



Early Childhood Policy in Institutions of Higher Education

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

Created originally as a prototypical syllabus by the Early Childhood Policy in Institutions of Higher Education (ECPIHE) initiative, this document has been modified for use by *Early Childhood and Family Policy Graduate Certificate Program* offered through Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (GP IDEA). This document supports ECPIHE's foundational intent to create and support a cadre of scholars who address early childhood policy. Moreover, it acknowledges ECPIHE's purposeful creation of comprehensive and adaptive materials that are designed to be modified to reflect the instructional goals and needs of diverse contexts and users. For more information about ECPIHE and/or to learn about additional coursework related to the initiative, please visit <https://ecpolicy.org>.

Faculty in eight institutions collaboratively modified the course syllabi developed by ECPIHE to create a 12-credit graduate certificate program entitled **Early Childhood and Family Policy**. The collaboration is facilitated through GP IDEA. Participating institutions include: Iowa State University, Michigan State University, Texas Tech University, University of Arizona, University of Kentucky, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, and University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Note: Course names and numbers can be different across institutions.

COURSE SYLLABUS I

ECFP: HISTORY, DEVELOPMENT, AND EQUITY IN SHAPING EARLY CHILDHOOD POLICY

3 credits, 8-week course, online

Course I of IV
Course Semester

Instructor Name
Instructor Title
Instructor Office
Instructor Phone
Instructor Email
Office Hours

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

In the United States, a national consensus supporting policies and programs that promote the well-being and educational success of young children is taking hold. Many Americans are aware of the critical importance of the first five years of life and recognize that desired developmental outcomes can be derailed by social, political, and economic circumstances, such as poverty, systemic racism, and inequality of opportunity. This course examines three important questions related to these complex intersecting issues, specifically:

- What are the historical antecedents and intellectual traditions that have shaped the study of child development in the United States, a society riven by inequality?
- What is achieved developmentally during the first five years of life that have contributed to our understanding of this period's importance as a public investment?
- What are the factors that can derail optimal early development and increase developmental and educational disparities?

This course is designed for students who wish to critically consider the developmental science that has informed policy and program development; the social, political and economic forces that have shaped the study of young

children and contributed to developmental trajectories that benefit some children while disadvantaging others; the changing roles of families; and the implications of these issues for policies affecting young children.

GENERAL COURSE DESCRIPTION AND CONTENT

Child development theory and research have had a profound influence on early childhood education and care (ECEC) policies, programs, and services in the United States and internationally. In eight weeks (three hours/week), this course provides an overview of the research on young children (birth to age five), demographics of this population, critical domains of development, significance of early brain development, and issues of inequality and disproportionality that deeply shape child outcomes. It attempts to explore what develops in the first years of life, why this period is so critical, what have been the central questions that have driven both research and policy, whether policies and research have helped to reduce inequality and advance equity, and what critical issues are still unanswered (or even unasked). The course familiarizes students with the cultural ideas, beliefs, values, and social purposes that have shaped and continue to influence children and families in the United States. Further, the course presents research from a range of disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, education, neuroscience, economics) to help students understand the complexity of developmental factors relevant to ECEC policy development and program design. The goals of the course are to help students understand the importance of early development, the critical need to develop ECEC policies grounded in research and practice, and the effectiveness and limitations of ECEC policies to address fundamental issues of inequality. Finally, the course is intended to enable students to place their own professional interests and concerns in a broader historical and educational context.

The organization of the course sessions is as follows:

1. The History of Early Childhood Education and Care, Inequality, and the Emergence of Child Development Science,
2. Child Poverty, Racial Disparities, and Inequity: Early Childhood Education and Care's Enduring Challenges
3. Early Childhood Education and Care Science, Neuroscience, and Infant and Toddler Development
4. Early Development, Poverty, Inequity, and Early Childhood Education and Care Policy
 - a. Infants and Toddlers
 - b. Preschool Children
5. Young Multilingual Children and Bilingual Children: Language Development and Federal and State Policy
6. ECEC Policies and Black, Indigenous, and Latinx Children: In Search of Solutions to Factors Related to the Preschool-to-Prison Pipeline
7. Early Childhood Education and Care Programs: Supporting Homeless Children and Immigrant and Refugee Children Who Experience Trauma
8. Growing Income Disparities, Lack of Opportunity, and Early Childhood Policies Targeted at Both Children and Their Families

COURSE GOALS

Upon successful completion of the course, students will:

1. Articulate past and current social purposes and forces (e.g., inequality, role of women, racial segregation, immigration) that shape the development of policies related to early development and ECEC for children who represent the racial, cultural, linguistic, and social class diversity of the United States. (Week 1, Session A.; Week 1, Session B.; and Week 2, Session A.)
2. Articulate the unique developmental period from birth to age five, and the role ECEC principles and science have played in influencing current public policy concerns related to ECEC (e.g., equity, segregation). (Week 3, Session A.; and Week 4, Session A.)
3. Critique the contributions of specific areas of research (e.g., neuroscience, trauma) and specific ECEC principles on policy. (Week 3, Session A.)
4. Critique the ECEC policies grounded in equity that promote inclusion and social wellbeing, including bilingual education, income transfer policies, and high-quality ECEC for those furthest from opportunity. (Week 5, Session A.; Week 6; Week 7; and Week 8)
5. Debate policies regarding the accessibility and equity of early education in the United States. (Week 3, Session

B.; and Week 5, Session B.)

6. Identify issues and questions related to child development research and policy that are still unanswered, as well as the possible limitations of policy solutions to particularly challenging social problems. (Week 6, Week 7, and Week 8)
7. Articulate their own values and experiences and hear those of others, in order to understand how various factors affect our own views of children and their needs. (Course Assignments: Class Participation, Formal Policy Debate, Equity and ECEC Policy Report)

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Assignment (Described in Detail Below)	Due Date	Points (Percentage of Grade)
Class Participation	Weekly	10 (10%)
Short Response Papers	XXXX, XXXX, XXXX	30 (30%)
Formal Policy Debate	XXXX	30 (30%)
Equity and ECEC Policy Report	XXXX	30 (30%)

All written work should be submitted through the course learning management system (e.g. Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) to the instructor by [specific deadline] on the indicated dates. All papers should be double-spaced with 1-inch margins and in 12-point Times New Roman font. Papers must follow APA style, 7th edition. Please review the course policy for late submissions.

