

**A STUDY OF ECE PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION
AT MAJOR UNIVERSITIES IN 38 PREK STATES¹**

**Jim Johnson, Rick Fiene, Kathleen McKinnon, and Sudha Babu
with Suzanne Swartz, Michael Johnson, Serap Celik, and Mei-Fang Cheng**

The Pennsylvania State University

Final Report

¹ This research was funded by a grant from the Foundation for Child Development

Preface

This report presents the findings of the Penn State Study of Early Childhood Education (ECE) Teacher Education (TE) Programs that was conducted in 2008 and 2009 and which was funded by the Foundation for Child Development (FCD). The Pennsylvania State University's College of Education, in collaboration with the College of Health and Human Development, investigated 40 major public research universities across the nation. Keying in on 38 states that had state funded Pre-Kindergarten programs (PreK), the study focused upon type and make-up of certification and degree programs that currently serve to prepare teachers of young children. The ECE teacher preparation programs at these 40 Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) were studied with reference to the PreK movement in public education and to the PreK-3rd approach to school organization. How are these TE programs preparing new ECE teachers to work in contemporary public schools? How have these programs changed, if they have, in response to PreK and PreK-3rd? What factors are perceived to help and hinder these ECE TE Programs in their efforts to prepare effective teachers to work in public schools?

The report begins with a discussion of ECE TE and current national trends that motivates this research. We address the following questions: (1) why study ECE TE programs? (2) why study ECE TE programs at this time? Then we state the general purpose and specific aims of our research, followed sections on methods and procedures,

results, and conclusions and recommendations. References, appendices and a special addition-- review of the background literature-- are appended to the report.

Introduction

...teachers must learn how to maintain a healthy dialectic between the goals of teaching subject matter towards a common set of curriculum objectives and teaching students in ways that attend to their diverse interests, abilities, starting points, and pathways. This is like simultaneously pursuing both sides of a double helix that repeatedly intertwines and separates and intertwines again: the teacher bends the curriculum toward the students by making connections and adaptations and then nudges the students toward the curriculum by scaffolding and motivating their learning. Attending to the demands of the curriculum and the needs of the child without losing sight of either requires deep understanding of subject matter and students, and the potential connection between the two.

Linda Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 40

Statement of the Problem

In the above quotation Linda Darling-Hammond suggests a double helix model of the child and the curriculum as an apt way to picture how effective and sensitive teachers must function in today's pluralistic and changing society. Generally accepted, this image looms large in teacher education (TE) where the challenge persists to find answers as to how to prepare new teachers to be ready to perform in this way. TE programs try to meet national standards concerning the importance of covering both the child and the content of learning, and how the two can go together in curriculum design and instruction and assessment. Coursework and field experiences in child development, family, culture, methods, pedagogy and other topics hopefully can have this desired effect in new

teachers. New teachers must be able to apply their knowledge in assessing and modifying instruction to match the needs and interests of individual children from an ever increasing range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, including those children with various disabilities and exceptionalities (Hyson, 2003).

National expectations for pre-service programs in early childhood education (ECE) are indeed formidable and are becoming even more so given the professional and public attention given to the importance of early learning and having intentional teachers for intentional young learners (Bowman, Donovan, & Burns, 2000). Moreover, added pressure is on ECE TE programs from the fact that increasing numbers of preschoolers are attending public schools or are in programs connected to the public schools (Barnett, Epstein, Friedman, Sansanelli, & Hustedt, 2009); early learning standards are foregrounded and recent graduates of ECE TE programs face new role responsibilities related to district policies on student academic mastery and teaching accountability. Changing expectations also exist or are emerging for what teachers should know and be able to do, and what their professional dispositions should be, when employed in schools operating within a PreK-3rd framework. An important question is how pre-service programs are changing in response to these recent developments.

Even with the economic downturn the numbers of young children in publicly funded programs continues to rise, although the rate of increase has dropped (Barnett et al, 2009). Moreover, the PreK expansion of the past two decades has been complemented by a newer broader focus on building PreK-3rd systems in elementary schools across the nation. These systems seek to combine ECE and the early grades in deliberate ways that promote and sustain learning. They aspire to have the following

characteristics: (1) high-quality, full day PreK for all 3- and 4- year-olds; (2) full day kindergarten; (3) standards, curriculum, assessments, and instructional methods that are aligned both horizontally (within grades) and vertically (from grade to grade); (4) qualified teachers at all grade levels; (5) appropriate resources and interventions for struggling students and those at risk of failing to achieve proficiency by third grade; (6) structures, policies, and practices that support collaboration and alignment within and across grade levels (the exact nature of the structures, policies and practices will vary with district and community needs); and (7) shared responsibility among all stakeholder—public schools, early childhood providers, families, and communities—for children’s achievement outcomes at the third grade (New America Foundation, 2010).

Unquestionably, administrators of pre-service programs preparing ECE and elementary teachers are or should be cognizant of these important new developments in state departments and school districts nation-wide. The PreK-3rd movement is a comprehensive reform strategy to assure that ever-increasing numbers of preschoolers have access to high quality classrooms, and then to strengthen the capacity of elementary schools to sustain learning gains. As this requires integration of ECE and elementary efforts, intending that all children receive a seamless, high quality, learning experience, this change has critically significant implications for both ECE and elementary TE programs. How the awareness of this reform movement is translating into TE program changes within IHE is one question that now begs for answers.

The timeliness of studying this question is indicated by the fact that the PreK-3rd movement is gaining momentum. For example, the U.S. Department of Education and Health and Human Services considers understanding preschool to 3rd grade a top priority;

the first webinar of the new Listening and Learning about Early Learning Tour was on this topic. Many districts are considering using American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus funds to bolster early learning. Advocacy efforts are taking place that recommend that ARRA Title I funds be used to leverage PreK–3rd reforms at the state, district and local level. Also, consider recent criticism of the K-12 Common Core State Standards Initiative as further evidence for this point. The Alliance for Childhood and other advocacy groups and organizations have opposed K-12 Common Core national standards; this opposition rests on the grounds that K-12 standards ignore what is known about PreK–3rd grade as a separate stage of child development and education.

PreK-3rd systems of education possess the six characteristics noted above. Furthermore, it is important to note what they are not. They are not meant to invite a downward extension of Elementary Education into the lower grades, producing academic pressure and the ‘hot-housing’ of young children. They are not intended to replace community childcare and early education programs or Head Start. These systems often partner with districts to make the PreK-3rd systems work. Realizing this, pre-service professional development programs must be based on the solid foundations and principles of ECE TE. However, principles of elementary TE are also important in order to achieve the goal represented by the double helix model presented earlier; subject matter knowledge in the various academic disciplines and methods of teaching the content in them to young children are necessary components of TE programs, together with understanding of the child, family, and cultural communities, among other factors.

Studying how IHE in their TE programs respond to the new realities in public education represented by the universal PreK movement and the broader and more recent

PreK-3rd grade reform strategy has to consider the relationship between ECE and elementary programs/faculties. The two fields have separate histories and different teaching principles and emphases (Bloch, 1992; Goldstein, 1997; Whitebook, Gomby, Bellm, Sakai, & Kipnis, 2009). Until now lower primary grade teachers have come from both traditions with the ECE TE pathway marked by an emphasis on the development of the child and developmentally appropriate practices (DAP), and the elementary TE pathway characterized by a greater concern for methods and the content of lessons. School districts in states with separate ECE and elementary teaching certificates—the clear majority—have a choice to hire graduates from one or the other TE programs. Similarities and differences between them notwithstanding, the new realities in the public schools asks for a marriage between the two fields; however, an engagement leading to such a marriage may not exist in IHE. It is possible that ECE TE and Elementary Education TE programs are not keeping pace with developments in many state departments and school districts due to inertia from their separate traditions.

Moreover, recent investigations of ECE TE programs have revealed the shortcomings and limitations of two- and four- year institutions, and the considerable challenges that ECE faculty encounter. Many programs experience difficulties teaching diversity content, hiring enough minority faculty, and preparing teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse children (Ray, Bowman, & Robbins, 2006). Programs are under-staffed and under-resourced. Faculty feel misunderstood because there is a lack of understanding of ECE within IHE . Also keeping up with the research literature and other research-related responsibilities can prove frustrating; programs have been reported to be in a ‘survival mode’ (Hyson, Tomlinson, & Morris, 2009).

Why Study ECE TE Programs?

Quality ECE programs are necessary to assure positive child outcomes in academic performance, motivation and commitment. They are needed to help alleviate our nation's social inequities in school readiness and the subsequent academic achievement gaps which social inequities produce. Citizens across the political spectrum have increasingly come to realize that the cost of sound ECE programming is worth the price: future benefits to society will far exceed the cost. The disenfranchised and marginalized are considered an untapped resource in any society, and certainly ours is traditionally an untapped pluralism. All our children are hidden treasures of intellectual and creative capital waiting to be cultivated to make our nation and the world stronger. Public schools are the key to the success of our historic mission. How many potential Olympic champion swimmers are never realized for lack of swimming lessons during childhood?

To have quality ECE programs you must have quality ECE teachers. One common way teacher quality has been indexed is in terms of the college degree and specialization in child development and ECE. Granting that having a college degree and specialization in ECE is a predictor of teaching effectiveness, (*e.g.*, Burchinal, Cryer, Clifford, & Howes, 2002; NICHD Early Childhood Research Network, 2000), questions can be asked about the quality of pre-service experiences of degreed teachers in ECE. TE programs are antecedent in a chain linking effective teachers with sound ECE programs with positive child outcomes. Yet only recently have studies begun examining TE programs in ECE (*e.g.*, Early & Winton, 2001; Maxwell, Lim, & Early, 2006). These pioneering studies and national surveys provide information about faculties and course

and fieldwork in ECE. Traditional descriptive studies and new inquiries regarding the challenges faculty face in implementing pre-service programs can provide information to spur program improvements to better meet the needs of the future ECE workforce and society's demands for effective ECE teachers.

Although the research literature on ECE pre-service programs is sparse, the need for quality research is clearly recognized. As previously noted, having effective teachers and high quality ECE programs usually results in success for children. But for this to happen requires good ECE TE programs as suggested by the official statements of standards and guidelines for TE by professional organizations, such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children (Hyson, 2003). Still, as Winton and McCollum (2008, p.6) state, "Little is known about the context, content, needs, and practices of early childhood faculty and programs."

Nevertheless, ECE TE programs have begun to be studied to a greater extent for a variety of reasons, including the fact that ECE has gained greater visibility and importance in educational policy matters and in the public sector. Research interest has been encouraged, for example, by the gaps identified by Early and Winton (2001) in areas such as the preparation of new teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students. As noted, a major concern exists for the lack of diversity in the faculty of ECE TE programs (*e.g.* Ray, Bowman, & Robbins, 2006).

Certainly a college degree with a focus on child development and early education could be very helpful in becoming a nurturing and effective teacher of young children. Yet a singular degree or major by itself cannot guarantee the teacher competence and effectiveness so important for program quality and consequential child learning. Recent

studies by Early et al. (2007) and Early et al. (2006) have indicated that teacher education and ECE specialization as distal variables are not as important as are proximal variables relating to the behaviors that teachers display in academic support, classroom and child management, and social-emotional climate. The latter variables override the former with respect to predicting academic performance in children. These recent research findings have motivated new research on ECE TE programs. Attendance in an ECE TE program is less important than the actual quality of these pre-service programs. As Hyson, Tomlinson, and Morris (2009, p.1) write, “The quality of the higher education program—that is, how well it prepares new teachers by, for example, grounding them in knowledge of child development and academic subject areas and providing them opportunities to practice new teaching skills—may be a more critical factor in a teacher’s ability to influence children’s development and learning in a positive way than having a degree per se.”

Why study ECE TE programs at this time?

As previously noted, two important reasons to study ECE TE programs are: (1) The Universal PreK Movement and (2) The PreK-3rd Initiative. Both PreK and PreK-3rd have affected the relation of ECE to public education. State departments responsible for teacher licensure or certification in ECE and Elementary Education have also been affected. The PreK and PreK-3rd movements have raised new challenges and aspirations with respect to how ECE relates to Elementary Education. Both of these movements are felt in basic and higher education alike, and it is important to learn more about this in order to have information to guide improvement efforts in ECE and Elementary TE programs. How does ECE relate to Elementary Education in practice and policy? How

are practice and policy being affected by the PreK and PreK-3rd movements? Answers to these questions are critical to teacher education. Learning more about this new ECE and Elementary relationship, within the PreK-3rd framework is one important motivation for this investigation.

ECE has changed enormously over the past several decades in the US. Only 10% of the nation's 3 and 4 year olds were in any type of center or classroom in 1960. This figure is now approximately 75% for 4 year olds and over 50% for 3 year olds (Barnett, Friedman, Hustedt, & Stevenson-Boyd, 2009). A major factor in this dramatic increase is the emergence of PreK enrolled in state funded programs. PreK is defined as ECE programs funded and administered by the state that have an educational goal and serve typically developing children at least two days per week.

The current PreK-3rd initiative is in its formative stages but is nevertheless an important movement for the ECE field and for public education. School reform based on an aligned and coordinated PreK-3rd educational system seems very promising as it is based on research in early education and child development (Bogard & Takanishi, 2005; Kauerz, 2006; Maeroff, 2006). Since 2001, when the Foundation for Child Development began promoting the PreK-3rd initiative (*Success By Third*), this movement has been gaining attention in state departments of education across the country (Boots, 2006). In addition, noticeable numbers of school principals and administrators committed to ECE now seek assistance in implementing PreK-3rd (FCD Report, 2006).

Currently, the PreK movement and the PreK-3rd reform initiatives are challenging developments for the early education field, stimulating reflection, discussion, and debate (Kagan, Kauerz, & Tarrant, 2008). One way this is being expressed is with

respect to reconsidering the boundaries of the field of ECE. What are the defined age and/or grade level boundaries of ECE? A second consideration deals with refining teachers' roles and creating new programs in basic and higher education (teacher education) that seek to better interconnect early and Elementary Education without marginalizing either. Embedded within both concerns are the increasing importance of diverse school populations and the corresponding need for comprehensive teacher preparation. Very important are the recruitment, graduation, and retention in the field of ECE teachers and ECE teacher educators from diverse cultural backgrounds.

General Purpose and Aims

Good ECE programs in the public schools are a necessity; this obviously requires that the teachers be of high quality. To prepare excellent teachers for our public schools we must have high quality TE programs. This requires making program changes to keep up with issues and trends in ECE in relation to the public schools, and in particular PreK and PreK-3rd. This research is directed towards exploring ECE TE programs and program changes as a descriptive investigation. The present study also examines reasons for program changes, program plans, program concerns, and the relation of ECE program/faculty with elementary TE program/faculty. More than just a descriptive study, we hope that the results of this investigation generate reflection and action about PreK, PreK-3rd, and the current needs, challenges, and aspirations of TE programs. The success of ECE and elementary TE programs rests upon reflection and action.

This study has a number of aims. It describes the make-up of the ECE TE programs in terms of faculty and program characteristics, courses and coursework, and field experiences as they are currently constituted. Another aim is identifying how

programs have or have not changed in recent years and the reasons for change. Special attention is directed to the influence of PreK and PreK-3rd with a focus on plans, perceived assets, and concerns.

This project hopefully will yield useful information for educational leaders and policy makers at national and state levels; and results aim to benefit the ECE professional community (*e.g.*, ECE teacher educators, researchers and administrators) and ECE organizations (*e.g.*, CDA, NAEYC). Results from this study hopefully will prove helpful in policy and program planning within IHE as well as in state departments and agencies.

Overview of the Study

There are many factors and dimensions in ECE TE programs to investigate. However, three general categories for study were selected. First, we selected the structural features of the ECE TE program, such as the faculty number and composition. Second, we investigated the components of the program, or the units and types of instructional delivery, such as the coursework and the field experiences. Finally, we inquired about the configurations or contextual elements of the ECE TE program, such as the relations within and across academic units on campus that deliver or service the ECE TE program, as well as the relations the ECE TE program has with the public schools and community programs and agencies.

Given our interest in ECE TE programs in relation to public schools and PreK and PreK-3rd initiatives, certain topics in particular were chosen as beneficial to study. For example, we are interested in the courses and coursework in child development, applied child development, family, English Language learners, diversity, special education, and teamwork. How well are ECE TE programs teaching about transitions and alignments?

In addition, we wish to determine how the methods courses are taught. For example, are there special sections of content courses or are singular courses dedicated to early childhood teacher candidates? Are ECE and Elementary teacher candidates combined in the same methods classes?

ECE TE programs were studied in three ways. First we did an examination of the program's website to extract relevant information; second we used a web-based survey with 41 items; and third we used phone interviews with persons identified as faculty responsible for the ECE TE program. A total of 42 ECE TE programs all from major public universities were in the study. They came from the 38 states that at the time of the study had in operation state-funded PreK programs.

Methods and Procedures

The states in the US that have developed PreK or PreK-3rd initiatives were selected as our sample. At the time of our data collection, 38 states fit this category. From this list of 38 states, for each state the major public research Institution of Higher Education (IHE) that had an ECE TE program was asked to be in the study. Initial phone contacts were made to the IHE to seek their participation in the study. Phone numbers were ascertained by searching the IHEs' web pages. The initial phone call script is in Appendix A.

The study selected research one (R1) universities to study realizing this was probably not where most of the new ECE teachers are coming from in most states. Our rationale was based on the assumption that R1 universities would be very influential in their states in relation to agencies in the government and in relation to other colleges preparing new teachers in ECE. The R1 universities often serve as training grounds for teacher educators who become faculty at four-year programs. Learning more about these programs would not yield data that could generalize across other ECE TE programs in smaller universities, private universities, and community colleges, but this could bring attention to programs that are influential in their states, learn their needs, challenges and aspirations, and thereby influence policy or stimulate dialogue about the important issues that come up when the voices of R1 ECE TE programs are given an opportunity to be heard.

All IHE cooperated in assisting us to locate the right person to be in the study, or the key informant to answer questions about the ECE TE program. The 42 key informants in the study had full-time ECE faculty status in 76% of the cases, 81% were females, 14% were full professors, and 36% held some administrative position. All informants had knowledge and understanding about the ECE TE program. The key informants were in ECE departments or divisions (autonomous academic unit with its own budget) in 21% of the cases; 48% of the ECE TE programs were related to Human Development and 74% were related to Elementary Education. Some were related to both.

A few glitches occurred during data collection. One informant who initially agreed, withdrew because the program was in a state of flux. In that state, another major public university with an ECE TE was found and contacted and that program agreed to be in the study. In one other state we were lead to believe that the chosen ECE TE program was going to participate, but that program did not complete the survey that they received (see paragraph below); in that state again we had to find another ECE TE program that met our selection criterion. In addition, in one other state our efforts to contact the informant proved unsuccessful and we again turned to a second choice.

Following the phone and/or any related email communications that usually transpired to secure the agreement to be in the study, a formal letter of invitation (Appendix B) was emailed that contained information about study, the website address and directions for the online survey (Appendix C), and a glossary of technical terms (Appendix D) associated with the survey. Most programs filled out the survey within a week or two of initial contact, and phone interviews were completed during the following

week in almost all cases. In a few cases the time between the survey completion and the interview was four weeks or more.

Several other developments occurred in selecting the ECE TE programs for the study. In two states there were not any major public research universities with a ECE TE program; we found in these states other IHE with a ECE TE program that were not research one universities. In one state in the Midwest the first chosen IHE, after completing participation in the study, recommended that we study another IHE in the same state. This we did. In another case we decided to include a second program in the same state, taking into our final sample a program that was the last one studied in our pilot research. We did this because this program was larger than the first ECE TE program. Finally, twice we studied two ECE TE programs within the same IHE. This occurred because the first one studied referred us to the second program as also having an ECE TE program. In the end, seven of the 42 ECE TE programs in the study were five-year programs; two of these were master's degree programs as the only way to obtain initial ECE teaching licensure (see Appendix E for the final list of 42 ECE TE programs in the study).

The survey generated data covering the following general areas: (1) characteristics of the programs, including graduate degrees, accreditation, academic home of the ECE TE program, enrollments, faculty and graduate assistants; (2) coursework, including use of technology in instructional delivery; (3) fieldwork, including student teaching in different ECE settings and with children of different ages, special needs, and from culturally diverse backgrounds; (4) faculty research, including research foci and participants; (5) impact of PreK and PreK-3rd on ECE TE programs, over-all and with

respect to practicum site availability and use, new collaborations, new professional development activities of faculty, and perceptions of how other educational professionals such as school building principals and school psychologists are being prepared for public education with PreK and PreK-3rd; and (6) program assets and weaknesses.

Once the respondent filled out the online survey, the assigned Principal Investigator (PI) made a call to the individual in order to set up a mutually agreeable phone interview. The three co-PI served as interviewers. Prior to the interview the interviewer reviewed the survey to make sure all the information was filled out and was understandable. If data were not, this would be followed up at the phone interview time. Interviews averaged 35-45 minutes in length in which the nine questions on the interview form (Appendix F) were discussed in detail. Also any incomplete survey questions were discussed during the interview. All interviews were digitally recorded for future analysis. When possible a second recorder was present for the interview. After each interview, the data were summarized into a report highlighting the responses to the nine questions so that individual case studies can be reported.

All data from the surveys were entered into SPSS 17.0 for further analysis. These data and the interview summaries were then shared with the national advisory board for their input and reaction. The national advisory board (Appendix G) was very helpful also in the design of the survey and interview forms.

The interview generated information on (1) program changes in the past three years; (2) reasons for modifications; (3) preparing new teachers for the PreK-3rd developmental continuum; (4) the relationship between ECE and Elementary Education

TE programs and faculty with respect to PreK-3rd teacher preparation; (5) program concerns; (6) program strengths; and (7) program plans for the immediate future.

To summarize, the data collection phase consisted of three stages: (1) website review; (2) online survey; and (3) phone interviews. All three forms of data collection had a degree of redundancy to increase the level of accuracy. The website contained the broadest brush with the data while the surveys and interviews generated detailed information.

The research methodology was planned and developed during the 2008 spring semester, and pilot data were collected during the following fall semester. Project data were gathered during the fall and winter semesters of 2008-2009. Part of the data collection was the review and analysis of program websites using a uniform web-coding sheet so that each data collector gathered the same type of information. Analyzing and interpreting the data and report writing began in the summer and fall of 2009 and continued into spring semester of 2010. The research methodology involved: (1) doing a careful study of the relevant website data from the targeted institutions; (2) completing a search procedure for identifying persons in charge of early childhood education programs at targeted institutions of higher education and making initial contact for obtaining informed consent; (3) sending a questionnaire to identified access persons – the access person was identified from the website or the program; and (4) scheduling and completing phone interviews with the access persons.

Repeated contacts were made with each target institution's access person as needed. Our aim was to achieve a comprehensive description of current and planned *components* and *configurations* of the 42 ECE TE programs. Components refer to units

and types of instructional delivery — e.g., courses, web-based courses, field experiences, methods courses, theory courses, etc. Configurations refer to relations within and across academic units on campus, as well as with public schools and community programs and agencies.

Special attention was given to analysis of components with respect to inclusive education and multicultural education and for content specific to working in PreK-3rd educational systems (e.g., vertical and horizontal alignment of standards, curriculum, assessment, trans-disciplinary communication and collaboration, etc). Various configurations were examined with particular concern for relations among faculty in different departments and colleges involved in the pre-service education, and for the kinds of degree majors, options, and concentrations that exist or are being planned. Primary attention was given to target institutions' components and configurations used in preparing teachers for early childhood education teaching in general and PreK-3rd education in particular. However, the study also looked to obtain some information from these target institutions concerning personnel preparation for school psychologists, counselors, administrators and others working in early childhood education and in PreK-3rd systems.

Based upon the information obtained and the analyses, the selected pre-service programs were described and evaluated among themselves, particularly looking at differences between current and planned programs within the same institution. Summaries included institutions' perceptions of needed resources to make changes deemed desirable. These results were discussed in connection with state standards and recommendations suggested by the research and scholarly literature.

Several case illustrations were done and will be included in the final report. Each one contains information following the same outline. First, some background information about the state's history in publically funded ECE programs is given using the 2008 NIEER State Preschool Yearbook. The *background* section also contains information about the state's certification bands and about the ECE TE program being illustrated using the IHE's website information concerning degrees and certificates and which departments and colleges are involved in offering preparation for teaching young children. Secondly, the case illustration described *instructional make-up*. In this section we provided information about courses, field experiences, and student teaching, noting any special features of the ECE TE program's service delivery such as use of cohorts. The organization of the case illustration then summarized data, using survey and interview results, with respect to *program changes, strengths, and plans and concerns*.

