets the Council's minimum guidelines for a
comprehensive program; and d) the reasons why children are not being
served;

- recommend to the Department of Education and the General Assembly
appropriate curricula and staff qualifications and training for early
elementary education and the coordination of the curricula with early
childhood development programs;

- award grants, subject to availability of funds, for programs that provide
new or additional child development services to at-risk children;

- encourage all potential providers of child development services to submit
grant requests and to be flexible in evaluating grants, recognizing that
different types of programs may be suitable for different locations in the
state;

- encourage the establishment of regional councils designed to facilitate the
development of programs for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds on a regional basis;

and

- annually submit recommendations to the governor and the General
Assembly on the need for investment in child development services in the
state (Iowa Senate File 2192, 1988).

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

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

The legislative appropriation for the Child Development Grants Program was $1.1 million. The number of Head Start eligible children is expected to increase from the current 19% of qualifying children to nearly 25% of qualifying children (Bruner, 1988). According to Senator Bruner (personal communication, January 18, 1989) one-third of the grants were awarded to school districts, one-third were awarded to Head Start projects, and one-third were awarded to day-care centers.

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

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

Key programmatic elements of the Child Development Grants Program include:

- Developmentally appropriate early childhood education curriculum;
- Parent involvement and training, including home visits, optional parent instruction on parenting and tutoring skills, and experiential education;
- Staff qualified in early childhood education or who have experience in child development services;
- Integration of program services with existing community resources and incorporation of health, medical, dental, and nutrition services;
- Low staff/child ratio, with not less than one staff member per eight children;
- Provision for child care in addition to child development services for families needing full-day child care;
- Provision for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of program goals; and
- Staff training and development and staff compensation "sufficient to assure continuity" (Iowa Senate File 2192, p. 4).

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

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

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

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

***

In summary, Iowa has an implied State Board of Education policy on ECE based on the work of the Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force created in 1986. The Task Force recommended guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten and kindergarten classes, as well as guidelines for a model for delivery of prekindergarten programs. Strong support of the business community was considered instrumental in facilitating the welfare reform legislation in 1988 that created a Child Development Coordinating Council to promote the provision of child development services to at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds. The legislature also appropriated $1.1 million for the Child Development Grants Program. The Center for Early Development Education was also created in 1988 through the enactment of another piece of legislation.
Michigan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9) **Instructional staff/personnel:** Programs must be staffed by individuals
with different levels of education and experience. Instructional staff
have responsibilities commensurate with their backgrounds, and
educational training. An early childhood teacher must have a bachelor's
degree in early childhood/preschool education or child development, OR
an early childhood (ZA) endorsement given by Michigan colleges and
universities upon completion of an 18-hour early childhood education
program requirement, OR equivalent continuing education experience as
approved by the State Board of Education, OR equivalent experiences as
a certified elementary teacher of children, birth through age 6.
Beginning September 1, 1993, all teachers must have the early childhood
(ZA) endorsement to teach in preschool programs. Early childhood
support staff, paraprofessionals, associate teachers, teacher aides, and teacher assistants must be trained to implement program activities and assist in the care and education of the children served under the supervision of the early childhood teacher. Non-paid personnel, such as parents and volunteers, must be used in the program to enhance program goals. All instructional staff must participate in ongoing professional development and must be supported by administrative and supervisory personnel. Class size and teacher/student ratio must be commensurate with the criteria established by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and recommendations of the High/Scope foundation (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

In 1985, the Michigan Department of Education allocated $1 million for pilot prekindergarten programs for 4-year-olds. Appropriation of the money was made during the 1986-87 school year (K. McAuliffe, personal communication, January 20, 1989). According to Morado (n.d.), an additional $100,000 was designated for the Department of Education to implement, monitor, and evaluate the programs. Local school districts were eligible to apply for state grants up to $100,000 (Morado, n.d.) and required to provide a 30% match of funds for their ECE programs (Gnezda & Robinson, 1986). Morado (n.d.) noted that "Half of the programs [were] targeted for children who 'have potential learning problems'" (p. 25).

No actual state dollars were appropriated for the 1987-88 school year (K. McAuliffe, personal communication, January 20, 1989) although Section 36 of Michigan Public Act (P.A.) 220 of 1987 (The Michigan School Aid Act) indicated there was $2 million available for the 1987-88 school year to enable LEAs to develop or expand:
comprehensive compensatory education programs designed to improve the readiness and subsequent achievement of educationally disadvantaged children as defined by the department who will be at least 4, but less than 5 years of age, as of December 1 of the year in which the programs are offered, who have extraordinary need of special assistance, and for whom the districts are not already receiving additional funds by virtue of the pupils being physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped (Shields, 1988a).

In actuality, the funds allocated in Section 36 could not be expended for the development or expansion of programs until after September 1, 1988 (Shields, 1988a).

Michigan P.A. 318 of 1988 indicated there were funds for the 1988-89 school year to enable eligible school districts to develop or expand preschool programs for educationally disadvantaged 4-year-olds. While no dollar amount was given in the legislation, the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Grants Coordination and Procurement, reported that $12 million was available for 1988-89 "State Allocation Grants for Early Childhood Programs for Four-Year-Olds." Local and intermediate districts were eligible for the grants (Michigan Department of Education, 1988).