Your papers and other assignments should meet the standards of graduate-level work. The following criteria will be used for grading all papers:

1. Content: your ideas are clearly stated, soundly argued, and supported with examples from course readings and the research literature;
2. Structure: your papers have a clear argument and are well organized;
3. Grammar: your papers have minimal grammatical and spelling errors.

CLASS PARTICIPATION (10%)

In order to build knowledge collectively and individually, you must be prepared to exchange ideas, criticisms, and perspectives on course readings and assignments, challenge assumptions, and rigorously, albeit collegially, debate ideas through the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) or another medium (e.g., Flipgrid, Slack, etc.). *To that end, you are expected to complete all course readings assigned for a particular class session and post a short response to those readings via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) or another medium (e.g., Flipgrid, Slack, etc.) by [specific deadline] of each week. You are then encouraged to respond to at least one of your classmate's postings by [specific deadline] of each week.* As you read, consider the following questions:

- What are the critical ideas? What is the particular point of view of the author(s)?
- With what do you agree and disagree?
- What questions did this week's readings raise for you?
- How do the ideas, topics, and issues raised relate to course themes and previous discussions, lectures, or resources?
- What is not clear?
- How does the material you read increase your understanding of child development, policy, or other key issues?

SHORT RESPONSE PAPERS (3 @ 10% each = 30%)

Your short response papers should respond to three of the following articles (one article per response paper). These articles are on topics that are related to the course. You are expected to use class readings (with appropriate attribution) to refute and/or support the author's arguments, positions, and assertions. Given the length of the paper it will be necessary for you to mount a clearly reasoned and concise response to the articles you choose. Your reaction papers should be a maximum of four pages in length, 12-pt font, Times New Roman, double spaced. ***Papers are due***

via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.).

1. The first paper is due by [specific deadline] of Week 2
2. The second is due by [specific deadline] of Week 4
3. The third is due by [specific deadline] in Week 5

Education – Jones, N. H. (2016, June 11). Choosing a school for my daughter in New York City. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/12/magazine/choosing-a-school-for-my-daughter-in-a-segregated-city.html>

Parental Agency and Education – Anderson, M. D. (2018, May 17). The radical self-reliance of Black homeschooling. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/05/black-homeschooling/560636/>

Child Care – Cohn, J. (2013, April 15). The hell of American day care. *The New Republic*. Retrieved from <https://newrepublic.com/article/112892/hell-american-day-care>

Pre-K Programs – Chen, M. (2019, February 19). Early-childhood education initiatives are promising more than they deliver: Pre-K programs are failing. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <https://www.thenation.com/article/education-pre-k-inequality-segregation/>

Bilingual Education – Williams, C. (2017, December 28). The intrusion of White families into bilingual schools. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/12/the-middle-class-takeover-of-bilingual-schools/549278/>

FORMAL POLICY DEBATE (30%)—SYNCHRONOUS

The goal of participating in a formal debate is to gain a deep understanding of a current policy, research the key arguments surrounding the policy, and articulate a position in favor of or against the policy.

Two teams of 2-3 people will research and prepare one side of a policy argument – affirmative or negative. Each team researches the topic, gathers evidence, and then meets synchronously for a formal debate. The affirmative team argues in favor of a policy, preparing a talk on the benefits of the policy. They will offer three specific evidence-based points in favor of the policy. The negative team prepares a talk about why the policy is a bad idea, why it will not work, why it is not the best use of resources, why it adds to inequity, why it harms children or families or what a better idea would be. They will offer three specific evidence-based points against the policy. After each team presents their arguments, they will take turns refuting the other team's points, as follows:

Affirmative prepared talk - 3 minutes
 Negative prepared talk - 3 minutes
 Affirmative rebuttal - 2 minutes
 Negative rebuttal - 2 minutes
 Affirmative rebuttal and sum-up - 2 minutes

Each team must give evidence to support their ideas; the evidence must be researched and prepared ahead of time. Evidence can come from journal articles, policy reports and other reputable sources.

Each team will turn in three main points, with at least one resource or reference per point, via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].

A good practice is to use notes when you speak, but do not read them word for word; and look at and address the audience. To keep up with the flow of arguments during the debate, each person should keep a flow chart – a list of

the main points made by each speaker and then the responses made by the next speaker and so. The goal is to follow the thread of each argument through to the end.

Topics for debate may include the following:

- The United States should implement universal preschool. Affirmative / Negative
- Technology should play a role in early childhood classrooms. Affirmative / Negative
- Schools should provide social services to children and families. Affirmative / Negative
- The U.S. federal government should continue to fund Head Start. Affirmative / Negative

This debate will take place synchronously, and students will attend via Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or another online platform. The instructor will share a login link and password with the students at least one week before this course session occurs. This synchronous course session will occur on XXXX at XXXX.

EQUITY AND ECEC POLICY REPORT (30%)

Individual or Small Group Project: A number of ECEC policies and programs have been developed to address perceived inequities due to structural and institutional barriers that contribute to unequal childhood outcomes for some groups of young children. Select one of these programs/policies (e.g., Head Start, Early Head Start, Bilingual Education Assessment [BEA], Child Care and Development Block Grant [CCDBG], Individuals with Disabilities Act [IDEA], and so forth) and research its origins, development, and intended goals, especially those related to equity and inequity.

