

REL Southwest Ask-A-REL Response Early Childhood Education

June 2017

Question 1:

To what extent have prekindergarten participation rates for subgroups of students (for example socioeconomic status, English language learner status, gender, and race/ethnicity) changed from the 2008/09 to 2014/15 school years?

Question 2:

What is known about the key facilitators and barriers (for example, distance, transportation, cultural, parental knowledge of prekindergarten benefits and application process) to student participation in prekindergarten?

Question 3:

In what ways do the facilitators and barriers to prekindergarten participation vary by student subpopulation and by geographic region?

Response:

Following an established REL Southwest research protocol, we conducted a search for research reports as well as descriptive study articles on prekindergarten participation. We focused on identifying resources that specifically addressed (1) the extent to which prekindergarten rates for subgroups of students have changed from the 2008/09 to 2014/15 school years, (2) the key facilitators and barriers to student participation in prekindergarten, and (3) how these facilitators and barriers vary by student subpopulations and geographic region. The sources included ERIC and other federally funded databases and organizations, research institutions, academic research databases, and general Internet search engines (For details, please see the methods section at the end of this memo.)

We have not evaluated the quality of references and the resources provided in this response and we offer them only for your reference. Also, we searched the references in the response from the most commonly used resources of research, but they are not comprehensive and other relevant references and resources may exist.

Research References

Question 1: To what extent have prekindergarten participation rates for subgroups of students (for example socioeconomic status, English language learner status, gender, and race/ethnicity) changed from the 2008/09 to 2014/15 school years?

Barnett, W. S., Carolan, M. E., Squires, J. H., and Brown, K. C. (2014). The state of preschool 2013. First Look. NCES 2014-078. *National Center for Education Statistics*.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED545098>

From the ERIC abstract: “Participation in preschool programs has been associated with a number of positive outcomes. Evaluating data from the 40-year follow-up to the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program Study, Belfield and his colleagues show how preschool participation by low income children relates to significant economic benefits both to the children by the time they are in their 40s and to society more generally (Belfield et al. 2006). Summarizing over 160 studies conducted from 1960 through 2000, Camilli et al. found that preschool had a range of shorter and longer term positive relationships to cognitive gains, progression through school, and social-emotional development (Camilli et al. 2010). This report provides an overview of state supported preschool enrollment and state funding of preschool programs. Information provided here is based primarily on data collected from state agencies that manage preschool programs through the State of Preschool 2012-13 data collection. Officials in states with state preschool programs were the respondents to the data collection effort. Data collection occurred between November 2013 and March 2014. Forty states and the District of Columbia operated 53 programs in 2012-13 (see Carolan et al. forthcoming). Two additional data sources are utilized in the report. Comparisons are made to data collected through the State of Preschool 2011-12 data collection. Population counts for determining the percentage of 3- and 4-year-olds in each state that are enrolled in state supported preschool programs were obtained from U.S. Census Population Estimates, State Population Datasets. The Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program (PEP) uses data on births, deaths, and migration to calculate population change since the most recent decennial census. Details about the data sources used in the report are provided in the appendices. Three appendices provide: (1) Technical Notes; (2) Glossary; and (3) Support Tables. [This report was prepared in part under Contract No. ED-IES-13-C-0055 with the National Institute for Early Education Research, Rutgers University.]”

Geraghty, T. M., Holian, L., & Gyekye, A. (2012). Prekindergarten participation rates in West Virginia. REL Technical Brief. REL 2012-No. 021. *Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED531483>

From the ERIC abstract: “In 2009, in response to concerns of state policymakers, Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia published "West Virginia's progress toward universal prekindergarten" (Cavalluzzo et al. 2009), which covered school years 2002/03-2006/07. This follow-up brief updates that report with data for 2007/08-2010/11. It compares the shares of preK seats provided by public school systems and collaborative partners--federal or private--and analyzes participation rates based on socioeconomic and racial/ethnic subgroups and district characteristics. This study answers five research

