Minnesota Round Table 2003
Linking Research and Public Policy to Improve Child Development: Local, State and National Perspectives

Tuesday, April 8, 2003 marked the 30-year anniversary of the Minnesota Roundtable on Early Childhood Education, sponsored by the Center for Early Education Development (CEED). The 2003 Round Table theme, “Linking Research and Public Policy to Improve Child Development: Local, State, and National Perspectives” was dedicated to the memory of Mary McEvoy, early childhood advocate and director of CEED from 1993-1999. Mary’s energy, spirit and commitment to young children were alive and present in the room of over 200 attendees and panelists at the Radisson Hotel in Minneapolis. Audience members included University of Minnesota students, faculty and staff, state and local policy makers, child care providers, parents, psychologists, social workers, nurses and many other professionals who work with or are committed to improving the lives of children.

The first Minnesota Round Table convened in 1973 and closed with a challenge for early educators to produce more relevant research, to improve practice, and to actively participate in creating policies that...
affect the lives of young children and their families. Since then, research and practice have contributed steadily to our knowledge of child development. As a society we have become more aware of the importance of the early years as a cornerstone for positive developmental and educational outcomes in children as they grow. Target populations for early intervention have broadened and public awareness about the needs of infants, young children, and their families has significantly increased. A window of opportunity is now open for our nation as it shapes changes in policy and practice that will make a difference in the lives of these children and their families. The Minnesota Round Table continues to be one way in which we reinforce the dissemination of important information about early childhood and contribute to a dialogue that informs public policy.

The 2003 Round Table followed the unique conference format that has ensured its success for the last 30 years. Seven nationally distinguished early childhood scholars, policy makers, and practitioners came together as a panel to address the intersection of practice, research, and policy as they relate to early childhood education. After a brief introduction, each of the seven panelists responded to questions posed by the moderator, Dr. Scott McConnell, Director of CEED and Professor in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Minnesota. Each panelist had a chance to reflect, explore intuitive hunches, and challenge each other's ideas in an open and constructive environment. The Round Table's unique format facilitated a variety of insights gained from research, policy and practice. Visionary suggestions for the future were offered and explored by the panel as well as the audience.

The 2003 Round Table was sponsored by CEED; the Irving B. Harris Training Center for Infant and Toddler Development (University of Minnesota); and the Children, Youth and Family Consortium. The following report contains comments taken from the daylong conversation between the panelists and the audience. In some cases quotations have been rephrased and/or moved to articulate the speaker's position on the topic. A complete, verbatim transcript of the 2003 Round Table is available online at http://education.umn.edu/ceed.

Sitting at the Round Table

Scott McConnell, Ph.D., is Professor and Coordinator of the School Psychology Program in the Department of Educational Psychology, and Director of the Center for Early Education and Development at the University of Minnesota. In addition, he is an Adjunct Professor of Child Psychology at the University of Minnesota. Dr. McConnell received his Ph.D. in Educational Psychology at the University of Oregon in 1982 and is a certified
School Psychologist. He served as the Co-Director of the Early Childhood Research Institute on Measuring Growth and Development, a five-year research, development, and dissemination effort to build procedures for describing young children’s growth and development over time, and to design interventions that support optimal rates of development. He has published articles on the assessment and treatment of social behavior deficits, social competence, school adjustment, and academic performance, including development of early literacy skills and other developmental competencies.

Samuel Odom, Ph.D. is the Otting Professor of Special Education at Indiana University in Bloomington, where he coordinates the Ph.D. program in Special Education. He has held positions as a preschool teacher, student teaching supervisor, program coordinator, teacher educator, and researcher. Dr. Odom is the author of many articles and chapters about early intervention for young children with disabilities and their families, and is the co-editor of five books on early intervention and childhood special education. His research has examined the inclusion of typically-developing children and young children with disabilities (particularly autism) in early childhood education settings, peer-mediated interventions for children with autism, and peer social relationships. Recently he served on the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Educational Interventions for Young Children with Autism. Currently, Dr. Odom is the President-Elect of the Division for Research on the Council for Exceptional Children.