1. Form your group or choose to work independently. Assess what work needs to be done to complete this project by Week 8. Plan how often you will need to meet (if working with a group) and how you will complete all of the tasks required. *Groups may be as small as two students, but the maximum size will be announced during the first class meeting and will be based on class size and the judgment of the course instructor.*
2. Identify the ECEC policy/program you will examine and send this information to the instructor. The instructor will approve your selection and may, if too many students are researching the same policy/program, suggest alternative policy/program options.
3. Gather the relevant documents, resources, and information that will help you to understand what led to this ECEC policy/program's development (e.g., legislation that authorized it, reauthorization legislation, research used to justify it, media coverage, legislative hearings, expert testimony, and all other information you deem relevant).
4. Interview one person implementing the program (e.g., administrator, director, teacher, social worker) and one person participating in the program. Design your interview to help you answer the questions in #5. Submit your interview questions to the course instructor by Week 4 for review and approval.
5. Address the following six issues and concerns in a report (elaborated below):
 - i. **Child Development:** What child development principles and research support this policy/program? You may refer to the Principles of Child Development and Learning from NAEYC.
<https://www.naeyc.org/resources/position-statements/equity/principles-of-development>
 - ii. **Intended Populations Served:** How many children and/or families are served by it currently? What are their characteristics? Who is not being served and why?
 - iii. **Scope of Services Provided:** What is the scope of services it provides?
 - iv. **Agency That Oversees This Program**
 - v. **Equity Issues:**
 - What were the equity issues that led to the development of legislation, regulations, and implementation of the policy? Explain these clearly.
 - Gather research evidence that helps you to understand the policy/program you selected: Does it reduce disparities and if so, is it sufficient? Be prepared to defend your position. What is the evidence that disparities are reduced, and for whom? Is every child or family who needs this service, program, or policy eligible to receive it?

- Does the program or policy increase inequity? If so, how? (Be sure to describe how you are assessing the increase in inequity).
- vi. **Recommendations Regarding Equity:** What are two or three specific changes you would make to this policy/program to increase equity in terms of access, affordability, availability, and other factors that you feel will improve its reach and reduce child or family disparities?

Equity and ECEC Policy/Program Report Format: Your report must include:

1. A **written report** (5-7 pages): the written report should address the six items outlined above.
2. A **recorded class presentation** (alternate format using video, Pecha Kucha, Ignite Talk, Blog) and
3. An **infographic or other visual representation** of key findings.

The **written report** will have the following sections:

1. A title page with all team members included
2. An introduction that explains your report's focus and purpose
3. Full and informative responses to the six items outlined above. This section must be written in a narrative form but organized with headings that identify the specific item you are addressing
4. Appendices of supporting documents your group has determined will help your classmates understand the ECEC policy/program
5. References in APA format

Alternative format presentations will be recorded and submitted via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) along with the infographic or other visual representation of key findings by [specific deadline]. Students will post a response to at least two presentations by [specific deadline].

COURSE GRADING

- Class Participation: 10%
- Short Response Papers: 3 @ 10% each: 30%
- Formal Policy Debate: 30%
- Equity and ECEC Policy Report: 30%

Your grade will be based on the following scale:

A	93-100%	A-	90-92%		
B+	87-89%	B	83-86%	B-	80-82%
C+	77-79%	C	73-76%	C-	70-72%
D+	67-69%	D	65-66%	F	Below 65%

REQUIRED TEXTS

There are no required textbooks for the course; instead, required readings are presented for class sessions, as indicated below. **Two to four readings will be selected as required by the instructor per session.** Recommended readings are indicated for some sessions. Readings should be read before the class session occurs. Most readings are available online.

This textbook is also recommended for purchase or rent, but is not required:

Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). *The development of children* (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

TENTATIVE COURSE CALENDAR

Topic (Dates)	Readings and Assignments
Week 1,	Review the course syllabus.

<p>Session A: The History of Early Childhood Education and Care, Inequality, and the Emergence of Child Development Science (XXXX)</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>Beatty, B. (1995). The school of infancy: European origins of the American preschool movement. In <i>Preschool education in America: The culture of young children from the colonial era to the present</i> (pp. 1-19). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.</p> <p>Children's Defense Fund (2021). <i>The state of America's children 2021</i>. Washington, DC [Read sections on young child, birth to age 5 data]. Retrieved from https://www.childrensdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/The-State-of-Americas-Children-2021.pdf</p> <p>Merolla, D. M., & Jackson, O. (2019). Structural racism as the fundamental cause of the academic achievement gap. <i>Sociology Compass</i>, (13)6, 1-13. doi:10.1111/soc4.12696</p> <p>Michel, S. (2011). <i>The history of child care in the United States</i>. VCU Libraries Social Welfare History Project. Retrieved from https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/programs/child-care-the-american-history/</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u></p> <p>Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). <i>The development of children</i> (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Preface and Chapter 1: The Study of Human Development; Developmental Science; Child, Society, and Science; and The Central Issues of Developmental Science.]</p> <p><u>Assignments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You will review the course syllabus and prepare your questions. You will submit your questions via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.). 2. Formal Policy Debate Preparation: You will select your debate teams, topics, and affirmative/negative positions. The teams will brainstorm the points (arguments) they plan to make in support of their topic and begin to research their topic.
<p>Week 1, Session B: The Emergence of the Early Childhood Education and Care System in the United States: Past to the Present (XXXX)</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>Beatty, B. (1995). A place for children in the modern world: Private nursery schools in the 1910s and 1920s. In <i>Preschool education in America: The culture of young children from the colonial era to the present</i> (pp. 132-150). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.</p> <p>Britto, P. R., Yoshikawa, H., & Boller, K. (2011). Quality of childhood development programs in global contexts: Rationale for investment, conceptual framework and implications for equity. <i>Social Policy Report</i>, 25(2), 1-31. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED519240.pdf</p> <p>Halpern, R. (1999). The emergence of supportive social services. In <i>Fragile families, fragile solutions</i> (pp. 29-48). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.</p> <p>Vogtman, J. (2017). Undervalued: A brief history of women's care work and child care policy in the United States. Washington, DC: National Women's Law Center. Retrieved from https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/final_nwlc_Undervalued2017.pdf</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u></p> <p>Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). <i>The development of children</i> (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Chapter 2: Bio-cultural Foundations and Inheriting Culture; The Coevolution of Culture and Biology; and Summary.]</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u></p>