questions: (1) What is the statewide participation rate in the preK program, and how did it change between 2002/03 and 2010/11?; (2) What is the participation rate by collaborative partners, and how did it change between 2002/03 and 2010/11?; (3) How does the participation rate vary by child subgroup, including children from a low-income household, racial/ethnic minority children, and children receiving special education services?; (4) How does the participation rate differ between rural and nonrural districts and between high-poverty rural districts and the state as a whole?; and (5) Do participation rates vary by child subgroup between rural and nonrural districts? These questions are answered using West Virginia Department of Education data on public school enrollments (West Virginia Department of Education 2011; West Virginia Department of Education, Office of School Readiness 2010); the U.S. Department of Education's (2011) Common Core of Data on student family incomes and levels of district urbanization; and U.S. Census Bureau (2008) geographical data. Key findings on statewide participation rates include: (1) The statewide participation rate in the preK program has more than doubled, from 26 percent in 2002/03 to 63 percent in 2010/11; (2) PreK enrollment has grown since 2007/08, though annual growth slowed from 7 percentage points a year from 2005/06 to 2007/08 to 4 percentage points a year from 2008/09 to 2010/11; and (3) Variation in participation rates between districts has shrunk since 2006/07. Most participation growth has been in districts where the participation rate was below the statewide median. Key finding on collaborative partners includes: (1) Seating capacity provided by collaborative partners has grown. By 2010/11, 53 of West Virginia's 55 districts had preK programs funded through contracts between local education agencies and collaborative partners, and 74 percent of the state's seating capacity was funded through collaborative partners. Key findings on preK participation by child subgroup include: (1) Since 2006/07, the participation rate of children from a low-income household, which at the time was lower than the statewide rate, has grown faster than (and now exceeds) the statewide participation rate; (2) The participation rates of racial/ethnic minority children is higher than the state-wide average and has mirrored statewide growth in preK participation; and (3) The participation rate of children receiving special education services exceeded the statewide average through 2006/07, but since 2007/08, has been lower than the statewide participation rate. Key finding on participation rates in rural and nonrural districts includes: (1) Since 2002/03, rural districts have had the highest preK participation rates, but nonrural districts have had the fastest growth in participation rates. Key findings on participation rates by subgroup in rural and nonrural districts include: (1) The participation rate of children from a low-income household was at least 5 percentage points higher in rural districts than in nonrural districts every school year except 2008/09; (2) The participation rate of racial/ethnic minority children in rural and nonrural districts has not followed a consistent pattern, though it has usually been higher in nonrural districts since 2004/05; and (3) The participation rate of special education students was on average 8 percentage points higher in rural districts than in nonrural districts over 2002/03-2010/11. Appended are: (1) Literature review; (2) Data and methodology; and (3) Detailed tables. (Contains 10 figures, 14 tables, 2 boxes, 2 maps and 2 notes.)”

Grehan, A., Cavalluzzo, L., Gnuschke, J., Hanson, R., Oliver, S., & Vosters, K. (2011). Participation during the first four years of Tennessee's voluntary prekindergarten program. *Issues & Answers. REL 2011-No. 107. Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia.* <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED524319>

From the ERIC abstract: “This study examines the first four years of Tennessee's Voluntary Prekindergarten program, directed to four-year-olds eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. It reviews participation levels and trends for the program as a whole, for collaborative partner classrooms, and for student and district subgroups and discusses the geographic distribution of program sites. Key findings include: (1) From 2005/06 to 2008/09, the number of PreK program participants increased from 6,943 to 18,746, the proportion of eligible children participating increased from 18 percent to 42 percent, and the proportion of local education agencies participating increased from 83 percent to nearly 99 percent; (2) The number of participants at collaborative partner classrooms increased from 1,428 (21 percent of all participants) in 2005/06 to 3,621 (19 percent) in 2008/09. Collaborative partner classrooms consistently accounted for approximately 21 percent of total PreK program classrooms; (3) PreK program participation levels and rates increased for all subgroups examined but exhibited varying growth rates across student and district subgroups. The participation rate increased faster for racial/ethnic minority students than for White students. Participation rates among students in special education increased from 8 percent to 32 percent. Large districts had fewer participants and lower participation rates than did small districts. Rural districts had higher levels and rates of participation than did nonrural districts. And the percentage of participants enrolled in collaborative classrooms was higher for racial/ethnic minority students and students in nonrural districts; and (4) The majority of public PreK program sites were in the four major urban areas of Tennessee: Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis, and Nashville. Collaborative partner sites were more evenly distributed across rural and nonrural areas. Appended are: (1) Literature review; (2) Background on Tennessee's Voluntary Prekindergarten program; (3) Data sources and methodology; (4) Participation by all four-year-olds in the state; and (5) Maps of public school and collaborative partner sites for Tennessee's Voluntary Prekindergarten program, 2005/06-2008/09. (Contains 3 boxes, 12 figures, 6 tables, 14 maps, and 3 notes.)”