Carol Johnson, Ph.D. was hired as superintendent of the Minneapolis Public Schools in 1997 after serving two years as superintendent of St. Louis Park schools. Before that, she had been a teacher, principal, and administrator in Minneapolis. Dr. Johnson received her bachelor’s degree in elementary education from Fisk University. She received her master’s degree in curriculum and instruction and her doctorate in educational policy and administration from the University of Minnesota. She has three children. Her youngest son graduated from Minneapolis North High School in 2000. The superintendent serves as the district’s chief executive officer and is responsible for carrying out the school board’s policies. To support the successful operation of the district, the superintendent brings recommendations to the board and advises the board.
Nancy Johnson has been involved in the early care and education field for over 25 years as a family child care provider, center teacher, center director, Project Organizational Quality Manager, Executive Director of Child Care WORKS, and Executive Director of the Minnesota Child Care Resource and Referral Network. In 1998, Ms. Johnson helped facilitate a groundbreaking think-tank on finance reform for early education learning from higher education financing. She helped launch the Minnesota Early Care and Education Finance Commission and has continued as a board member of the Ready 4 K initiative. From September 2001 until August 2002, Ms. Johnson was a National Head Start Fellow working in the Child Care Bureau in Washington D.C. During her fellowship, Ms. Johnson worked on projects and policy issues for the Bureau including: the Leadership Forum on Early Literacy; the president’s Good Start, Grow Smart initiative, the Early Head Start/Child Care partnerships summer seminar; the State Administrators Meeting; and the Distance Learning Work Group. Since September 2002, Ms. Johnson has been directing the Early Education Finance Demonstration Project at the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, which is focused on systemic finance reform. The demonstration project includes development of an interactive Web site for universal access to financing information, increasing private investments linked to program quality ratings, and building public will for investment in early education.

Jane Kretzmann joined the Bush Foundation in 1988 and is a senior program officer with responsibility in the areas of child development, human services, and the environment. Prior to joining Bush, she worked for 13 years in refugee resettlement, including 10 years with the Minnesota Department of Human Services as the State Refugee Coordinator. Ms. Kretzmann previously taught junior high English. She received her bachelor’s and master’s degrees from the University of Iowa.

John Love, Ph.D, is a senior fellow at Mathematica Policy Research with more than 30 years of experience conducting research, program evaluations, and policy studies with early care and education and family programs. For the last seven years he co-directed the national evaluation of the Early Head Start program for the Administration for Children and Families. This study examined program impacts on infants and toddlers and their families within a randomized design. The study encompassed many policy
issues, including childcare use and quality, the role of fathers in programs and families, children with disabilities, and welfare reform. With a Ph.D. in child behavior and development from the University of Iowa, Dr. Love has extensive experience in measuring children’s development and well being throughout the period from infancy into the early elementary grades. He has a special interest in expanding the often-narrow perspectives of school readiness and has worked extensively with federal, state, and community-level groups on issues of conceptualizing and assessing school readiness. He has applied his knowledge of early childhood measurement in studies of Head Start and Early Head Start, Even Start, Title I preschool programs, state pre-kindergarten programs and childcare. Dr. Love has also been committed to understanding the environments in which children develop and learn. He has conducted a number of studies of childcare and is lead author of an Early Head Start childcare policy paper. He has served on numerous panels and advisory committees, including the Head Start Performance Measures Technical Work Group, the advisory panel for the evaluation of the Carnegie Corporation’s Starting Points initiative, and the DHHS Secretary’s Advisory Committee on Head Start Research and Evaluation. He is a member of the Commission on NAEYC Early Childhood Program Standards and Accreditation Criteria, appointed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Todd Otis is Executive Director of Ready 4 K. Otis served as a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives for 12 years and lobbied on behalf of Head Start during two legislative sessions. He served on the Early Care and Education Finance Commission both as staff and as a member.

Nora Slawik is serving her third term in the Minnesota House of Representatives, representing Oakdale and southern Maplewood. Her committee assignments include E-12 Education Policy and Finance Committees and Transportation Policy. She is an Assistant Minority Leader Co-Chair of the Early Childhood Caucus. Representative Slawik also owns her own resource development consulting business and is a board member of Human Services Inc., the Minnesota Children’s Museum, and Co-Action Academic Resources.
Panelist Perspectives

Each panelist took time to introduce themselves and share their perspective and approach to the topic “Linking Research and Public Policy.”

**Love:** My perspective comes from two places: family-related and work-related. I am following my father’s example as a plant geneticist. My father provided valuable information to the Agricultural Extension Office at the University of California, doing things to improve the crops and pasturelands in California. What I am doing is using information from child development research and program evaluation to provide information for programs and policy makers. The other perspective I bring is working in the field for the last 30 years and in the last seven years working with the Early Head Start Program Evaluation.

**Odom:** My background is in special education and early education. Most of my work has focused on research in the classroom. My research has focused on questions such as —

- What happens in classrooms?
- How do teachers support children’s learning?
- What effects do peer relationships have?
- How do we implement inclusion?
- What organizational and systemic factors are essential or barriers to inclusion?