Preliminary Information

Here we present information about the 42 ECE TE programs. The information below covers findings obtained from the websites and survey answers from the participating programs. This information is preliminary to presenting the results of the study that are used in answering the research questions and are covered in the next section.

Program Characteristics

First is summarized what we learned about program characteristics. A number of program attributes were examined. We present information in Table 1 which describes the ECE TE programs in terms of accreditation, offered degrees, total number and type of credits earned, undergraduate financial assistance, graduate assistantships, enrollment trends, and types of Colleges/Departments in which the ECE TE programs are housed within their Institutions of Higher Education (IHE).

Table 1: ECE Teacher Education Program Characteristics (N=42)

	Percentage	Frequency
NAEYC Accredited		
Yes	50%	21
No	50%	21
Doctoral Degree		
Yes	57.5%	23
No	42.5%	17
Master Degree		
Yes	78%	32
No	22%	9
Type Credits		
Semester	94.7%	36
Quarter	5.3%	2
Undergraduate Financial Assistance		
Yes	21.1%	8
No	78.9%	30
Enrollments		
Increasing	46.2%	18
Decreasing	17.9%	7
Staying Level	35.9%	14
College Housed		
Education	57.1%	24
Human Development	7.1%	3
Mixed	33.3%	14
Special Education	2.3%	1
Total Number of Credits	#Hours	#IHE's
Semester	126.8	29
Quarter	191.5	2
Other	N/A	11

Table 2: ECE Teacher Education Program Characteristics (N=42)

Graduate Assistants	Average
Current	3.27 (3.69)
Three Years Ago	2.88 (3.32)
In Three Year projected	3.66 (4.31)

As shown in Table 1 exactly half the programs (21 of the 42 programs in the sample) were NAEYC accredited. All programs were selected because they offered pre-service training leading to ECE teaching certificates; and 40 did this in conjunction with a bachelor's degree and two in conjunction with a master's degree; four programs required a fifth year for completing the certification program. Graduate degree programs in ECE were fairly common in our sample, which is to be expected in that all but two programs were at R1 IHE; and all ECE TE programs were housed within major public universities. Doctoral programs in ECE existed at 23 universities in the sample (57.5%) and master's programs in ECE were available at 32 universities (78%). Undergraduate programs operated predominantly on the semester system (94.7%) and averaged a total of 126.8 credits for program completion; quarter system programs (5.3% or N=2) averaged 191.5 credits. Undergraduate financial assistance was available at only 21.1% of the programs. Enrollments were increasing at 46.2% (N=18) of the ECE TE programs, decreasing at 17.9% (N=7) and staying level at 35.9% (N=14). Over half the ECE TE programs were located in Colleges of Education (N=24); one program was located in a college/department of special education; three were in Human Development departments, and 14 were in programs that were mixed (e.g., College of Human Ecology and Education). Finally, current graduate assistantships numbered on the average 3.27; three years previous the number was reported to be 2.88 and anticipated in three years to be 3.66 (Table 2).

Table 3: ECE Teacher Education Faculty Numbers

	Full-time Tenure	Part-time Tenure	Full-time Non tenure	Part-time Non tenure
Current	3.5 (2.60)	.59 (1.50)	1.66 (1.58)	2.02 (2.37)
Three Year Past	3.45 (2.63)	.53 (1.94)	1.34 (1.33)	2.08 (2.49)
Three Year	3.73 (2.61)	.59 (1.45)	1.68 (1.91)	2.13 (2.64)

Table 4: Current Faculty in Special Ed. & from Cultural Diverse Background

	Average
Current Special Education	1.57 (1.69)
Current from Cultural Diverse Background	1.22 (1.41)

Table 3 reports the mean number of different types of faculty working in the ECE TE programs. As can be seen, there were on the average 3.5 tenure-line full-time professors (three years ago this number was reported to be 3.45, and projected to be 3.73 in three years). Interestingly, one ECE TE program at a research one IHE indicated having zero tenure-line full-time professors. Part-time non-tenured faculty were on the average reported to be 2.02(now), 2.08(past), and 2.13(future). Part-time tenured faculty (joint appointments) were much less common—mean scores on this variable were .59 (now), .53 (past), and .59 (future). The mean number of full-time non-tenure faculty now, three years ago, and anticipated in three years were 1.66, 1.34, and 1.68, respectively. Of the current full-time tenure lines, an average of 1.57 were special education-related appointments and 1.22 on the average were from culturally diverse backgrounds (Table 4). Only 8 programs (19%) were without any special education faculty; 16 (38%) were without diversity representation on their faculty.

The questionnaire had separate items asking how these ECE TE programs did fieldwork and student teaching with respect to the kinds of sites that they used. Placement sites were characterized as to program type (e.g. Public schools, Head Start, Campus ECE Lab, etc.) as well as to age group program served (*i.e.*, Preschool, Kindergarten, Primary Grades, and Infant/Toddler Programs) and whether the site served Inclusive and/or Culturally/Linguistically Diverse populations (see Table 5).

Table 5: Sites for Fieldwork for Different Categories of Experience

	Preschool	Kindergarten	Primary Grades	Infant/Toddler Programs	Inclusive	Culturally/Linguistically Diverse
Early Head Start	11	4	2	13	13	13
Head Start	25	3	1	0	18	19
Public Schools	24	37	31	1	31	29
Community	28	9	4	14	18	23
Campus ECE	27	8	0	10	19	17
Campus Elem.	1	2	3	2	1	1
Campus Child Center	17	3	0	10	10	11
Prof. Dev. School	4	7	8	1	5	6
Private School	11	9	7	3	6	4
Charter School	1	8	7	0	3	3
Family Child Care Homes	1	0	0	3	2	2
Other	7	1	0	3	1	2

Note: *Other* means library, hospital, specialized programs, bookstores, etc.

Table 5 provides a summary of how the ECE TE programs characterized their fieldwork. Most common was the use of Public Schools, especially as Kindergarten (N=37) and Primary Grade (31) fieldwork sites. Many ECE TE programs were also using a variety of other sites for fieldwork with these two age/developmental levels,

especially Kindergarten. For example, eight ECE TE programs reported that their students did fieldwork with kindergarteners in Campus ECE lab schools and in Charter Schools, and nine ECE TE programs reported fieldwork involving kindergarteners in sites in the Community (not Public Schools) or in Private Schools. Teacher candidates in the ECE TE programs had opportunities to acquire fieldwork experiences with preschoolers in a wide range of programs. ECE TE programs reported Preschool fieldwork in Early Head Start (N=11), Head Start (N=25), sites in Public Schools (N=24), Community sites (N=28), Campus ECE lab schools (N=27), and Campus Child Development Centers (N=11), etc. Infant/Toddler field experiences were also available in multiple sites as well but were less frequently reported than the other three-age/developmental level groups (*e.g.* Early Head Start 13, Community 14, Campus ECE Lab 10, and Campus Child Development Centers 10). ECE TE programs reported using Family Child Care Homes very infrequently, once for Preschool and three times for Infant/Toddler field experiences.

Encouragingly, all ECE TE programs reported using fieldwork opportunities sites that were Inclusive. Most commonly reported in the Inclusive category were Public School sites (N=31), followed by Campus ECE lab schools (N=19), Head Start and Community sites (N=18 for each), Early Head Start (N=13), and Campus Child Development Centers (N=10). To a slightly lesser degree, ECE TE programs reported using fieldwork placement sites that served Culturally/Linguistically Diverse clientele. The pattern of these findings coincides with that found with regard to inclusion. ECE TE programs reported using fieldwork sites serving Culturally/Linguistically Diverse populations that were in a variety of programs including Public Schools (N=29),

Community sites (N=23), Head Start programs (N=19), Campus ECE lab schools (N=17), Early Head Start (N=13), and Campus Child Development Centers (N=11).

Table 6: Sites for Student Teaching in Different Categories of Experience

	Preschool	Kindergarten	Primary Grades	Infant/ Toddler Programs	Inclusive	Culturally/ Linguistically Diverse
Early Head Start	5	2	1	6	7	9
Head Start	14	2	1	0	9	10
Public Schools	20	35	32	0	32	30
Community	10	4	2	1	4	6
Campus ECE	21	7	0	4	11	11
Campus Elem.	1	1	2	0	0	0
Campus Child Center	5	0	0	3	2	3
Prof. Dev. School	2	4	4	0	3	4
Private School	8	8	6	0	3	4
Charter School	2	5	5	1	2	2
Other	2	3	3	2	1	2

Note: *Other* represents library, hospital, specialized programs, bookstores, etc.

Table 6 reports how student teaching as opposed to fieldwork was distributed across sites labeled in terms of kinds of programs and categories of experience identical to Table 5's format but excluding Family Child Care Homes. The most active site for student teaching by far was the Public Schools. Public Schools were reported being used for student teaching Primary Grade children, Kindergarteners, and Preschoolers at a frequency count of 32, 35, and 20 respectively. As can be seen in Table 6, Public School sites were checked as inclusive (N=32) and as serving culturally/linguistically diverse children and their families (N=30) in a relatively high number of cases. Student teaching preschoolers was reported to occur across a number of sites in addition to the Public Schools, such as Early Head Start (N=5), Head Start (N=14), Community Sites (N=10),

Campus Lab Schools (N=21), Private Schools (N=8), and Campus Child Development Centers (N=5). Noteworthy is the scattering of ECE TE programs' reporting of student teaching of infants and toddlers, such as in Early Head Start (N=6), Campus Lab (N=3), and Campus Child Development Center (N=3), and Other (N=2) programs.

Courses and Course Work:

We were interested in how the 42 ECE TE programs were providing instruction across a range of subjects or topics pertinent to the field of ECE. The topics are grouped into three categories as shown in the following three Tables.

Table 7: Specific Topics Covered in Program

Specific Topics	Full course required	Topic embedded in a course	Is fieldwork linked to course, part of this topic	Full course elective usually offered	Full course elective seldom offered	Topic covered in internet instruction
Child Development	39	10	19	2	0	1
Applied Child Development	21	18	13	1	0	0
Infant/Toddler Development	21	20	19	2	0	2
Play	6	35	18	2	0	2
Family-school Comm. Prtnshp.	21	23	11	1	0	1
Family-school Partnerships	17	22	9	0	0	1
Diversity and Culture	24	24	10	2	0	2
English Language Learn	6	32	4	4	1	2
Special Ed.	37	11	12	1	0	1
Child Mental Health	1	33	3	1	0	2
Health & Nutrition	7	31	3	1	0	2

Note: Numbers represent frequency scores for positive responses.

Table 7 summarizes how a variety of topics commonly expected of ECE TE programs were taught. Child Development had its own full course 39 times and Special Education did 37 times. Full courses were reported frequently by the ECE TE programs for the topics of Diversity and Culture (N=24), Applied Child Development (N=21), Infant and Toddler Development (N=21), Family-School-Community Partnerships (N=21), and Family-School Partnerships (N=17). Although the important topics of Play, English Language Learners, Child Mental Health, and Health and Nutrition were not

reported to be taught as separate and complete courses very often (6, 6, 1 and 7 times, respectively), these subjects were reported to be given as coursework embedded in other courses very often (35, 32, 33, and 31 times, respectively). Findings shown in this Table also reveal three patterns: (1) fieldwork is linked to subject matter coverage to only a moderate extent; (2) topics are not covered very often in electives that are either offered usually or seldom; and (3) topics are offered even less frequently as internet instruction.

Table 8: Content Topics Covered in Program

Covered Topics	Full course required	Topic embedded in a course	Is fieldwork linked to course, part of this topic	Full course elective usually offered	Full course elective seldom offered	Topic covered in internet instruction
Early learning standards	4	38	18	0	0	3
K-12 Standards	2	37	13	0	0	2
Assessment	31	17	16	0	0	1
Technology	20	21	4	4	0	3
Educational Policies	12	26	3	2	0	2
Leadership	8	30	4	2	0	2
Professional Ethic	3	39	7	0	0	2
Public Policies	2	36	1	0	0	2
Class management	20	22	10	1	0	2
Advocacy	5	34	5	0	0	2
Teambuilding in PreK-3rd	2	33	8	1	0	2
Professional dispositions	0	37	7	0	0	2

Note: Numbers represent frequency scores for positive responses.

Table 8 summarizes survey questionnaire information that furthers the description of how the ECE TE programs were covering different additional topics. Subjects in this Table include ones also commonly associated with ECE but others connected to education in general. Most of the listed topics were listed as either a full course or coursework embedded in another course, but not both of these kinds of instructional delivery. Three topics commonly warranted a full course in the ECE TE programs: Assessment (N=31), Technology (N=20), and Class Management (N=20). Adding together the frequencies for full course or topic embedded in another course, the most highly covered topics were in order of magnitude: Assessment, Class Management, Early Learning Standards, Professional Ethics, Technology, Advocacy, K-12 Standards, Educational Policies, Leadership, Public Policies, Professional Dispositions, and PreK-3rd Teambuilding. Again, topics covered in courses and coursework were only linked to fieldwork to a moderate extent (ranging from 18 times for early learning standards to one time for public policies). Electives and web-based instruction were uncommon.

Table 9: Method Topics Covered in Teacher Education Program

Methods Topics	Full Course Required	Topic embedded in a course	Is fieldwork linked to course, part of this topic	Full course elective usually offered	Full course elective seldom offered	Topic covered in internet instruction
Math Ed	29	18	16	1	0	1
Science	28	19	15	1	0	1
Social Stud.	25	22	16	0	0	1
Literacy Ed.	38	9	21	0	0	0
Music Ed.	13	24	5	1	0	0
Art Ed.	12	28	7	2	0	0
Physical Ed.	8	25	5	1	0	0
Other	3	12	1	3	0	0

Note: Numbers represent frequency scores for positive responses.

Table 9 gives a summary for the coverage of methods topics reputed to appear in ECE TE programs. Once again the same pattern of results was indicated with respect to electives and internet instruction (seldom reported to be offered by the ECE TE programs), and linkage to fieldwork (moderate extent of links between course/coursework topics and fieldwork). For example, only once was an internet offering noted for Math, Science, and Social Studies methods, with zero frequencies for the remaining methods topics. Elective courses that are seldom offered was never checked across all the methods topics; frequencies were zero, one, two or three for elective courses usually offered across the eight topics, with the three frequency checked for the other education methods courses option.

Again, frequencies of entries under full course required and under topic embedded in a course were somewhat reciprocally related with the topic covered usually one way or the other. Literacy education clearly led in frequency of having a full course required

(N=38), followed by math methods (N=29), science methods (N=28), and social studies (N=25). The least mentioned method's subject as a topic covered in the ECE TE program, either as a required course or as a topic embedded in a course, was physical education. Only eight ECE TE programs required a course in methods of physical education; these figures were 13 and 12 for music and art methods courses respectively.

Table 10: Use of Technology in ECE TE Programs

	Percentage	Frequency
Computer Conference	25%	10
Online Learning	72.5%	29
Laptop Instruction	37.5%	15
Digital Camera	67.5%	27
None	5%	2
Other	20%	8

Table 10 above summarizes how the ECE TE programs reported they were using technology. This item on the questionnaire, like other items, allowed the respondent to check all of the items that applied. The most frequently reported use of technology was on-line learning (72.5%) followed by digital camera (67.5%). The other category included almost entirely the use of videos, according to the write-in comments.

Results

The previous section described various characteristics of the ECE TE programs and their current faculty. Program changes and reasons for the changes are presented next.

Program Changes and Reasons for Changes

There were a number of areas of inquiry where information came exclusively or almost exclusively from the interviews. The first of these areas was how programs changed in the last three years (or in some cases going further back in time), and the reasons for the changes. Appendix H summarizes this information.

As can be seen from Appendix H, many different changes occurred in the ECE TE programs within the previous three years, and diverse reasons were given for these changes. The most frequent changes pertained to courses and secondly to more general changes in ECE TE programs relating to new developments, extensions, standards, and state certification bands. Course changes included adding courses to the ECE TE program. These courses included, among others, autism, assessment, behavioral management, emergent literacy, infant-toddler, math, science, child guidance, social issues, phonics, and Head Start. Other courses were being developed, such as play, emergent curriculum, and leadership and advocacy (to be added to the master's program). Other program changes mentioned were requiring six more credits of special education and the advent of a course on inclusion. Program changes included establishing a dual license by combining ECE and special education TE, alternative pathways to certification program extension, changing fieldwork and courses throughout the ECE TE program to

meet early learning standards, and program changes in response to state changes in certification bands, such as in one case changing birth to K to birth to second grade.

Also very commonly mentioned were changes in partnerships and collaborations. ECE TE programs were forming new links with academic departments, such as physical therapy and psychology and human ecology and special education. There were recently bridges made from ECE TE programs to the public schools and programs within them, such as family literacy. More meeting and more partnerships were noted with schools and state agencies; there was reference to new connections and articulation agreements with community colleges. A fair number of ECE TE programs noted alterations in field experiences, such as more hours added, order of placements, changes in sites, and new initiatives; some programs were adding more attention to infants and toddlers and PreK to kindergarten transitions. These program changes were often related with new emphases on special education and inclusion. Specifically, ECE TE programs were adding internship work with disabilities, for example, new attention to inclusive PreK, more emphasis on dialect differences, or finding ways to learn more about the misidentification of children, as one respondent put it. In addition, several ECE TE programs made recent changes in the area of family, community, schools, and service learning. Finally, there were some programs which said they have changes through new hires, or new masters degrees.

Why did the ECE TE programs change in recent years? Interviews revealed reasons that are summarized in Appendix H. Some of the explanations for recent changes in ECE TE programs are pretty straightforward—e.g., increases in resources or funds, or increases in students. New emphases, such as on state early learning standards or on

literacy during the early years were each cited several times as causes for program changes. New courses and practicums were noted, suggesting a fuzzy line between changes in a program and the reason for changes. This suggests a dynamic can occur where some program changes lead to more program changes.

The most commonly given reasons for ECE TE program change were partnership or collaboration opportunities, certification changes and emphasis on special education and inclusion. Respondents reported focus on PreK in the public schools, the PreK-3rd initiative, and changes in state certification bands as prompting ECE TE program changes. Respondents also gave as reasons for their changes alterations in state standards for ECE TE programs. Here one finds the ECE TE programs responded to, for example, mandates for more requirements for special education classes and fieldwork.

Impacts from PreK and PreK-3rd

The impact of PreK and PreK-3rd on ECE TE Programs was studied in a number of ways. First we look at informant ratings for general impacts from PreK and PreK-3rd on ECE TE programs. Next we examined the kinds of professional development activities reported by faculty. Other impacts were also studied. These were new collaborations reported in response to PreK and PreK-3rd, evidence that school personnel other than classroom teachers are being prepared differently because of PreK and PreK-3rd movements in our nation's public schools. Also examined were how different topics are taught to students in the ECE TE Programs, where different kinds of field experiences and student teaching are taking place, what problems or topics are the focus of faculty research, and who are the participants in this research.

Table 11: Impacts from Public School, PreK and PreK-3rd

Group	Not at all	Very Little	Some what	Definite Impact	Strong Impact
PreK	14.6% (6)	17.1% (7)	37.7% (13)	26.8% (11)	9.8% (4)
PreK-3rd	17.5% (7)	20% (8)	25% (10)	27.5% (11)	10% (4)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are frequencies

We asked each ECE TE program how it is affected by what is happening in the public schools with respect to increasing presence of PreK programs and secondly, with the movement towards PreK-3rd school organization. As can be seen in Table 11, the majority of the ECE TE programs indicated that these trends in public education affected their programs somewhat (37.7% PreK, 25% PreK-3rd), definite impact (26.8% PreK and 27.5% PreK-3rd), or strong impact (9.8% PreK and 10% PreK-3rd). There were 13 programs who answered very little (7) or no impact (6) of PreK in the public schools; the corresponding figures are 8 and 7 for response to PreK-3rd. The influences on ECE TE programs of PreK and of PreK-3rd were about the same. We learned from interviews that a common reason for little or no impact was that other factors such as recent changes in state standards or new hires were current major concerns affecting the program—the PreK and PreK-3rd initiatives were “old hat” in their states. Program alterations happened earlier in response to these factors, especially the PreK factor.

Professional Development Activities:

Table 12: Professional Development of ECE/TE faculty with respect to work in PreK classrooms and the PreK-3rd Schools

Development Activities	PreK	PreK-3rd
Conferences	59 %	56 %
Additional Faculty Meeting	37 %	34 %
New Committees	34 %	33 %
Site Visits	27 %	24 %
Retreats	21 %	13 %
Mentoring Arrangements	19 %	14 %
Special Workshops	17 %	14 %
New Co-Teaching	13 %	15 %
Outside Speakers	5 %	9 %

Respondents were asked to rank the top three kinds of professional development activities they experienced to improve their ECE TE programs and make them more helpful to their students for working in PreK classrooms and PreK-3rd public schools. The numbers displayed in Table 12 are composite scores using weights where first rankings were 3 points, second rankings 2 points, and third rankings 1 point. The higher the number for a given professional development category, the more prevalent was that kind of faculty activity. With the exception of the lowest scored categories (new co-teaching and outside speakers), the orders in which the categories were ranked were the same across PreK and PreK-3rd goals for the professional development activity. As can be seen in Table 12, Conferences stood out as the most common form of in-service for higher education faculty. Additional Faculty Meetings and New Committees were a

distant second and third, followed by Site Visits, Retreats, Mentoring Arrangements, and Special Workshops.

New Collaborations

We asked whether new collaborations have become established connecting their ECE TE program with other units on campus or off campus due to their state’s emphasis on PreK, PreK-3rd, or both. Table 13 shows the frequencies of different types of collaborations.

Table 13: Number of Program Reporting New Collaboration As A Result Of Your State Emphasis on PreK, PreK-3rd, or Both

Collaboration	PreK Impact	PreK-3rd Impact	PreK and PreK-3rd	Total
Inter-Departmental	3	2	10	15
Inter-College	4	3	8	15
Inter-Institutional Relations	1	2	6	9
With School Districts	7	4	10	21
With Community Agencies	3	2	4	9
With State Departments	5	1	8	14
Total	23	14	46	83

As can be seen in Table 13, the numbers are not high. For any given type of collaboration, less than a quarter of the respondents gave a “yes” answer for each column representing the type of impact. Summing across the scores for the different kinds of collaboration, there were 23 collaborations for PreK reasons, and only 14 new collaborations for PreK-3rd reasons, and 46 collaborations for both PreK and PreK-3rd reasons for the whole sample. New collaborations With School Districts (N=21) were

indicated most frequently, followed by ones within campus, namely Inter-Departmental (N=15) and Inter-College (N=15). New collaborations With State Departments were noted with some frequency as well (N=14); less common were new collaborations With Community Agencies (N=9) and with other institutions (N=9).

Preparing School Personnel other than Teachers for PreK and PreK-3rd

The survey asked respondents whether PreK, PreK-3rd, or both of these public school initiatives were affecting how educational professionals (in addition to classroom teachers) were being prepared to work in the public schools. Table 14 summarizes the results.

Table 14: Preparing Professionals for Change in Public School

School Professionals	PreK Impact	P-3 Impact	PreK and P-3	Total
School Principals	0	0	1	1
School Psychologists	0	0	2	2
Superintendents	0	0	1	1
School Counselors	0	0	2	2
Special Educators	3	2	4	9
Other	1	1	2	4

Note: Maximum score per cell is 42.

As can be seen there was little indication from the respondents that their universities were preparing future school principals, school psychologists, superintendents, or school counselors who will work with young children and their teachers and parents in our nation’s changing public schools with respect to PreK and PreK-3rd. Only one or two positive responses were given to each of the above four important positions in public schools in connection with both PreK and PreK-3rd. Special educators received more positive responses (N=9 across PreK, P-3, and both impacts. Of course, our respondents may have not been in a position to know what was

happening in other departments’ training for these future positions, or it was not deemed relevant at the undergraduate level since these positions require graduate studies and degrees. Interviews supported these findings when respondents said they did not think any kind of new preparation was currently happening to ready new professionals for schools with PreK and PreK-3rd.

Fieldwork and Student Teaching:

From Table 15, a total of 36 of the 42 programs or 85.7% reported that they had available for their use PreK and PreK-3rd public schools as practicum sites. Table 16 shows how well these sites were being used.