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

1) complies with the Michigan State Board of Education's Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds;

2) provides for active and continuous parent or guardian participation in the program;

3) describes the district's participation plan as part of the application;

4) employs only teachers possessing proper training in early childhood development, including (ZA) endorsement and/or child development associate, and trained support staff;
5) identifies in its application all early childhood development programs operating in the community and all collaborative activities between the district and other operators of early childhood programs;

6) submits for approval a program budget that includes only those costs that are not reimbursed or reimbursable by federal funding, are clearly and directly attributable to the preschool readiness program, and would not be incurred if the program were not being offered;

7) establishes a committee on early childhood education curriculum -- consisting of, at least, classroom teachers for prekindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade, a parent of a prekindergarten child, and the district curriculum director or equivalent administrator, and if feasible, a school psychologist, school social worker, or school counselor -- to ensure ongoing articulation between the district’s preschool, kindergarten, and first grade programs and review all referrals of children for participation in the preschool programs and recommend children for placement;

8) submits for Departmental approval a plan to conduct and report annual preschool program evaluations using criteria approved by the Department. At a minimum, the evaluations must include assessment of preschool participant gains in educational readiness and progress through first grade; and

9) establishes a community advisory committee that must be involved in the planning and evaluation of the program and has provided for collaboration with and the involvement of appropriate community, volunteer, social service agencies and organizations, and parents in addressing all aspects of educational disadvantages (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).
The legislation also indicates that eligible school districts are allowed to use the available state funds in conjunction with whatever federal funds are available under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Head Start Act. Further, children other than those determined to be educationally disadvantaged may also participate in the preschool program. However, state reimbursement for the preschool program will be limited to the portion of approved costs attributable to educationally disadvantaged children. The law also stipulates a formula for the allocation of funds (Shields, 1988b).

In August, 1988, the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Grants Coordination and Procurement, reported that an additional $3 million was available for the development and implementation of ECE programs designed to improve the readiness and subsequent achievement of prekindergarten children. Public or private non-profit agencies, and local or intermediate school districts were eligible to apply for the grants which would be awarded on a competitive basis for the 1988-89 school year (Michigan Department of Education, 1988).

***

In summary, the Michigan State Board of Education approved Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds in 1986 based on the work of a 22-member Early Childhood Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. Nine critical elements were included in the Standards. Since 1985, the Michigan Legislature has appropriated $16 million for grant programs for educationally disadvantaged 4-year-olds.
Minnesota's involvement with preschool-aged children has a 14-year history. In 1974, the Minnesota legislature authorized a bill sponsored by Senator Jerome Hughes to begin six pilot Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) programs. The ECFE program is designed for all children from birth to kindergarten enrollment age and their parents. Its primary purposes are to strengthen families by supporting and enhancing parents' ability to provide for their children's learning and development, and to provide young children opportunities to develop socially, emotionally, physically, and intellectually (Engstrom, 1988).

The ECFE program is based on two premises:

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

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

During its pilot phase, the program was guided under the auspices of the Council on Quality Education which represented a variety of interests and services, including health, child care, higher education, social services, minorities, and the handicapped. In 1984, ECFE was brought from pilot status to permanent, institutionalized status through additional legislation which directed the Minnesota Department of Education to develop a mechanism to finance the program statewide (Engstrom, 1988; Hausman & Weiss, 1988). Currently, the program is funded with state aid, local tax levies, and in some cases, participant fees (Early Childhood Family Education [ECFE] Aid, 1987; ECFE Programs, 1987; Engstrom, 1988). In FY88, the ECFE program had an $18.3 million budget -- $7.5 million supported by state aid and $10.7 million provided by local tax levies (Hausman & Weiss, 1988).
The enabling legislation selected Community Education as the delivery system "because of its reputation for involving the community in program design and decisionmaking, and its history of cooperating with other community resources to facilitate new efforts and prevent duplication of services" (Engstrom, 1988, p. 16). According to the legislation, any district that provides a Community Education program is allowed to establish an ECFE program. Further, two or more districts, each of which provides a Community Education program, may cooperate to jointly provide an ECFE program (ECFE Programs, 1987).

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

1) programs to educate parents about the physical, mental, and emotional development of children;
2) programs to enhance the skills of parents in providing for their children's learning and development;
3) learning experiences for children and parents;
4) activities designed to detect children's physical, mental, emotional, or behavioral problems that may cause learning problems;
5) educational materials which may be borrowed for home use;
6) information on related community resources; or
7) other programs or activities (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2).

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

a) parents must be physically present much of the time in classes with their children or be in concurrent classes;
b) parenting education or family education must be an integral part of every early childhood family education program;
c) early childhood family education appropriations must not be used for traditional day care or nursery school, or similar programs; and
d) the form of parent involvement common to kindergarten, elementary school, or early childhood special education programs such as parent conferences, newsletters, and notes to parents do not qualify a program under subdivision 2 [Program characteristics] (ECFE Programs, 1987, Subd. 2a).