**Slawik:** It is good to see so many people in the audience who I know have been advocating up at the Capitol for early childhood. I can’t tell you how important that is. Yesterday, the senate came out with early childhood funding in their budget, so we are farther ahead today than we were yesterday. My perspective for today is as a policy maker. Research can be hard for policy makers to relate to and use effectively. The atmosphere at the Capitol is around winners and losers, it’s around making the budget work, and we aren’t very thoughtful, we aren’t strategic, we don’t think about whom we are hurting when we make our cuts. I’m embarrassed by this. From our perspective we need to do a better job of looking at research. We need to be long term, strategic — of which the legislature can be the antithesis. I am really looking forward to our conversation today, hearing from and learning from all of you.

**Otis:** I am a recovering politician, so I relate to Nora. I used to use research as something good to substantiate what I am for. I am going to be challenging myself to get
beyond this. I agree with Nora that, in the fray, research is used as a tool to make your argument but it should be used to inform policy.

**Nancy Johnson:** I have been thinking about Mary McEvoy’s example and how she was so fearless. She really believed in bringing people together. I have seen over the years how research can make a difference, how we can move in terms of children, their parents, the lives of workers.

**Kretzmann:** I’ve been with the Bush Foundation for 15 years. I am humbled by the Bush foundation and its history of being steeped in child development. Irving B. Harris was a great champion for child development and pushing the foundation to assume some leadership in this area. Several Bush centers in child development and social policy have been created (UCLA, Michigan, Yale.) In 1993 I was given the assignment to find a way to reduce risk for children in the Bush region (Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota.) We found a research-based program, the Program for Infant Toddler Care, developed in California. We realized we had no universal training for childcare providers in the three states. Our goal was not to crop dust the training but to try to graft it. We found ourselves over the years about the business of systems change. We continue to ask states to raise the importance of infants and toddlers on a policy level.

**How does research inform policy?**

Scott McConnell asked Sam Odom to give a brief overview of the kinds of research being conducted around early childhood issues.

**Sam Odom:** It is important to define what we mean by research in the early childhood field. First, there is basic research that examines influences on children’s development, such as their family, community, or health. This kind of research might appear in a journal like Child Development. An example of basic research would be the early research done on attachment that occurred in laboratory settings.

The next area of research informing public policy is in early childhood education. For example, the High Scope project is examining what happens in classrooms and how what occurs affects the outcomes for children. This research will be pushing what kind of outcomes we look for in programs for young children.

Finally, there is research on early childhood intervention. This kind of research is being designed to change and produce positive outcomes for children, such as trying to identify factors and instructional strategies that lead to positive outcomes for children.

At the federal level there is a lack of confidence in the quality of early childhood research. There is belief that neither early childhood educa-
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tion nor early childhood intervention are effective, make a difference, or are up to par with other educational research.

The present administration wants to increase the quality of research in education by mainly following a medical model — randomized clinical trials that will answer a specific question. There is an assumption that if it can be proven, then it will be used. There is a perception that the hard sciences have a model that education should follow. There is a belief that if we copy the hard sciences, our findings will be stronger, inform policy, and lead to concrete findings. It is very difficult, though not impossible, for education to follow a medical model of research because of the many variables that need to be controlled. There is a belief that primary and secondary education makes a difference in the lives of children. This is reflected in the formation of the Institute of Educational Sciences and the Center on Special Education Research.

A general perspective on research has been pushed by an influential commission operating out of the National Academy of Sciences, which developed a report on scientific research in education. The purpose of the commission and report they produced was to improve the quality of educational research. Three organizing questions were developed to inform educational research and are legitimate scientific questions, with the emphasis on science, and how science may inform practice and policy. Those questions were —

- What is happening?
- Is there a systematic effect for what is happening? This question is pushing much of educational research currently; for example, does strategy A lead to the child outcome that we are seeking?
- Why or how is it happening? This is a process question that will explain why the effect is occurring.

What do we mean by social policy?

As once defined by Jim Gallagher, social policy means, “rules and standards by which scarce public resources are allocated to almost unlimited need.” Some of the major public policy questions include —

- Who shall receive resources/services?
• Who shall deliver resources/services?
• What is the nature of the resources/services?
• What is the condition under which resources/services shall be delivered?

What is the relationship between social policy and research?