Table 15: Availability of PreK and PreK-3rd sites

Available as placement sites	Percentage	Frequency
Yes	85.7%	36
No	14.3%	6

Table 16: How well PreK and PreK-3rd sites were used

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
0% (0)	9.8% (4)	43.9% (18)	31.7% (13)	14.6% (6)

Note: numbers in parentheses are frequencies

As can be seen from Table 16, a majority of the ECE TE programs felt that they were using their PreK and PreK-3rd practicum sites in either a good (N=18) or excellent (N=13) fashion. Only four programs reported that they were using these sites in only a fair manner, and none reported use as being poor.

Table 17: How PreK Methods Courses Are Covered Within ECE/TE Programs

Methods Courses/Topics	Separate	Linked	Same Course
Math	45.0% (18)	7.5% (3)	52.5% (21)
Science	37.5% (15)	12.5% (5)	57.5% (23)
Social Studies	39.5% (5)	15.8% (6)	50.0% (19)
Language and Literacy	57.5% (23)	12.5% (5)	37.5% (15)
Music	25.8% (8)	12.9% (4)	64.5% (20)
Art	25.0% (8)	15.6% (5)	62.5% (20)
Physical Education	37.0% (10)	11.1% (3)	51.9% (14)
Other Method Courses	30.8% (4)	15.4% (2)	61.5% (8)

Table 17 shows the way PreK methods courses/topics were configured with respect to how methods' topics were presented for kindergarten and primary grades methods teaching. The question asked was whether PreK methods courses in different content areas were taught in the same course as kindergarten and primary grade methods, in discrete but linked courses, or as separate courses. Separate courses or coursework means that the methods in a given content area are dedicated to PreK only, with separate course coverage for kindergarten and primary grade teaching methods in the given content area such as Math or Science.

As can be seen, Language and Literacy methods most often were reported as having separate courses for PreK and kindergarten to primary grades (57.5%), followed by Math methods (45%). Usually methods for teaching young children from PreK into grade school in a given content area were covered in the same course, with the single exception of Language and Literacy methods.

Table 18 shows how the ECE TE programs rated themselves in preparing their students with respect to different objectives. Each content area was rated on a four point scale: 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Excellent. Programs were asked: Based on current developments and related literature in the field, how well is your existing program preparing new teachers in each of the following?

Table 18: Self Ratings in TE Quality in Content areas

Content Area	Rating Average
Language and Literacy	3.59 (.591)
Teacher Child Relationships	3.54 (.552)
Teaching Strategies and Tactics	3.49 (.553)
Diversity	3.32 (.567)
Family-School-Community Partnerships	3.30 (.648)
Inclusion	3.24 (.734)
Math	3.20 (.511)
Family Member-Teacher Relations	3.20 (.749)
Science	3.02 (.524)
Technology	3.02 (.651)
Teamwork for P-3	2.55 (1.22)
Infant/Toddler Development	2.53 (1.28)
English Language Learners	2.59 (.921)
Transition PreK to Kindergarten	2.80 (.823)
Transition into PreK	2.62 (1.06)
Transition between Grades	2.44 (.852)

As can be seen in Table 18 there is considerable range in ratings across the content areas. ECE TE programs on the average rated themselves as good to excellent in most areas, particularly language and literacy (3.59), Teacher-Child Relationships (3.54), and Teaching Strategies and Tactics (3.49). Somewhat less positively did the ECE TE programs rate themselves in the areas of preparing students for Diversity (3.32), Families (3.5), Inclusion (3.24), and Math (3.2). ECE TE programs considered themselves good in

science (3.02) and technology (3.02) but on the average between good and fair in all the other areas. ECE TE programs thought least well of themselves in the following areas: Teamwork for P-3 (2.55), Infant/Toddler Development (2.53), English Language Learners (2.59), and Transitions into PreK (2.62) and Between Grade Levels (2.44). Interestingly, they rated themselves notably higher for transitions between PreK and Kindergarten (2.80).

Table 19 reports information about faculty research covering both the topics of research and the participants in the studies.

Table 19: Topics and Participants in ECE faculty research

Research Topics	Percentage
Inclusion	60%
Diversity	55%
Teacher-Child Relations	50%
Human Development	50%
Family-School Community Partnership	35%
English Language Learners	32.5%
Technology	32.5%
Family Member- Teacher Relations	30%

Research Participant	Percentage
Teacher	74%
Preschooler	72%
Student Teacher	51%
Kindergarten	46%
Teacher Educator	46%
Parents	38%
Infant & Toddler	36%
Primary Grade Children	33%
Mentor	20%
Administrators	13%
Supervisors	5%

On the last page in Table 19, the most frequently noted research topics were on inclusion and diversity. Sixty percent of the ECE TE programs reported research dealing with inclusion and 55% on diversity. Teacher-child relations and human development research were each reported occurring in 50% of the ECE TE programs, with the other topics listed on this questionnaire items occurring less than 50%: Family-School-Community Partnerships (35%), English Language Learners and Technology (each 32.5%), and Family Member-Teacher Relations (30%). The most frequently mentioned research participants were teachers (74%) and preschoolers (72%). The least commonly mentioned research participants were mentors (20%), administrators (13%) and Supervisors (5%). Intermediate levels of interest were indicated for studies with the following kinds of research participants: Student teachers (51%), Kindergarteners (46%), Teacher Educators (46%), Parents (38%), Infant & Toddlers (36%), and Primary Grade Children (33%).

Preparing for PreK-3rd Grade Continuum

As part of the interview we asked: “How do your students learn about coordinating curriculum and instruction across the PreK through third grade continuum?” All 42 ECE TE programs saw this as a significant aim and many considered this as very important or even a central goal. The question generated a great variety of answers that are summarized in Table 20 (additional information on how the 42 programs responded to this question can be found in Appendix I). Usually the response contained multiple ideas, some rather unexpected and uncommon and only appearing in one or a few programs. These were put into an “Other” category in Table 20 and included such entries as “we have an EDUCATE facility in the area”, “home visits”, “Head Start teamwork

serves as an example and they are exposed to that; they go to a Policy Council meeting”, “our constructivist underpinnings and they learn from the children” and “ecological perspective on inclusive settings and family-determined services.”

Table 20: Preparing for PreK-3rd Grade Continuum

Means	Frequency
Diversity	16
Inclusion	15
Standards	13
Field Experiences	12
Method Courses	10
Curriculum & Assessment	7
Transition	5
Integrated Curriculum	4
Student Portfolios	4
Students’ Action Research	3
Mentoring	3
DAP	3
Emergent Curriculum	2
Spiral Curriculum	2
Child Development	2
Child Development Center	2
Others	17

As Table 20 shows, the most frequent kinds of replies made reference to Diversity (16), Inclusion (15), Standards (13), Field Experiences (12), and Course Work (10). One respondent said, “There is an over-dominance on child development. There is an emphasis on child development. We are grounded in development but try to give far more focus on diverse families, differences in family-community-cultural contexts.” Another included in her answer, “Team building embedded in the special education course, inclusion, learning about collaboration with multiple disciplines...talking about the transition process, PreK to kindergarten for all kids, and entry into PreK classes from early intervention programs. This happens in infant-toddler methods courses and PreK

methods courses.” This respondent opined that she thought this carried over to help students be more responsive and sensitive to individual differences and variability in rates of development at the higher grades. Often the developmental perspective was implicit in the answers given and reflected indirectly when mention was made about the importance of inclusion and diversity learning, or coming to understand early learning standards for children as they grow and develop from infancy on up. Multiple field experiences across different age groups was viewed as very helpful, as were courses and coursework that included different ages/grades, or were dedicated to integrating the curriculum. A couple ECE TE programs noted that this aim is important because of NAEYC standards and that they follow NAEYC and provide learning field experiences in preschool, kindergarten, and primary grades. Students create portfolios and show in exit interviews how their work demonstrates alignment to NAEYC standards.

In answering this question respondents often mentioned concerns and challenges they faced in trying to achieve this aim. These concerns were also varied and sometimes mentioned by only one or two programs. For example, some school buildings house PreK and kindergarten only, so student teachers cannot see how these levels are coordinated with the primary grades during their practicum. As one respondent put it, “The developmental perspective creates a bridge, the educational system creates gaps.” Another noted that how well this is done depends on the teacher—or the students in the class—if there are students in the elementary certification program enrolled in the same class as ECE teacher candidates. It does not help when adjuncts are hired to teach methods courses and do not attend faculty meetings or share a common understanding about ECE TE program over-arching goals, or when a math methods class covers

material and content for teaching, curriculum, and student evaluation all the way up to the 6th grade. Such inappropriate methods courses were the case in at least one program in our study. Moreover, a few times it was noted across the interviews that foundation and other courses (*e.g.* educational psychology, theory and policy, etc.) in the teacher candidates' pre-service training did not include any content (*i.e.*, knowledge, skills, or dispositions) connecting ECE with K-12 models of teacher preparation, thereby being counterproductive or regressive with respect to the important goal of learning how to coordinate curriculum and instruction from PreK-3rd. As one respondent complained, her dean was supportive of ECE but there was no leadership across departments.

Relationship of ECE & Elementary Teacher Educators

A question asked during the interview was: "How would you characterize your relationship with the elementary TE program?" Answers were evaluated sentence by sentence to determine whether the ECE TE program had a positive or negative relation with the elementary TE faculty or program, or whether it was mixed, with some statements positive and others negative in tone, content or both. A fourth category was used for programs that can best be described as independent; that is, the ECE and Elementary programs function separately from each other without any indications of structures or communications that could be deemed positive or negative in nature. For three of the 42 programs in the study there was insufficient information to assign a score. Table 21 summarizes these findings (additional information on this is provided in Appendix J).

Table 21: Relationship of ECE & ELEM.

Nature of Relations	Frequency
Positive	6
Mixed	7
Independent	19
Negative	6
No Information	3

Note: 1=Negative 2=Independent; 3=Mixed; 4=Positive

As can be seen, six programs were scored as having a positive relation between ECE and Elementary faculty/program, and six programs were seen as negative, with seven programs considered to have a mixed relation. Half of the programs scored, (N=19), were judged to be independent or separate from each other based upon the statements given in response to the interview question and follow up questions.

There were various reasons cited for why an ECE TE program had positive relations across ECE and Elementary Programs and faculty. One program, for example, noted a good, competitive relationship, with both the ECE faculty and the Elementary faculty doing research and making better teachers. This ECE TE program complemented the elementary teacher certification program, which was not concerned about infancy. Here a big community donor who wanted to change culture beginning in infancy helped out the ECE TE program a great deal and made them stronger and more respected in their College and University and in the surrounding area. Another ECE TE program participant when asked about the relation with elementary faculty and TE program said, “Fine. It’s good.” Here also the ECE TE program was strong. The elementary faculty was shrinking although their enrollments were still considerably larger than the ECE program. However, the on-line ECE Master’s program had over 90 students with the elementary program soon to have their own on-line program; subject matter specials are

“Okay. Up.” As a third example, the relation was deemed positive by virtue of mutual valuing of the importance of multiple field experiences across the age/grade range, and helping student teachers learn about transitioning, developmental continuity and learning, and curricular alignment. Interestingly, this program said that the ECE student teachers had better field practicums than coursework in infant/toddlers, but that there was student concern about not enough interaction with primary grade children.

Among the several programs grouped as positive, we also found commonality in the faculties’ educational philosophy, mutual respect, and administrative encouragement for positive relations between the ECE and Elementary faculty/programs. As one respondent said, “We have a strong social constructivist approach that permeates birth to age 8 years, and the elementary have a subject matter focus but say they are constructivists.” This respondent went on to say that each has a long separate history and philosophy and that sometimes the relation is more productive than at other times, and that their relationship has improved with changes in the faculty. Nevertheless, a further comment was, “. . .our students see we differ in how we talk about children, we have different jargon and students have trouble bridging the gap.” In sum, the programs in this category all appeared to be positive even though the relationship between ECE and elementary was also nuanced and had to be qualified in some way as seen in the above examples. There was not a single case of a program with a perfect relationship or viewing themselves as operating as a harmonious whole. Faculties were distinct. Faculties were reported to be either identified with ECE or elementary, not both, quite unlike the relationships we found occurring a number of times between ECE and special education.

A comparable number of ECE TE programs were scored as mixed because, although positive factors describing the relationship between ECE and elementary faculty and programs were noted, the answers to this interview question also included statements referring to clearly negative factors—more than just qualifications or nuances concerning a positive relation, as was typically found in the first category discussed above. For instance, one respondent said that she thought it would not be “a big leap for elementary teacher education [to understand ECE]...if you have a conversation and think about it”—but that there is no encouragement or time or energy for this, that teacher educators and teachers are under so much pressure. She added, “We need to reignite the desire to connect.” This respondent was critical that the elementary world of basic and higher education could, but did not understand, early development. As another respondent put it, “we are poor cousins”; here the concern was different views on assessment and interpretation of child actions and intentions even though the faculties were meeting monthly and doing admissions together.

A third cluster of about the same number of ECE TE programs were characterized as negative with respect to the reported relationship between the ECE and elementary faculty and program. Here we find explicitly negative statements dominating the answer to this interview question. Comments indicating a lack of respect and communication were common. As one respondent said, “There is no collaboration, no communication, we do not serve on committees together.” Another program serviced by, but not in a college of education, was worried about a take-over which would result in the ECE TE program being administratively run by the college of education where she felt there was disregard for Developmentally Appropriate Practices (DAP), infants and toddlers, and the

importance of the family in education. She said this about the ECE and elementary relationship, “Negative, really a sense there is really nothing to discuss. We are substandard... We need to talk to them.” Deep resentment and frustration were heard in these kinds of replies.

The negativity carried over to how ECE was viewed as not accepted in the public school placement sites. One respondent said that many principals do not want those kids (pre-kindergarteners) in their building and they are often put in separate buildings with the kindergarten classrooms. First grade teachers often share the principals’ negative attitude about ECE. Even though her state has a state-wide assessment system involving transferring a child’s folder onto the next grade level teacher, “...first grade teachers throw it in the trash...there is not a lot of respect...the first grade teachers say ‘aren’t those babies cute.’” She added that barriers are beginning to be knocked down, but there is great room for progress. Other programs in this cluster indicated that there is an underestimation of the complexity of ECE and philosophical differences and that it is hard to do much about this from a position of being in the minority—from a position of weakness. As one respondent put it, “you have to pick your battles.”

By far the most common characterization was ‘independent’ with respect to the reported nature of the relationship between the ECE and the elementary programs or faculties at a given IHE in our study. Half of scored responses to the interview question dealing with this matter (N=19) were best described in this way. Here it was common to hear statements such as “They are totally separate programs,” “Parallel programs that do not intersect,” or “Distinctly different foci—we have primary concern with the child and elementary on content; we see the world differently.” This state of affairs was noted in a

matter of fact way for the most part, without positive or negative connotations or evaluations; statements were descriptions of the way things operated. For example, one respondent said, “In teacher preparation the ECE and the elementary are distinct programs with little overlap—the only overlap is in the general education requirements. Method courses are distinct. All method courses are distinct.” As a second example, the interviewee stated that, “We are in the same department but have different program requirements...elementary aims for deep content knowledge...they have a minor...they do not have a family course...educational psych provides the child development course. ECE is user friendly, offering evening classes, flexible, and has grown. We have equity and resource issues that serve to keep things tense below the surface.”

Program Weaknesses

Table 22: Program Weakness

Types	Frequency
Attitudinal Barriers	20
Budget	19
Lack of Faculty Staff	13
Finding Practicum Sites	11
Certification	11
Lack of ECE/Elem. Collaboration	9
Liabilities	2
Lack of Student Supervision	2
Number of Students	2

As can be seen from the Table 22 the most frequently appearing weaknesses had to do with attitudes and budget. Negative attitudes can be seen in statements such as “Department divisions play a huge role in what curriculum exists, the content in TE, and philosophical differences—the very strong behavioral traditions are an obstacle.” As a

second example, a respondent said, “Biggest hurdle is lack of collaboration between us and Elementary—see many developmentally inappropriate practices in Elementary methods classes. Would like more cohesive philosophy and training across birth to 5 years and K to fifth grade.” Another respondent added the need for more respect, and that ECE is separate but not equal to Elementary education. Elementary education has so much to cover that they took away child development and family courses from their pre-service training program. As another clear example, “There are attitude problems, people not having a commitment, or agreeing with certain content areas emphases, such as the courses needed...there is difficulty in convincing people of the importance of what is needed in ECE and that it is not the same needs as Elementary Education.”

In addition, budget woes and lack of faculty were clearly seen as negatively impacting quality ECE TE programming in many answers. For example, one respondent said, “There was a 15% budget cut and we lost two of the four tenure-line faculty”; another said, “Lack of funding and fear of losing the program due to other decreases is overwhelming.” Others also alluded to concerns over survival because of fiscal problems. Hopes were expressed to keep programs going.

Other kinds of impediments were heard. For example, one respondent said, “The state government has made it more difficult to get certified in a timely fashion.” Another said, “There is problem with placements.” Another said, “It is difficulty to move students to diverse field placements...there are very rigid and tight time parameters...supervision is done by adjuncts not in ECE.” In addition, one respondent bemoaned the fact that student teachers did not get exceptionalism and SES diversity in their placements. There

were shortages of cooperating teachers, quality placement sites (additional information on this is provided in Appendix K).

Program Assets

An item from the interview inquired about program assets, producing a wide range of responses. A summary of different prevalent types of assets appears below in Table 23; data from the interview and the questionnaire for each of the 42 ECE TE programs can be found in Appendix L.

Table 23: Program Assets

Type	Frequency
Faculty Staff	19
Departmental	19
Collaboration	17
Research	16
Lab school	6
Field Placements	5
Library	3
Others	9

As can be seen from Table 23, most of the assets were coded as relating to the faculty and staff of the ECE TE program, the department, collaborations that were in existence, or research activity. Many respondents reported that assets were helpful for achieving success in teacher preparation and in fulfilling their commitments to the students. Program strengths were viewed as being needed to maintain quality and to plan for ECE TE program improvements. Many stated assets related to the faculty themselves. For example, one respondent said, “We work well together and are committed...collaborate constantly, take time, take five hour retreats three times per semester...even though we do not get any credit for this.” Other examples were: “Faculty is strong”; “Faculty in ECE is respected.” Assets relating to the departments

were features that supported the ECE TE program that came from the departments and its operations and policies. For example, granting release time, course release, or extra money. One respondent said, “We have good administrative support.”

Collaboration and research were categories of assets that also appeared very frequently in the answers to this interview subject. Collaborations were cited in connection to various departments, programs, state agencies and public schools. Some ECE TE programs reported being energized by collaborations, and that these collaborations were very important to the faculty and its mission of preparing new ECE teachers. For example, one respondent noted, “Early childhood is very visible in our state because of the PreK and PreK to 3 initiatives...there is outreach to Head Start.” “New collaborations involve working with the Family Literacy Program on offering a reading and writing course,” added another respondent. Many kinds of exciting and well-established, as well as relatively new arrangements, were noted. Sometimes collaborations involved research, which was another category of assets. Some research teams were interdisciplinary and interdepartmental. Often this involved research between ECE and Special Education. In contrast, others noted research done more independently and exclusively within their own ECE TE faculty. One respondent said, “We have a great deal of autonomy. We have a four-year grant to study assessment.”

Program Plans

The final question of the interview was: “What are your immediate expectations?” Follow-up probes were used to elicit program plans for the immediate future. Table 24 summarizes the kinds of answers given (see Appendix M for additional information about plans). Usually a program gave more than one answer, and 11 answers were unique and

classified as “Other.” “Other” responses to this question included: “More student research,” “new birth to five ECE Administrator’s certificate,” “Graduate program in educational leadership in ECE,” “Improve the quality of the lab school,” “More fun, less academic work sheets!” etc.

Table 24: Program Plans

Directions	Frequency
Program Goals/Certification	33
Faculty	9
Student Diversity	9
Courses	7
Research	7
Student Number	5
Survival	5
Field Sites	3
ECE/EL Collaboration	3
Collaboration with Districts	2
Others	11

As can be seen in Table 24, the majority of the answers (N=33) took a macro-view and made reference to their program in general or the certification requirements. Here were represented answers such as, “Become an important part of a state-wide initiative to improve ECE quality in programs”, “Better serve minorities and families impacted by poverty”, “Have the state approve our latest changes”, “Develop a fourth grade and a fifth grade endorsement”, “Pull together and reinvent our program”, and “Need more training on inclusion.” Faculty-related plans were noted nine times and included fulfilling specific needs by bringing in an infant-toddler specialist, a bilingual teacher educator, or someone in math or science, and general wants such as “much more full-time faculty”, or “a new tenure track line in ECE,” etc. Other more specific or narrow-view plans pertained to recruiting students, students from diverse backgrounds, or

graduate students, or had to do with courses or research projects or field placements or collaborations. A few times plans explicitly dealt with improved relationships between ECE and Elementary Teacher Educators, and better preparing new teachers for working in public schools that were organized in terms of the PreK through third grade framework. Five programs replied, in effect, that they just wanted to survive. Comments from these programs included: “Hope to continue to exist”, “Maintain and hold ground”, “Stay alive”, “Hang onto resources in these difficult economic times,” and “Want to continue to be around.”

Variable Relationships

In Table 25, the various institutions are compared with those having a Ph.D. program and those that do not have a Ph.D. program. Although the differences are not statistically significant, it is clear that there are trends in the data.

Table 25: Faculty and Students in Ph.D. ECE TE Programs

Faculty	Ph.D. (N=23)	Non Ph.D. (N=19)
<i>Tenure</i>		
Full Time Now	3.74 (3.19)	3.29 (1.72)
Full Time 3 Yrs Ago	3.39 (2.79)	3.65 (2.62)
Full Time Next 3 Yrs	4.23 (3.11)	3.13 (1.86)
<i>Non Tenure</i>		
Full Time Now	1.68 (1.46)	1.76 (1.79)
Full Time 3 Yrs Ago	1.41 (1.26)	1.35 (1.50)
Full Time Next 3 Yrs	1.76 (1.61)	1.73 (2.37)
Graduate Students		
Now	3.50 (2.89)	3.31 (4.76)
Three Yrs Ago	2.73 (2.66)	3.25 (4.28)
Next 3 Yrs	3.90 (3.51)	3.67 (5.53)

Note: Figures are Means and Standard Deviations (in parentheses)

The average number of full-time tenure track faculty is now higher in the IHE with a Ph.D. program rather than those IHE without a Ph.D. program. The average number of full-time non-tenure track faculty is about the same in both IHE with Ph.D. programs and those without. The average number of graduate students is a bit higher in IHE with Ph.D. programs rather than those IHE without a Ph.D. program. These results are not totally unexpected.

In Table 26, a comparison is made between programs that are NAEYC accredited with those programs that are not related to the average number of faculty. Although the

differences are not statistically significant, it is clear that there are trends in the data regarding types of faculty positions.

Table 26: Faculty and Students in NAEYC Accredited Programs

Faculty	Accredited (N=21)	Not Accredited (N=21)
<i>Tenure</i>		
Full Time Now	3.76 (2.68)	3.24 (2.55)
Full Time 3 Yrs Ago	3.86 (2.46)	3.05 (2.80)
Full Time Next 3 Yrs	4.00 (2.56)	3.45 (2.72)
<i>Non Tenure</i>		
Full Time Now	1.81 (1.75)	1.50 (1.40)
Full Time 3 Yrs Ago	1.29 (1.35)	1.40 (1.35)
Full Time Next 3 Yrs	1.95 (2.17)	1.42 (1.61)
Graduate Students		
Now	2.68 (3.15)	3.81 (4.13)
Three Yrs Ago	2.95 (3.78)	2.81 (2.94)
Next 3 Yrs	3.00 (3.26)	4.19 (5.03)

Note: Figures are Means and Standard Deviations (in parentheses)

It is clear from these results that there is and has been on the average more tenure track faculty in programs that are accredited than those that are not. With non-tenure track faculty there are on average more non-tenure track faculty today and the plan is to have more in the future; however, that wasn't the case three years ago. With graduate students there is not a clear trend and actually the plans for the next three years favor those programs that are not accredited.

Impact of PreK and P-3 Initiatives on Teacher Education Programs

A series of survey questions dealing with the impact of PreK and P-3 initiative on teacher education programs were asked and the results are presented here. There was a positive relationship between how well public school sites were being used as part of the

respective ECE Teacher Preparation Programs and if the program indicated that the PreK movement impacted their program significantly ($r = .43, p < .005$).

The following occurred in ECE Teacher Preparation Programs if the program indicated that the PreK movement impacted their program significantly, the program was very successful in teaching about the transition into PreK and the transition between PreK and Kindergarten ($r = .40, p < .01$ and $r = .31, p < .05$ respectively).