The legislation for the ECFE Programs also explains that:

1) districts must maintain separate accounts within the Community Education fund for money for the ECFE programs;

2) districts may charge a reasonable participant fee but it must be waived for a participant who is unable to pay;

3) districts may receive funds from any government agency or private source;

4) districts are encouraged to coordinate the ECFE program with special education and vocational education as well as with related services provided by other government and nonprofit agencies;

5) the school board of each participating district must appoint an advisory council from the area in which the program is provided; parents in the program must compose the majority of the council; the council must assist the school board in developing, planning, and monitoring the programs; and the council must report to the school board and the Community Education advisory council;

6) the school board of each participating district must employ qualified teachers for the ECFE program;

7) the Minnesota State Board of Education must provide assistance to districts with ECFE programs; and

8) the Minnesota State Board of Education may adopt rules about program facilities, staff, services, and procedures (ECFE Programs, 1987).
The Minnesota State Board of Education did, in fact, adopt rules for the ECFE programs. The rules pertain to categorical aid funding, tax levies, finances, responsibilities of coordinators, directors and administrators of ECFE programs, contracted services, facilities, and annual reporting procedures. In addition, the Board adopted a requirement for the completion of a one-credit workshop entitled "Introduction to Early Childhood Family Education." This requirement pertains to all instructional and administrative staff who receive any part of their salary from the ECFE program funds, and is effective July 1, 1989 (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).

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

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

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

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

In addition to parent-child classes, family activities, such as field trips and parties, are provided in some ECFE programs. Some programs also provide toy- and book-lending libraries, parent education resource centers, working-family resource centers in downtown skyways, "family schools" co-sponsored by human services to provide for more intensive participation by families with multiple stress problems, or even parent discussion topics presented on cable TV. Home visits by ECFE program staff and/or public health staff are also conducted. Referrals to the ECFE program are made by medical personnel, human service agencies, and friends and neighbors of program participants. ECFE program staff also refer families in the program to appropriate community agencies and resources as needed (Engstrom, 1988).
The focus of each ECFE program and the services it provides are determined by input from its Advisory Council. While parents in the ECFE program compose the majority of council membership, other members may represent day-care providers, the medical profession, the clergy, elementary principals, kindergarten teachers, Head Start, human services, law enforcement, and other early childhood education providers, both public and private (Engstrom, 1988).

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

Further, in 1984, a statewide regional inservice network was established providing easily accessible inservice education and an ongoing networking capability. The network, staffed by volunteer professionals from local programs, compiles resources for statewide dissemination and develops evaluation strategies. According to Engstrom (1988), the network has greatly expanded the leadership base for Early Childhood Family Education.
The Minnesota ECFE was the first and is still the largest, state-sponsored parent education and family support program developed in the U.S. (For a discussion of the other state-sponsored programs, see Hausman & Weiss, 1988.)

The ECFE program is open to all families with young children and is not targeted to just at-risk families, although many do participate. Several reasons account for this:

... First, all parents need support and education especially during the first years of parenting. Second, it is important to recruit a heterogeneous group of families to maximize the modeling and learning of child-rearing strategies that occur during interaction. Programs that would limit eligibility to at-risk families would be less beneficial because these families would lose the opportunity to observe the child-rearing strategies common to 'normal' families. Although program directors are the first to acknowledge that recruitment of at-risk families is sometimes more difficult from the schools, they are nevertheless convinced that only a universal access system will expose participants to a broader set of values and practices.

Third, targeted programs stigmatize and label parents and children, putting them into at-risk categories and ensuring alienation and nonparticipation (Hausman & Weiss, 1988, pp. 13-14).

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

Program criteria include:

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

***

In summary, Minnesota has a 14-year history of providing services to young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, through the Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program. In FY88, the ECFE program had an $18.3 million budget, $7.5 million supported by state aid and $10.7 million provided by local tax levies. Delivered through Community Education, the program requires substantial parent involvement and utilizes statewide interagency cooperation. In 1988, a $500,000 grant program was made available through legislation which provided opportunities for eligible recipients of the grants to develop programs for children, age 3 to kindergarten enrollment age, who are poor or significantly developmentally delayed.

Ohio

In the early fall of 1983, the Ohio Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed an Early Childhood Task Force to review different aspects of early childhood education. The original Task Force was composed of Ohio Department of Education staff and school district representatives. Based on the findings of the Department's research staff and the Task Force, the State Board of Education passed a resolution in October, 1983, making the Early Childhood Task Force a Commission with an expanded membership. The 24-member Commission included parents of young children as well as representatives from public schools, private interests, and other state agencies which serve children (Ohio Commission on Early Childhood Education [ECE], 1984).
The Commission was charged to 1) further study early childhood issues with particular emphasis on preschool, latchkey, early entrance screening, and early identification programs; 2) prepare a report to be submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for consideration and recommendations to the State Board of Education by July, 1984; 3) identify available services and those which were needed; and 4) to develop ways to encourage agencies to interact, avoid duplication of efforts, and "help young children in Ohio become as well prepared as possible for their education experience" (Ohio Commission on ECE, 1984, p. 3).

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

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

**Preschool**

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

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

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

4) Public, private, and parochial school program personnel must develop a cooperative dialogue and serve as disseminators of information about early childhood education.
5) An outline of developmental experiences for children and uniform program standards in quality early childhood education programs should be developed.

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

**Early Identification**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Early Childhood Section of the Division of Educational Services, Ohio Department of Education, formed an internal committee to meet with experts and consider a design for the longitudinal study. A 22-member advisory committee was formed to oversee the study.
The advisory committee developed research objectives for the longitudinal study, and four separate studies were specified as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

In 1987, the Ohio General Assembly passed House Bill 67 which revised the School Code and:

1) permitted boards of education to establish preschool programs and use school funds in support of the program;

2) permitted boards of education to establish fees or tuition, graduated to family income, for participation in the preschool program; however, boards were required to waive the fees or tuition in cases where payment would create a hardship for the child's parent or guardian;

3) permitted boards of education providing preschool programs to provide transportation for children participating in the programs; and
4) required the State Board of Education to formulate and prescribe by rule, minimum standards to be applied to all preschool programs (Ohio H.B. 67, 1987).