Ask a researcher about the relationship and she may describe it as: Research informs Social Policy which influences/effects Practice.
Ask a Policymaker about the relationship and he may describe it as: Social Policy exists, but we need to discover if social policy is working, so we turn to Research and then Research influences Social Policy that informs Practice.
In reality, both scenarios occur with different types of policy and research. For example, there is plenty of research around children’s development, families, and community influences that may well influence policy. In other situations, policy makers will go to researchers and say this is the kind of research we need.

There is a continuum of research from basic research, as described before, to applied research to translative research. Applied research tries to understand basic research and its effects on children’s outcomes. It is usually performed in constrained situations so research methods are well conducted. Translative research examines the effects of a program or intervention and its influence in natural conditions. A translative approach may be the most effective for policy makers. Policy makers must make fast decisions, and so it is important that the research they review be concise and solid.

How does policy inform research?

Scott McConnell asked Nancy Johnson to address the next question because of her extensive experience with policy making.

Nancy Johnson: For a number of years I have worked in the policy arena. I’ve never worked as a researcher but I have seen the power of research. Last year being in D.C., I saw how policy often drives research. It was interesting to me that the kind of questions asked are driven by who is in a policy position. The questions being researched will influence the outcomes and the information made available. From the beginning, policy does drive the questions asked in research.

We often forget that research can be incredibly powerful. For example, in Brown vs The Board of Education in 1954, one of the main arguments used was a research piece on child development showing that separate but equal policies were detrimental to both black and white children.

Policy often comes from the “conventional wisdom” generally held by policymakers. However, research can challenge this conventional wisdom. It will be interesting to see if our country’s general wisdom will be challenged by research findings.

I worked very closely with the political appointee from the current administration to the Child Care...
Bureau. She did not have a long-term early education background. However, she had been very involved with women’s roles in the workforce and was very open to seeing how things really looked for children, parents, and providers. While she was not an ideological person, representing the administration’s perspective on many things, her own perspective helped support research for different children issues. This is very different from working with someone who looks to research in order for it to confirm his or her position.

Policy makers need evidence to see what the policy is doing. They need to be able to go into the community and tell people what their tax dollars are buying. For example, when a new stadium is built, conversation ensues about the best way, the best place, what is good public policy. In the end, people will feel invested and point at the stadium and say, “That’s the stadium we built.” The Early Childhood community has a challenge in providing for people something they can “touch” and look at to say, “Yes, that’s something we built or something in which we are invested.” It is important that research provides these tangible results and helps us demonstrate what it is we’re doing for families and children.

How do research and policy improve and increase the resources, both formal and informal, that are available to support families?

Otis: A key thing for researchers to do is to make policy makers aware of the value of their research. My frustration with the legislature is they have no interest in seeing what is happening and what is working. We also don’t have as good of an assessment of the effectiveness of some of the programs to “make the sale.” For example, one of the critiques of Early Childhood Family Education is that we can’t prove that it works. And yet the legislature won’t give money to research that documents the outcomes. I would advocate that research people be more “in the face” of policy makers about the value of doing research in the first place.

McConnell: John, can you talk about the Early Head Start study?

Love: The Early Head Start (EHS) study is a good marriage between policy and research. However, let me say that often policy makers believe there are other budget priorities and constraints.
They are unwilling to spend money on well-designed research projects, which are expensive.

The idea of the EHS study came out of advisory committees that were appointed by the administration in the 1990s. At the same time, Congress appropriated a certain amount of money from the Head Start budget for families with infants/toddlers. The policy makers at the time asked that researchers design a rigorous study to measure the effect of the program. What was important is that they decided to invest a large amount of money to study the program at both national and local levels. A consortium was created that included researchers, program staff, and policy makers in Washington, so there was a constant dialogue about everything from what the measures should be, data collection, how you shape the report, how you present the findings in a way that is meaningful at many different levels.

**McConnell:** Nora, as a policy maker how do you use research?

**Slawik:** Relationships are really key. All the research in the world goes nowhere if you aren’t talking to your policy makers. We need to know you and be accountable to you. Not only are we policy makers but we are politicians, and we are influenced by our constituents, as well as by who you are and how often you visit us.

It is frustrating up at the Capitol. As you know, the Governor proposed a $12 million cut to Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE). He shifted the formula so that it looks like it’s going to serve more low-income kids, although we don’t know the reality of that. So, there was a policy involved in a major funding shift. But was that policy based on research? There seems to be a big disconnect between our policies and our research. Art Rolnick’s report is the kind of research legislators can use. It concisely explains the benefit of investing in early childhood education. In this fiscal environment, legislators are looking for dollars-and-cents kind of research.