Mamedova, S. & Redford, J. (2015). Early childhood program participation, from the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2012. First Look. NCES 2013-029. Rev. *National Center for Education Statistics.* <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED556340>

From the ERIC abstract: “This report presents data on the early care and education arrangements and selected family activities of children in the United States from birth through the age of 5 who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten in the spring of 2012. The report also presents data on parents' satisfaction with various aspects of these care arrangements and on their participation in various learning activities with their children. For each category of information included in the report, the results are broken down by child, parent, and family characteristics. The data in this report are from the 2012 National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES: 2012) Early Childhood Program Participation (ECP) Survey. The ECP survey is used to collect information on children from birth through age 6 who are not yet enrolled in kindergarten. Prior to the

2012 ECPP survey that is the focus of the current report, the survey was last conducted in 2005. The ECPP asks detailed questions about children's participation in relative care, nonrelative care, and center-based care arrangements. It also asks about the main reason for choosing care; what factors were important to parents when choosing a care arrangement; what activities the family does with the child, such as reading, singing, and arts and crafts; and what the child is learning, such as counting, recognizing the letters of the alphabet, and reading. This report (NCES 2013-029.REV) is revised from an earlier version of the report (NCES 2013-029) that was released in August 2013. This updated version is based on estimates that utilize the final NHES: 2012 data, for which survey weights have been corrected. Findings include: (1) Approximately 60 percent of children 5 and younger not enrolled in kindergarten were in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement, as reported by their parents. Among children in a weekly nonparental care arrangement, 56 percent were attending a day care center, preschool, or prekindergarten (center-based care); 42 percent were cared for by a relative (relative care); and 24 percent were cared for in a private home by someone not related to them (nonrelative care) (table 1); (2) Among children with relative care, the primary caregiver for 78 percent of children was a grandparent in the primary relative care arrangement, compared to 11 percent who were cared for by an aunt or uncle and 10 percent whose care was provided by another relative (table 2); (3) Among children who were one to two years old, the mean length of time that they had been in their primary care arrangement was longer for children in their primary relative care arrangement (18 months) compared to their primary nonrelative care (15 months) or center-based care arrangement (13 months) (table 3); (4) Among families with any out-of-pocket costs for care using the primary care arrangement in each category reported, the per child out-of-pocket costs for center-based care were higher for children in families with incomes at or above the poverty threshold (\$6.96 per hour) compared to children in families with incomes below the poverty threshold (\$3.53 per hour) (table 4); (5) The most common location for children's primary center-based care arrangement, as reported in the survey, was a building of its own (46 percent). Other reported locations were a church, synagogue, or other place of worship (20 percent); a public school (20 percent); and various other types of locations (14 percent) (table 5); (6) Among children in a weekly nonparental care arrangement who had a parent that reported trying to find care, 81 percent of children had parents who reported that the learning activities of the child care arrangement were very important to them when they chose the arrangement where their child spends the most time. This percentage varied by parental education level, as a higher percentage of children whose parents/guardians had less than a high school credential (92 percent) or a high school diploma or equivalent (91 percent) had parents/guardians who reported that the learning activities at the care arrangement were very important in their choice compared to children whose parents/guardians had a vocational/technical degree or some college education (81 percent), children whose parents/guardians had a bachelor's degree (79 percent), and children whose parents/guardians had a graduate or professional degree (71 percent) (table 6); and (7) Approximately 98 percent of children ages three to five who were not yet in kindergarten had parents who taught them letters, words, or numbers in the past week; 95 percent had parents who read to them; 94 percent had parents who sang songs with them; 86 percent had parents who worked on arts and crafts with them; and 83

percent had parents who told them a story (table 7). The following are appended: (1) Technical Notes; (2) Glossary of Terms; and (3) Standard Error Tables.”