The School Code was revised again with Substitute House Bill 253. Among its many provisions, Substitute H.B. 253 (1987) outlined requirements for persons hired to direct a preschool and required that minimum standards for eligible preschools would be developed jointly by the State Board of Education and the Director of Human Services no later than July 1, 1988. Further, the law stipulated facility requirements and supervision and evaluations of staff according to planned sequences of observations and evaluation conferences, and prescribed maximum staff/child ratios and maximum group size for each of the following age ranges: birth to less than 12 months; 12 months to less than 18 months; 18 months to less than 30 months; 30 months to less than 3 years; 3-year-olds; and 4- and 5-year-olds.

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

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

1) requirements for written philosophy and goal statements;
2) provisions to encourage parent involvement;
3) procedures for reporting child progress;
4) certification and coursework requirements;
5) maximum staff/child ratios and maximum group sizes;
6) written policies and procedures regarding staff; cumulative student records; health and safety; attendance and discipline; management of communicable diseases; and developmentally appropriate program planning, selection and use of materials, equipment, and resources that meet the child's intellectual, physical, social, and emotional needs;

7) requirements concerning cumulative records;

8) requirements regarding the facility, space, equipment, and supplies;

9) procedures for evaluation and monitoring of the program; and

10) requirements for school food services (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

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

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

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

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

The preschool programs are also targeted to **cyclical poverty** and **inadequate readiness skills/developmental delay**. Further, Ohio's preschools are targeted to address another factor which places them at risk of school failure and not entering into productive lives of employment -- **family structure**. The Ohio Department of Education defines this factor as including "students who are raised
in an unstable environment and do not receive sufficient nurturing and positive modeling" (Ohio Department of Education, 1988, p. 3).

According to Jane Weichel, Assistant Director of the Division of Educational Services, Early Childhood Education Section, Ohio Department of Education, 21 early identification programs, 11 preschool programs, and 23 latchkey programs were funded by the Department of Education since the 1985-86 school year (Weichel, 1988).

***

In summary, Ohio provides services to preschool children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, through adoption grants which were legislated in 1986 following the development of model programs for rural, suburban, and urban areas in 1985. Adoption grants are also available for latchkey and early identification programs, and 70 counties have received incentive grants to initiate interagency coordination for projects serving young children and their families. Since 1987, local boards of education have been allowed to establish preschool programs and use school funds in support of the programs which are targeted to address factors that contribute to academic failure.

The State Board of Education's Commission on Early Childhood Education and a 22-member advisory committee have assisted in the development of Ohio's programs for young children. The Ohio Department of Education has promulgated rules to accompany the provisions under the revised School Code. A four-year longitudinal study of preschool and kindergarten in the state was begun in the spring of 1986 to produce information and data which may be helpful to policymakers.
In 1985, the Wisconsin legislature amended the Wisconsin School Code permitting school districts to provide preschool programs for 4-year-olds and to receive per pupil reimbursement based on class membership count and the state aid formula. According to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), this amendment was in response to nationwide recognition of the importance of early childhood education, particularly for those children who are disadvantaged (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction [DPI], 1988a).

According to Jim McCoy, Early Childhood Consultant, Wisconsin DPI, 20 Wisconsin school districts are serving 5,000 of the eligible 75,000 4-year-olds in the 1988-89 school year in the preschool programs, and most of those programs serve at-risk children. The average local contribution to the 4-year-old preschool program was approximately 58% in FY87. No participation fees were charged. More than $4 million in state aid is spent on these programs (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988).

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

- provided structured educational experiences for 4-year-olds that focused on the needs of low-income children and included activities that encouraged early skill development.
- beginning in the 1987-88 school year, annually tested the children enrolled in preschool programs and in grades 1 through 3 in reading, language arts, and math using tests approved by the DPI;
- beginning in the 1987-88 school year, annually tested the children in grades 4 and 5 in reading, language arts, math, science, and social studies using tests approved by the DPI;
- implemented a multidisciplinary team approach to the identification and remediation of problems of children with significant needs;
- restricted class size in all grades below the sixth grade to no more than 25 students per teacher;
- annually prepared a written performance evaluation of each staff member providing services in this program;
- required inservice training for all administrative and instructional staff in the elementary grades that focuses on educational practices and policies identified by the DPI as effective in improving student achievement;
- established a council composed of teachers, parents of students enrolled in the school district, school board members, and community leaders to monitor and make recommendations to the school board concerning the school's educational programs; and
- developed plans to encourage and increase parental involvement in efforts to improve the quality of education (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.45).