We also need to hear from the consumers of these programs — the moms, teachers, and parents. They don’t always understand or know if the programs they use are based on research and they don’t always talk to their legislators. They just know that their ECFE programs work. So, again the relationships are important. We need to continue to hear from the University and be re-
minded of the work you are doing. We need to work harder to make connections.

**McConnell:** Jane, it seems that the foundation community can play a big role here. Talk about the foundation’s role in trying to strengthen resources and services for families through its support of research.

**Kretzmann:** Foundations have special privileges because of our tax status and we have certain responsibilities because of the privileges we’ve been granted. It is our responsibility to try and bring about improvements in the world. There is a delicate balance that must be maintained with legislators. But when a foundation puts its good name to something like Ready 4 K, it says, “this is important” and we want the public to know. So when we make a grant, we take a stand.

The other role we have is in the research and development phase. We need to let programs develop and let local communities adapt. Our role is to nurture programs and not get too committed too early to the “outcome” agenda, which of course is a policy/political issue.

**McConnell:** Who needs to know what? Do we just issue a well-founded dictate or do we educate moms, dads, and policy makers? What is the tension for you in educating people versus just telling them to do something?

**Odom:** Policy makers are often in the position of needing information immediately and having to make a decision. They don’t always have the time to fully digest and figure out what is the best thing. Sometimes the match between the amount of information and the decision that needs to be made should be considered. If you’re going into a committee or on to the House floor, having someone to tell you yes or no can be extremely helpful. Sometimes policy makers can take the time to evaluate the research and come away with a deeper understanding. This of course would be the ultimate goal.

**Love:** I think that researchers have an obligation to provide policy makers with the information they need to make informed decisions. There are very few early childhood questions that can be answered yes or no. EHS is successful, but you need context and can’t just give a short answer. Nora, how do you deal...
with conflicting research? Head Start has thousands of conflicting reports. You can find any research you want to support your point.

**Slawik:** We want research that supports public opinion or their policy viewpoint. Legislators and policy makers are still asking where is the research on early childhood programs? Policy makers need researchers to be present to inform them when critical decisions are being made. We can use better research at the right time and if we knew whom to call on, it would be helpful.

**McConnell:** Can you share your sense of how state and local initiatives relate to this discussion?

**Otis:** The core of what Ready 4 K is trying to do is be an advocacy organization, broadly defined. We believe the community is the deeper basis for movement. We are trying to do grassroots organizing of the early childhood community, including parents, so that there is a common unified voice politically on policy matters. We are also working with local communities through the Minnesota Initiative Foundations to internally deal with the issue and move it forward. We need a shift in norms around child policies. We need to design specific initiatives in neighborhoods that are based on the idea that the well being of children birth to five really does matter. It is exciting work because when you talk to people, across the board, their hearts are there. Our challenge is to help people connect their hearts with their heads through the research that supports their work. That’s why having Art Rolnick’s article on early childhood programs is so encouraging. Having an economist validate the field without any self-interest is really powerful. It gets business people interested in the field.

Having a community basis is important because things at the legislature have been very demoralizing over the last few years. If you think the well being of children depends only on the legislature, it can be pretty depressing. But if you think the well-being depends on your community, school, or neighborhood, then there’s a little more hope.

**McConnell:** Describe the Minnesota Initiative Foundation (MIF).

**Otis:** The MIF formed as economic development entities to provide stimulus to the rural economy during tough times. They’ve evolved into economic and social development entities. For the first time in history, they’ve decided to focus on one common issue together — early childhood. They are convening people in different parts of the state to come together and make a plan on how we can improve things for little kids.
McConnell: There are many elements to this discussion that unite researchers, policy makers, practitioners—and they are probably at the level of their heart. John and Sam, I’m interested in your experience of trying to connect the research corpus with the folks who aren’t researchers. How do you extract knowledge in a way that is meaningful to them but maintains the integrity of the research base?

Love: When we finished the evaluation report of Early Head Start, it was over 400 pages, with 300 pages of appendices. We spent a long time working on sound bites. We wanted one-sentence answers to questions that Bob Edwards might ask. For example, “What did you learn about this program?” So we’d say, “There were a lot of positive things that happened with young children that improved language, reduced their aggressive behavior problems, and made their parents more likely to do the kinds of things at home that support their language and learning.” That summarized a lot of pages and tables.

Another example came from the Head Start Bureau that wanted to create a dissemination package. They created an Early Head Start Information Kit. It is still available on-line and you can order CDs that contain PowerPoint presentations with instructions on how to tailor the slideshow for your own use. There are two presentations available, one on childcare, and one on working with mothers who suffer from depression. As you may know this is a problem for many women with young children. Forty-eight percent of women in our sample scored at the level of “at-risk for clinical depression.” We found that in many ways the program was very beneficial for these families. This dissemination piece is a great example of taking research and making it more user-friendly and available for policy makers.