	There is no assignment for this course session.
Week 2, Session A: Child Poverty, Racial Disparities, and Inequity: Early Childhood Education and Care's Enduring Challenges (XXXX)	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>Badger, E., Miller, C. C., Pearce, A., and Quealy, K. (2018, March 19). Extensive data shows the punishing reach of racism for Black boys. <i>The New York Times</i>. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/03/19/upshot/race-class-white-and-black-men.html</p> <p>Collins, D. (2013, May 28). The wealthy kids are all right. <i>The American Prospect</i>. Retrieved from https://prospect.org/article/wealthy-kids-are-all-right</p> <p>Frankenberg, E. (2016). <i>Segregation at an early age</i>. Center for Education and Civil Rights, University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved from https://school-diversity.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Segregation_At_An_Early_Age_Frankenberg_2016.pdf</p> <p>Garcia Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H., & Garcia, H. V. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children, <i>Child Development</i>, 67(5), 1891-1914.</p> <p>Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education</i>, 11(1), 7-24. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/095183998236863</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short Response Paper 1: Select an article from the list on page 4 of the syllabus to which you want to respond. These articles are on topics that are related to the course. You are expected to use class readings (with appropriate attribution) to refute and/or support the author's arguments, positions, and assertions. Given the length of the paper it will be necessary for you to mount a clearly reasoned and concise response to the article you choose. Your paper should be no more than four pages double-spaced with a maximum of one-inch margins, in APA format. <i>This short response paper will be due via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i> 2. Formal Policy Debate Plan: A plan detailing a list of three points the teams plan to make, with at least one resource or reference for each point, is <i>due from each group via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i> The debate will occur synchronously on XXXX at XXXX.
Week 2, Session B: Equity and ECEC Policy Report (XXXX)	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>There are no assigned readings for this class session.</p> <p><u>Assignments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Form your group or choose to work independently for the <i>ECEC Policy Report assignment</i>. Assess what work needs to be done to complete this project by Week 8. Plan how often you will need to meet (if working with a group) and how you will complete all of the tasks required. <i>You may work independently, or groups may be as small as two students, but the maximum size will be announced during the first class meeting and will be based on class size and the judgment of the course instructor.</i> 2. You will identify the ECEC policy/program you will examine and <i>send this information to the instructor via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i> The instructor will approve your selection and may, if too many students are researching the same policy/program, suggest alternative policy/program options.
Week 3, Session A: Early	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>Jessen-Howard, S., Malik, R., Workman, S., & Hamm, K. (2018). <i>Understanding infant and toddler deserts</i>. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from</p>

<p>Childhood Education and Care Science, Neuroscience, and Infant and Toddler Development (XXXX)</p>	<p>https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/reports/2018/10/31/460128/understanding-infant-toddler-child-care-deserts/</p> <p>National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2004). <i>Young children develop in an environment of relationships: Working paper #1</i>. Retrieved from https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/wp1/</p> <p>National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2005/2014). <i>Excessive Stress Disrupts the Architecture of the Developing Brain: Working paper #3, Updated edition</i>. Retrieved from https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/wp3/</p> <p>National Scientific Council on the Developing Child. (2011). <i>Building the brain's "air traffic control" system: How early experiences shape the development of executive function, Working paper #11</i>. Retrieved from https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/building-the-brains-air-traffic-control-system-how-early-experiences-shape-the-development-of-executive-function/</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u> Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). <i>The development of children</i> (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Chapter 4: The First Three Months, Physical Growth, Brain Development, Becoming Coordinated with the Social World, and Summary; Chapter 5: Physical and Cognitive Development—Brain Development, and Summary.]</p> <p><u>Assignments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Short Response Paper 2: Select an article from the list on page 4 of the syllabus to which you want to respond. These articles are on topics that are related to the course. You are expected to use class readings (with appropriate attribution) to refute and/or support the author's arguments, positions, and assertions. Given the length of the paper it will be necessary for you to mount a clearly reasoned and concise response to the article you choose. Your paper should be no more than four pages double-spaced with a maximum of one-inch margins, in APA format. <i>This short response paper will be due via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i> 2. Formal Policy Debate Plan Update: Debate teams turn in an updated list of three points they plan to make with at least two references or resources for each point. <i>This updated list is due from each group via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i> The debate will occur synchronously on XXXX at XXXX.
<p>Week 3, Session B: The Formal Debate Process (XXXX)</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u> Barnett, S., Brown, K., & Shore, R. (2004, April 6). The universal vs. targeted debate: Should the United States have preschool for all? Retrieved from <i>Preschool Policy Matters</i>. https://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/6.pdf</p> <p>Miller, C.C.C. (2020, March 15). Public school is a child's right. Should preschool be also? Retrieved from <i>The New York Times</i>. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/15/upshot/universal-child-care-democratic-platform.html</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Formal Policy Debate Preparation: Debate teams will review and refine their points and the evidence they will use to support their points. Teams will gather more evidence as needed.</p>
<p>Week 4, Session A: Infants and Toddlers: Early</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u> Tout, K., Halle, T., Daily, S., Albertson-Junkans, L., & Moodie, S. (2013). The research base for a birth through age eight state policy framework [pp. 10-36]. Retrieved from https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/2013-42AllianceBirthto81.pdf</p>