The following occurred in ECE Teacher Preparation Programs if the program indicated that the P-3 movement impacted their program significantly, the program was very successful in teaching about the transition between grade levels and the transition into PreK ($r = .37, p < .02$ and $r = .35, p < .03$ respectively).

Teacher Education Program Course Offerings

Reviewing the survey responses of course offerings across programs, there were several courses that were related in that they were offered either as full course requirements or that the topic was embedded in a course. Early learning Standards and math methods ($r = .56, p < .0001$), literacy methods ($r = .57, p < .0001$), and physical education methods ($r = .47, p < .003$). K – 12 Standards and math methods ($r = .66, p < .0001$), literacy methods ($r = .65, p < .0001$), science methods ($r = .65, p < .0001$), and social studies methods ($r = .51, p < .001$). On the following page, Table 27 presents correlations between types of fieldwork and types of courses.

Table 27: Fieldwork and Course Correlation

Field Work	Courses									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0.43									
2		0.35								
3			0.31			-0.46				0.38
4				-0.34						
5					0.33					
6						-0.34				
7						-0.34				
8						-0.35				
9						-0.46				0.34
10						-0.41				0.33
11							0.31			
12		0.33	0.31					0.31		
13								0.41		
14									-0.36	
15				-0.33						
16						-0.35				
17								0.36		
18				-0.39						

<u>Field Work</u>	<u>Courses</u>
1 = Infant Toddler Development	1 = Infant Toddler Development
2 = Applied Child Development	2 = Applied Child Development
3 = Physical Education Methods	3 = Physical Education Methods
4 = Child Development	4 = Classroom Management
5 = Play	5 = Health Nutrition
6 = Math Education Methods	6 = Play
7 = Science Education Methods	7 = Early Learning Standards
8 = Literacy Education Methods	8 = Other Education Methods
9 = Art Education Methods	9 = Family School Partnership
10 = Other Education Methods	10 = Educational Policies
11 = K-12 Standards	
12 = Technology	
13 = Family School Community Partnership	
14 = Diversity Culture	p < .05
15 = Music Education Methods	p < .01
16 = Public Policy	
17 = English Language Learners	
18 = Special Education	

All the education methods courses were inter-related: math and science ($r = .95$, $p < .0001$), social studies and math ($r = .59$, $p < .0001$), literacy and social studies ($r = .79$, $p < .0001$), and art and music ($r = .71$, $p < .0001$).

Assessment was inter-related with the following: K-21 standards ($r = .32$, $p < .05$), math methods ($r = .45$, $p < .003$), science methods ($r = .44$, $p < .004$), literacy methods ($r = .45$, $p < .003$), music methods ($r = .43$, $p < .004$), and art methods ($r = .52$, $p < .0001$).

Elementary and ECE Faculty Correlations

Elementary and ECE faculty who had a positive relationship in cooperating across their respective programs succeeded more than those who had a more negative relationship, in teaching about transition into PreK ($t = -2.907$, $p < .02$) and transition between PreK and Kindergarten ($t = -3.162$, $p < .01$).

Results from survey questions regarding the number of courses and the amount of fieldwork related to courses indicated significant correlations between these two areas.

Several survey questions dealt with courses and the perceptions of faculty regarding these courses being offered. The results demonstrate the significant correlations between these two areas as well.

An interesting series of negative relationships was formed between having a course on play and the various methods fieldwork. Having a play course shows a significant negative relationship with physical education methods fieldwork ($r = -.46$; $p < .01$); art education methods fieldwork ($r = -.46$; $p < .01$); other education methods fieldwork ($r = -.41$; $p < .01$); math education methods fieldwork ($r = -.34$; $p < .05$);

science education methods fieldwork ($r = -.34$; $p < .01$); and literacy education methods fieldwork ($r = -.35$; $p < .05$).

An interesting series of positive and negative relationships were found between having specific perceptions regarding preparing new teachers in infant toddler development and having courses on child development and math and science teaching methods. Having perceptions regarding preparing new teachers in infant toddler development shows a significant negative relationship with math education methods courses ($r = -.33$; $p < .05$); science education methods courses ($r = -.32$; $p < .01$); but showed a significant positive relationship with courses in infant toddler development ($r = -.58$; $p < .01$) and child development ($r = .38$; $p < .05$) which would be expected. It is interesting in that this was the only time that perceptions matched with course offerings. These results need further study.

Case Illustrations

In this section we provide six case illustrations of programs. By pulling together information from the questionnaires, interviews and websites for a given program we seek to give a composite picture. We selected the cases to illustrate programs that are working well in different ways at the time of the study. Although every one of the 42 programs shared the same general mission and faced similar complex realities and challenges with similar responses to them, these six cases were chosen because they exemplified particularly well the following positive features that contribute program success:

- ~ High level of engagement and dynamism in program implementation
- ~ Collaboration across departments and even colleges
- ~ Dedicated and experienced faculty
- ~ ECE and elementary programs working together rather than separately
- ~ Strong PreK or early childhood activity at the state level
- ~ Support staff and other resources
- ~ Central administration support

Program I

Background: State's PreK began in 1992 with a pilot program of 750 children who were considered to be 'at risk'. Governor established a state lottery to fund special education projects, one of which was the voluntary PreK for 4 year olds who were disadvantaged to become ready for kindergarten. In 1995 state's PreK was opened to all four year olds, regardless of family income. On July 1, 2004 state became the first state to open a Department of Early Care and Learning "Bright from the Start" to build a coordinated early care and education system. All PreK programs must follow its guidelines. These include PreK content standards, aligned with state's performance standards for kindergarten and state's Early Learning Standards from birth through age three years.

Teaching Certification Bands: PreK to 5th grade; 4th to 8th grade.

College of Education: PreK to 5th Grade

Characteristics: The Department of Elementary and Social Studies Education offers to about 150 students per year the PreK to 5th grade ECE teacher certification four -year undergraduate degree program, and to about 30 students a PreK to 2nd grade emphasis program in partnership with the College of Family and Consumer Science's Department of Child and Family Development. There is also a masters level early childhood certification option. There are seven tenured and four untenured full-time faculty, four of whom are from diverse 'minority status' backgrounds, one part-time non-tenured faculty, one special education faculty, and six graduate assistants. A couple faculty members have shared appointments with Child and Family Development.

Instructional Make-Up: Required courses include methods courses in math, science, social studies, and language and literacy, and courses in technology, assessment, and

special education. Fieldwork is yoked to three ECE courses dealing with orientation to ECE, decision-making, and integrating the curriculum. Student teaching is done in cooperation with about 30 public schools, and now more community centers for preschool field placements. The program makes good use of PreK public schools, and rates itself as good on teaching about transitions between grade levels, but only fair on transitions to PreK and from PreK to kindergarten. The program rates itself as excellent on math and science methods teacher preparation, but as poor on teaching for English language learning, and its course on infant and toddler development. PreK-3rd framework concepts such as pedagogic aligning and coordination of curriculum are achieved through the ECE courses noted above.

Program Changes: There has been much new collaboration with the state department, school districts, and between Departments and Colleges with the University. There is work on creating a clearer connection between coursework and field experiences. There has been since 2007 and faculty retirements that happened then, efforts to help new faculty learn about ECE and the PreK to 2nd grade emphasis program offered in conjunction with the Department of Child and Family Development. Work has been done on improving the ECE core courses. This has been somewhat due to the state's PreK program, and has been impacted strongly by the PreK-3rd grade movement (although it is not clear whether the Bright from the Start initiative in state emphasizes the PreK to third grade framework or only includes it, stressing instead building a early care and education coordinated system from birth to 5 years).

Program Strengths: In state as elsewhere there is a shortage of ECE teachers and ECE is a high demand major and receives attention from state organizations. ECE has great

visibility in the university and state organizations. It is unclear whether upper level administration support exists within the university, but assets include faculty expertise, and collaborations across colleges. Excellent library resources were noted, and there is a masters and doctorate program in ECE, and faculty research in various areas including inclusion, diversity, technology topics, and on family member-teacher relations, teacher-child relations, and family-school-community partnerships. Noted participants in the research were teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators.

Program Plans and Concerns: There is current work on the core, revising the program to better align coursework with field experiences. In the College of Education there is a new vision that emphasizes collaborative inquiry. Because of budget cuts, there is worry that retiring faculty cannot be replaced even though enrollments keep rising. There is some perceived lack of instructional support and coordination. ECE faculty sometimes have experienced that the elementary faculty “do not understand ECE, this is one of our struggles.” Often, methods courses relevant to ECE are taught to ECE undergraduate students by graduate assistants without ECE experiences.

College of Family and Consumer Sciences: PreK to 2nd Grade Emphasis Program

Characteristics: The Department of Child and Family Development runs the PreK to 2nd grade emphasis program (Teacher candidates who successfully complete this program receive PreK to 5th grade certification). This ECE emphasis program began in 1992. The program operates with faculty in the COE within special education. About 30 students are going through the program each semester. They do not take classes together with PreK to 5th grade students. With special education faculty, the Department also offers a “Birth to 5 years” program, in which graduates can work as certified teachers in

PreK and kindergarten classrooms. Three tenured faculties and one non-tenured faculty along with 2 part-time faculty and one graduate assistant run the programs. There also is one faculty from special education who is heavily involved in the program. Two faculties are joint appointed with the College of Education, and teach in the PreK to 5th grade certification program as well. There are two faculty from diverse ‘minority status’ backgrounds.

Instructional Make-Up: Required courses include ones on play, child development, applied child development, methods classes, family, technology, special education, and classroom management. There is a lab school that is used, for children from birth to age four years old. Fieldwork used to include home visits in accord with a family service/social work model, but this has been discontinued due to budget cuts. Program makes excellent use of PreK sites in the public schools and in the community. Field experiences are credited with the way students learn about teamwork, transitions, and aligning and coordinating the curriculum with complementary learning experiences in the home, neighborhood and community. However, teaching about team- work was only rated a “fair.” Rated instruction on transitions to PreK, between PreK and kindergarten, and between grades all ‘excellent’. Model of instruction is PreK to 5th grade methods taught together, and also separate courses highlighting the early years. Faculty works well with the elementary faculty.

Program Changes: The program has not changed very much within the last three years. There were new developments going back to the early 1990s when state was beginning its universal PreK movement. Also, in 1999-2000 there were major program revisions when the university went from a quarter system to a semester system. About this time

the Board of Regents required three math courses that caused the elimination of the family course as it existed at that time. The birth to age 5 program is new, and also working more with the COE faculty involved in the PreK to 2nd grade program. These program developments are not impacted very much by the PreK or the PreK-3rd grade initiatives of interest in this study. Whether the program is influenced much by the state's newer "Bright from the Start" program remains unknown.

Program Strengths: Perceived strengths of the program are varied but strongly linked to personnel. Strengths that were listed include: There is available many state funded pre k classrooms for practicum sites; the pool of candidates enrolled in the existing PreK to 5th program who can chose to become specialized in the PreK to 2nd grade program.; experienced faculty knows the community well, the cooperating teachers, and is allowed to, and can make good matches between candidate teachers and practicum sites; Dedicated faculty can design a good sequence in the program. All of these perceived strengths provide for a strong Department of Child and Family Development

Program Plans and Concerns: Budget cuts. Money problems now dominate. PreK to 2nd grade and the birth to 5 years old programs want to survive. There is some concern that administrators do not understand teacher education. Faculty time is spread too thin. Field supervision is understaffed. There are too many students given faculty resources. In the public schools do not see center times, see great pressure on teachers to perform to get the children scoring high on standardized tests. DAP is not in the public schools because of effects of NCLB. Finally, a concern is the stressful math courses that the students must take, that may look good on their resumes but do not seem to help them be

good teachers. Extra math general education requirements are not worth it, as perceived by the students in the ECE programs.

Program II

Background:

State serves with state dollars birth to threes in a Parents as Teachers initiative and it has since 1998 an At Risk Four-Year-Old Children Preschool Program. In 2006-7 state began a small-scale PreK program and the following year began training teachers on the state's new Early Learning Standards. This decade has seen the Early Childhood Higher Education Option (ECHO) in state, a consortium of university faculty (in special education, early childhood, and some elementary) from public and private IHE s to create TE programs to meet standards for the Early Childhood Unified License: ECHO helps with developing curricula, courses, learning resources to support on-campus instruction.

State Certification Bands: Birth to K; Birth to 3rd Grade; K to 6th Grade.

Program IIa

Characteristics: Located in College of Human Ecology in the School of Family Studies and Human Services. Program is Early Childhood Education. Program is four years, 124 semester hours and is taught by 3 full-time tenured ECE faculty and 5 adjuncts, one of which is from a minority background. Six faculty from Special Education work in the program, and there are 11 graduate assistants. Graduates work with children from birth through age five years. As a Unified Birth through 5 years or K program, it is accredited by both NAEYC and CEC.

Instructional Make-Up: Courses required include child development, family, assessment, special education, and classroom management. Faculty reported excellent instruction on infants and toddlers and inclusive education. Although impact from PreK-3rd framework was not rated as important, and teaching about transitions between grades rated likewise, the program still may prepare students for understanding and applying the developmental continuum from birth through kindergarten through sequenced planned instruction, field experiences, and reflection, and a common educational philosophy of constructivism that threads the entire program. For example, a series of “teacher aiding” opportunities, a name given to student teaching that is before final student teaching, promote opportunities to discover how to teach all children across age/grade levels, including and up to PreK and k in the public schools.

Program Changes: There are new courses and reflective practices including a new kindergarten practicum, all of which integrates content areas attending to individual differences in this new blended or unified program leading to an ECE Generalist with a Unified License (Early childhood special education certification is available with advanced study). There must be inclusive placements. The new program also has pulled out from methods courses run by the elementary, and the students do not go to classes together with elementary students in the K-6 program for elementary teacher certification. Changes are all within the past three years and are not due to PreK to 3 framework trends, but primarily to the new state early childhood unified license, and universal PreK. Undergraduate programs could not go to the fifth year, so College of Education opted not to create a new unified birth to 3rd grade, as did the University, and hence were relieved when the College of Human Ecology responded to the new state

mandate for early childhood unified program up to kindergarten. The College of Education felt it could not do a respectable birth to 3rd grade unified teacher licensure program in a four-year span of time. They were happy that at least they could have some response to the mandate. Heightened appreciation if not respect was given to ECE teacher education faculty on campus as a result, according to the interviewee.

Future changes include more students enrolling in the program because of the PreK and kindergarten credential with special education endorsement, which is attractive to the market, and greater attention to transitions and connectivity between age/grade levels in program instructional delivery. The latter is accord with the ideals of the PreK-3rd grade framework, which was and is supported by ECHO.

Program Strengths: The Lab School is state-of-the-art helping with the program's excellent pre service education in infant and toddler care and education, and inclusive practices training. Excellent faculty research including use of music in social skills development, music and drama therapy, inclusion and diversity; research on teachers, parents, infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. Another asset that was reported is strong administrative support and collegial relations with the college of education, and positive reputation of the faculty.

Program Goals: Increase to up to 33% (from 100 to 150 students) in student enrollments given that state has K to 21 special education, but to now not including the PreK. level for working in the public schools. Hence, new unified teacher's license birth to k is highly attractive to students and is marketable to districts. The faculty in this ECE teacher education program wants to grow in numbers accordingly. Goals also include further

distance education development; it has an on-line masters degree program in ECE.

Another goal is improved collaboration with the College of Education.

Program Concerns: Three concerns noted on the survey were university budget problems, reduced state funding to school districts, and increasing cost of providing care to families. Interview revealed concerns with little kindergarten final student teaching opportunities because COE needs all K placements. Yet program's student teachers earn praise from district teachers for having greater involvement with the children than shown by K-6 student teachers. Concerns were mentioned in the interview about how well DAP is practiced in the public schools. There are new challenges that are recognized in the new program. It was noted how difficult it will be to bring the unified ECE teaching into the public schools up to the third grade, even as this is not the explicit concern of the birth to 5 program. For example, it was reported in the interview that the state's K-6 program in the COE does not have a child development course nor a family course. Multicultural education in the elementary schools embeds the family, putting on equal footing the community library with the family. The K-6 student evaluation form did not have a single item mentioning the family and so the birth-to-5 program created a new category for the family consisting of six items. The K-6 program has considered using this also, but does not have a course or coursework teaching the content covered in the six items.

Program IIb

Characteristics: Birth to 3rd Early Childhood Unified License is earned in a 126 semester hours bachelor of science degree program plus 18 graduate hours in a fifth year. Students move into a masters program and receive the teacher's license at the end of the fifth year.

The program is housed in the School of Education in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, and in the Graduate Licensure Program. There are two full-time tenure line faculty running the program, both also in special education. There are five graduate assistants.

Instructional Make-Up: Full courses that are required include child development, infant toddler development, applied child development, a number of subject matter methods courses such as math and science, and courses on family, technology, special education, assessment, and diversity. Reported field placements included diversity and inclusive education ones, and sites covering a range of age/grade levels. Good use was being made of PreK/p-3 schools in terms of placements.

Program Changes: A whole new sequence of courses is offered because of the new licensure. The new blended license required a complete revision of the program and its courses. ECHO was started in 2004 and is behind the new state early childhood education unified teacher licensures; ECHO is advocated by special and early educators and some elementary to blend early, special and primary education up to grade three. There is a new curriculum course on integrating content and individualizing instruction, and two courses on methods that are new in the birth to 3rd grade early childhood unified program.

Program Strengths: An asset is good supervision from an endowment that adds 18 thousand dollars per year to the placement office. There are many field experiences with resources behind them. A supportive administration encourages research and practice around the use of technology, and the use of interactive video conferencing. This assists the strong program of field experience in urban, suburban, and rural settings. Another

strength is the focus on partnerships with families., and all learners particularly those with special needs.

Program Concerns: Noted on the survey were the need for true full linkage and partnership with grades 1 to 3 faculty partners, as well as the recession economy and the declining resources for faculty positions and resources needed to support well extended field experiences. There is a concern to change the older policy of allowing any teacher license to allow one to teach young children in the public schools. There is advocacy to get parent educators in public schools the same pay as other teachers, including the 4 year olds at risk teachers who now have pay equity with other teachers. Relations with K-6 have problems, for example poor attitudes by elementary faculty thinking that increased interest in ECE by students is due to the view that the courses are easier. There is concern that students in the birth to 3rd grade program have to take methods courses with content up to teaching sixth grade, because they are in these courses with K-6 students and K-6 teacher educators.

Conclusion: Both University I and University II are alike with their excellent programs preparing new teachers to work in inclusive settings, and making good use of PreK practicum sites. The program with the smaller faculty, University II, interestingly has a doctoral program. Both programs voiced similar concerns relating to the economy, and the need for deeper and more authentic and functional relations with the elementary teacher education faculty. Both programs' survey and interview responses suggested that having more viable and positive ECE presence in the public schools remains problematic and there is much room to improve in this area.

Program III

Background: In the state, local school boards began to offer preschool education programs for 3- and 4-year-olds in 1983 as part of a revision to the Public School Early Childhood Education Initiative. In 2002, expansion of the program occurred to provide for the mandate that prekindergarten available to all 4-year-olds in the state by the 2012-2013 school year. The state has successfully increased the number of 4 year olds served and offers programs in all school districts. However, the increase in services to 4 year olds has decreased the access to services by 3 year olds. The state is working with all 55 counties to increase access and services to 3 year olds and 4 year olds as well as ensure that the classroom developed meet the state's quality standards. The program is now called Universal PreK System. (Retrieved from NIER Yearbook, 2008, July 30, 2009)

Characteristics: The Early Childhood program is in the same college unit as the Elementary Education program but the two programs run separately. Recent changes in the overall structure have also moved the Child Development program over the same college, it too runs independently and does not provide early childhood certification. The Early Childhood Education program in the college of Education program is oriented towards developing an understanding of developmentally appropriate, research-based methods of teaching and assessing young children, age's birth to eight years. The initial certification program in Early Childhood Education includes study of international early childhood education programs from Reggio Emilia Preschools [Italy], Montessori Schools [Italy], Forest Kindergartens [Germany & Austria], Head Start Programs [USA], and a wide variety of program models used across the United States and the world. (Retrieved from college website (May 20, 2009))

Instructional Make-Up: There is a strong focus on emergent literacy looking at teacher education then look at requirements and content related to emergent literacy. Efforts are made to emphasize the need to support all types of communication and what young children can do. Faculty has traveled to learn new approaches. Last semester included a trip to Italy to learn about Montessori math. Math is currently a major focus as faculty strives to create meaningful learning. A major program goal is to assist future teachers in developing a repertoire of teaching possibilities in different ways instead of one way of teaching. In relationship to the Elementary program, it is the same program- all courses are for everyone—there are two additional ECE courses, they also take the method courses. All the programs work independently – even with the Elementary program, students take the same classes, but The Early Childhood program is arranged to and maintain an independent program.

Program Changes: In light of the PreK-3rd movement and changes in state certifications, the programs biggest impact is from the state with the mandate for preschool that requires universal PreK for all children 2012. There is currently a surge for professionals needed certification because centers want certified teacher to answer the need we have developed evening courses, summer courses and independent work. The largest major is always Elementary Ed/ECE .

In regards to programmatic changes, we are focusing on emergent literacy looking at teacher education then look at requirements and content related to emergent literacy. Help support all types of communication and what young children can do. Last semester we went to Rome to learn about Montessori math. Also looking at Math—creating meaningful learning. Developing at repertoire of teaching possibilities in different ways

instead of one way of teaching. Another welcome change is in administration at the college unit level with a new Dean. The college has an interim dean for an extended period and the program did not develop during that time. The new dean is supportive of the program and providing resources to meet the needs for more teachers, as Universal PreK gets closer. A welcome approval of faculty member hire will help in the preparation of ECE teachers.

Program Strengths: The general method courses include this content also case studies in the field experience. ALL method courses are linked to field -work. There is an explicit connection of research to practice. The program strives to emphasize concepts of developmental appropriate practice, international models and giving students a global perspective.

Another strength is the programs strong collaborative relationship with area school districts. The program participants in several professional development school programs so the teacher candidates my experience the full value of their pre-service experience. Teacher candidates have opportunities for field placement in infant toddler, preschool and primary grade settings. Faculty members consult and participate in district developments and problems.

Program Plans and Concerns: Plans include a faculty hire to assist in the development and implementation of the early childhood baccalaureate program and certification preparation. The large influx of teachers anticipated for the Universal K program has the program pressed to develop courses on line and work to address the needs of teachers in the state.

Program IV

Background: Presently, the early childhood teacher education program and the teacher education program for elementary teachers are totally separate programs. There is a birth to kindergarten certificate and a kindergarten to 6th grade certificate. There is discussion about a birth to 3rd grade certificate. Early childhood teacher candidates do not necessarily learn about coordinating curriculum and instruction through the education system from PreK-3rd grade however that is changing with the First School Initiative. Faculty is testing the waters with a project approach curriculum between early childhood and Elementary Education.

Birth–Kindergarten certificate and Kindergarten–6th Grade certificate

Characteristics: University offers a Bachelor of Arts in Education degree (A.B.Ed.) in Child Development and Family Studies (Birth-Kindergarten) out of the School of Education. The program has four core faculty and two additional faculty members. There are currently 30 students in the program. The School of Education also offers a separate A.B.Ed in Elementary Education (focusing on grades K-6th grade). This program has twelve-core faculty, two additional faculty, two lecturers and multiple teaching assistants. Both of these degrees prepare the students enrolled for licensure.

Instructional Make-Up: The degree in Child Development and Family Studies requires 121 semester-hours. General college requirement classes make up sixty of these hours. Typically in the junior and senior years of their degree, students complete sixty-one credits of Child Development and Family Studies courses. These classes include, but are not limited to, courses in child development, family studies, assessment and intervention, and literacy. Of these sixty-one credits, twelve of the credits are received in one of two

specialized areas: Community Resource Facilitation and Development or Infant and Child Development. Students complete three semesters of internship. During their first semester, students complete an internship within either an infant or toddler classroom. The next internship is with the preschool and kindergarten age group. Their final internship is full-time and takes place in a preschool and kindergarten classroom.

Program Changes: The University recently hired a new associate professor of early childhood education at the School of Education and who will serve as a Fellow at the Child Development Institute. In filling this joint position, the incumbent will be responsible for providing leadership in linking First School Initiative with the School of Education's teacher education programs. First School is a new vision for seamless early schooling of three- to eight-year-old children which provides a framework for integrating the best of early childhood and Elementary Education. First School is being developed through a partnership among families, schools, the community, and the University.