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

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

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

- be licensed under state statute (section 48.65) or certified under section 48.651;
- offer developmental child day care and early childhood education through age 6 at least 10 hours each day for at least 260 days each year;
- employ or utilize only persons appropriately licensed by the State Superintendent under section 115.28 (7) for children in the program or
ensure that only such persons supervise the individuals providing
instruction and support services to the children in the program;
- maintain a staff/child ratio of no more that 1:12;
- offer opportunities for parent participation in the program including 1)
direct involvement in decisionmaking in program planning and analysis,
2) participation in classroom and program activities, and 3) participation
in training sessions on child growth and development;
- record and periodically report to the board student attendance data and
parent involvement activities;
- provide activities that support and enhance the parents' role as the
principal influence in their child's education and development;
- ensure that at least 50% of the children participating in each day-care
center's program fall into one or more of the following categories:
  - children with a parent in need of child-care services as defined under
    Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 46.98 (4) (a) 1 to 3;
  - children with a parent in need of child-care services as defined under
    Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 46.98 (4) (a) 4;
  - children with a parent who is a school age parent, as defined under
    Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.91 (1); and
  - children who have language, psychomotor development, social,
    behavioral, or educational problems that warrant intervention, as
determined by the board other than children with exceptional
    educational needs, as defined under Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.76 (3).
- pay each contracting day-care center, for each full-time equivalent child
served by the center under the contract, an amount equal to at least 80%
of the average per student cost for kindergarten children enrolled in the
school district, adjusted to a full-time equivalent basis; and
- evaluate the success of the program through the use of standardized basic educational skills tests and the collection of data on the appropriate placements for students at the end of the first grade (Wisconsin Statutes, Section 119.72, 1987).

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

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

According to Jim McCoy, Early Childhood Consultant, Wisconsin DPI, (personal communication, November 10, 1988) no specific curricular requirements were in place for the preschool programs as of the 1988-89 school year, other than what was stipulated in state statutes. However, an Early Childhood Education Resource and Planning Guide is being developed by the DPI.

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

***

In summary, Wisconsin's school districts have been permitted to provide preschool programs for 4-year-olds and receive per pupil reimbursement based on
class membership count and the state aid formula since 1985. Most of the 20 school districts that provide preschool programs serve at-risk children. The P-5 program targets additional state resources to elementary schools in Milwaukee, Beloit, and Kenosha. Since 1985, $6.19 million has been appropriated for the P-5 program. The Milwaukee school board is also required by legislation to contract with private, non-profit, non-sectarian day-care centers to provide ECE to 4- and 5-year-olds. Requirements for a new teaching license and teacher preparatory program in ECE will go into effect July 1, 1992.

Summary

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

EARLY INTERVENTION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

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

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

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

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

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

The High/Scope Foundation

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

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

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

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

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

- a ratio of teaching staff to children of no more that 1 to 10 and a classroom group size of no more than 20; and

- collaboration between teaching staff and parents as partners in the education and development of children, including substantive face-to-face communication at least monthly (Schweinhart, 1987, pp. 17-18).

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

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

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

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

In its expanded edition of Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early
Childhood Programs Serving Children From Birth Through Age 8 (Bredekamp,
1987), NAEYC describes research-based developmentally appropriate practices for
children in the following age categories: infants and toddlers from birth to age 3;
3-year-olds; 4- and 5-year-olds; and those in the primary grades serving 5- through
8-year-olds. Since all of the states in this study have addressed programs for
4-year-olds or include 4-year-olds in their multi-age programs, the researcher
presents in brief, NAEYC's recommendations for 13 areas of developmentally
appropriate practice for this age group.

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. **Aesthetic Development**: Opportunities are provided daily for children to express themselves through art and music.
8. **Motivation:** The natural curiosity of children and their desire to make sense of their world are used to encourage them to get involved in learning activities.

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

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

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

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

13. **Staffing:** Group size and teacher/child ratios are limited to provide individualized and age-appropriate programming. Maximum group size for 4-year-olds is 20 with two adults (Bredekamp, 1987).
NAEYC also recommends the following policies that are considered essential in order to implement developmentally appropriate early childhood programs:

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

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

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

***

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

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

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

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

**Analysis of States' Early Intervention Programs**

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

**Developmentally Appropriate Practice**

For the purpose of the following discussion, developmentally appropriate practice refers to developmentally appropriate curriculum and teaching practices based on theory, research, and practice.
All seven states (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) either specifically mention developmentally appropriate practice or imply that such practice should be used in their preschool programs.

Illinois requires educational components to be based on sound theories of child development (ISBE, 1988a). Indiana recommends the use of a validated, developmentally appropriate curriculum model and even refers to the one recommended by NAEYC (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b]). A developmentally appropriate ECE curriculum is mandated in Iowa's legislation for Child Development Grants Program (Iowa Senate File 2192). One of Michigan's nine Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds outlines developmentally appropriate practices (Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).

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

The Ohio Department of Education promulgated rules for early childhood programs, one of which pertained to written policies and procedures regarding developmentally appropriate program planning, selection, and use of materials, equipment, and resources that meet the child's intellectual, physical, social, and emotional needs (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).
There is no specific mention of developmentally appropriate practice in Wisconsin. However, Jim McCoy, Early Childhood Consultant, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), indicated that the DPI was in the process of developing an Early Childhood Education Resource and Planning Guide that will address this issue. Further, technical assistance is being delivered to local school districts by the DPI regarding developmentally appropriate practice (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988).