Development, Inequity, and Early Childhood Education and Care Policy (XXXX)	<p>Zero to Three and CLASP (2017). Early Head Start: A critical support for infants, toddlers, and families. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2017/10/2017_EarlyHeadStartACriticalSupport.pdf</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u> Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). The development of children (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Chapter 6: Social Emotional Development in Infancy, The Nature of Infant Emotions and Emotional Expressions, The First Emotional Relationships, A Sense of Self, and Summary.]</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Short Response Paper 3: Select an article from the list on page 4 of the syllabus to which you want to respond. These articles are on topics that are related to the course. You are expected to use class readings (with appropriate attribution) to refute and/or support the author's arguments, positions, and assertions. Given the length of the paper it will be necessary for you to mount a clearly reasoned and concise response to the article you choose. Your paper should be no more than four pages double-spaced with a maximum of one-inch margins, in APA format. <i>This short response paper will be due via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i></p>
Week 4, Session B: Preschool Children: Poverty, Language Development, and Early Learning (XXXX)	<p><u>Readings:</u> Blair, C. (2010). Stress and the development of self-regulation in context. <i>Child Development Perspectives</i>, 4(3), 181-188.</p> <p>Center on the Developing Child (2012). <i>InBrief: Executive function</i>. Retrieved from https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/inbrief-executive-function/</p> <p>Chen, M. (2019, February 19). Early-childhood education initiatives are promising more than they deliver: Pre-K programs are failing. <i>The Nation</i>. Retrieved from https://www.thenation.com/article/education-pre-k-inequality-segregation/</p> <p>Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. <i>Science</i>, 341(6149), 976-980.</p> <p>Ursache, A., Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2012). The promotion of self-regulation as a means of enhancing school readiness and early achievement in children at risk for school failure. <i>Child Development Perspectives</i>, 6(2), 122-128.</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u> Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). <i>The development of children</i> (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Chapter 7: Language Development in Early childhood Education and Care; and Chapter 8: Physical and Cognitive Development in Early Childhood Education and Care.]</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> Formal Policy Debate Preparation: Debate teams prepare and practice their presentations. The debate will occur synchronously on XXXX at XXXX.</p>
Week 5, Session A: Young Multilingual and Bilingual Children:	<p><u>Readings:</u> Espinosa, L. M., & Calderon, M. (2015). State early learning and development standards/guidelines, policies & related practices: How responsive are they to the needs of young dual language learners? BUILD Initiative. Retrieved from http://buildinitiative.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/BuildDLLReport2015.pdf</p>

<p>Language Development and Federal and State Policy (XXXX)</p>	<p>National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. [Chapter 2: Policy Context and Chapter 13: Recommendations.] Retrieved from https://www.nap.edu/read/24677/chapter/1</p> <p>McCarty, T. L. (2003). Revitalizing Indigenous language in homogenizing times. <i>Comparative Education</i>, 39(2), 147-163. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228956465_Revitalizing_Indigenous_Languages_in_Homogenizing_Times</p> <p>Park, M., Zong, J., & Batalova, J. (2018). Growing superdiversity among young U.S. dual language learners and its implications. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/growing-superdiversity-among-young-us-duallanguage-learners-and-its-implications</p> <p>Severns, M. (2012). <i>Starting early with dual language learners: First lessons from Illinois</i>. New America Foundation. Retrieved from https://static.newamerica.org/attachments/7424-growing-research-consensus-on-effective-strategies-for-dual-language-instruction-in-early-childhood/Starting_Early_With_English_Language_Learners.b6f98ba325b349de9326081842d8af75.pdf</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> <i>Formal Policy Debate Preparation:</i> Debate teams prepare and practice their presentations. The debate will occur synchronously on XXXX at XXXX.</p>
<p>Week 5, Session B: Formal Policy Debates (XXXX)</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u> There are no assigned readings for this session.</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> <i>Formal Policy Debates will occur synchronously on XXXX at XXXX. You will attend via Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or another online platform. The instructor will share a login link and password with you at least one week before this course session occurs.</i></p>
<p>Week 6: ECEC Policies and Black, Indigenous, and Latinx Children: In Search of Solutions to Factors Related to the Preschool-to-Prison Pipeline (XXXX)</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u> Adamu, M., & Hogan, L. (2015). Point of entry: The preschool-to-prison pipeline. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/08000111/PointOfEntry-reportUPDATE.pdf</p> <p>Administration for Children & Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2015). State and local action to prevent expulsion and suspension in early learning settings. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ece/state_and_local_profiles_expulsion.pdf</p> <p>Bertrand, M., & Pan, J. (2013). The trouble with boys: Social influences and the gender gap in disruptive behavior. <i>American Economic Journal: Applied Economics</i>, 5(1), 32-64.</p> <p>Chang, H. N., Russell-Tucker, C. M., & Sullivan, K. (2017). Chronic early absence: What states can do. <i>Phi Delta Kappan</i>, 98(2), 22-27. Retrieved from: https://www.attendanceworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/22pdk_98_2-Kappan-Chronic-Absence-2016.pdf</p> <p>Gilliam, W. S., Maupin, A. N., Reyes, C. R., Accavitti, M., & Shic, F. (2016). Do early educators' implicit biases regarding sex and race relate to behavior expectations and recommendations of preschool expulsions and suspensions? New Haven, CT: Yale University Child Study Center. Retrieved from https://medicine.yale.edu/childstudy/zigler/publications/Preschool%20Implicit%20Bias%20Policy%20Brief%20final%209%2026%20276766%205379%20v1.pdf</p>

	<p>Redfield, S. E., & Nance, J. P., (2016). The American Bar Association Joint Task Force on reversing the school-to-prison pipeline preliminary report. University of Florida Levin College of Law Research Paper No. 16-44; University of Memphis Law Review 1. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2736323</p> <p>Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2002). Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title I Chicago Child-Parent Centers. <i>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis</i>, 24(4), 267-303. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Judy_Temple/publication/228541174_Age_21_Cost-Benefit_Analysis_of_the_Title_I_Chicago_Child-Parent_Centers/links/0fcfd5069faefc3e21000000.pdf</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u> Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). <i>The development of children</i> (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Chapter 9: Social Emotional Development in Young Children.]</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> <i>Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation Preparation:</i> You will work independently or with your small group to prepare for your Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation. These presentations will be uploaded via the course learning management system (e.g., Canvas, Blackboard, etc.) by [specific deadline].</p>
<p>Week 7: Early Education and Care Programs: Supporting Homeless Children and Immigrant and Refugee Children Who Experience Trauma (XXXX)</p>	<p><u>Readings:</u> Blair, C., Raver, C., Granger, D., Mills-Koonce, R., Hibel, L. & the Family Life Project Key Investigators. (2011). Allostatic and allostatic load in the context of poverty in early childhood. <i>Developmental Psychopathology</i>, 23(3), 845-857. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4167021/</p> <p>Elliott, A. (2013, December 9). Invisible child: Dasani's homeless life (Parts 1-5). <i>The New York Times</i>. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/projects/2013/invisiblechild/index.html#/?chapt=1</p> <p>Hernandez, D. J., & Napierala, J. S. (2012). Children in immigrant families: Essential to America's future. Washington, DC: Foundation for Child Development. Retrieved from https://www.fcd-us.org/children-in-immigrant-families-essential-to-americas-future/</p> <p>National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). [Explore this resource and read about trauma informed systems and trauma informed care.] Retrieved from https://www.nctsn.org/trauma-informed-care/creating-trauma-informed-systems</p> <p>National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (n.d.). <i>Creating trauma-informed systems</i>. Retrieved from https://www.nctsn.org/trauma-informed-care/creating-trauma-informed-systems</p> <p>Park, M., & Katsiaficas. (2019). <i>Mitigating the effects of trauma among young immigrants and refugees: The role of early childhood education and care programs</i>. Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/mitigating-effects-trauma-young-children-immigrants-refugees</p> <p><u>Recommended Reading:</u> Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S. R. (2018). <i>The development of children</i> (Eighth Edition). New York, NY: Worth Publishers. [Chapter 10: Contexts of Development, The Family Context, Non-Parental Child Care, Neighborhoods and Communities, Media Contexts, and Summary.]</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u> <i>Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation Preparation:</i> You will work independently or with your small group to prepare for your Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation. These</p>