Program Strengths: The First School Initiative is an innovative approach to seamless education addressing collaboration across professional and institutional settings; examining greater communication and collaboration across home, school and community settings to insure greater coherence and continuity across the preschool and primary grades; and exploring the potentials of inquiry-oriented curriculum to support children's home-school transitions and involve children's families in their early education.

Program Plans and Concerns: Faculty from across the state are part of a Consortium of Higher Education and an Early Childhood Task Force. Community colleges and school principals are working together. There is cooperation between Early Childhood and Elementary and the Child Development Institute, between Human Development and

Psychology within the School of Education, and with Allied Health and Communication departments. A report will be submitted to the State Department responsible for teacher licensing programs that will discuss the results of the First School Initiative. A professional development committee has been formed to bring faculty together in order to re-think the pre-service professional from PreK-3rd.

Program VII

Background: University started Early Childhood Four-Year-Old Program in 1980 and in 1998 became the second state to have universal voluntary free PreK to all its 4-year-olds. During the 2006-2007 academic year university began the Pilot Early Childhood Program for some children in the birth to three –year- old age range, with plans to expand this infant/toddler program with state, local and private funds. The Early Childhood Four-Year-Old Program has new partnerships between public schools and highest rated (three stars) child care facilities using various incentives such as tax free purchases of learning materials.

State Certification Bands: PreK-3rd Grade; Elementary is 1-8th Grade.

Characteristics: University offers a B.S. out of its College of Education, Department of Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum with certification in PreK-3rd grade. A newer ECE teacher preparation program now exists at Campus I, created by a generous donation motivated by the desire to promote quality infant/toddler teachers who eventually can become certified by the state. This donation provided for three ECE faculty, including one endowed chair in ECE, scholarships for students, and a new Infant to Three Year Olds Center used for teacher training, research, and family service in its

child care and education function. The Campus II faculty, the participants of this research, has two ECE faculty, more students than Campus I, along with two adjuncts or non-tenure associated faculty, two special education faculty, and six graduate assistants. Campus II's ECE program includes study for a masters and doctorate in ECE.

Instructional Make-Up: Courses required for the PreK-3rd Grade teaching certificate include Child Development, various Methods courses, Technology, Special Education, and Health and Nutrition. While the Elementary candidate teachers go through the program in cohorts of 55, the Early Childhood students are in groups or cohorts of 35 at the first campus. The final student teaching is divided into 8 weeks at the kindergarten level or below, and 8 weeks in grades 1,2, or 3. There are diverse field experiences in a variety of settings, including inclusive classrooms, and programs serving diverse learners from various backgrounds including Native Americans, and Hispanics. The program makes excellent use of public school PreK sites and has its methods courses shared with the elementary program. While the program over-all is in a state of change, with great efforts to coordinate and create similar programs across the two campuses, in common is a new strong emphasis on preparing new teachers to work with infants and toddlers.

Second campus has the new infant-toddler lab school, plus the city has a new (opening in 2009) Educare Center that serves between 150 and 200 of the community's at risk children from birth to 5 years and their families. In Educare Centers infants and toddlers make up about a third of the enrollments. They are part of the Bounce Learning Network of Educare Centers and seek to become within communities a "Head Start to the second power" and as such are a wonderful resource for the ECE teacher-training program at the

first campus. Second campus is also increasing its collaborations with infant/toddler programs.

Educare coming to Campus I has been inspirational, and the new Infant-Toddler Center as well, in underscoring the desirability of collaborations and partnerships to assist in preparing new teachers to possess a knowledge base and skill set relating to transitions, and alignments, and team work. Faculty rated themselves as good in the area of preparing students regarding transitions into PreK and between PreK and kindergarten, but they rated themselves poor in the area of transitions between grades.

Program Changes: Over the years the PreK movement in the public schools has had and continues to play a strong role in this University's ECE teacher preparation program. To a lesser extent has the PreK-3rd framework initiative been influential. Now the changes are focused on creating a new infant/toddler course, and up-dating and improving the whole ECE teacher preparation program, putting stronger emphasis on teacher leadership and professional dispositions training, and being ready to meet NAEYC accreditation standards. Changes include a new 15 hours practicum working with infants, and a capstone course on implementing integrated curriculum. Program is attracting more students due to good press about the areas' public schooling for 4-year-olds, and the new Educare Center, and the new infant-toddler center. The state's Pilot Early Childhood Program (birth to 3-year-olds) has also been influential to cause change or awareness for need for change in the ECE teacher-training program.

Program Strengths: Second campus listed on the survey these three strengths: campus preschool lab, strong relationship with the public schools, and upper administration recognition. Reference was made to the recent growth and development of the first

campus ECE teacher preparation program as previously noted. Assets at Campus II include the masters and doctorate programs, with research on inclusion, and the strong relationship with elementary in the area of language and literacy (only methods course rated as “excellent” whereas others were rated as “good”).

Program Plans and Concerns: Program plans include pulling together the faculties and aligning the ECE teacher preparations programs at both campuses with NAEYC accreditation standards. Faculty wants the same program across campuses with emphasis on infants. Their website notes TE-PLUS for Teacher Education that emphasizes PLUS which stands for Professionalism, Leadership, Understanding, and Scholarship. New teachers should possess abilities for these roles: teacher as educator, teacher as communicator, teacher as decision-maker, teacher as scholar, teacher as action researcher, and teacher as leader.

Program concerns include the split final student teaching with 8 weeks before primary grades and 8 weeks in primary grade classrooms, and finding good placement sites. Noted also was difficulty in hiring ECE/Elementary faculty with particular curricular focus. Currently the PreK-3rd grade teacher candidates take a course in methods in social studies, for example, that includes content up to the 8th grade. Program needs to improve on transitions between grade levels, and the faculty in ECE and Elementary do not work together, although they also do not put up barriers against each other. It was said in the interview that the elementary teacher education faculty does not understand ECE.

Program VIII

Background: In 2006-2007 this state's PreK Initiative was in its second year of operation, with a budget of \$6.7million serving more than 2000 children, with funding increases for helping an additional number of 1, 375 children served during 2007-2008. During 2006-2007 school year, all staff members were trained to use the state's PreK Observational Assessment and were later implemented through out all programs. State prekindergarten programs operate primarily to provide center-based early childhood services to 4 year-olds. There are no specific mandated requirements; except two-thirds of children enrolled in the program must reside in the attendance zone of a Title 1 Elementary school.

The state also provides funding for school programs, in areas where a large percentage of school children are unable to meet the reading and math standards set by No Child Left Behind. Fifty percent of these children are enrolled in public school programs and the other fifty percent are in a variety of setting— family care home, community and municipal child care providers, Head Start programs, universities and a Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Funding is allotted based on competition; half-day funding streams are usually directed towards kindergarteners.

Besides the PreK initiative the state also funds the Child Development Program that facilitates family support services, home visits, and preschool education, mostly for at-risk children from birth to age 3 who do not meet the eligibility requirements set by other programs, but are faced with certain risk factors such as having a teen parent, poverty and homelessness. In recent years due to funding cuts fewer than one percent of the 3 year olds are being served.

In addition to the two programs, the state also funds Head Start like and Head Start programs to provide supplemental services.

Teaching Certification Bands: Birth to 3rd Grade, and K-8th Grade

College of Education: Birth to 3rd Grade

Characteristics: The Department of Individual, Family & Community Education (IFCE) offers 40-60 students per year the Birth to 3rd Grade Early Childhood Multicultural Education (ECME) teacher certification four year undergraduate program.

There is also a master's program that is part of Master of Arts in Elementary Education Program with concentration in Early Childhood Education. However, the Elementary Education program although is part of the College of Education, is housed in the Department of Teacher Education.

In other words, ECE and Elementary Education are two separate, intact programs located in two different departments. The early childhood TE program is competency based while the elementary program has more of a methods focus. The early childhood curriculum courses have methods introduced but the emphasis is on how to integrate the methods rather than an emphasis on the methods themselves.

There are three additional courses offered as part of the early childhood major that is not part of the licensing requirements: 1) Research and Evaluation; 2) Social, Cultural ; 3) Early childhood advocacy and public policy.

Within the Department of Individual, Family & Community Education (IFCE), besides the Early Childhood Multicultural Education (ECME) program, there are four other programs 1) Counselor Education 2) Educational Psychology 3) Family Studies and 4) Nutrition Program.

In the Department of Teacher Education, besides Elementary Education Program there is 1) Secondary Education Program and 2) Mathematics, Science, Environmental, and Technology Education Program (MSET):

The Special Education Program is part of the College of Education and is under the Department of Educational Specialties, where 1) Art Education 2) APS/UNM Partnership Program in Mental Retardation & Severe Disabilities Partnership and 3) Educational Diagnostician Preparation Program are also housed.

There are four full-time faculty members who teach courses in the ECE program. Instructional Make-Up: Early Childhood Multicultural Education (ECME) leads to licensure for teachers working with children from birth to age eight in classrooms that include children who are developing both typically and atypically.

The program is developed and supported by content from child development, curriculum and instruction, family studies, language and literacy, special education, nutrition, physical education and health education. Emphasizing multicultural education the program prepares professionals to work with young children and their families from a variety of cultural backgrounds.

Prospective early childhood teachers are expected to complete 57 hours of general education, 75 hours of professional early childhood education that includes 42 hours of coursework, 9 hours of supervised practicum, and 12 hours of student teaching as per the Public Education Department requirement.

Students learn about coordinating curriculum and instruction and this is followed up in the practicum classes culminating in the student teaching experience. In student

teaching there is a student portfolio that consists of competency statements dealing with above-mentioned topics. It is a self-narrative/assessment that the student completes.

Main focus is on integration of curriculum and this is followed up in the practicum classes that ECE students take. Coordination and alignment of curriculum, assessment, instruction and standards, diversity and inclusion are included in classes or have separate classes devoted to these topics. Admission to the Early Childhood Multicultural Education program requires a cumulative grade point average of 2.50 and a minimum of 26 credit hours. All upper division ECME courses (300 & 400 level) must be passed with a B or better.

In addition, prior to admission students are required to obtain a passing score on the Teacher Assessment Test–Basic Skills. Students are required to complete 30 hours of practicum per credit hour and do their student teaching in programs approved placements. Upon fulfilling all the requirements and successful completion of the program and students may apply to the State Department of Education for a Level 1 license.

Program Changes: Every 5-7 years a review of licensing requirements occur which leads to changes. These changes are suggested by a Higher Education Task Force for Early Childhood Education which the University is part of. All 2 year and 4 year colleges are also part of this group.

The latest changes were made in 2006 and it involved new curriculum courses and field experiences to be offered in each year that the student is in the program, as a freshman, sophomore, junior and senior. The changes that occurred with courses was more related to the course content than to proposed new courses. There have been no changes in response to PreK/PreK-3rd.

Program Strengths: The University has over the years collaborated with other universities and with early childhood professionals to assist the state Office of Child Development in instituting many of the changes for the PreK and PreK-3rd initiative. There are many partnerships with the public schools and local programs that are well established and have been in place for many years. There is outreach to Head Start, Native American programs and to the City of Albuquerque Child Development Centers. There is a good deal of cooperation between the ECE faculty and special education, health, and nutrition faculty and as guest speakers would visit each other's classrooms.

Students are offered placements for practicum in PreK sites. There is a kindergarten summer institute offered to all PreK teachers. There is a 45 hour course at the entry level that is competency based which is focused upon the common core content all the state universities have been working on.

The University Administration refers to the P-12 program, rather than the K-12 program. Early childhood is very visible in the state because of the PreK and PreK-3rd initiatives with a Children's Cabinet at the state level.

Program Plans and Concerns: There are plans to establish four areas of concentration within the Baccalaureate program: 1) Birth to age 4; 2) Age 3 to Grade 3; 3) Family and Infant/Toddler; and 4) Early Childhood Administrators. There are awaiting state approval for this change. There are also plans to establish a new Master's program in early childhood studies that would have five areas of specialization, and tie that master's program to an alternative license/certification program. Changes that have occurred in the state government have proven to be a major impediment and made it more difficult to get the licensing requirements approved in a timely fashion.

Suggested improvements include moving student teaching from a semester program to a full year program and make it more realistic for students. Another concern was in reference to student entering from community colleges and shed light on lack of preparedness in taking advanced courses at the university. More collaboration between upper and lower division programs is needed.

There are no new resources, the program was designed to run with four tenure-track faculty members, and that is how it has been. However having adequate number of staff members has become a major problem causing faculty members shouldering administrative duties. There had been attitudinal barriers in the past, but since 2006 they no longer exist. In addition, convincing university administrators the need for adequate number of clinical supervisors to monitor students during pre-student and student teaching is yet another challenge faculty members are trying to cope. Over all, it is an excellent early childhood teacher preparation program.

Case Illustration Summary

These eight case illustrations of ECE TE programs show the positive characteristics noted in introducing them. Reading through them one is impressed with the variety of ways one can detect the commitment and motivation to carry out program objectives and aims, and the range of different solutions to the same or similar problems. The programs show dynamic and adaptive responses to significant challenges, typically involving faculty cooperation between ECE and elementary TE programs as well as collaboration across departments and even colleges. Committed and experienced ECE faculty, even if relatively small in number compared to other faculty at a teacher preparation IHE, have designed and are implementing very successful programs, especially with central administration support and when staff and other resources are available.

Significant state-level contextual features are seen in the program examples. These features are external to the IHE and are governmental or from the private sector or both. For example, case illustration six described the strong visibility of ECE in the state and the establishment of an Office of Child Development and a Children's Cabinet; case illustration three noted the history of PreK going back to 1983 in their state and the Universal PreK by 2012 mandate as now having a great influence on their ECE TE program. Case illustration two showed how the ECHO initiative over several years worked to bring together a new license unifying early special education and ECE in one state. A network of EDUCARE programs led to the emphasis in infant and toddler TE in case illustration five; FirstSchools in case illustration four fosters collaboration across schools, communities and the IHE in an effort to connect ECE with K-Primary Grade

education—which is strongly impacting ECE TE. All these and other developments at the state level are affecting how ECE TE programs are working to prepare teachers of young children.

The case illustrations also demonstrate a variety of ways that programs are meeting national state ECE TE standards. For example, case illustration six shows a strong response to the need to foster multicultural competency in new teachers; case illustration two is particularly noteworthy as an example to prepare teachers for working in inclusive educational settings. In addition, these programs show that they are developing, becoming more differentiated or specialized, to keep up with the new realities teachers face when they work in public school settings. The influence of PreK and PreK-3rd on them is evident even as there is concern for preparing teachers to work in community settings as well, and outside the 3 to 8 years age range.

As strong as the eight ECE TE programs represented in these six case illustrations are, they are not immune from imperfections or having to make adjustments and compromises along the way. For instance, case illustration five had to split final student teaching into two halves against its better judgment—8 weeks student teaching in a pre-primary site and 8 weeks spent teaching in a primary grade site. As a second example, case illustration one confessed a concern with having some methods courses enrolled by ECE and elementary and even middle school teacher candidates all together, not the best way of preparing ECE teachers for the exact ages and grades of learners. This represents an inappropriate fusion of ECE and elementary TE, a state of affairs that is neither authentic nor functional. In general, however, the quality of the ECE TE programs in these case illustrations is very good. Even superb programs are constrained by the

realities of all TE programs, having to work within the parameters on particular circumstances.

Another noteworthy aspect is that quality ECE TE programs are intentional towards a philosophy or operate within an articulated conceptual framework., something Lee Shulman(2006) has called ‘signature pedagogy’. Case illustration five is a good example with its TE-PLUS for *Professionalism, Leadership, Understanding, and Scholarship*. This program aspires to prepare teachers as educators, communicators, decision-makers, scholars, action researchers, and leaders.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study of 42 ECE TE programs at major universities in 38 PreK states focused on courses and fieldwork and various context features and how and why they have changes in the preceding three years, with special reference to impacts of the PreK and PreK-3rd movements in public education. In addition, the study provided information about program plans and concerns, with special reference to resource supports and needs as well as the ECE program's relationship to the Elementary Education program. This section discusses four major themes that emerged from the findings and then offers some recommendations to improve ECE and elementary TE programs at major research universities across the nation.

Voices of the ECE TE Programs: Standards, Inclusion, and Diversity Education

This study demonstrated a considerable range of programs when examining them with respect to faculty size and make-up (*e.g.* full-time positions, adjunct, diversity status, etc.), as well as the actual programs offered. ECE TE programs most often were housed in Colleges of Education (N=24 out of 42). As to the composition of coursework and practicum, we found quite an array of offerings as detailed in the preceding section and in the appendices of this document. Cutting through this diversity and within program variation, however, we are left with the distinct impression that ECE TE at the IHE in this study are meeting national standards and are making definite progress in responding to the challenges we face as a nation in preparing teachers for the 21st century to work in inclusive settings and with diverse children.

Clearly the ECE TE programs have been designed and implemented with national standards in mind. The coursework and field experiences of all of the programs studies

cover the key areas of child development and family relations, for example. Similarly, coursework in math, science, and literacy is consistently found, as would be expected. The highest average rating of 3.59 out of 4(excellent) for perceptions of how good a job a program was going in different areas was given for language and literacy. This may have been due to the decade's influence of NCLB and the premium put on preparing teachers to teach reading. Noteworthy also is the inclusion of program content emphasizing early learning, K-12 learning standards, assessment, technology, and professional ethics. Although some topics no doubt deserve more attention (*e.g.* infant-toddler development, professional leadership and advocacy), the respondents were generally aware of these program limitations and desired to improve coverage of neglected topics when possible. In all, the ECE TE programs were keeping up with the national standards.

This positive quality of adhering to national and state standards and aspiring to improve is evident in the ECE TE programs' responses to the mandate for new teachers to be effective when working with all children and their families. This study yielded findings that programs are very concerned about helping new teachers become prepared for working with children with exceptionalities and special education needs; the importance of teaching in inclusive settings was apparent. Not only were courses and field experiences devoted to these subjects, but also faculty research was reported to be on inclusion more than any other research topic.

Likewise, the ECE TE programs, to varying degrees, were also concerned with preparing new teachers to work with other multiple diversities in addition to the ability diversity which special education entails. Pre-service education needs to promote better understanding and skills in new teachers to work with culturally, ethnically, social class

and linguistically (language and dialect differences) diverse children. This awareness was noted by the programs in the courses and practica offered, as well as in the research agenda of the faculty.

Faculty dedication was expressed to the ideals of meeting and surpassing standards and expectations in the above areas of early learning, working with families, special education and multiple diversities. ECE TE faculty often saw themselves as an indicator of program strength and noted their research and commitment to teaching. One program with a small ECE TE faculty held retreats periodically over each semester for a half day, without compensation, funding or recognition, but with the expressed intent of self and program improvement. Another ECE TE program with faculty size shrunk to three from nine in just a matter of a few years still found time to in-service elementary TE faculty in ECE in general and DAP in particular.

PreK and PreK-3rd

About half the ECE TE programs reported impacts of the PreK and the PreK-3rd movements on program changes within the past three years, with the former movement more noticeable than the latter movement. The moderating factor is how recent the state began to emphasize public funds and programs in school and in communities for preschool children. Program changes are due to a host of other reasons as well, such as a state's adoption of early learning standards or a new teaching license or certification bands. Still, we can conclude that programs were affected by PreK and to a lesser extent PreK-3rd.

The clearest sign of PreK influencing program development is the response to the interview question about how new teachers are being prepared for working in PreK-3rd

settings. All programs immediately grasped the significance of what was being asked (although one informant confessed to not hearing about the PreK-3rd initiative due to being out of the country on sabbatical) and, as we report in the previous section and in the appendices, they came up with a variety of good and perhaps not so good answers-- such as in teamwork and coordination coursework, efforts to align program with NAEYC's TE standards, getting students into diverse settings, etc.. Many program features were mentioned as relevant to preparing teachers to work in the PreK-3rd setting. We unfortunately could not probe for explanations as to how certain cited features could have this desired outcome.

On the other hand, noteworthy is the finding that the least favorable self-perceptions were in the area of instructing teacher candidates about transitions: Into PreK, Between PreK and K, and Between Grades. In order to better prepare new teachers for the PreK-3rd approach to school organization, greater attention needs to be given to transitions. In addition, coursework and field experiences dedicated to team-building and collaboration across the PreK-3rd continuum would be necessary.

The ECE TE programs expressed themselves in various ways to suggest that other issues besides PreK and PreK-3rd are important to their vision and mission. Even as there is growing recognition of the importance of preparing teachers to work in the public schools with three- and four- year olds, and to know how to teach in a PreK-3rd framework, ECE TE programs stay committed to traditional goals as well. These include preparing teachers to work with infants and toddlers, teaching in non-public school settings, and instilling values such as social justice, concerns about compensation, adaptive leadership, and multicultural competence. While heralding the importance of

PreK and PreK-3rd, ECE TE programs see these two movements within the broader context of these other concerns.

Faculty Challenges

ECE TE face significant challenges and operate under stressful constraints. Relative to Elementary Education TE faculty, ECE TE faculty is small in size. Consequently, ECE TE faculty have to cope with more limited human capital than elementary TE faculty, often having less influence when decisions are made because of their minority group status in those departments that house both faculties. At research universities pressure exists for faculty to have external grants and to engage in research and publish in peer reviewed journals. ECE faculty few in number have little wiggle room in coping with the important task of juggling their research obligations with running a TE program.

Shrinking budgets are now a primary concern. Fiscal constraints restrain the recruitment of new faculty members; positions are not being filled when faculty leave the program. ECE TE faculty members report having to work harder, longer hours and having to take on additional responsibilities. In some programs, lack of higher education administrative support as well as understaffing forced ECE TE faculty to work longer hours doing paper work, leaving less time for research.

Another faculty challenge in many programs is the reliance on work carried out by adjuncts and not tenure line staff. ECE TE programs have a limited number of full positions. Under such circumstances, establishing consistent instructional practices is problematic. Opportunities for interaction among faculty members to plan and

implement programs are limited, adversely impacting program quality; there is also pressure from the central administration to keep TE programs under four years.

Access to quality field placement sites is another major faculty concern. A shortage of field supervisors and cooperating teachers besets many programs. Field placements are bound by restrictions, once the placement was set-up it is difficult to move the student elsewhere. In addition, since ECE TE programs offer only a limited number of field visits, some faculty help their students by making additional visits to field sites, at their own time and expense.

Tensions Between ECE and Elementary TE

ECE TE programs displayed varying relations with their elementary counterparts. Many times the relationship could be described as a form of parallel play; many programs appeared as separate or as functioning in a relatively independent way. To be sure, a fair number of times the situation came across as having a favorable cooperative quality. However, a similar number of times there appeared an unfavorable quality. Usually, the relation of ECE program or faculty with elementary program or faculty seemed of mixed quality—in some ways okay or good, in other ways not so good or indifferent or irrelevant.

There are points of tension that can and do exist between ECE and elementary TE programs (and by extension in the public schools) and these need to be recognized. From our research, seven sources of this tension were noted across the 42 ECE TE programs studied. Each source of conflict or perceived conflict or tension was heard at least once in the interviews.

1. *How well DAP is seen in the public schools.* More than a few times examples were given about the conflict between what teacher candidates are taught in the ECE TE program and what they will encounter in the public school placements where often there is academic focus and teacher directed emphasize that can become antithetical to DAP and ECE values.

2. *What's missing in elementary TE; competition in shared placement sites* At times informants noted that the elementary TE program at the IHE did not have any longer the family-school-community course ,or never did; child development was missing. ECE TE programs bowed to elementary TE control over placement sites or had to encounter sharing them and having their student teachers with others with a different background and orientation to teaching.

3. *Lumping methods courses and inappropriate instructors* A problem was repeatedly noted that ECE candidate teachers were forced to take methods classes serving an age/grade range beyond third grade; instructors, often graduate students, lacked any background in ECE.

4. *Left out of PDS* One informant mentioned needing to petition to have ECE TE undergraduates become part of their IHE Professional Development School. This tension surfaces when both the school district and the IHE TE program are dominated by a K-12 mentality that deliberately excludes ECE.

5. *Disrespectful attitude* Reports of rumors that ECE enrollments are growing because it is an easier program than the elementary TE program. In the public schools the notion that poor teachers will be reassigned to a lower grade. Transition practices and sharing

information not that important because the preschool teacher is not really teaching anyway, just minding little babies.

6. *Philosophical differences* Often heard is that ECE TE operates in accord with a child-centered philosophy, and the elementary TE program is content-centered.