Staff Training and Supervision

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

Illinois' legislation stipulates that teachers of the at-risk preschool program must hold either early childhood teaching certificates as designated in the School Code of Illinois for preschool to age 6 (Type 02) or preschool through grade 3 (Type 04) or meet the requirements for supervising a day-care center under the Child Care Act of 1969, as amended (School Code of Illinois, 1985, Sec. 2 & 3.48 [b]; ISBE, 1988a). There is no indication in legislation, policies, rules, guidelines, or requirements that teachers or supervisors must receive ongoing training. However, one of the findings in the Early Childhood Education Policy Study addressed the fact that the training and experience of elementary school principals typically had not encompassed the needs of young children. Further, it was noted that most of the principals had teaching experience limited to intermediate and upper grades (ISBE, 1985a). Since 1986, ECE consultants have been hired by ISBE to conduct on-site evaluations of each of the programs and provide technical assistance to improve areas of weakness (ISBE, n.d.).
Indiana's guidelines recommend that teachers be prepared in curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation, and that appropriate support systems, such as administrative leadership in instruction, be available to maintain the curriculum model. Indiana's guidelines also recommend inservice training in the curriculum model (Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b]). No additional specifications or requirements are identified by Departmental rules or guidelines.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board rules also stipulate that effective July 1, 1989, teachers who teach young children and/or parent-child interaction must hold one of the following four licenses: 1) nursery school; 2) prekindergarten; 3) early childhood special education; or 4) early childhood family educator (Minnesota State Board of Education, 1986).
Inservice education opportunities and a statewide inservice network are available to staff in the ECFE program (Engstrom, 1988).

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

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

1) a valid pre-kindergarten teaching certificate; or
2) a valid pre-kindergarten associate certificate; or
3) a valid kindergarten-primary teaching certificate and completion of at least four courses in child development or ECE from an accredited college, university, or technical college; or
4) a degree in ECE or child development from an accredited college, university, or technical college; or
5) evidence of completion of a training program approved by the Department of Education (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- study and experience designed to develop skills in promoting parent education and family involvement in the early childhood program;

- study of professionalism, program and staff development, supervision and evaluation of support staff, advisory groups, community agencies and resources, and pupil services personnel as related to early childhood programs;

- study to develop knowledge of and the abilities to apply developmentally appropriate assessment tools with children, birth through age 8;

- study designed to develop knowledge and skills to identify and teach children, birth through age 8, with exceptional educational needs and talents; and

- study of program, curriculum, and instructional approaches which contribute to the preparation of students for work including career exploration, practical application of the basic skills, and employability skills and attitudes (Wisconsin DPI, 1988b).

**Teacher/Student Ratio**

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

Illinois’ and Indiana’s preschool programs for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds, and Michigan’s preschool programs for 4-year-olds require a staff/child ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20 (ISBE, 1988a; Indiana Department of Education, n.d. [b]; Michigan State Board of Education, 1986).
Iowa's legislation that created the Child Development Grants Program mandates a lower staff/child ratio than was recommended by High/Scope and NAEYC. The legislation requires not less than one staff member per eight children (Iowa Senate File 2192). Class size limit is not addressed in the legislation.

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

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement

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

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

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

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

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

Included among the rules promulgated by the Ohio State Board of Education under the revised School Code was a provision for a written plan given to each parent to encourage parent involvement and participation and to keep parents informed about the program and its services (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).
Wisconsin’s P-5 program requires the school boards of Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit to develop plans to encourage and increase parent involvement in efforts to improve the quality of education (Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 115.45, 1985). Wisconsin Statutes, Sec. 119.72 (1987), also require day-care centers with whom the Milwaukee board of education contracts to offer opportunities for parent participation in the day-care program including 1) direct involvement in decision-making in program planning and analysis; 2) participation in classroom and program activities; and 3) participation in training sessions on child growth and development.

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

Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- the LEA superintendent or designee will monitor monthly the administration of the program, facilities, funding, and record keeping;
- information from monthly evaluations will be aggregated and submitted to the Department of Education in an annual report;
- each LEA superintendent or designee will receive training provided by the Department of Education in evaluating programs;
- the program will be evaluated by the Department of Education to determine if it is in compliance with the rules promulgated by the Department. This evaluation will take place at least once every five years. A written report of the results of the evaluation will be mailed to the LEA superintendent, the preschool program director, and the president of the school board. The evaluation will specify any deficiencies and dates by which corrections will be required. Parents are to be invited to a meeting to discuss the program evaluation. A plan to correct any deficiencies must be prepared and submitted to the Department. Timelines may be extended as approved by the Department.
Failure to comply with the rules promulgated by the Department concerning the preschool program may be cause for initiating proceedings for withholding of funds (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).

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

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

**Eligibility**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In Minnesota, the ECFE program is open to all families with young children and is not targeted only to families with children who are at risk of academic failure (Engstrom, 1988; Hausmann & Weiss, 1988). The Minnesota developmental program for young children who are significantly developmentally delayed and whose families' economics are at or below the poverty level is targeted to a specific at-risk population (Minnesota Department of Education, 1988).

Ohio's preschool programs are open to all young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age. However, the Department of Education noted that the early identification and preschool programs were created specifically to focus on the needs of at-risk children (Ohio Department of Education, 1988). The Department of Education has also promulgated rules that specify procedures for reporting children's progress (Ohio Department of Education, n.d.).
Wisconsin's preschool programs are open to all 4-year-olds, however, most programs serve at-risk children (J. McCoy, personal communication, November 10, 1988). The P-5 programs in Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit are targeted specifically to the needs of economically disadvantaged children (Wisconsin DPI, 1988a).

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF EARLY INTERVENTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2) ECE teachers must have practical, supervised experience teaching young children prior to being in charge of a group; and
3) Teacher/child ratios must be appropriate for the ages of the children in the program, and maximum class size must be limited to ensure individualized and appropriate care and education (Bredekamp, 1987)

Staff Qualifications

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

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

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

- Two years of college credit with 18 hours of coursework in child care and/or child development; or
- Two years of child development experience in a school or day-care setting plus 10 hours of college coursework in child care/child development, with proof of intent to complete two years of college; or

- Current credential as a Child Development Associate plus 12 hours of college coursework in child care/child development and two years of child development experience in a school or day care setting; or

- Completion of a Montessori teacher training program as a substitute for the college coursework requirement (ISBE, 1988b, p. 4).