Redford, J., Desrochers, D., & Hoyer, K. M. (2017). The years before school: Children's nonparental care arrangements from 2001 to 2012. *Stats in Brief*. NCES 2017-096. *National Center for Education Statistics*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED573320>

From the ERIC abstract: “Nearly 24 million children age 5 and under resided in the United States in 2014. Previous research has shown that about 60 percent of these children have some type of nonparental care arrangement before entering kindergarten. Studies of nonparental care arrangements are important because it is through such arrangements that many children receive basic care while their parents are at work, school, or otherwise not able to care for them. They are also where children may learn early literacy and numeracy skills that are important for kindergarten entry. Policymakers have focused on establishing broader access to quality preschool and kindergarten programs. Four in five states now have public prekindergarten programs, and enrollment has expanded rapidly over the past decade. In 2010, over 50 percent of children entering kindergarten had attended a center care arrangement in the previous year. This *Statistics in Brief* examines the nonparental care arrangements of children in the United States, from birth through age 5, who are not yet enrolled in kindergarten. The report draws on data from the National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES) Early Childhood Program Participation (ECPP) Surveys of 2001, 2005, and 2012. Previous reports have shown that children's nonparental care arrangements vary by age, with higher percentages of older children participating in center care arrangements. The evidence suggests that this may be because as children get older, their parents begin to focus more on their academic skills. Younger children's parents, in contrast, may be more concerned about practical factors such as cost and arrangement reliability as well as factors related to caregivers' trustworthiness and ability to form caring, home- or family-like relationships with children. Given the emphasis in recent years on young children's early learning and nonparental care arrangements, it is important to better understand where children are spending their time during the years before school entry. This report presents findings on nonparental care over time, specifically on the arrangements children participate in, the time they spend in these arrangements, and the out-of-pocket expense for these arrangements. The following are appended: (1) Data Tables; and (2) Standard Error Tables.”

Question 2: What is known about the key facilitators and barriers (for example, distance, transportation, cultural, parental knowledge of prekindergarten benefits and application process) to student participation in prekindergarten?

Barton, E. E. & Smith, B. J. (2015). Advancing high-quality preschool inclusion: A discussion and recommendations for the field. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 35(2), 69-78. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1066913>

From the ERIC abstract: “Although considerable progress has been achieved regarding the research and laws supporting preschool inclusion, access to inclusive preschool environments remains intangible for many children with disabilities in the United States. The purpose of this article is to discuss current challenges and solutions to high-quality

preschool inclusion. We use the conceptual framework identified in the Division for Early Childhood (DEC)/National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) inclusion position statement to promote solutions to support high-quality inclusion and the success of all children. We provide conceptual and empirical support for preschool inclusion and outline recommendations to the field.”

Gelatt, J., Adams, G., & Huerta, S. (2014). Supporting immigrant families' access to prekindergarten. *Urban Institute*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED559309>

From the ERIC abstract: “In recent years, many states have expanded their state-funded prekindergarten programs, drawing on evidence that public investments in early childhood education bring substantial returns in children's educational trajectories and a more skilled future workforce. Evidence also suggests that returns to early education may be larger for children of immigrants (defined as children with at least one parent born outside of the United States, including refugees) than for other children. Yet children of immigrants and of English language learners (ELLs) remain underrepresented in early education programs such as prekindergarten. Obstacles such as parents' lack of awareness of available programs, language barriers, logistical barriers to enrollment, and lack of comfort with available programs can all prevent immigrant families from enrolling their children. Given that children of immigrants form a growing share of the population of young children in the country, policymakers wishing to ensure that their prekindergarten programs are reaching children who could benefit from early education must continue to work to attract and include immigrant families and ELLs. This report is intended to help those interested in improving participation--from program staff to state directors and policymakers--learn from the experiences of other communities about ways to facilitate immigrant families' enrollment in public prekindergarten programs. To understand what strategies programs can adopt to enroll more children of immigrants, the authors conducted more than 40 telephone interviews with local prekindergarten program directors, outreach specialists, English as a second language (ESL) specialists, state prekindergarten directors, directors of other early childhood education programs such as Head Start, and national early childhood education specialists in communities and states across the country involved with diverse types of early childhood education programs. The strategies described fall into four main categories: outreach, enrollment assistance, building relationships with parents, and building immigrant-friendly prekindergarten programs. For each strategy, the authors describe actions used by local programs and regional program directors and discuss some of the policies, funding, and infrastructure at the state level that they identified as being helpful for this work. Some strategies involve substantial investments of resources and staff time, while others are quite simple and inexpensive to implement. The following are appended: (1) Examples of Programs Integrating Several Strategies for Including Immigrant Families; and (2) List of Interviewees.” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Guralnick, M. J. and Bruder, M. B. (2016). Early childhood inclusion in the united states: Goals, current status, and future directions. *Infants and Young Children*, 29(3),166-177. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1103451>