7. *Different Professional Identities* ECE TE faculty engage in different state-level professional development activities than do elementary TE faculty, both as consumers and producers or professional development instructors. The two faculties read different literature, subscribe to different journals, join different professional organizations, and in general have different traditions and histories. Consequently, there lacks opportunities for professional networking and the formation of friendships.

Recommendations

These recommendations are offered with understanding that further research is needed to evaluate ECE TE programs in other settings, including four-year colleges and private institutions. In addition, further research is needed examining program changes and faculty plans and concerns from the point of view of elementary TE.

The recommendations that follow are directed primarily towards administrators, educational leaders and policy-makers within major public research universities. Deans, associate deans of teacher education, and department and division chairs and their elementary and ECE TE faculty are the intended audience. The recommendations are also meant to be heard by state officials and policy-makers involved with ECE and higher education.

1. Refocusing, Redefining, and Recognizing ECE as a Distinct Discipline Area

We must not view ECE TE as an appendage or part of elementary TE. Unfortunately this has been the case all too often in IHE, perhaps mainly because the ECE faculty have been dwarfed by elementary ones in size, power, and resources. ECE TE programs are piggybacked on elementary programs, acquiring a stepchild status within departments.

Ironically, this is not the case in public policy and state programs outside public education where ECE is seen as a separate area. As states such as PA move away from over-lapping teacher certifications, which have reinforced elementary TE dominance over ECE TE, the need to appreciate ECE as a separate field is brought into sharp relief.

Paradoxically, ECE must be seen as part of elementary and as separate from elementary TE. This refocusing of ECE TE is needed in order for PreK and PreK-3rd

reform efforts in public education to succeed. Moreover, equally important and paradoxical, the elementary TE program must be re-conceptualized as part of the ECE TE program, as well as a program separate when preparing new teachers for the intermediate grades.

Redefining ECE and elementary TE programs within IHE in this way will not be easy due to their different traditions. However, we must strive towards this new, dialectical relationship to fulfill the critical needs to prepare new teachers for inclusion and multiple diversities. Moreover, refocusing ECE TE and forming synergistic relationships with elementary TE can serve the aim of meeting national TE standards with their new attention to the applied developmental foundations of education. Of course, preparing teachers for PreK and PreK-3rd in public education stands to gain from this redefining of ECE and elementary TE in IHE. The reason for the gain is that this redefinition is conducive to preparing and supporting effective and sensitive teachers for our changing and pluralistic society.

2. Central Administration Support AND Leadership

Immediate attention to the ECE TE faculty shortages is required. As public schools serve ever increasing numbers of preschoolers, and with increasing numbers of districts nation-wide converting to the PreK-3rd approach to school organization, a greater number of ECE TE specialists is needed in higher education, especially at the research university level. Here graduate programs in ECE exist that prepare the faculty and staff for two- and four- year ECE TE programs in IHE. ECE TE faculty at major research university, accordingly, are impacting the ECE work force through both their

undergraduate teacher preparation programs and their masters and doctoral programs that produce ECE teacher educators for two- and four- year IHE.

Resources need to be re-directed for new tenure lines in ECE TE faculties at major research universities. Graduate assistants should be recruited who also have ECE backgrounds. A priority must continue to be given to minority recruitment. Moreover, both ECE generalists and specialists are needed, to teach introductory ECE courses and courses on family-school-community partnerships, curriculum models, assessment, professional leadership and advocacy and other basic coursework in ECE. ECE specialists, those with background in ECE plus another important area such as early special education, diversity education, or one or more of the content areas of math, science, social studies, music, art, language and literacy and so forth, are also greatly needed.

State-level and university central administration attention is urgently needed to address the resource needs of shifting TE faculties to meet the challenges of properly preparing teachers for working with young children and their families in our schools. Eventually, the K-12 model will change to a P-12 model of basic education; and the support and leadership of IHE is required for successful adaptation to the new realities of public education. Not only new teachers but also principals, school counselors, school psychologists and special educators and other personnel must be educated for P-12, and not K-12 basic education. All must be good active scholars in their subjects, in pedagogy, and development. This vision can only become a reality with major changes in funding priorities by states and the central administration of IHE; otherwise this vision remains a hallucination or, at best, an idea ahead of its time.

3. Enhanced Opportunities for Collaboration between ECE and Elementary TE

State and university policies and practices need to support and provide leadership for enhanced communication, cooperation and collaboration between ECE and elementary TE programs. A new partnership must be created and formed in such a way that the enrichment of the ECE program is not done to the diminishment of the elementary program.

This new partnership between ECE and elementary programs can be done in different ways; but in the end it must seek to accomplish important goals internal and external to the TE ECE-elementary program. Internally, the joint objectives of the combined faculties pertain to course and coursework, the program's conceptual framework, and its assessment system. Externally, the shared aims have to do with field placements, professional development schools, teacher educators' organizations and professional development opportunities and the sponsorship of student organizations. The new partnership needs to establish courses and coursework and field experiences that cover inclusion and special education topics as well as multiple diversities. Methods classes need to be connected to fieldwork and be specialized as to the age range and grade levels of the children to be taught by new teachers. Greater attention must be given to transitions and all types of coordination and alignments—horizontal, vertical, temporal and external. Conceptual frameworks or vision and mission statements of new partnership TE programs must be articulated; ECE and elementary faculty must be required to (and supported and rewarded) work together on TE program assessment systems as well. Strong administrative leadership is required in order to have this partnership develop.

In addition, states and IHE must support and lead in the promotion of partnerships between ECE and elementary faculty in the area of what perhaps best be described as extra-curricular activities. Here would fall such projects as working with teacher student organizations. Dialogue about topics common across ECE and elementary, by both faculty and students, will foster better understanding and shared commitment. Other examples include faculty and school district and community events that are structured to bring concerted attention to ECE and Elementary Education working together. Panels, focus groups and conferences should be organized with this intention.

For instance, local mini-conferences on Saturday mornings and into the early afternoon can be arranged in which presenters are expert teachers at the PreK, K, and Primary levels all in the same session and all sharing the same topic—such as mathematics. Each session also would have two expert commentators, a graduate student or faculty from primarily an ECE background, and another from elementary. The presentations, discussions, and questions and answers from the mixed audience (*e.g.*, ECE TE faculty and students, elementary TE faculty and students, local school district administrators, staff, teachers, and parents, etc.) should go along way towards raising awareness and reflection about the significance and rationale for the PreK and PreK-3rd reform movements in basic and higher education.

Finally, although not directly investigated in this study, one gathers from listening to some key informants in our study that Elementary Education TE programs may not be preparing new teachers as well as they could for a PreK-3rd system of education. According to interview statements, for example, some elementary programs (probably most) do not have a required course on school-family partnerships. As a second example,

if teaching about transitions are perceived to be a weakness in ECE TE programs, *a fortiori* one suspects the problem exists in elementary TE programs. Many Elementary Education graduates prefer assignments the early grades. Unless they are graduating with an endorsement or minor in ECE, or are qualified upon graduation to apply for dual certification in both ECE and Elementary Education, an important question is how well they are prepared to teach in a PreK-3rd system.

In this vein, we recommend that states work towards having non-overlapping PreK-3rd grade teaching certificate bands whenever possible. And when this is not possible or politically feasible, we recommend that elementary TE programs preparing new teachers for K to 6th grade or K to 8th grade (or whatever the highest grade level is for a particular state) forge new partnerships with ECE programs. With or without a chance to form such new alliances with ECE TE programs, the elementary TE programs themselves should seek to better prepare teachers for the PreK-3rd system of education. Such improvement can come about by changes in coursework and field experiences that emphasizes child development, family, culture, child-teacher relations, individual differences and methods courses that include coverage of emergent literacy, science, math, social studies, and the like. Consultation with ECE experts would be needed. The preferred approach always is active engagement and cooperation among educators from different academic backgrounds sharing their mutual concerns for quality TE --and graduating effective and sensitive new teachers and other professionals for the PreK-3rd system of education.

Epilogue: Final Recommendation

To address faculty shortages that exist in ECE TE programs, efforts aimed at hiring qualified ECE professors to work at the level of research universities will prove frustrating unless there is a sufficient pool of qualified applicants. These applicants need to have doctorates in ECE or closely related fields with a concentration in ECE. They need to be prepared for the research challenges they will face at research universities, as well as be knowledgeable and competent in teaching graduate and undergraduate students. They need a high level of technical competence and real world experience in ECE settings. Accordingly, ECE graduate programs must become more concerned about preparing assistant professors who will work at research universities.

Being aware of this need and trying to attend to it may not be enough. Many graduate students enrolled in ECE doctoral programs are older students with ties to their family and communities and are unwilling or unable to move to a distant geographical location to take a new job at a research university. Existing ECE doctoral programs at research universities must continue to graduate students who will take jobs at two- and four- year institutions—but they must also see other research universities as professional outlets for their doctoral graduates. To boost start and sustain the effort to produce more research-oriented and mobile PhD graduates in ECE, pre-doctoral training programs should be created. The fellowships and other incentives would attract bright young applicants to begin a doctoral career leading to a PhD and career in ECE at a research university. Such younger students would be willing to move since they would not be tied down by life's commitments.

However, pre-doctorate training programs targeting bright young people must be joined with another program to make this plan work. Young assistant professors in ECE will necessarily lack real world experience in the field, assuming they began graduate school in their early twenties. To compensate for this shortcoming, they will need mentoring and intense field experiences in ECE settings. This can take place either while they are earning the doctorate, or when they take the first academic position. The rationale is that theory and research in the abstract must be combined with practical experience.

Mentors will likely be less educated in terms of formal degrees. They will be wise veterans who can teach young bright ECE scholars about the workings of ECE settings, and who can provide guidance to them as they acquire direct experiences in the field to balance their book knowledge and help them become effective and sensitive ECE teacher educators. Such arrangements should involve a variety of ECE settings, including public school settings in order for communication with ECE and elementary education to occur. Hence, multiple border-crossings are seen entailing basic and higher education, and ECE and elementary education. New energizing partnerships are forged connecting in productive ways people who otherwise would have remained apart from each other.

References

- Barnett, S., Friedman, A., Hustedt, J., & Stevenson-Boyd, J.(2009). An overview of prekindergarten policy in the United States: Program governance, eligibility, standards, and finance. In R. Pianta& C. Howes, (Eds.),*The promise of PreK.*, pp. 3-30, Baltimore: Paul H.Brookes.
- Bloch, M.N. (1992). Critical perspectives on the historical relationship between child development and early childhood education research. In S.A. Kessler & B.B. Swadener (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the early childhood curriculum: Beginning the dialogue* (pp. 3-20). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bogard, K. & Takanishi, R. (2005). PreK-3rd: An aligned and coordinated approach to education for children 3 to 8 years old. *Social Policy Report: Giving Child and Youth Development Knowledge Away*, 19(3), 1-23, Society for Research in Child Development.
- Boots, S. (2006, January). *Preparing quality teachers for PreK-3rd*. FCD Meeting Summary, Foundation for Child Development.
- Bowman, B.T., Donovan, M.S., & Burns, M.S.(Eds.). (2000). *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers* (Report of the Committee on Early Childhood Pedagogy, National Research Council). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Burchinal, M., Cryer,D., Clifford,R., & Howes,C. (2002). Caregiver training and classroom quality in child care centers. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(1), 2-11.
- Darling-Hammond, L., et al (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Early , D., Maxwell, K., Burchinal, M., Alva, S., Bender, R., Bryant, D., Cai, K., Clifford, R., Ebanks, C., Griffin, J., Henry, G., Howes, C., Iriondo-Perez, J., Jeon, H., Mashburn, A., Peisner-Feinberg, E., Pianta, R., Vandergrift, N., Zill, N. (2007). Teachers' education, classroom quality, and young children's academic skills: Results from seven studies of preschool programs. *Child Development*, 78(2), 558-580.
- Early, D., Bryant, D., Pianta, R., Clifford, R., Burchinal, M., Ritchie, S., Howes, C., & Barbarin, O. (2006). Are teachers' education, major, and credentials related to classroom quality and children's academic gains in PreKindergarten? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 21(2), 174-195.
- Early. D., & Winton, P. (2001). Preparing the workforce: Early childhood teacher preparation at 2- and 4- year institutes of higher education. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 16, 285-306.
- Foundation for Child Development (2006, October). Ready to teach? Providing children with the teachers they deserve. A Report from the Foundation for Child Development. New York: Foundation for Child Development.

Goldstein, L.S. (1997). Between a rock and a hard place in the primary grades: The challenge of providing developmentally appropriate early childhood education in an elementary school setting. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 12, 3-27.

Hyson, M. (2003). *Preparing early childhood professionals: NAEYC's standards for programs*. Washington, DC: NAEYC.

Hyson, M., Tomlinson, H., & Morris, C. (2009). *Quality improvement in early childhood teacher education: Faculty perspectives and recommendations for the future*. *Early childhood research and practices*, 11, 1.

Kagan, S., Kauerz, K., & Tarrant, K. (2008). *The early care and education teaching workforce at the fulcrum: An agenda for reform*. Teacher's College Press, New York.

Kauerz, K. (2006, January). Ladders of learning: Fighting fade-out by advancing PreK-3rd alignment. New America Foundation Early Education Initiative. Issue Brief #2

Maeroff, G. (2006). *Building blocks: Making children successful in the early years of school*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Maxwell, K., Lim, C., & Early, D. (2006). *Early childhood teacher preparation in the United States: National report*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute.

Mead, S. (2009, May). *Building a solid foundation: How states and school districts can use federal stimulus funds to support proficiency by third grade*. Issue Brief, New America Foundation.

NICHD Early Childhood Care Research Network (2000). Characteristics and quality of care for toddlers and preschoolers. *Applied Developmental Science*, 4(3), 116-135.

Ray, A., Bowman, B., & Robbins, J. (2006). *Preparing early childhood teachers to successfully educate all children: The contribution of four-year undergraduate teacher preparation programs*. New York: Foundation for Child Development.

Shulman, L.S. (2005, February). *The signature pedagogies of the professions of law, medicine, engineering, and the clergy: Potential lessons for the education of teachers*. Paper presented at the Math Science Partnerships (MSP) Workshop: Teacher Education for Effective Teaching and Learning. Retrieved January 12, 2007, from <http://iw73535.tripod.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/shulmanarticle.pdf>

Whitebook, M., Gomby, D., Bellm, D., Sakai, L., & Kipnis, F. (2009). *Effective teacher preparation in early care and education: Toward a comprehensive research agenda*. Part II of *Preparing teachers of young children: The current state of knowledge, and a blueprint for the future*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, University of California at Berkeley.

Winton, P. & McCollum, J. (2008). Preparing and supporting high-quality early childhood practitioners : Issues and evidence. In P. Winton, J. McCollum, & C. Catlett (Eds.) *Practical approaches to early childhood professional development: Evidence, strategies, and resources*. Pp. 1-12, Washington DC: Zero to Three: National Center for Infants, Toddlers, and Families.

Index of Appendices

Appendix	Title
A	Script for Initial Phone Call
B	Letter of Invitation
C	Web Survey Instructions
D	Glossary
E	42 ECE Teacher Education Programs
F	Interview Form
G	External Consultants
H	Program Changes & Reasons for Changes
I	PreK-3rd Coordination Means
J	ECE & ELEM. Relationship
K	Program Weakness
L	Programs Assets
M	Program Plans

Appendix A: Script for Initial Phone Call

Step 1 Greetings and Identification of Caller

This is _____, from Penn State University, main campus. Is this _____? I learned from your web-site that that you are the designated person in charge of the Early Childhood Teacher Education Program. Is that correct? May I have a few minutes of your time to explain the purpose of this phone call and our research? This is a research study.

Step 2 Purpose of Call

We are doing a national research study funded by the Foundation for Child Development about Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs in forty, carefully selected, higher education institutions across the U.S. We wish to find out or verify the information about who we should be contacting and sending by mail/email a survey form

Step 3 Verbal Consent

In addition to the (e-)mailed survey (which may take up to an hour to complete), there will be a subsequent telephone interview (which also may take up to an hour to complete and will be audio recorded). Notes of your answers to the interview questions will be taken by a research assistant as well. In both the survey and telephone interview your confidentiality will be respected and any answers given are voluntary. In other words, your participation in this research is voluntary and confidential, as the cover letter to the survey you will receive will indicate. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable or are unfamiliar with.

Step 4 Confirming Contact Information

Please let me know if this person and phone number is correct or give me the name and number of the right person to send the survey to. If you have the need to contact us about this research study our project coordinator, Sudha G. Babu, can be reached at sgb114@psu.edu or 814-865-1790.

Step 5 Cover Letter and Survey

Based on the information you just provided we will send the survey form with a cover letter explaining what is required.

Thank you very much for contributing important information for this national research study. Have a good day.

Appendix B: Letter of Invitation

Dear Professor:

We are requesting your participation in a study of early childhood education (ECE) teacher education (TE) programs that we are conducting at Penn State with a grant from the Foundation for Child Development. This is not a large-scale survey but a smaller in-depth examination of 38 selected programs from different geographic areas in the United States. Your program is chosen to help us learn more about the impact of the Pre-kindergarten (PreK) initiative in public education.

Essentially, we seek to learn how teacher education programs in ECE prepare teachers and other personnel for working in public school settings or community settings connected with public schools. We are focusing on early childhood teacher certification programs.

Our intent is to bring attention to ECE teacher education with respect to the PreK and P-3 national trends and to have you participate in the conversation that will hopefully identify features to improve TE and basic ECE in the years to come. By participating in the study you will be joining a network of selected institutions that are sharing information that hopefully will lead to positive change.

The methods we are employing in this study are threefold: (1) We are extracting information from institution's websites concerning ECE pre-service teacher certification programs; (2) We are asking participants to complete the enclosed survey; and (3) We will be following up with a phone call to interview you about your present ECE TE program and plans for the future. We wish to explore factors that facilitate and factors that interfere with creating better ECE TE and what is envisioned as constituting better pre-service given the PreK and P-3 national trends.

The final research report will be reporting aggregate data and will not be comparing programs. The data will be discussed with respect to state departments' professional development activity, early learning standards, and ECE certification programs. We are also conducting an extensive and comprehensive literature review that will be included the final research report and which will help in the formulation of conclusions, implications, and recommendations. Reports will be made available to you soon after the study is completed in the summer of 2009.

Thank you very much for your time to complete the survey (estimated approximately 30 minutes) and follow-up phone interview (approximately 30 minutes). Along with the survey an information form will be enclosed and will provide further details about your consent to be involved in the study. Please e-mail us the completed survey at your earliest convenience, omitting any items that you cannot readily answer or chose not to do so. Again, thank you very much for participating in this study and we look forward to our follow-up phone conversation that will be set up at a convenient time for you in the near future.

Sincerely,

Sudha Babu Ph. D
Project Coordinator
sgb114@psu.edu
Phone: 814-865-1790

Prof. Kate McKinnon
Co-Investigator
kmm25@psu.edu
814-865-2236

Prof. Rick Fiene
Co-Investigator
rjf8@psu.edu
717-948-6061

Prof. Jim Johnson
Principal Investigator
jej4@psu.edu
814-865-2230

Appendix C: Web Survey Instructions

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

1. To begin, please click the weblink included in your e-mail:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=1oc8VpjwXGueA27jVVwhow_3d_3d
2. Once you finish a page, click on the “Next” button at the bottom of the page to continue the survey.
3. If you would like to change any of your answers, you can navigate backwards by clicking on the “Prev” button at the bottom of the page.
4. At anytime you may leave the survey by selecting “Exit this survey” at the top of the page. It may seem like nothing is happening, but this will automatically save * your completed answers. You may then close your browser.

** Make sure that your internet browser is set up to accept “cookies.” Most browsers are set to accept cookies by default, but this can be modified in settings / preferences - privacy.*

(A “cookie” is a very small packet of information from a website.)

5. To finish your survey use the same link:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=1oc8VpjwXGueA27jVVwhow_3d_3d

You must use the exact same computer (IP address) to complete the survey later on.

6. When you complete the survey, on the last page you will click the “Done” button. This will submit your survey responses. Thank you again for your participation.

Appendix D: Glossary

1. Alignments or Systems Co-ordinations:
 - Horizontal Alignment: This term refers to coordination within the same age/grade level with respect to learning standards or educational goals, curriculum, instruction and assessment.
 - Vertical Alignment: This term refers to co-ordination across different age/grade levels.
 - Temporal Alignment: This term refers to any planned formal or informal educational or educational related activities that reinforce school learning over time periods away from times allotted for formal education in the classroom such as over weekends, summer vacation and after school and before school programs.
 - Environmental Alignment: This term refers to alignment with community resources for complementing or supplementing formal education at school; including any Home-School-Community partnerships of various kinds.
2. Applied Child Development: It is a subset of Child Development; research and theory deemed applicable to educators in practical settings. Usability of Child Development theory and research for observing the Whole Child in naturalistic contexts.
3. Basic ECE (Early Childhood Education) : This term refers to care and education provided to children, as opposed to teacher education.
4. Credits or Equivalent: They refer to units of academic college work recorded on transcripts and used to determine completion of degree requirements.
5. Components: Parts or elements of a large system or program, how are they linked, e.g. how are courses linked to field experiences in early childhood teacher education programs.
6. Configurations: Ways in which parts of a program are organized.
7. Diversity: This term refers to differences in personal and demographic characteristics of individuals and groups based on a variety of variables including, gender or sex, ethnic group, racial group, linguistic or language status, age, religious background, and so forth.

8. ECE Faculty: This term refers to tenure-line professors of all ranks, instructors, lecturers and other teacher educators, resident or adjunct, full or part-time (each person counts only once).
9. ECE Teaching Certification: This term refers to State license or certification in early childhood education covering any age/grade levels as long as the certificate entitles the holder to be a certified public school teacher in the state.
10. English Language Learners (ELL): is the most current and appropriate term for students with limited English proficiency, which includes students who do not possess sufficient English language proficiency to participate fully in regular education classes.
11. Family-School Partnerships: The relationship that is created or that exists between families and schools.
12. Family-School-Community Partnerships: “Partnerships that can improve school programs, school climate, family services and support, increase parental skills and leadership, connect families with others in the school and community, and help teachers with their work...help all youngsters succeed in school and in later life. When parents, teachers and students and others view one another as partners in education, a caring community forms around students and begins its work (Epstein, 2002, p.7).”
13. Field-Experience: In includes a variation of activities that teacher education students may be involved as part of their certification program. E.g. they may include classroom observations, pre-service teaching, and student teaching practice where they work directly with young children in preschool and early elementary school settings, under the guidance of a mentor teacher and field supervisor.
14. Inclusion: This term refers to classrooms that include children with Spled, English language learners and or all children.
15. Initial Licensing: This term refers to first certificate needed to begin employment as a certified teacher in public schools.
16. P-3: This term refers to PreK to third grade programs in public schools when such programs make a deliberate attempt to create, maintain and improvise a coordination and alignment within and across age/grade levels of educational philosophies, standards or learning goals, curriculum, instruction and assessment or part of an organized system of early education for children from three to eight years of age.

17. PreK: Pre-kindergarten. When kids are four years old.
18. Partnership of ECE to K-3/4/5/6/7/8: This is in reference to how Teacher Education (TE) for preparing students for work in PreK interconnects with TE for preparing them to work in K and primary grades with respect to faculty communication and team work in delivery and assessing their on-going TE programs considered as a whole.
19. Professional Development: Attitudes and beliefs that you may have about your professional role and responsibilities compared to personal beliefs and attitudes.
20. Professional Dispositions: (NCATE) Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development.
21. Special Education (Spled) and ECE: This term refers to Teacher Education (TE) programs in which partnership and co-operation exists and is used in ECE/Spled Teacher Education with reference to courses and field experiences.
22. Transition (s): "a child's transition to school is understood in terms of the influence of contexts (for example, family, classroom, community) and the connections among these contexts (e.g., family-school relationships) at any given time and across time"...establishing a relationship between the home and the school in which the child's development is the key focus or goal" (Pianta, Rimm-Kaufman, & Cox, 1999, p. 4).