	presentations will be uploaded via the course learning management system (e.g., Canvas, Blackboard, etc.) by [specific deadline].
Week 8, Session A: Growing Income Disparities, Lack of Opportunity , and Early Childhood Policies Targeted at Both Children and Their Families (XXXX)	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Brooks-Gun, J. (2014). Two-generation programs in the twenty-first century. <i>Future of Children</i>, 24(1), 13-39.</p> <p>Hernandez, D. J. (2011). <i>Declining fortunes of children in middle-class families: Economic inequality and child well-being in the 21st century</i>. Foundation for Child Development. Retrieved from https://www.fcd-us.org/declining-fortunes-of-children-in-middle-class-families/</p> <p>Kalil, A. (2014). <i>Addressing the parenting divide and children's life chances</i>. The Hamilton Project. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.</p> <p>National Conference of State Legislators. (2018). <i>Two-generation approaches to addressing poverty: A toolkit for state legislators</i>. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/cyf/2Gen_toolkit_f04_1.pdf</p> <p>Shonkoff, J. P., & Fisher, P. A. (2013). Rethinking evidence-based practice and two-generation programs to create the future of early childhood policy. <i>Developmental Psychopathology</i>, 25(4.2), 1635-1653.</p> <p>The Saguaro Seminar (2016). <i>Closing the opportunity gap</i>. Cambridge MA: Harvard Kennedy School. Retrieved from https://theopportunitygap.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/april25.pdf</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u></p> <p><i>Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation Preparation:</i> You will work independently or with your small groups to prepare for your Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation. These presentations will be uploaded via the course learning management system (e.g., Canvas, Blackboard, etc.) by [specific deadline].</p>
Week 8, Session B: Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentation s	<p><u>Readings:</u></p> <p>There are no assigned readings for this session.</p> <p><u>Assignment:</u></p> <p><i>Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentations:</i> Equity and ECEC Policy Report presentations will be uploaded via the course learning management system (e.g., Canvas, Blackboard, etc.) by [specific deadline]. Further details can be found on page 4 of this syllabus.</p> <p><i>Proposed policy papers are due via the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].</i></p>

COURSE TOPICS

Week 1, Session A: The History of Early Childhood Education and Care, Inequality, and the Emergence of Child Development Science

THEMES: Every country's approach to ECEC is a cultural expression; a matter of conscious and unconscious choices that involve including and excluding, privileging and devaluing certain policies and practices. These educational policies and practices are, at all times, facilitated and constrained by each country's particular history, views of children, circumstances, values, priorities, and more. A critical factor in the United States and many other Western societies has been the influence of research on both public attitudes toward early childhood as a critical period of development, and public policies designed to ameliorate perceived challenges that threaten development due to inequality and other factors.

This week we will focus on how, why, when, and where the various forms of organized ECEC first emerged in

Europe and the United States, with consideration of the influence that Enlightenment philosophy, industrialization, changing views of children, and changing family structure and roles had on these developments. This class also looks at various early historical figures that had a lasting influence on the practice of caring and educating young children. In addition, we will identify the foundational ideas and research that have shaped child development research and ECEC science, and begin to develop an understanding of the structure of unequal childhoods in the United States.

GOALS:

- To identify the social and historical factors (e.g., racialization, social movements for justice and equality, changing nature of women's roles) that have shaped ECEC development in the United States.
- To articulate the development of the study of the child and key theorists, both classic and modern who have shaped the field.
- To identify the importance of neuroscience and ECEC.
- To recognize and identify the demographics of children birth to age 5 in the United States, the emerging trends in that population, and the scope and distribution of inequality (e.g., racial, social class, gender) among young children.

Week 1, Session B: The Emergence of the Early Childhood Education and Care System in the United States: Past to the Present

THEMES: In this session we will take a broad look at the history of ECEC in the United States, examining the social and historical variables that contributed to its emergence as a field. The influence of emerging fields of professional practice and knowledge, such as psychology and social work, on caring for and educating young children will be discussed. The rise of government-funded initiatives intended to support families in need will be addressed. The session will also consider the influence of changes in urban poverty, growth in maternal employment, changing family structure, early development and neuroscience, and immigration patterns, among other factors. In addition, we will begin to examine a foundational concept of early developmental research, namely that all human development is due to an interaction between the individual, culture, and biology.

GOALS:

- To identify critical social and historical antecedents of ECEC in the United States.
- To articulate why issues related to the welfare and education of children became a concern of government and contributed to the rise of particular professional fields of expertise and practice.
- To identify the contribution of various factors and forces (e.g., social movements, research, immigration, and economic inequality) to the development of an ECEC system.
- To recognize and identify the fundamental ideas that frame all human development as cultural and biological.

Week 2, Session A: Child Poverty, Racial Disparities, and Inequity: Early Childhood Education and Care's Enduring Challenges

THEMES: In this session, we consider inequality as a reality of ECEC in the United States. It is a reflection of historic and current structural and institutional injustice and oppression that has privileged a racial and social class hierarchy, patriarchy, and heteronormativity. Social stratification, segregation, and ideology form the unique developmental context for children of color, children for whom English is a second language, children with diverse abilities, and children in poverty among others. We will consider the extent and impact of poverty, segregation, and racialization on young children; a model for understanding the development of young children in a racialized society; and the value of critical race theory for understanding disparities in ECEC programs and policies.