From the ERIC abstract: “The current status and future directions of early childhood inclusion in the United States are discussed from the perspective of 4 key goals: access, accommodations and feasibility, developmental progress, and social integration. Recommendations are put forward to promote inclusion goals emphasizing administrative structures, personnel preparation, licensing and national standards, team processes, and expansion of inclusive practices beyond school settings. These recommendations are discussed within the context of an early childhood systems framework that encompasses all children.”

Kealey, Jarrett; Peterson, Renee; Thompson, Angela; Waters, Kristin. (2015). Paving the Road for Student Success: Building a Case for Integrated Strategic Planning from Pre-K to Post-Doc *College and University*, 90(4), 8-14. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1083685>

From the ERIC abstract: “The road from prekindergarten (pre-K) to post-doctoral (post-doc) work is riddled with potholes, detours, u-turns, and construction zones. National education initiatives such as No Child Left Behind, the Common Core, Race to the Top, Performance-Based Funding, College Readiness and Completion Acts, and Post-Graduate Gainful Employment Reports demonstrate attempts by government agencies to increase high school and college completion rates in the United States. Currently, students and their families who investigate the options for higher education lack a clear map to guide them. Today's students are told that college is either the best investment they can make or a waste of time. As a result of government involvement as well as student and family expectations, education administrators are under increasing pressure to ensure that all students succeed from pre-K through "grade" sixteen. To ensure a smooth transition from secondary to postsecondary education, administrators from both groups must come together to build roads of transition for all. The purpose of this article is to identify the road blocks that currently exist and to recommend patches that can be put in place in building roadways for students' smooth transition from pre-K through grade 16.”

Mattern, Janet A. (2015). A mixed-methods study of early intervention Implementation in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Supports, services, and policies for young children with developmental delays and disabilities. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 43(1), 57-67. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1049248>

From the ERIC abstract: “Participation in high quality early intervention programs is critical for eligible young children who experience atypical development for their future academic success. High quality programs promote access to services, incorporate instructional strategies that encourage children's participation, and advocate public policy that supports professional development and collaboration among families, early childhood educators, and early intervention providers. Although program implementation according to evidence-based practice is recognized as the key, little research currently exists documenting the implementation of evidence-based practices in early intervention programs. The primary goal of this mixed-methods study was to determine if families, early childhood educators, and early intervention service providers were knowledgeable about evidence-based practices for early intervention and if these practices were currently being implemented consistently throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Families (n = 11), early childhood educators (n = 149), and early intervention providers (n = 66) completed online surveys, and 12 participants participated in semi-structured interviews to report their experiences. Early intervention providers reported a significantly higher perception than early childhood educators that early intervention services were implemented according to evidence-based practice. Early childhood educators were knowledgeable about evidence-based practices in early intervention, but they did not feel they were implemented in their programs. Study findings are discussed in the context of providing early childhood educators with recommendations for improving the quality of early intervention implementation for children with atypical development in their community preschools including access, participation, and policy support.”