Appendix E: 42 ECE Teacher Education Programs

- 1.** College of Education, Dept. of Curriculum & Teaching. Early Childhood Education (preschool to 3rd grade), B.S., M.Ed. or M.S., Ed.S., Ph.D. 122-123 Credit Hours. Elementary Certification: K-6th grade. HDFS Program offers the Human Development and Family studies Curriculum, as well as a Dual Objective curriculum with Early Childhood Education.
- 2.** College of Education, Division of Curriculum & Instruction, The School of Educational Innovation and Teacher Preparation offers a Bachelor of Arts (BAE) degree in Early Childhood Education designed to prepare future teachers for the PreK-3rd classroom. Endorsement: English as a Second Language (Provisional). Structured English Immersion. Early Childhood Education M.Ed Initial Certification Program.
- 3.** College of Education & Health Professions. Bachelor of Science in Education (B. S. E.). Childhood Education Certification (PreK-4). B.S.E. in Childhood/Middle Level Education. (Grades 5-8). Master of Arts in Childhood Education: The Childhood Education Program prepares teachers for elementary schools.
- 4.** School of Education, Department of Literacy Studies and Elementary Education. Master of Arts Degree in Early Childhood Education. The Early Childhood Education Concentration is designed to prepare teachers to work in public school and community-based programs that serve children from infancy through third grade (ages birth to age eight). Candidates need not possess a teaching credential; they may prepare for leadership and advocacy positions in a variety of settings. However, a basic course in child development and at least one year of experience working with children in educational settings are prerequisites to admission to the program. This degree also qualifies teachers for advanced levels of the Child Development Permit. (0-8yrs.)
- 5.** School of Education and Human Development, Master's ECE Teacher Licensing Program (PreK-3rd grade). Master's in Early Childhood Education with Early Childhood Special Education Specialist License (0-8yrs)/ Elementary Education: K to 6th grade.
- 6.** School of Education and Studies, Department of Education - The State requires that those receiving a certificate after 1993 have a subject matter major outside of education. Early Childhood Education teacher candidates are encouraged to complete either Psychology or Sociology majors, but may major in any discipline. Undergraduate ECE Certification Pre-kindergarten to 3rd Grade. Early Childhood Education Certification and Master of Science Program. Elementary Education Certification requires an academic major in an academic subject other than Education, Psychology or Sociology or a major in a Physical Educational Field.
- 7.** College of Human Services, Education and Public Policy, Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies, Endorsed for certification in Early Care and Education and Early Childhood Special Education. (Birth to 2nd Grade). Students can earn a teaching certification qualifying them to work with students from birth to second grade in both early childhood education *and* early childhood special education. BS Ed. Elementary Teacher Education (K-6).

8. College of Education. The College of Education has been condensed into three departments. Please see below for more information about our new departments. Department 1 School of Teaching & Learning Department 2: Special Education, School Psychology, Early Childhood Education Department 3: Counselor Education, Educational Administration & Policy, Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation Methods (REM)

Department 2: Early Childhood Education ECE Teacher Certification---PreK-3rd grade. The faculty within the Early Childhood Education program are pleased to offer four options for students interested in careers in the exciting field of early childhood education. These options are:

1. Unified Early Childhood ProTeach (teacher certification program)
2. Master of Education with an Early Childhood Emphasis
3. Master of Arts in Education with an Early Childhood Emphasis
4. Doctoral Strand in Early Childhood Education

9. College of Education, Department of Elementary and Social Studies Education. There are three opportunities available for students who are seeking initial certification from the state to teach children from prekindergarten to grade 5: the undergraduate partnership program, the undergraduate prekindergarten to grade 2 emphasis, and the master's-level early childhood certification option (ECCO). A fourth option, a master of arts in teaching program with a focus on young children, is under review by the University System.

10. Department of Child and Family Development in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences. The P-2 emphasis is administered in collaboration with the Department of Child and Family Development in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences, and with faculty in special education in the College of Education.

11. College of Education, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, Division of Curriculum, Aesthetics, and Teacher Education (CATE). Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education. Certification: Birth to 3rd grade. Graduates of the program qualify for the early childhood certificate with early childhood special education approval. Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education: This program prepares teachers for grades kindergarten through nine.

12. College of Education, Department of Teaching & Learning. Undergraduate Degree in Early Childhood Studies. The Interdisciplinary Program in Early Childhood Studies is a collaborative program offered by the School of Family, Consumer, and Nutrition Sciences in the College of Health and Human Sciences and the Department of Teaching and Learning in the College of Education. The program is designed to prepare professionals to serve children from birth through age eight and their families. 04 Certification with Preschool Special Education Approval (College of Education). 04 Early Childhood Certification (College of Health and Human Sciences). Early Childhood Education (Master's). Elementary Education: K to 9th grade Certification. Early Childhood Special Education. This specialization prepares students to obtain early childhood special education (ECSE) approval to work with children with disabilities from

3-5 years of age. Students must hold or obtain certification in special education (Type 10) or early childhood (Type 04) in order to apply for the ECSE approval.*

13. College of Human Sciences, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, ECE Teaching Certification: Birth to 3rd grade. The Early Childhood Education Program is an interdepartmental program, administered by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Department of Human Development and Family Studies. The Elementary Education (El Ed) prepares people to teach in grades Kindergarten to Grade 6. Elementary education majors must complete one area of endorsement and may complete additional endorsements.

14. College of Human Ecology. The School of Family Studies and Human Services. Early Childhood Education. Graduates work with children from birth to age five. Early childhood special education certification is available with advanced study. There is a M.S. program in early childhood education Elementary education prepares you to work with children in kindergarten through sixth grade, and in some cases through ninth grade. Your studies will include three areas:

15. School of Education, Department of Curriculum & Teaching. Graduate Licensure Program (GLP). Currently, the only option available for licensure in Elementary Education, Early Childhood Unified, Secondary English, or Secondary History and Government (social studies) is our five-year undergraduate program. Elementary Education: Planning for Provisional Endorsement in Adaptive Special Education K-6.

16. College of Education, Department of Curriculum & Instruction. Bachelor of Science degree in Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education with Birth to Pre-kindergarten certification (B-P)---Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation Programs. It also offers a graduate level non-degree initial certification (IECE level III); advanced certification programs; (IECE levels II and I); as well as an MEd program.

17. College of Education, The Department of Educational Theory, Policy & Practice, Division of Elementary Education. The Division of Elementary Education comprises three programs from the pre-school through the elementary years. Offers both undergraduate and graduate programs. Early Childhood/PreK-3rd.

18. There is a second program that deal with ECE, and it is in the School of Human Ecology

19. College of Education & Human Development. Undergraduate program is part of Child Development and Family Relations major with emphasis area in Early Childhood Education: Birth through 5 Certification Option. The typical definition of "early childhood" is ages 0-8. Child Development/Family Relations majors with an interest in Early Childhood Education have an option to prepare for the early Elementary Education credential. This program is separate and distinct from the College of Education's K-8 Elementary Education Certification Program.

20. College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Education. Early Childhood Education Program is a state-approved certification program. Undergraduate and graduate teacher candidates complete a course of study that can lead to certification as a teacher of children from preschool through grade 3.

21. School of Education, Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies, Early Childhood and Elementary Teacher Preparation Program: Master's level Collaborative Teacher Education Program, either in elementary or early childhood education. ECE Teacher Preparation Program (PreK to 2nd grade). Licensure is from PreK to grade 2 for typical and atypical developing children. There is a birth to kindergarten endorsement and a separate Elementary Education license for grades 1-6.

22. College of Education, Teacher Education Division, Early Childhood Education Endorsement Program, Birth to 3rd Grade. The certification is K-5 elementary, or a content area for 6-8, and an ECE endorsement from birth to grade 3. ECE and elementary are separate and distinct programs.

23. College of Education and Human Service Professions. Department of Education. Unified Early Childhood Programs: Birth through Grade 3 licensure. Elementary/Middle School. The Elementary Education Program offers Kindergarten through Grade 8 licensure, with an academic specialty areas in Communication Arts/Literature, Math, Science, Social Studies, French*, German*, Spanish*, or Ojibwe. The Special Education Program offers: Licensure for Kindergarten through Grade 12 in Emotional/Behavioral Disorders, and Learning Disabilities Licensure for Birth through Age 6 Years 11 Months in Early Childhood Special Education. Special Education Minor. Deaf Studies Minor. The College of Education and Human Service Professions (CEHSP) offers two graduate degrees: Master of Education (M.Ed.), including Master of Education in Environmental Education. Master of Special Education (M.Sp.Ed.). They also have a Doctoral Program.

24. College of Education, Teacher Development Program, Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education certifies to teach Birth to 3rd grade. This ECE program is part of the Learning, Teaching and Curriculum Department; the Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) also has an early childhood program, however they do not certify in the area. State certification for ECE is birth through grade 3 and Elementary Education certification is grades 1-6. In the state once an individual is certified in one area, they can take the Praxis in ANY area and then teach if they pass.

25. College of Education and Human Services, Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education. Elementary Education Teacher Program. Additional endorsements may be earned in Early Childhood Education, Inclusive Early Childhood Education. Post-Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Programs. Inclusive Early Childhood Education (Birth - Grade 3) can be earned as part of the graduate program. This program is offered collaboratively through three departments: Child Youth and Family Studies; Special Education and Communication Disorders; and Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education. Certification is called a unified endorsement that goes from birth to grade 3. There is a proposal to have a birth to 5-year-old endorsement. There is a

separate Elementary Education endorsement that covers K-6.

26. Department of Educational Specialties & the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning in the College of Education, with collaboration and support from other departments throughout the University. The Early Childhood Education (ECE) program is jointly administered by the Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) and the Department of Education Specialties (EDS). Education for young children aged 0-8 years old. The required internship semester is completed as part of the bachelor's degree (Teacher licensure is gained for K-2 grades only). The state certification is from PreK to 2nd grade. There are 60-70 pre-majors in HDFS and 20-30 majors in Early Childhood.

27. Graduate School of Education. Early Childhood Education Endorsement program for preschool to 3rd grade. ECE program has recently been developed and will begin in the Fall of 2009. There are presently 12 students in this initial cohort. This is a 5 year M.A. ECE certification program; the students must choose to certify in either K-5 w/ middle school certification, K-5 w/ special education certification, or K-5 with P-3 certification. The program has a total of 69 credits (39 undergraduate + 30 graduate credits).

28. College of Education. Department of Individual, Family and Community Education. Early Childhood Multicultural Education Program, Bachelor of Science Degree with Teaching Credentials from Birth to 3rd grade. Students who complete the program graduate with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Education with ECME as their major. Graduates of the program develop the required competencies and become eligible to apply for licensure in Early Childhood Education, Birth to Grade 3, from the Public Education Department. There is a separate Birth to 3rd grade teacher license/certification for early childhood with a separate Elementary Education teacher license/certification from K-8.

29. Graduate School of Education. Department of Learning and Instruction in cooperation with Teacher Education Institute. Programs in early childhood and childhood education deal with children from preschool up to the middle school years. Students may choose to emphasize early childhood (birth-grade 2), childhood teaching (grades 1-6), or both, or a specific childhood curriculum field, such as literacy or mathematics. The programs in early childhood or childhood education are also available with a bilingual extension/specialization.

30. School of Education, Academic Program---Child Development & Family Studies. The Bachelor of Arts in Education (A.B.Ed.) degree in Child Development and Family Studies is a 121-semester-hour program. Child Development and Family Studies students will meet competencies for a Birth through Kindergarten teaching licensure. There is a separate Birth to Kindergarten teacher license/certification for early childhood with a separate Elementary Education teacher license/certification from K-6.

31. College of Education, Criminal Justice & Human Services, Division of Teacher Education. Degree options, including baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees.

Teacher preparation programs in Early Childhood Education (PreK-3rd), Middle Childhood Education (grades four through nine), Secondary Education (grades 7 through 12) and Special Education (kindergarten through grade 12) enable successful graduates to enter the teaching profession with appropriate State licenses. A birth-to-five non-license program prepares successful graduates to work in Head Start, preschool and childcare programs, and family child care programs. Graduate degree programs at the masters and doctoral level programs exist. Endorsement programs permit licensed teachers to add to their qualifications in reading, teaching English as a second language, special education and other areas.

32. College of Education. Department of Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum. Early Childhood Education Certification comes with a Bachelor of Science Degree. Age range not mentioned? Its goals are reflected by the acronym, TE-PLUS that is a Teacher Education (TE) program that emphasizes: Professionalism, Leadership, Understanding, and Scholarship (PLUS). The TE-PLUS program prepares teachers to successfully serve in the following, interrelated roles: Teacher as educator, Teacher as communicator, Teacher as decision maker, Teacher as scholar, Teacher as action researcher, and Teacher as leader.

33. Special Education Program, Early Intervention Early Childhood Special Education Endorsement in Special Education. Due to the nature of the program several Questions in the Survey were not answered. We had to go over the survey. It is a year long Master's Program, (after Bachelor's) plus license (0-8yrs). Students can come from different academic backgrounds, with some experience or no experience. It is a 60-credit program. Students may get waiver to some courses, depending on their bachelor's degree. They follow a quarter-system. This is a program that is funded through a Grant. There are on their second year. Class size varies from 12 students to 30 students. They are not PreK focused. Even though their program is about (0-8yrs) they focus on 0-5yrs, depending on the students' interest. Students in this program are placed in public schools for their practicum with 3-5 year olds. It is a unique program, the School Districts sub-contract with Early Intervention Agencies, who provide the support in the school.

34. College of Education, Department of Instruction and Learning, Early Childhood Education Teaching Certification. Early Childhood Education Instructional I Certificate - State Teaching Certification (birth to age 8). The program is designed for full-time study, but may be adapted for part-time study. The Early Childhood Certification Program is intended for individuals from a wide-range of undergraduate backgrounds including: Communications Science and Disorders, Psychology, Child Care/Child Development, Law, Business, Social Work, or other related fields of study who wish to pursue careers as Early Childhood Educators. A student who successfully completes the program, including the PRAXIS I and II Exams, and complete the Statewide Evaluation Form for Student Professional Knowledge and Practice (PDE 430) is eligible to apply for a Pennsylvania Instructional I Certificate for Nursery School - Grade 3.

35. College of Education. The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education. Initial Certification Programs. B.A. in Early Childhood Education focusing on the education of young children, birth to grade 3. Teacher certification for PreK-3rd. Certification: ECE: PreK-4-3rd Over lap: ELED- 2-5 Middle – 5-8.

36. College of Education, Health and Human Sciences. Department of Child and Family Studies. Early Childhood Education Teacher Licensure (PreK-K). This licensure program prepares students to teach children with and without disabilities, birth through age 5. Students who wish to pursue this licensure must complete the Early Childhood Education Teacher Licensure: PreK-K specialty area. Early Childhood Education Teacher Licensure (PreK-3rd). The early childhood education licensure option is offered in conjunction with a master's degree in child and family studies (early childhood education concentration). College of Education, Health and Human Sciences. Department of Theory and Practice in Teacher Education, Modified and Early Childhood Special Education Concentration. The Modified and Early Childhood Special Education Concentration at the University offers degrees at the bachelor's, master's, and educational specialist levels. The undergraduate program is unique in that it is part of a 5-year program, culminating with a master's degree. Modified and Early Childhood Special Education is a dual-license program leading to licensure to teach in modified settings (for those students with mild to moderate disabilities) and comprehensive settings (for those students with severe disabilities) in grades Kindergarten through 12. PreK-3rd grade program is a Graduate Program---5th year program. They have roots in the Holmes Group---PDS Partnership. PreK-Kindergarten licensing program late in state. Students who want to be in the public schools seek this license.

37. College of Education and Human Development. Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture offers students the ability to pursue an early childhood certification program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree (B.S.) with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies (INST) through the PreK-4 Generalist Certification Program. It is a heavily field-based program, with students spending extensive time in early childhood and elementary classes. The State changes have influenced their program—Certification is going from PreK-4 to P K-6

38. College of Education and Social Services. Department of Integrated Professional Studies, Early Childhood ²: The Early Childhood PreK-3rd Teacher Education Program has been recognized by the US Department of Education as one of fourteen "exemplary" early childhood teacher education programs in the country. The PreK-3rd program leads to teach licensure birth through grade three. Early Childhood Special Education³: designed for students to work with young children from birth through age six, and their families in a range of settings. The Program leads to a dual teacher licensure in both Early Childhood and Early Childhood Special Education.

39. School of Education. Academic Programs, Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education. 1. New interdisciplinary Teacher-Preparation program in Psychology, Early Childhood, and Early Childhood Special Education. Educational programs that serve children birth through age eight with a range of risk and disability

conditions as well as typically developing children. BA/MT: Graduates of the program will be certified to teach in the early elementary grades (PreK through three) and to teach children with disabilities birth through age five. Upon completion of the five-year program, students will earn a bachelor's degree in psychology and a master's degree in education. The program of study in Early Childhood and Developmental Risk prepares students to work with young children either those who are in the primary grades (K-3) or who have disabilities (birth through age 5).

40. College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences. Early Childhood Education (P-3) Teacher Certification Endorsement . The early childhood education offering under the human development major provides a residency-teaching certificate with primary endorsements in both early childhood and Elementary Education. Bachelor of Arts in human development with P-3 teaching certification.

41. College of Human Resources and Education. Department of Technology, Learning & Culture. The undergraduate program in Child Development and Families Studies consists of a B.S. in Birth through PreK Early Childhood Education. Upon graduation, students may apply for the State Department of Education Certification in Birth through PreK Education. The department of Curriculum & Instruction Literacy Studies in the College of Human Resources & Education offers initial certification in Early Childhood Education. Ages birth to eight years. The initial certification program in Early Childhood Education includes study of international early childhood education programs from Reggio Emilia Preschools [Italy], Montessori Schools [Italy], Forest Kindergartens [Germany & Austria], Head Start Programs [USA], and a wide variety of program models used across the United States and the world. Opportunities for participation in future international study tours can be arranged. Early Childhood Education Specialization. Required Courses to be added to the Elementary Certification Program.

42. School of Education, Department of Curriculum & Instruction. The Early Childhood Program is available for students who plan to teach children from birth to age 8 in PreK-3rd. Undergraduate Degree Offered. Bachelor's degree leading to licensure in Early Childhood Education. Early Childhood through Adolescence Program: Certification at the Early Childhood through Adolescence Program is available for students who plan to teach children from birth to age 21 in PreK through 12th grade. Students may be certified to teach a foreign language or English as a Second Language at this certification level.

Appendix F: Interview Form

FCD Study of ECE Teacher Education Programs Interview

Interviewer: _____ State: _____

ID: _____ Date: _____

Time Start: _____ Time End: _____

Survey items discussed:

1. Has your ECE Teacher Education program been modified within the last three years?

How?

New courses?

New field experience?

New collaborations?

New Partnerships?

2. What prompted these changes in your ECE Teacher Education Program?

How about PreK/P-3 in your state's public schools?

Can you elaborate on the changes in your TE Program that are due to the national or state-level PreK and/or P-3 trend?

If new course, fieldwork or collaborations or partnerships are mentioned and it is uncertain as to their status then:

Are they being planned, under review, already approved or currently operative?

3. How would you characterize your early childhood TE program in relationship with TE for Elementary teachers?

Are ECE or PreK methods of teaching blended into method courses for the higher grades or are they kept separate: courses just for PreK?

4. Do ECE teacher candidates learn about coordinating curriculum and instruction throughout the educational system from PreK-3rd grade?

How does this get across to your teacher candidates? (Courses, Fieldwork)

What Concepts are emphasized? (Coordination and Alignment of Curriculum Assessment, Instruction and Standards; Differentiation; Diversity; Inclusion, etc.)

How well do you think that you are getting this across to your students?

What could be done better?

5. Has your program changed in any other ways in response to PreK/P-3?

Is there cooperation between ECE and other academic units on campus (e.g. special education, human development)?

Is there outreach to the public schools, to community agencies?

If yes, can you give an example?

How is this working?

6. What resources and supports are presently available for your ECE TE Program that are helpful in making changes in response to the PreK/P-3 Initiative?

Ask about their research.

Extra office space, up-dated or new journal subscriptions, library or resource center additions (e.g. math lab, science, etc.).

New hires? Adding faculty positions, new graduate teaching assistants, etc.

7. What impediments or hurdles exist in trying to make the changes?

Structural barriers (lack of practicum site for PreK, insufficient funds for staffing, etc.)

Attitudinal barriers (resistance, negative attitudes of PreK/P-3 by the faculty in ECE or in elementary program)

Would the program prefer to go back to before the PreK initiative?

Why or why not?

8. What are your program's expectations for the immediate future?

9. Anything else you would like to share?

10. Do you have any questions about our study?

11. Is it okay to get back to you if we need to?

For example, we may need documentation for new courses/fieldwork. **What is the best way to obtain this information?** (e-mail attachments, we send to you a self-addresses stamped envelope with a hard-copy, on website)

Thank you for participating. As a participant in the study you will be receiving a copy of our final research report, this will include a list of references and resources and an up-to-date review of the literature-something that may be helpful to you in your program.

Appendix G: External Consultants

1. Ms. Mary Lou Hyson
Director of Professional Development
National Association for the Education of Young Children
1509 16th Street
N.W. Washington, DC 20036-1426
Phone: (800) 424-2460
Fax: (202) 328-1846

2. Sharon Ritchie, Project Co-Director
FPG Child Development Institute
517 South Greensboro Street
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB 8040
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8040
Phone: (919) 843-2779
Fax: (919) 966-1786
Email: Ritchie@mail.fpg.unc.edu

3. Ellen Frede, Ph.D
Co-Director
National Institute for Early Education Research
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
120 Albany Street, Suite 500
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Phone: (732) 932-4350, ext. 237
Fax: (732) 932-4360

4. Linda M. Espinosa, B.A., Ed.M., Ph.D.
Professor of Early Childhood Education
University of Missouri-Columbia
Phone: (573) 882-2659
Fax: (573) 884-2917
espinosal@missouri.edu

Appendix H: Program Changes & Reasons for Changes

<u>ECE TE Program</u>	Program change	Reason for change
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school readiness allowance • Fund teachers teacher candidates and Blue Ribbon Day Care facilities • ECE faculty and Dean's office coordinate together
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication and interaction with the community college • Advent of head start course • New dean searching for new development head 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of bachelor degree ECE teachers • Increase social mobility
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head start 0-8 years • 4 years four blocks • Stronger focus on preschool • 10 week student teaching in preschool • New partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth to grade 3 certification • Integrated emergent literacy • Math and science covered separately
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE emphasis in multiple subjects, preschool and Kindergarten emphasis eliminated • Issues in higher education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have not checked • Standards not defined yet • Courses offered now like before about six years ago
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Away from birth through 5 • Increasing working with younger children • Help partnership with schools • Help understand ECE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaption's of other courses • New production promoted by student licensure.