Odom: The Early Childhood Institute on Inclusion did a large five-year descriptive study, published in many academic journals. We also believe research should inform practice. So, for many of our studies, we published one-page briefs that indicated the conclusions of the project. We met with a marketing expert who said that each brief should contain no more than eight points, with no more than eight words each. We then developed parenting manuals, administrative manuals, and curriculum guides for teachers. We had a summary of our findings published by Teacher’s College Press. I think it takes that level of effort — not just publishing in academic journals but in the
variety of formats that people are likely to look at and use.

**McConnell:** Researchers are often encouraged to translate their research for lay audiences. The assumption is often that big words are not okay, little words are better. However, I worry that it ignores the continuum of research that Sam mentioned earlier. Is there a fear that if we distill our research into simple terms, then it won’t be as sophisticated? Can the panel comment on the obligation of researchers to translate their work and make it more disseminable? Good thing, bad thing?

**Otis:** It is absolutely essential and important to break down the jargon.

**Nancy Johnson:** Mary McEvoy once said that translation of research needs to be described in terms that are understandable and applicable to the information that families, communities, and policy makers need.

**Odom:** Some of my research colleagues don’t feel it is their role to translate their findings for those in practice. There is room for people to be engaged in translating the research, and some of my colleagues probably should not be the ones to do the translating! Teacher education is translation of the literature and research. The translation process can happen in a number of ways. It may or may not be the researcher who does it.

**Slawik:** In the political world, we call it the “spin.” As legislators, we need the research to be as simple as possible.

---

**Presentation by Carol Johnson**

Carol Johnson joined the panel for a brief time during the late morning session. Below are excerpted comments from her presentation.

Over the last decade, a myriad of research has come out recommending the need to make significant investments in early childhood. What that tells me, however, is that simply having the research and information is not enough to get people to take action. It is similar to having the information on smoking; people know it is hazardous, but continue to smoke. When you look at the research reports, they focus on the piece-meal and haphazard set of preschool options that don’t ensure equal opportunity or equal access. Because Minnesota has a large female workforce, it increases the ante for us in how we support children as moms are working. In our own data, we see significant gaps in achievement between children who come from affluent families and children who come from poor families, and a lot of those differences are really attributed back to their early childhood experiences or lack of experiences. A lot of knowledge we have today is based on the brain research that comes from the neural sciences. The most recent work around benefit/cost analysis of early childhood intervention has helped us look at the issue in another way, such as other efficiencies, and has relayed more powerful results that warrant our attention. The National Institute of Educational Research, in association with the Pew Charitable Trust, has
assessed a $4 return for every $1 invested in Pre-K education. This investment saves school districts more than $11,000 in special and remedial education services. A research project done in Chicago found a $7 savings, a 29% increase in graduation rates, and a 33% decrease in juvenile arrests. The data set we have describes three distinct areas: academic progress, efficiencies and cost containment, and issues around quality of life and how these interventions improve the overall well being of these children.

Madison, Wisconsin has just begun offering half-day kindergarten for four-year-olds. They are doing this through a partnership with the school district but it does require a shift in thinking by the K-12 community as we move from being adversaries to partners with the early childhood community. In both North Carolina and New Jersey, there have been court cases focusing on the quality of education for students who were not able to have a good preschool experience. For poor kids in particular, states are not living up to the constitutional requirement they have to provide adequate opportunity for kids.

In 1995, Minneapolis wrote its first K-12 standards. About a year later we decided we needed preschool curriculum standards. These were shaped by our work in the ECFE program, our High Five Program, and our Early Childhood Special Education teachers. We think this set the groundwork for a pilot program in 1997 to assess every kindergartner when they came in to the school. We hired teachers who administered these assessments. We were trying to figure out what the kids were coming in to school knowing. We then backtracked with some of those kids to find out where they went to preschool and then gave that data back to the early childhood providers as a way of saying, “Here’s what we think kids ought to know and be able to do when they enter, and this is what we see in your students.”

In the last few years, we have tried to increase the opportunity for all-day kindergarten, recognizing that we still had children coming to school not knowing the concepts of print, not knowing their shapes or numbers, not knowing the alphabet, the kinds of things that predict early and successful literacy by third grade. In the 2001-2002 school year, 60% of our kids were in all-day kindergarten programs. We continued to prioritize it despite our budget cuts because we believe it is the very best investment we can make to reduce remedial classes and special education referrals.