Sherfinski, M., Weekley, B., S., and Mathew, S. (2015). Reconceptualising advocacy: Creating inclusive education in US universal pre-kindergarten. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19(2), 1213-1228. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1081589>

From the ERIC abstract: “This narrative inquiry concerns preschool education in the USA. It describes and analyses the barriers and possibilities for inclusion/exclusion that educators and parents of young children in a West Virginian community believe that it poses. The researchers present a case study designed to examine the context of inclusive education as revealed in 15 educators' and parents' narratives and observations of universal pre-kindergarten (UPK) practice. Due to semi-market-based orientations, new UPK structures, and perceptions of acceptable roles for parents and educators, possibilities for advocacy, and inclusive education often went unrealised. Based on these data, the researchers offer suggestions for how teacher education might be further developed to reconceptualise advocacy as inclusive education created in part through a praxis orientation and deliberative relationships between homes and schools.”

Question 3: In what ways do the facilitators and barriers to prekindergarten participation vary by student subpopulation and by geographic region?

Bassok, D. & Galdo, E. (2016). Inequality in preschool quality? Community-level disparities in access to high-quality learning environments. *Early Education and Development*, 27(1), 128-144. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1084810>

From the ERIC abstract: “In recent years, unequal access to high-quality preschool has emerged as a growing public policy concern. Because of data limitations, it is notoriously difficult to measure disparities in access to early learning opportunities across communities and particularly challenging to quantify gaps in access to "high-quality" programs. Research Findings: Using unique data from Georgia's universal prekindergarten program, this study provides empirical evidence of the relationship between community characteristics and the availability of high-quality preschool opportunities. We show that in Georgia, a national leader with respect to preschool access as well as quality, there are still meaningful differences in quality across communities. Low-income and high-minority communities offer state preschool classrooms that are rated significantly lower on a widely used and validated measure of classroom process quality. Practice or Policy: This process quality gap is troubling given the positive relationship between our process quality measure and children's learning. Note that we do

not see similar gaps in "structural" measures of quality, which are the aspects of quality more often regulated but are also weaker, inconsistent predictors of children's learning. Implications for policy are discussed."

Crosnoe, R., Purtell, K. M., Davis-Kean, P., Ansari, A., & Benner, A. D. (2016). The selection of children from low-income families into preschool. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(4), 599-612. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1094912>

From the ERIC abstract: "Because children from low-income families benefit from preschool but are less likely than other children to enroll, identifying factors that promote their enrollment can support research and policy aiming to reduce socioeconomic disparities in education. In this study, we tested an accommodations model with data on 6,250 children in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort. In general, parental necessity (e.g., maternal employment) and human capital considerations (e.g., maternal education) most consistently predicted preschool enrollment among children from low-income families. Supply side factors (e.g., local child care options) and more necessity and human capital factors (e.g., having fewer children, desiring preparation for school) selected such children into preschool over parental care or other care arrangements, and several necessity factors (e.g., being less concerned about costs) selected them into non-Head Start preschools over Head Start programs. Systemic connections and child elicitation did not consistently predict preschool enrollment in this population."

Greenberg, J. P. & Kahn, J. M. (2011). The influence of immigration status on early childhood education and care enrollment. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 9(1), 20-35. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ916055>

From the ERIC abstract: "Early childhood education and care has become the norm for children in the United States and most European countries. In the United States, immigrant children, a growing demographic, are under-enrolled, particularly in formal settings. This research revealed that younger children of immigrant mothers were less likely to be in non-parental care, but immigrant status did not affect enrollment of three-five-year-old children when various parental and child characteristics were controlled. Socio-economic factors were more important predictors of early childhood education and care use than immigrant status in the older group, which suggests that policies aimed at increasing enrollment among immigrants must consider the primacy of these variables. (Contains 7 tables and 1 note.)"

Morrier, M. J. & Gallagher, P. A. (2011). Disproportionate representation in placements of preschoolers with disabilities in five southern states. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 31(1), 48-57. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ920658>

From the ERIC abstract: "Special education placements for more than 69,000 preschoolers with disabilities were examined within and across five southern states. Data were gathered from the 2007 December 1st Child Count reported to the U.S. Department of Education. All states examined offered state-funded prekindergarten programs. Analyses compared disproportionate representation in placements (three levels of inclusion) across child ethnicity and state of residence. Disproportionate representation

indexes were calculated using risk index (RI) and risk ratio (RR). Results reveal that a full inclusion setting was used most frequently, followed by no known inclusion, and finally partial inclusion. Overall, although individual state variation was great, no disproportionate representation occurred in full or partial inclusion settings, whereas children classified as American Indian were underrepresented in the no known inclusion setting (RR = 0.22). Inspection of individual RI by state found significant differences (Wilks's $\lambda = 0.001$, $F = 10.354$, $p = 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.902$) between states for full ($p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.902$), partial ($p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.873$), and no known inclusion ($p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.699$) settings. Policy implications of the data are discussed. (Contains 5 tables.)”