GOALS:

- To recognize and identify that in the United States, early development (birth to age five) is profoundly influenced by structural inequality which disproportionately influences the developmental and educational outcomes of children of color, multiple language learners, children with diverse abilities, and children in poverty.
- To identify the structural and contextual issues and factors that shape unequal childhoods and the possible ways policy may intervene to dismantle and/or perpetuate inequality.

- To identify critical race theory and apply it to the study of ECEC policy and research.
- To recognize and identify the demographics of child poverty, segregation, and racialization for children birth to age five in the United States
- To articulate appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity.

Week 2, Session B: EQUITY AND ECEC POLICY REPORT

1. Form your group or choose to work independently. Assess what work needs to be done to complete this project by Week 8. Plan how often you will need to meet (if you are working with a group) and how you will complete all of the tasks required. Groups may be as small as two students, but the maximum size will be announced during the first class meeting and will be based on class size and the judgment of the course instructor.
2. Identify the ECEC policy/program you will examine and send this information to the instructor. The instructor will approve your selection and may, if too many students are researching the same policy/program, suggest alternative policy/program options.

Week 3, Session A: Early Childhood Education and Care Science, Neuroscience, and Infant and Toddler Development

THEMES: This week we consider the important developmental achievements of infants during the first months of life and in particular the interrelated advances in brain, physical, and social development. The research we will read identifies the key principles of child development that have emerged from neuroscience and informed ECEC policies for children birth to age five. In light of this seminal research we will consider the state of infant care in the United States and the lack of widely available, high-quality infant care.

GOALS:

- To describe the unique developmental achievements that begin in infancy and the interrelationship and interdependence of domains of development (e.g., physical and cognitive).
- To recognize and identify the significance of neurological development in the infant and the importance of neuroscience research to our understanding of early development.
- To articulate key principles of child development that have influenced ECEC policy.
- To consider appropriate policy responses and additional research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity, based on neuroscience and infant development.

Week 3, Session B: The Formal Debate Process

THEMES: The focus for this session includes strategies and approaches to the formal debate process including preparation of arguments and gathering of evidence. We will look at an example of a policy debate about universal preschool. The topics covered in this session will scaffold the skills you will use in your team policy debate.

GOALS:

- To explore and identify the positions taken regarding the policy of universal preschool.
- To review, study, and evaluate the key arguments surrounding the policy.
- To articulate a position regarding the policy based on the evidence.

Week 4, Session A: Infants and Toddlers: Early Development, Inequity, and Early Childhood Education and Care Policy

THEMES: This session builds on our developing understanding of the critical importance of infant development and the particular interaction of critical factors (e.g., cultural ways of knowing, infant reactivity, caregiver responsively) during this period. We will integrate our understanding of infant physical growth and brain development discussed in the previous class with new information on the infant's social-emotional development and emerging sense of self. In addition, we will consider issues of equity and federal and state policy responses to the critical needs of infants and their families.

GOALS:

- To articulate what it means to be "social" and the critical nature of social-emotional development during the

first years of life.

- To identify the interrelationship and interdependence of domains of development (e.g., physical, social, and cognitive).
- To recognize and identify the significance of neurological development in the infant.
- To identify key principles of child development and equity that have influenced home visiting and Early Head Start.
- To consider appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve infant outcomes and advance equity.

Week 4, Session B: Preschool Children: Poverty, Language Development, and Early Learning

THEMES: ECEC policy and research have focused on how to understand and prevent poor educational outcomes for children furthest from opportunity (e.g., children in poverty, children of color, children who are immigrants, children with diverse abilities). Building on what we have learned in previous classes about early development, this session considers research on the cognitive and language development of preschoolers and the role of poverty in early learning; and neuroscience on the importance of executive functioning and self-regulation to school success and learning. In addition, we will discuss the current capacity of policies and ECEC programs to respond effectively to the developmental and educational challenges of young children who may need additional support to adjust successfully to the demands and expectations of formal preschool and ECEC settings.

GOALS:

- To identify the developmental achievements in language, physical growth, and cognitive development that occur in the preschool years (ages 3-5).
- To articulate how poverty may place early cognitive development at risk.
- To recognize and identify the implications of neuroscience to preschool success and particularly to issues such as executive functioning and self-regulation.
- To articulate the current state of early childhood education and care policies and programs to adequately and effectively respond to the needs of young children.
- To consider and recommend appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity.

Week 5, Session A: Young Multilingual and Bilingual Children: Language Development and Federal and State Policy

THEMES: The United States has a long and ambivalent history regarding the use of languages other than English in schools and public activities. While at various times and places, Indigenous languages and “foreign” languages have been the language of instruction in some public schools and tribal-lead schools, the belief that English should be the only sanctioned “public” language is widespread and persistent. During this class we will discuss the changing demographics related to young multilingual and bilingual children, research findings related to state and federal policies and multilingual and bilingual children, and the history of language policies associated with Indigenous language communities and immigrant children. In addition, we will discuss recent state legislative, funding, and program issues in bilingual education within political contexts that may support or deter bilingual education.

GOALS:

- To identify the history of ECEC language policies as they relate to young children who are learning English and are bilingual or multilingual.
- To recognize and identify the profound demographic shift occurring in the United States, driven by young children of color and children who are bilingual or multilingual.
- To articulate how state and federal policies have or have not responded effectively to the developmental and educational needs of multilingual and bilingual children, including speakers of Indigenous languages and immigrant children.
- To consider and recommend appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity.

Week 5, Session B: Formal Policy Debates—Synchronous

Formal Policy Debates will occur synchronously on XXXX at XXXX. You will attend via Zoom, Microsoft Teams,

or another online platform. The instructor will share a login link and password with you at least one week before this course session occurs.