When we looked at some of the Minnesota Basic Standard Test scores, we found that 2nd grade scores had 85% predictability of 8th
grade scores. This suggests that early intervention needs to be sooner and more deliberate so second graders are at a better place for them to be able to achieve success.

I would like to say a couple of words about the research community. Often research operates within a political context. It is important for us to recognize that education of children is a non-partisan issue and needs to be promoted as such by the research community. We need a reiterative process between researchers and practitioners so that it isn’t as difficult to take research and put it in a practical application. Policy makers should put in place incentives to help ensure that this process occurs.

We are similar to Thomas Jefferson in 1788 when he told the Virginia Assembly that for the good of our new country, the founders needed a literate public. At that time, people dismissed him because those who were more affluent said, “Why should we pay for the education of other people’s children?” It wasn’t until the early 1830s when Horace Mann, the first Secretary of Education in Massachusetts, went around on horseback and observed huge inequities in who was educated and who wasn’t. This is where we are now. There are huge inequities in who is receiving high quality preschool and who isn’t.

If we want to catch up with the rest of the world, we need to play the game. Belgium, France, and Italy have universal, voluntary, free preschool for children ages three to six. They enroll 95-99% of all their students and have a full-day, seven-hour program. Denmark, Sweden, and Finland enroll 73-93% of their three- to six-year-olds. They are integrating education and child care in the same settings. The Netherlands, Spain, and Austria enroll 70%; Germany enrolls 85% of three- to six-year-olds. In the UK, 90% of their four-year-olds are in preschool and slightly less than that for their three-year-olds. These are all publicly financed programs and parents share the cost when they are financially able.

Language is very important. Language communicates concepts. Old language used in the past suggests the status quo. We need to create shorthands that conjure up ideas that communicate early educa-
tion is about America and apple pie. This is the way we are going to get changes to occur.

Dr. Johnson then presented results of all-day kindergarten offered by Minneapolis Public Schools —

• All kindergarten students are assessed as to how many letter sounds they could identify in one minute, and all students improved from the fall to the spring.
• Research then compared students who participated in half-day vs. all-day kindergarten programs.
• Full-day children did significantly better at letter-sound identification across race, gender and socio-economic status.
• Some parents who do not want their children in all-day programs do enriching activities with their children at home. However, for poor families we can’t expect enriching activities to happen in the other half of the day. That is why it is so critical that we work with early childhood providers so that we can sustain results over time. A lot of research, such as that conducted at Perry Preschool, has shown that sustainability is a major issue, even after kids made progress in their early childhood programs.
• Another important variable is quality. How do you take the extra time that an all-day program affords and ensure that the quality of the instruction is at a high level? With the help of Drs. Scott McConnell, Mary McEvoy, Ann Casey, and our staff, we created a training program for teachers so that instruction quality was increased.
• Full-day teachers say they are teaching more, getting to more concepts, science, math, and technology.

  **McConnell:** Panel, would you like to respond to some of the points Carol has made?
  **Slawik:** As a policy maker, the information presented was what we need, particularly the information on testing. It’s helpful to know where kids are at in the state as standards are being formed. I think universal preschool is necessary and needed. As a state, we are behind in this respect. This is the kind of research I could bring forward on how much it would help folks to invest in this kind of programming.
  **Odom:** I would assume that full-day costs twice as much as half-day kindergarten. As a policy maker, I would ask does the state get twice the outcome?
  **McConnell:** Carol, you went to the voters to ask them if they would be willing to put up the money to pay for full-day kindergarten. In light of all the budget cuts, how do you engage the public in what the right thing is to do?
  **Carol Johnson:** Having the results matters. Without the data, it is very hard to convince people how to prioritize with limited resources. There is a tendency to think that if you have high drop-out rates and failure rates at the high school level, that is where you should put your money because that is where the problem is. The problem starts way back and you have to convince people that they don’t have to have
this problem. There is a way to invest to prevent the problem. Those in suburban communities are giving parents the choice to pay for kindergarten. For many parents, this is just a shift from paying for childcare to paying for kindergarten. For some third-ring schools in outlying suburbs, this is a difficult thing to offer because of the lack of physical space. It requires us to rethink what schooling is in America. I’m not sure we’re at the place where we’ve sold it, which is why people readily bring up financial costs. I think this is the right investment and has the best pay-off for the future and reduces remedial costs and other costs that are much more expensive.

Nancy Johnson: What percentage of voters has no children?

Carol Johnson: Eighty-five percent of our households have no children in our schools.