Vesely, C. K. & Ginsberg, M. R. (2011). Strategies and practices for working with immigrant families in early education programs. *Young Children*, 66(1), 84-89.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ930010>

From the ERIC abstract: “This study explores how early childhood education programs engage immigrant families in their children's learning, how programs learn about these families and incorporate their cultures into the classrooms, and what programs are doing in terms of their staff's professional development related to working with immigrant children and families. The programs participating in this study represent the upper echelon of early education programs in the United States and Eastern Europe, some with greater resources than many other early education programs. However, their experiences provide insight into a variety of ways practitioners and researchers can work more effectively with young immigrant children and their families. More applied research, as well as discussions among early childhood education practitioners who work with immigrant families, is needed to continue to increase one's understanding of successfully meeting the needs immigrant families with young children around the world.”

Wright, T. S. (2011). Countering the politics of class, race, gender, and geography in early childhood education. *Educational Policy*, 25(1), 240-261.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ911213>

From the ERIC abstract: “Mirroring many of the same social and geographic inequities present in the K-12 educational system, the promise of early childhood education has been unfulfilled for many young children and their families. Social norms and funding structures, including the lack of universal, publicly funded high-quality preschool offerings, have served to perpetuate gender, class, economic, and racial inequity. The outcomes of these inequities are clearly manifested in the politics of universal preschool access and quality. In this policy analysis, the author discusses disparities in preschool access and quality, critiques social and political barriers to equitable distribution of preschool resources, and suggests several strategies for countering the current politics of class, race, gender, and geography in early childhood education. Findings from this analysis suggest that in order to provide high-quality early childhood education for all children, policy makers and advocates must address structural and attitudinal inequities.”

Additional Organizations to Consult

National Institute for Early Education Research at Rutgers University—

<http://nieer.org/about> and http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/YB2016_StateofPreschool2.pdf

From the website: “The National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) conducts academic research to inform policy supporting high-quality, early education for all young children. Such education promotes the physical, cognitive and social development needed for children to succeed in school and later life. NIEER provides independent, research-based analysis and technical assistance to policymakers, journalists, researchers, and educators.”

Methods

Keywords and Search Strings

The following keywords and search strings were used to search the reference databases and other sources:

Prekindergarten programs
Preschool
Enrollment
Access,
Participation,
Barriers
Challenges
Opportunities
Facilitators
Promotion
Students
Early childhood education
Geographic

Databases and Resources

We searched ERIC for relevant resources. ERIC is a free online library of over 1.6 million citations of education research sponsored by the Institute of Education Sciences. Additionally, we searched Google Scholar and PsychInfo.

Reference Search and Selection Criteria

When we were searching and reviewing resources, we considered the following criteria:

Date of the publication: References and resources published for last 15 years, from 2001 to present, were include in the search and review.

Search Priorities of Reference Sources: Search priority is given to study reports, briefs, and other documents that are published and/or reviewed by IES and other federal or federally funded organizations, academic databases, including ERIC, EBSCO databases, JSTOR database, PsychInfo, PsychArticle, and Google Scholar.

Methodology: Following methodological priorities/considerations were given in the review and selection of the references: (a) study types – randomized control trials,, quasi experiments, surveys, descriptive data analyses, literature reviews, policy briefs, etc., generally in this order (b) target population, samples (representativeness of the target population, sample size, volunteered or randomly selected, etc.), study duration, etc. (c) limitations, generalizability of the findings and conclusions, etc.

This memorandum is one in a series of quick-turnaround responses to specific questions posed by stakeholders in the Southwest Region (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas), which is served by the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southwest at SEDL. This memorandum was prepared by REL Southwest under a contract with the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Contract ED-IES-12-C-0012, administered by SEDL. Its content does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.