6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having 15 credits of human development • Emphasis on inclusive PreK • Six credits of special education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State emphasis on inclusion and reading
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State birth to K to birth to 2nd grade • Move to fit elementary K to 6th grade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State certification
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No real changes • Add internship work with disabilities • 20 new graduate assistants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anticipate more doctoral students • Have a strong specialization in ECE, someday a degree
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four core courses • Organize classroom • Integrate curriculum • Increase field hours • Have two P-2 • Try to understand young children and families 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer connections between courses and field experiences • New interest, expertise, energies • So many students • Budget cuts, labor intensive • Family and consumer sciences • Graduates get certified to work in public schools
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1999-2000 switch semester/quarter system • Work with other schools • Three course sequencing math, science, not methods, but content courses, had to take family courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole child response • Have DAP in early grades • Understand standards, alignment of standards
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added endorsement for ECE Spld • ELL • Grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing diversity in state ELL • Pressure for articulations

12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No modifications within 3 years, 1999-2000 big changes • At time add-on to K-6, add PreK revamped • Increase ECE student teaching, SPLED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now focus is on PreK through 3rd grade • Now ECE teachers are more attraction • PreK make sure not root preschool
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire adjuncts • Have inter college collaboration • Teach in inclusive setting • Professional development advisory committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have 4 adjuncts • Advice from professionals • Collaboration with SPLED and meet their needs
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nig change to incorporate primary grades and SPLED with ECE • Partnership with schools • Primary grade placement, full of fifth year • Transition PreK and Kindergarten and infant/toddler placements • Taking master courses • Inclusive infant/toddler methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in teacher licensure • ECE and SPLED • Lots of advocacy • Professional experience • Teachers not suppose to work with babies • Very active parents as teachers
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New course reflective practices • Inclusive classroom, emergent lite course and behavioral management course • Active advocates for TE change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response

16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1990 whole new certification, within 3 years not have any changes • Before state funded PreK, changes made, full-time faculty four full-time, non tenure, three years ago same figure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last time was significant change, change colleges, moved to college of education, from human ecology • Same courses, field experiences, no plans
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on service learning throughout the university • The order of placement in the field • More meetings with community • PreK initiative in the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program has been totally restricted • All the ECE majors are college of education majors
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign of legislature on certification • Collaboration between human ecology and education • Collaboration between school districts and field placement sites • Each course is developed and modified with feedback from former students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the state level, change in certification legislature • Changed the curriculum within the existing courses depending on feedback they have received from students

19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in student teaching sites • Separate sections for ECE only • Licensure will starting in the fall 2009 be part of an academic concentration in child and family studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal effect of the state PreK/P-3 trend on the program • The big change for the program was licensure changes back in 2002-2003
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes about 5 years ago (not more recently and not related to PreK or P-3 initiative) • Undergrad course were changed to 400 level courses, with the content remaining the same • They have added head start program for placements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state has PreK/Pre however it is not required and has not affected their program yet • No universal PreK in Maryland • For about 15-20 years there has been a program called triple E (Early Education Enrichment) which is designed to help children who may have difficulties in school
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few changes • They have been able to hire one new faculty member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The university has been very active • Bringing together faculty in ECE, SPLED and literacy to design new course
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have new standards • More inclusive now • Added new courses on inclusion • Became a separate major 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More impact on the state then vice versa • Advocacy groups and ECE consortium • Michigan has a new office of for ECE development and learning
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE and SPLED program combined for a dual license • New field experiences • New collaboration with the physical therapy/psychology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE and SPLED fully integrated

24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normal changes with the courses, but no program changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ECE program already had a focus on the PreK before the initiative. In 2000 the teacher education program was organized and totally separated Elementary education
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new ECE course is being offered as part of the Elementary Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater collaboration between the school of education and the Frank Portes Graham Child Development Institute • Integrate the SPLED, ECE and Elementary Education
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some changes related to course requirements(reading and disability course) • Additional practicum video in head start classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of reading disability course and lab occurred • Changes to the preschool practicum where more head start programs is being wed
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing new courses (play methods and integrated curriculum) • New field experience is in a preschool setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes to the certification requirements in ECE
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in teacher certification • A universal curriculum is being offered • New curriculum courses • New field experiences to be offered each year • New collaborations with family literacy program • New collaboration with public schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offering placements for practicum in PreK sites • Kindergarten summer institute for all PreK teachers

29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two courses have been added (literacy and disabilities) • Structural changes • Partnership with the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New course was created and offered on the basis of assessment/review • Big push for literacy from NCLB
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate program • Alternative certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two courses in phonics • PreK through 6th grade math endorsement • 4th and 5th grade endorsement to the PreK to 3 license, attach 6th and 5th grade endorsement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonics had to be in the title of the course • Push out infant/toddler • Emphasis on inclusion • Have a course called accommodations and adaptations
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on infancy • Work with some centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis to meet NAEYC standards • New students • Some courses specific to ECE • Lab on campus PreK lab
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New program to meet the chapter 69 requirements • Work collaboratively with families and other professionals • Wide range of undergraduate backgrounds • Emphasis on diversity and special ed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of accreditation process • Added leadership and advocacy course to our master's program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PreK is a pilot in our state for 4 years old

36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grad program is rigorous • New course, realigned course • Separate literature and assessment course • Add math, literacy and assessment to the graduate program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was answered in question 1
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in certification • New courses were developed to fill in the gap or 4th and 8th grade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State changes • 12 hours of ECE or content emphasis
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused on birth to 5 years • Social issues course • Add course on autism • New collaborations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interdisciplinary courses, ESL • Interest in SPLED
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 years ago • Preparing students to teach in primary grades • New course taken over from elementary method courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course around literacy and math
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge in the Education Department for PreK-3rd students take their block classes together with their cohort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewed interest in ECE in College of education • More funding • Interaction between ECE and SPLED

41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses changed • More field experiences • More emphasis on dialect, misidentification of children • Guidance course added 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty listening to feedback from students
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating systematic observation and data collection systems • Emphasis on family and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evening courses • Summer courses • Independent work

Appendix I: PreK-3rd Coordination Means

<u>ECE TE Program</u>	PreK-3rd Coordination Means
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They do a good job with Kindergarten course • They have a kindergarten center • They have a preschool and enrichment programs during the summer
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some reference to • Have to relate to the standards of the state of AR • For accreditation demonstrate teaching and learning • Student teachers do research projects
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on child development
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning in the course
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approaches AECE5(text book) • Visit a lot of programs
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on big picture • Using our 5 program themes • Students show how their work demonstrate alignment to NAEYC standards
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class on professional issues • Observations 6 weeks through second grade
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family interviews • Method courses • Intervention
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The core course in GA ECE is P-5, P-2 is specialized ECE P-2 really certify to teach up to 5th grade
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home visitors, social workers
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone in TE take • Transitional challenges, each TE program
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teamwork and collaboration is central • Focus Japanese 100 year program • PreK teaching 15 week 8-12 everyday • Use to hire with high school backgrounds
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to make units • Technology supports • Special ed. approval and student from development
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intro to discipline of ECE, early ed. learning • Team building embedded in course SPLED course • Collaboration with multiple disciplines
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses and field experiences • Advanced reflective practices, lesson planning, development those skills
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth-5, transition to K • Get into diverse setting
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum and assessment in emphasized in classes • Diversity is emphasized

18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They talk about emergent curriculum • How to create curriculum based on district and state requirement • Diversity, inclusion is emphasized
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different method courses
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field component in the course load every semester • The courses are tied with the field placements for each semester
21.	
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-content courses • Emergent literacy
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through coursework is taught to teacher candidates • Instruction is emphasized
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction is emphasized
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination and alignment of instruction
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All coursework is fully integrated at the PreK and K-3 level
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction is emphasized
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coursework
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • classes they take • CD instructors
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In everyone of our course
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus lab school • EDUCARE faculty
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize social justice
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intro class • Relationship with classroom professionalism
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courses are topic focused • ESL course
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate ECE and EL • Admin leadership
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Appendix J: ECE & ELEM. Relationship

<u>ECE TE Program</u>	<u>ECE & EL relationship</u>	<u>Score</u>
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Repsonse 	
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not big leap for EL TE • They can understand ECE • They are not encouraged • Teachers under so much pressure 	3 (mixed)
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fine, it's good • Shrinking faculty for EL Ed. • Have subject matter specials are ok • Student in EL larger enrollment • Rapid growth past back 	4 (positive)
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not good • Underestimation of complexity of ECE • Lack of continuity between the levels • Fear about early learning standards 	1 (negative)
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive • Distinct and separate • Shared meetings • No personality issues 	4 (positive)
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings together • Do admissions together but programs are very different • Different views on assessment and interpretation • We are poor cousins 	3 (mixed)
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No collaboration • PreK is separate from K-primary • No mutual respect • Our is constructivist, EL behaviorist • Negative 	1 (negative)
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well, okay • Have worked out several relations • Not competing with new students • Encourage them to do ECE 	4 (positive)
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P-5 elem, P-2 more ECE • Own personal opinion • Partnership P-5 more about elem 	2 (independent)
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parallel with PreK to 5th • Work well together • Always different • Don't take classes together 	2 (independent)

11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamental philosophic difference • Not shared method courses in math • EL TE decided 99% 4-6; 1% K-3 	1 (negative)
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing issue • Student don't do both • Relation fairly not existent • Don't take same method courses 	1 (negative)
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method courses separated • Content areas all support primary child • Supervisions are slightly different • Two of us strong with preschool, two with primary • We know how to use DAP, related to primary • Not easy to tell our philosophy, not want change 	3 (mixed)
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration better ECE & SPED than EL • Elem. Says due to be easier to be ECE teacher than EL • Elem. Don't mind being minority in these cohorts 	2 (independent)
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinctly different focus • We have primary focus on child, elem. Content • We see world differently 	2 (independent)
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No collaboration/communication • No methods in elem. • Don't serve on committees 	1 (negative)
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totally separate in how they approach their methods course • There has been some interaction between two programs recently 	3 (mixed)
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE & EL TE programs are not blended • They are two separate programs, except prior to formal admittance to the program • The students travel through the program as cohort 	3 (mixed)
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE is being pulled out and separate sections • NCATE really helped to move this change 	2 (independent)
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parallel programs that do not intersect • EL commonly come from particular subject, ECE have a stronger grounding in child development 	2 (independent)

21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good deal of overlap between two programs • Share some core courses • Share teacher placement coordination • They went through NCATE together 	4 (positive)
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are kept separate • They are trying to develop an integrated curriculum 	2 (independent)
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE students are best prepared to teach Birth-3 • EL students are not prepared for how young children develop during this development stage • They are all separate. 	2 (independent)
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are totally separate programs • The general education requirements for ECE program differ from that of the elem. 	2 (independent)
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are totally separate programs now but with a plan to bring them closer together 	3 (mixed)
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totally separate programs • Student teaching occurs at the preschool & K-3 levels for ECE students 	2 (independent)
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE students will be getting the same coursework as EL, however the ECE students will take an additional 4-5 courses • Separately the ECE students from the EL students totally 	2 (independent)
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are totally separate programs • ECE is competency based, EL method focus 	2 (independent)
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are two different worlds • ECE students receive a lot info. On develop & families, EL students only get one class • EL is more traditional focus • ECE progressive method focus 	2 (independent)
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning & instruction sometime overlap • Face competition • Positive relation 	3 (mixed)
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sharing of students • Have no control & varying degrees of influence • Not working with them 	1 (negative)

32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good • Competitive • Both research & making better teachers 	4 (positive)
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small difference • EL focus on life skills, placements • New program not implemented yet 	2 (independent)
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distinct programs with little overlap • Method courses are distinct 	2 (independent)
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unique, not typical • Two licensure programs 	2 (independent)
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty meetings discuss admission standards, not pertinent • Very separate 	2 (independent)
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive collaboration • Linked vertically and horizontally 	4 (positive)
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opened up some possibilities for students who are interested in younger children • EL has not much emphasis on developmental aspects 	3 (mixed)
41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same department different program requirements • Some sharing of faculty 	2 (independent)
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the same program all course are for everyone • There are two additional courses, they also take the method courses 	2 (independent)

Appendix K: Program Weakness

<u>ECE TE Program</u>	Interview Question #7	Survey Question #40
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certification Changes • Application for ECE few than before • Retired faculty left • New faculty was not well versed with ECE & hence left 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unfilled tenure track position in ECE
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudinal barrier, intervene to much • Make own placement and did own supervision • Drift using placement office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of science and math specialist on faculty • Faculty in admin. positions and less available to teach in program
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liabilities • Resources limited, shrinking budget • State of mind • Lack of understanding • Neglect of early years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not really did get support • Articulation with two year cc, can transfer 9 units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of funding for field supervision
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of people to do the work, understanding • Number of students • Denver is very diverse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources • Resources • Limited ECE experience of many elementary school administrators
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liabilities • Pressure from administration to keep program 4 years • State demands more in special ed, inclusion, ELL • Hard to research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative support • Personnel support • Sound clinical sites
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Univ. President does not seem to value ECE • New budget system • Wreaked left faculty opening vacant • School system • Pacing guides 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of faculty • Budget cuts • Campus restructuring

8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We lost 2 faculty members because of economy • No research • Insufficient funds • Problems with placement • Not many sites for inclusive ed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our grads don't want to teach preK because of low salaries • The major P-3 initiative is in South Florida.
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general economy • Insufficient funds • Practicum sites, lack of coordination from 3 to 3 and inclusive sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our grads don't want to teach preK because of low salaries • The major P-3 initiative is in South Florida
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ faculty assignments • Not having to be spread so thin • Supervision to schools • No reimbursement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget crises • Administrators that do not understand teacher education • Non developmentally appropriate response at public schools to meet NCLB
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget cuts • Difficulty getting placement sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing budget cuts • Lack of instructional support and coordination • High demand for increasing the number of teacher candidates.
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality placements • Lack of commitment • Rumors early retirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of commitment • Weak administrative support
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Try to respond to so many needs • Concerned to avoid failure by our students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philosophical differences • Now more intervention focus • Cannot hire someone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of public school K-3 teachers responsible for IEP's • Limited numbers of inclusive placements • Limited range of low SES and low incidence
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little, continuous battle, equal to, ? skilled as elem. Teacher • Find more and better placement sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • True full/link partnership with primary faculty partners • Economy and thus declining resource and faculty positions

16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money • All of our classrooms have IEPs, IFSP, special services • Lots of grad. Students none from Spl. Ed. • Never K student teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University budget problem • Increasing cost of providing care to families • Reduced state funding to school districts
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of collaboration between us and elem. • Cannot make it a student teaching experience yet, no supervisors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE and Primary in different departments • ECE and Primary not on same philosophical page • NCLB
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need staff/administrative support for completing paper work and certification requirements • Need additional support for doing research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current organizational structure • Lack of staff support • Money for research
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding practicum sites and placements • Attitudinal differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demands of being on the tenure track • Problems in public school leadership not understanding the importance of ECE • Need to bring ECE and elem. closer together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty tend not to supervise in the schools • Having enough faculty to supervise and mentor teachers • No master degree in ECE
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have more faculty than needed • Attitudinal barriers • PDS is good, however, it is too rigid and doesn't allow to move in and out of school easily 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over emphases on literacy which state requires (12 credits) • We don't have a major in ECE • Budget cuts
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget cuts • Elem. Ed. Faculty feel that they can teach not only at the elem. level but also at the early childhood level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on elem. • Economy • Administrative organizations make it difficult to collaborate with special ed.

23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to keep up with the standards • Need more money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active faculty research agendas • University funded collaboration research initiatives with schools • University advocating state legislature on PreK/P-3
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program does not have enough cooperative teachers • Difficulties finding enough field experiences/placements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial crises within the entire system • Limited funds to supervise students in the field • Limited funds for professional development opportunities
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial hurdles • There are not any attitudinal barriers that exist, they are very congenial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget cuts in our institution • Only one full-time tenure track faculty member in ECE • Changing adjunct faculty from year to year
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None really • Problem with placements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of funding • Lack of understanding of ECE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication between public school administration and university faculty • Philosophical differences • Balancing DAP with district standards
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudinal barriers • Not speaking the same language and remain on the same page coming from different disciplines • People not having a commitment or agreeing with certain content area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of institutional support • Lack of supplies • Too much focus on content area separately.

29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural barriers • Not having sufficient staff • Attitudinal barriers • Difficult to get the licensing requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of faculty lines and funding for full-time clinical supervisors. • Outreach and advisement staff support • Limited TEACH scholarship funds
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competition with alternative pathway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to move students around once they are placed in particular settings. • Having too few faculty in supervisory classes • Few ECE senior faculty members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R1 THE tenure pressure on research/publications • Two meetings with adjuncts always a negative, oversight what they are teaching, no knowledge about mentoring them, hold to constructivist philosophy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget concerns at both university and in schools • Focus on research at a research institution • Emphasis on NCATE issues
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking for more high quality PreK sites • Split placements • EL TE faculty, not working together • El faculty don't understand ECE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget-we will be experiencing additional budget cuts this year
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting the program to 1 year is difficult, there is a lot of pressure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is just not the main focus of our program • No ECE faculty/specific courses • Lack of focus in el. Schools on ECE standards/programs.
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going to specific classes • Content specific course • Not child focused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of full-time tenure stream faculty • Restriction of university to post-baccalaureate certification only • Small program
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedural checks • Distinctly separate from elementary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget deficits

37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finances • No structural barriers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of diverse faculty and ECE students • Limited inclusive sites for regular ECE undergrad. limited exposure to urban settings in the undergrad program
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudinal barriers • All programs had to cut 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of knowledge • Resistance to change
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a larger lab school, at least for faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited university support
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because of certification cannot teach in at-risk and head-start • State department not encouraging • Separate class in normal dev, separate assessment class, teaming course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different goals and philosophies between human dev. and edu. departments
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No problems • No attitude problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money for faculty • Faculty numbers • Support for tuition waivers

Appendix L: Programs Assets

<u>ECE TE Program</u>	Interview Question 6	Survey Question 39
1.	With specific need can approach the dean	Strong professional development partnerships and field experience placements for teacher candidates
2.	Combination grad students, mixed PreK and different age/grade level, not have infant specialists, lower primary and preschool show a good balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field based coursework in diverse schools & preschools. • Strong coursework in ELL and diversity issues. • Experienced non-tenure track faculty teaching in program
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased funds for travel to conferences. • Field experience with younger children • Connection to head start 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty in is greatest asset. • Close ties with preschool center on campus. • No resources for research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committed faculty • A preschool on campus • Collaboration with the Child Development program at the junior college
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuity of faculty • Follow up with program graduates • Coordinate license with undergraduate degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Student maturity • Network of former students
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four full-time committed faculty • Take time • Good IT department • Have on site preschool program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty expertise • Consistent accreditation related data analysis • Consistent program revisions
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lab preschool • Full day full year research • In-service for elementary • TE in ECE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent library • Math and Science lab • Own childhood lab • Five full-time tenure line faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong faculty • Relationship with south Florida P-3 initiative • Certificates & credentials offered that cover birth-8 years

9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain cohorts of 30 • Dedicated faculty • Experienced teachers for 18 years • Interest in terms of TE program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An existing and strong department of child and family development. • An available emphasis program where PreK-5th pre-service teachers can become specialized in PreK-2nd • Many state funded PreK classrooms in the community where students can do field experience
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High demand major • Attention from parents, state organization • Have nice library • Administrator understand the need • ECE more attention than middle school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visibility of the program in the university & the state organizations • Collaboration across colleges • Faculty with expertise
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working hard under constraints • TE everywhere • Increased number of adjuncts and clinical people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Special education faculty
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who have been hired • Provide classes in technology • Have administration support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty expertise • Excellent technology
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to hire tenure track faculty • Have maintained lab school • Have special education endorsement • Have positive behavioral grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links between faculty and school administrators • Depth and breadth of ECE curriculum • Collaboration between special education and regular education
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong, active research and practice around use of technology • Research on inclusive programming • Response to intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on all learners particularly those with special needs • Focus on partnership with families • Opportunities for field experience in Urban, Suburban and Rural programs

15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High tech lab school • Research studies • Have collaboration across departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collegial relations with college of education faculty • Positive reputation of our faculty & lab school • Strong administrative support
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have lab school • Maintain support • Campus wide, Uk contracted with outside vendor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty knowledge • Faculty connections • Body of research available
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two new faculty lines • New young program • Administrative support • Great interaction & outreach with community • Solid student teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Administration • Neighboring school system
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center for teacher excellence • Information technology online assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative faculty • Cooperative relationships with schools • 2 soft-money initiatives one in early intervention 0-5 and the other ESL
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information/speaker on the Maryland Model for School Readiness • Funded research from National Science foundation for STEM projects • University has experienced furloughs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long standing faculty with interest and experience in preK • Strong child development basis of the program • Early field placements with children under 5
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is nothing to report (because at this point the PreK/P-3 initiative is so new) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty knowledge of PreK • Grad students coming in our interest
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New hires in science, math, social studies but not in ECE • They are working to enroll freshman into the college of education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Faculty partnerships with schools • Faculty partnerships with Michigan Department of Education

23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial support • A tenure track line • Very supportive dean and president 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We were allowed to have one cohort per year • We have four tenure track lines for relatively small program • Strong administrative support
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't have extra supports • There have not been any new hires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty is knowledgeable about PreK
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good deal of ECE funded research going on in the department • Good deal of support from the three programs • They were able to hire 2 new faculty with ECE focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No influence • There is research which is agriculture extension service funded • No new hires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty expertise • Faculty willingness to collaborate • College-wide communication
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding from the foundation of child development in the past 6 years • Not have extra office • No new hires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty
28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new resources • Not having adequate number of staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our participation in the state wide higher education early childhood took force • Our state license that is birth to 3rd grade • Our placement of students in PreK sites often times with our prior graduates
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research center (2 classrooms) • Persons work across programs • Strong faculty, technology, math 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new resources with exception of Dr. New's position to help facilitate ECE and Elementary collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response

31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hired new persons • Separate building separate from other in college of education • Sharing, informing our teaching engage students in research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strength of faculty • History of programs emphasis on P-3 • Working relationship with school
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge amount of money from donor • Given lots to EDUCARE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus preschool lab • Strong relationship with public school • Recognition by upper administration of the equality of our program
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is funded through their grant • They also get help from the larger unit Prof. Barton is engaged in many research projects. • No new faculty hire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate ECE major in our Human development and family Res. Dept. • Kindergarten & 1-2 student teaching placements • Collegiality among our ECE candidates
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong early interventions program • Coursework in family community partnership • Two student teaching placements
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program has a high level of autonomy • Active research • Have a 4 year grant funded authentic assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Collaborative relationships with various state agencies • Administrative staff
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensive, diverse practice and internships • Close links between fieldwork and coursework • Cohort model
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field placements • Technology use • Diversity awareness
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared we of resources • Lab school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lab school teachers and children • Faculty and colleagues

39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory board is really strong • Parent agencies • Lots of field placements • Dean very supportive • Faculty strong • Research grants • Good students • ECSC program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong faculty • Partnerships with schools. Teachers, families, agencies • Dedication of our university for the promotion of research to practice
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain program • Good administrative support • Dean supportive • University wide survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration and discussion with state organizations • University wide coalition of researchers & instructors in ECE • Experience of instructors for delivering ECE courses
41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with public school • Expertise of faculty • Vision of dean
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library • Have placement office • 3 faculty • Student center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of our alumni working in the local urban district • Strong program vision

Appendix M: Program Plans

<u>ECE TE Program</u>	Plans
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising programs
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chancellor take vision to use college of education to raise the state • Promises for TE • Tenure line ECE professor • Having graduate program • Have C&I doctoral program emphasis in ECE
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruit more bilingual teachers • Diverse student body • Someone in science and math • Recruiting graduate students
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE and special education certification • Need teach abc
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New faculty • New hire research expectation • Serve lower SES, children of color, serve them better
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on changes needed for 2010, going up to 3rd grade • Try to keep the program a 4 year program via interdisciplinary collaboration with sociology department and English department
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survive crisis • Rebudgeting crisis
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to grow doctorate program in ECE • Save pro teaching • Prepare to work in R1 IHE • Rigorous research • Early intervention focus • Infant and toddler specialist • Find more sites • No school psychologist
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay alive as a program due to current budget • Larger school environment • Could be more fun, more DAP then completing worksheet after worksheet
11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC methods courses not taught well • Lack of assessment analytic skills • CC have to have general education • Career tech education programs • Have to combine courses

12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No idea • New head does nothing about the program, going to have a search
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs of schools, preschool • Need to be in letter touch with clinical, visit schools • More student research
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grow in numbers • Marketing, selling point • No grad birth through K...grad birth through third, birth through K, first through third grade
15.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student enrollment will increase average from 100-150 • Much interest in Special education and K endorsement • Need teachers with this lisence
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and hold ground • FCA website P-3 • Define ECE 0-8 years
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a new ECE administration certificate from birth-5
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hopes to continue to increase enrollement
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being able to hang onto resources in the difficult economy
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hopes to continue to increase program enrollment • A course on inclusion
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting ECE endorsement approved for the program • More supervision in the field placements • More infant/toddler focus
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to increase quality of the new lab school • Have ECE approved as a major • Increase content for early intervention
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating the online program • Graduating 2nd cohort since this new curriculum has been standard and then evaluating and making necessary changes
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hopes to continue to increase program enrollment • Much more full-time faculty
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trying to change the ECE and EL programs
26.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing the newest faculty members • Integrating them fully into the ECE program
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To start the program • Moving from the abstract to concrete implementation of the program • Need more training on special education and inclusion

28.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To have the state government approve the latest teacher licensing changes • To establish a new Monler's program in ECE • Need for more collaborations with the lower division program
29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hopes to continue to exist • Continue to graduate high quality students • New resources for ECE
30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content based • Get grants • Use of research center • Expand hiring • EL and ECE collaborations • Support teaching
31.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter to semester system • 4th and 5th grade endorsement • Recognized licenses bands
32.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To pull together, reinvent program • Align well with NAEYC standards
33.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop courses ourselves
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of a 5 year program with Applied development psychology leading to certificate in ECE and Special Education and on M.ED in the fifth year
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a part-time program offerings to attract child care workers
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk about immediate concerns with districts and their budgets • Collaborating with districts to solve problems
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PreK-3rd initiative • Aligned and coordinated system • Including other personnel that work in the school buildings • Constructive ways to integrate ECE and ELEM
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate program in educational leadership in ECE
41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to survive • Published report • ECE through Middle childhood birth through grade six
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborating with districts to solve problems