Week 6: ECEC Policies and Black, Indigenous, and Latinx Children: In Search of Solutions to Factors Related to the Preschool-to-Prison Pipeline

THEMES: Black, Indigenous, and Latinx children are disproportionately vulnerable to a set of conditions that may contribute to significant and lifelong developmental and educational risks compared to their White peers. These conditions (e.g., deep poverty, bias and discrimination, under-resourced communities, lack of opportunity, school disciplinary practices) are often referred to as the “preschool-to-prison pipeline” (P2PP). ECEC policies and programs cannot solve, change, or dismantle all of the factors that may be implicated in the P2PP. But, they may make problematic contributions to a long-term developmental trajectory that increases the chances that children of color and in poverty may be at risk for lives crippled by circumstances, including incarceration in adolescence and adulthood. Research on teacher implicit bias, disciplinary practices, absenteeism, and poor quality early learning experiences will be considered in this class. In addition, we will discuss the long-term developmental contribution of high-quality ECEC programs to the P2PP.

GOALS:

- To articulate what is meant by the use of the term “preschool-to-prison pipeline” and why it is employed as a metaphor for a set of structural and institutional conditions that operate to disproportionately impact the educational and developmental trajectories of many young Black, Latinx, Indigenous, Asian American, and Pacific Islander children.
- To recognize and articulate the current state of ECEC federal and state policies and their ability to adequately and effectively respond to absenteeism and the practice of expulsions/suspensions, the developmental needs of children, the ECEC workforce, and the ECEC system.
- To consider and recommend appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity.

Week 7: Early Education and Care Programs: Supporting Homeless Children and Immigrant and Refugee Children Who Experience Trauma

THEMES: Children of immigrants (who are born in the United States), immigrant children, refugee children, and homeless children may experience developmental challenges due to poverty, migration, social dislocation violence, and other factors. The sessions this week will examine these issues through research and popular media presentations to understand how homelessness and immigration may create unique developmental and educational challenges for young children. We will build on our understanding of the complexity of early development and the role of families and other supports in helping children manage the challenges of homelessness and immigration. We will also consider the issues of plasticity and resiliency in responding to developmental challenges. Further, we will consider how ECEC settings may support children and families experiencing significant social dislocation.

GOALS:

- To recognize and identify that children are embedded in multiple contexts (e.g., family, neighborhood, preschool, faith community) that influence their development and that they also influence.
- To identify circumstances that are significantly threatening to child well-being (e.g., deep poverty, war), and how they can contribute to developmental challenges or problems.
- To identify how immigration may influence early development.
- To identify how homelessness may influence early development.
- To articulate how early childhood education and care programs and policies may work to support the development of young children who are immigrants, refugees, and/or homeless.
- To consider and recommend appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity.

Week 8, Session A: Growing Income Disparities, Lack of Opportunity, and Early Childhood Policies Targeted at Both Children and Their Families

THEMES: As we have discussed throughout this class, poverty has a pernicious effect on early development. Federal and state anti-poverty programs have generally targeted adults and not children in an attempt to support or improve the workforce preparation and participation of adult earners. These efforts included strategies (e.g., direct income

transfers, workforce participation requirements for benefit eligibility) to improve family economic stability. In this session, we will examine an additional federal and state effort to disrupt poverty through policies that simultaneously target both young children and adults, namely two-generation approaches. We will read work from multiple disciplines (e.g., sociology, economics, child development) and from advocates, policy groups, and think tanks all concerned with factors that are contributing to increased economic and social inequality in the United States. We will specifically read papers that examine the viability of two-generational strategies to lift both young children and their parents/families from poverty. Finally, we will examine the future of these programs from the perspective of leading experts on both child development, family support, and ECEC policy.

GOALS:

- To articulate how growing inequality and diminished opportunity for many American children, birth to age five, threatens both the working poor and middle-class families.
- To identify the goals, strategies, design, and effectiveness of two-generation approaches to both optimal child development and family stability and well-being.
- To consider the future of these programs and identify what children and families need in a society undergoing significant economic change.
- To consider and recommend appropriate policy responses and research efforts that might help to improve child outcomes and advance equity.

Week 8, Session B: Equity and ECEC Policy Report Presentations

ASSIGNMENT: You will submit your recorded alternative presentation and infographic or other visual representation of key findings from your *Equity and ECEC Policy Report* into the course learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, etc.) by [specific deadline].

EQUITY AND ECEC POLICY REPORT: A number of ECEC policies and programs have been developed to address perceived inequities due to structural and institutional barriers that contribute to unequal childhood outcomes for some groups of young children. Select one of these programs/policies (e.g., Head Start, Early Head Start, Bilingual Education Assessment [BEA], Child Care and Development Block Grant [CCDBG], Individuals with Disabilities Act [IDEA], and so forth) and research its origins, development, and intended goals, especially those related to equity and inequity. *See full assignment requirements on pages 5-6 of this syllabus.*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

Accommodations for students with disabilities

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

Incompletes

The grade of Incomplete will be assigned only when the course attendance requirement has been met but, for reasons satisfactory to the instructor, the granting of a final grade has been postponed because certain course assignments are outstanding. If the outstanding assignments are completed within one calendar year from the date of the close of term in which the grade of Incomplete was received and a final grade submitted, the final grade will be recorded on the permanent transcript, replacing the grade of Incomplete, with a transcript notation indicating the date that the grade of Incomplete was replaced by a final grade. If the outstanding work is not completed within one calendar year from the date of the close of term in which the grade of Incomplete was received, the grade will remain as a permanent Incomplete on the transcript. In such instances, if the course is a required course or part of an approved program of study, students will be required to re-enroll in the course including repayment of all tuition and fee charges for the new registration and satisfactorily complete all course requirements. If the required course is not offered in subsequent terms, the student should speak with the faculty advisor or Program Coordinator about their options for fulfilling the degree requirement. Doctoral students with six or more credits with grades of Incomplete included on their program of study will not be allowed to sit for their certification exam.

Course Communication

All official communications from the College (e.g., information on graduation, announcements of closing due to severe storm, flu epidemic, transportation disruption, etc.) will be sent to the student's email account. Students are responsible for either reading email there, or, for utilizing the mail forwarding option to forward mail from their account to an email address which they will monitor.

Religious Observances

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

Academic Dishonesty

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