The policy paper states:

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

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

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

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

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

Recruitment and Retention of Teachers

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

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

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

Facilities

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

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

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

In Wisconsin, the issue is not only crowded school buildings. The major concern is old, unsafe school buildings. Many of Wisconsin's schools were constructed prior to 1930. Wisconsin Statutes require that schools need only meet the building codes in effect at the time they were constructed. Thus, many buildings fall below current expectations for safe and healthful facilities.
A combination of financial and procedural hurdles has produced a situation where only 1% of Wisconsin's 2000+ school buildings have been replaced in the last four years. This replacement rate corresponds to a building life expectancy of 400 years, clearly unrealistic (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1988c, p. 69).

While Wisconsin's State Superintendent of Public Instruction is seeking legislative support to rectify the problems of unsafe school facilities, the current situation is that many LEAs could not house preschool programs in their own buildings even if they wanted to do so.

Articulation Between Early Childhood Levels

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

All of the states concur with NAEYC and High/Scope that programs for young children should be developmentally appropriate. Further, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio created study groups, task forces, or commissions to examine the issues pertaining to ECE. Results of their work revealed that many existing programs, particularly in kindergarten through grade 3, focus too much on early
academics and expect children to adjust to the demands of an inappropriate program. The emphasis on developmentally appropriate practice may indeed be felt throughout elementary schools, especially in the early grades. Kindergarten and primary teachers and administrators may need to look critically at curriculum, instruction, and assessment to determine whether or not all three are aligned and reflect the development of young children.

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

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

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

Parent Involvement: Intervention or Intrusion?

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

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

**Delivery and Coordination of Services**

The North Central Region is geographically large and demographically diverse. In terms of area, it covers 379,474 square miles or 25% of the land area of the continental United States. Of the 48.7 million inhabitants of the region, three-fourths live in metropolitan areas and one-fourth live in rural areas. Two-thirds of the region's elementary and secondary students attend schools in metropolitan areas while one-third attend schools in rural areas. Each state in this region reflects similar diversity (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 1987).

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

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

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

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

Will these services be only educational or will they provide:

- health services, such as screening for delays, physical examinations, or other direct health services provided by a doctor, nurse, or dentist?

- social services, such as assistance with obtaining services from community or government agencies?

- nutrition services, such as meals or snacks so that children receive the major portion of their daily nutritional requirements during the hours of the preschool program?

- day-care services to address the needs of working parents?

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

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

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

Not only will LEAs need to work in cooperation with other agencies, they may also want to consider establishing cooperation with existing school programs, such as Chapter I, bilingual, and provisions under PL 99-457, the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986. Thoughtful and careful coordination may be necessary in order to maximize resources available. This will be no small task.

For the past 20 years, the policy framework established has promoted categorical and fragmented programming (Kagan, 1989). While some may claim that serving all children in a holistic manner is long overdue, the time and political climate may be ripe for those who serve children to turn this trend around.

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

Accountability

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

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

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

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

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

Summary

This study has attempted to:

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

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

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

This is the place to start, for that is where the children are. For only a hard look at the world in which they live -- a world we adults have created for them in large part by default -- can convince us of the urgency of their plight and the consequences of our inaction. Then perhaps it will come to pass that, in the words of Isaiah, 'A little child shall lead them' (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, p. 165).
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APPENDIX A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association of School Administrators</td>
<td>Gary Marx 703/528-0700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 North Moore Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, VA 22209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 North West Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22314-2798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for Exceptional Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 Association Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reston, VA 22091-1589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 North Capitol St., N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of the Great City Schools</td>
<td>202/371-0163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413 K Street, N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Commission of the States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860 Lincoln Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO 80296-9987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 Connecticut Ave., N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Elementary School Principals</td>
<td>Pat Braxton 703/684-3345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615 Duke Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22314-3483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of State Boards of Education</td>
<td>Tom Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 North Fairfax St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of State Directors of Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 K Street, N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agency

National Community Education Association
119 North Payne St.
Alexandria, VA  22314

National Conference of State Legislatures
1050 17th St.
Suite 2100
Denver, CO  80265

National Education Association
1201 16th Street
Washington, DC  20036

National Governors’ Association
Hall of the States
444 North Capitol St., N.W.
Suite 250
Washington, DC  20001

Contact

Carolyn Breedlove
202/822-7300
March 28, 1988

National Association of
State Boards of Education
701 North Fairfax Street
Suite 340
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Information Officer:

I am in the process of writing a dissertation on legislation and state education agencies' policies, rules, and regulations regarding Early Intervention Programs for At-Risk Children, ages birth to five years of age. Specifically, I will be looking at programs that are targeted to the pre-kindergarten population with the intended purpose to prevent future academic failure.

I understand that your association has a position paper or other publications pertaining to Early Intervention and/or preschool education. Would you please send me a copy of all documents that pertain to this subject. Please invoice me should there be a charge for these documents.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda G. Kunesh
Coordinator of Constituency Affairs
APPENDIX B
Agency

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325

Bank Street College
Center for Children's Policy
610 West 112th St.
New York, NY 10025

Carolina Institute for Child and Family Policy
Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center
CB No. 8040, 300 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Center for Policy Research in Education
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles St.
Baltimore, MD 21218

Children's Defense Fund
122 C Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Committee for Economic Development
477 Madison Ave.
New York, NY 10022

ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education
University of Illinois
College of Education
805 West Pennsylvania Ave.
Urbana, IL 61801-4897

ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Dr.
Reston, VA 22091-1589

Contact

Policy and Planning Center

Anne Mitchell
212/663-7200

Mima Spencer
217/333-1386

703/620-3660
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High/Scope Educational Research Foundation</td>
<td>Evelyn Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 North River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ypsilanti, MI 48197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Black Child Development Institute</td>
<td>Carl Marburger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463 Rhode Island Ave., N.W.</td>
<td>301/596-5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Citizens in Education</td>
<td>Pascal Trohanis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10840 Little Patuxent Parkway</td>
<td>919/962-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, MD 21044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB No. 8040, 500 NCNB Plaza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill, NC 27599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for the Improvement of Education</td>
<td>202/822-7840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 Sixteenth St., N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Maternal and Child Health Resource Center</td>
<td>319/335-9046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa City, IA 52242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Research in Child Development</td>
<td>Jeanette Goodstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Liaison Office</td>
<td>202/543-9582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 North Carolina Ave., S.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>Robert L. Egbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>402/472-3153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 Henzlik Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68588-0355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
<td>Michelle Seligson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Research on Women</td>
<td>617/431-1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley, MA 02181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 26, 1988

Children's Defense Fund
122 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Information Officer:

I am in the process of writing a dissertation on legislation and state education agencies' policies, rules, and regulations regarding Early Intervention Programs for At Risk Children, ages birth to five. Specifically, I will be looking at programs that are targeted to the pre-kindergarten population with the intended purpose to prevent future academic failure.

I understand that your organization has a position statement pertaining to Early Intervention and/or preschool education. Would you please send me a copy of your position statement, a publications list, and any free abstracts or executive summaries that pertain to this subject.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda G. Kunesh
Coordinator of Constituency Affairs
APPENDIX C
Agency
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001
  Sally Pancrazio, Research and Statistics, 217/782-3950
  Chalmer Moore, Remediation and Intervention
  Audrey Witzman, Remediation and Intervention
  Edith Helmich, Research and Evaluation
  Sandra Crews, Special Education

Department of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798
  Carol D'Amico, Policy Analyst, 312/232-3513
  Dennis Jackson, At-Risk Program Manager
  Joan Murray, Early Childhood Consultant
  Linda Ann Bond, Policy and Planning Specialist

Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA
  Leland Tack, Chief of Planning, Research and Development, 515/281-4835
  Gail Sullivan Fleig, Policy Analyst
  Carol Phillips, Early Childhood Task Force
  Karen Goodenow, President, Iowa State Board of Education

Iowa General Assembly
  Senator Charles Bruner, 515/281-3371

Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
  Dorothy VanLooy, Technical Assistance and Evaluation, 517/373-1830
  Carolyn Logan, Early Childhood Education Programs
  Kate McAuliffe, Policy Analyst

Minnesota Department of Education
Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar St.
St. Paul, MN 55101
  Harold MacDermot, Technology and Curriculum, 612/297-2534
  Corinna Moncada, Preschool and Kindergarten
  Mary Jo Richardson, Community and Adult Education
  Lois Engstrom, Early Childhood and Family Education
  Ann Bettenberg, Specialist, Rules Development & Policy
Agency

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

Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH  43215
   Margaret Trent, Research and Communications, 614/466-4838
   Jane Wiechel, Early Childhood Section

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI  53707
   Thomas Stefonek, Bureau for Achievement Testing, 608/266-1782
   William Erpenbach, Bureau for Pupil Services
   Arnold Chandler, Bureau for Program Development
   Paul Halverson, Bureau for Exceptional Children
   Jenny Lange, Early Childhood Handicapped Programs
   Dennis Van Den Heuvel, Children at Risk Consultant
   James McCoy, Early Childhood Specialist
March 28, 1988

Dr. Tom Stefonek  
Director of the Bureau for  
Achievement Testing  
Department of Public Instruction  
125 South Webster  
P.O. Box 7841  
Madison, WI 53707

Dear Tom:

The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance with a special project. I am in the doctoral program at Loyola University in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. My dissertation topic will be a comparative analysis of legislation and SEA policies, rules, and regulations regarding early intervention programs for children at risk in our seven state region. I will need copies of legislation, policies, rules, and regulations for all programs that the states mandate or permit for children, ages birth through five years of age. My definition of "at risk" may include disadvantaged, bilingual, special education, etc. I will also try to identify "effective components" of early intervention programs that research says programs should include.

My plan is to include all pertinent information through 1987 and anything I can find in the way of pending legislation for 1988. The paper will be finished by May of 1989, and I hope it will be useful information for our state policymakers. NCREL plans to publish the information I collect, probably in monograph form.

What would you suggest I do to collect this information in Wisconsin? Is there a particular protocol I should follow or a person (or persons) I should contact? Any suggestions or advice you can give me, Tom, would be appreciated.

Thanks for your assistance. Take care.

Sincerely,

Linda G. Kunesh  
Coordinator of Constituency Affairs
The dissertation submitted by Linda Grace Kunesh has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. L. Arthur Safer, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and
Associate Dean, School of Education, Loyola

Dr. Joan Smith
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and
Associate Dean, Graduate School, Loyola

Dr. Carol Harding
Associate Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date: April 3, 1989

Director’s Signature