Nancy Johnson: So, 85% of voters don’t think they have a connection to what goes on in the schools. The brilliance of Art Rolnick’s article is that it brings to their level the financial and long-term quality of life interest that voters with no children have. I don’t think we’ve been clear enough with the community about the benefits of thinking more broadly about public education. Brain research has started to show us that services and parent support should start even earlier for babies and toddlers, before preschool and kindergarten. How do we put into context the connection between services for young children and quality preschool programs? How do we work together so that the results you see in all-day kindergarten are the results you see in all-day childcare?

Love: Because you have to go to the electorate to get approval, is there a way in which that process influences what kind of research you collect, report, or present? What is the interplay between the research/policy/public interests? Did you present this data because it is the outcomes the school district wants to see for children or you thought it was what the public wanted to see?

Carol Johnson: Right now there is a lot of pressure on the K-12 system to produce results. People think that testing kids will be the magic bullet. The public also expects a certain level of social development as part of the schooling process, which is difficult to assess. There is a perception, based on our testing data, that Minneapolis is either not doing a good job or not using the money it spends per pupil wisely. We are very conscious of the need to constantly treat the public as if they were in a continuous referendum. Big urban schools have a greater challenge of producing results for the public. Hopefully those results will guide the public policy.

Kretzmann: There is such a disconnect in the public for the reality of families with young children. In the climate of welfare
reform with everyone working, babies without good relationships will grow up to have a hard time sitting still as four-year-olds in the classroom. And yet we have a government that doesn’t want to get involved with families and their children. This makes it difficult for us to tell the truth, which is, there are very serious problems in our childcare and it is compromising systems along the way.

**Otis:** The legislature is a zero sum game; money spent on all-day kindergarten will not go to early childhood. We need to make the connection between the two. I wish we could document whether things are getting worse for kindergarten teachers. Anecdotally, it seems that they are worse, especially with social/emotional issues.

**Love:** Trying to address your question could be some of the easiest research to do; it doesn’t require a randomized design. What we want to do is describe what is going on and look at change over time. Many of these research projects are not being repeated so we can’t see how things are changing. These are the kind of descriptive studies we can advocate for.

**McConnell:** Could the panel talk about relationships? For example we’ve talked about partnerships between early childhood and kindergarten, researchers and policy makers. Can you share an effective partnership that you’ve had?

**Slawik:** Relationships are the essence of life. My best example is Todd Otis. He talks about the vision, explains the research, and provides good information.

**Otis:** Ready 4 K’s partnership with business is essential to our success. A few years ago we decided we were going to advocate for more money for Head Start. One executive, who was very close to Don Fraser at Hamline University, wrote a letter to Arne Carlson saying it’s time for a gut check on Head Start. This was so effective that $10 million was added to Head Start.

**Carol Johnson:** The Youth Coordinating Board Partnership brings together elected officials from the schools, counties, and cities to make sure the resources are in place for children. They do this through the resolutions they issue and investments that they make. Early childhood hasn’t been as much on the front burner. It’s time we reenergize around this issue. The University has been very helpful to us with our all-day kindergarten. The partnership has allowed us to ask the question what do we do with the kids when they are there, which is just as critical as having the time.

**Love:** The CD on Early Head
Start that I showed you came out of the relationships that came out of the federal program. These partnerships included a national evaluator, local University research centers in each of the programs, program directors, federal program people, federal research people, those that designed the program, technical assistance workers, people at the Office of Special Education Programming, and the Department of Education. Rhode Island Kids Counts formed a network from 16 states for work on school readiness indicators.

What do researchers and policymakers mean by “scientifically based practices” and “effective programs?”

Love: A recent grant announcement just came out for research on Early Reading Programs. What they want are practices based on research that follow a randomized design. A randomized design would demonstrate, for example, that children in a program do better than those in a control group or not in a group. Evaluation of Early Head Start was particularly advantageous to showing program results because there was no way to do a pre-test. All the participants were babies or not born yet! So changes could be attributed to the program or intervention.

Odom: There is a concern that if randomized designs are the only standard, other forms of design are excluded. There are many situations where random assignment is unethical or impossible. Another experimental design is called single subject design that can demonstrate the relationship between an instructional program and children’s outcomes. The downside to this is the small number of participants; therefore, aggregation is necessary. Correlational designs allow for detecting relationships but can’t always prove an effect between intervention and outcome. Qualitative designs are legitimate but describe “what is it” and can’t inform the question of “why is it?” This is a big issue in special education because a lot of practice is on single subject design. The Division for Research of the Council for Exception Children is trying to create quality indicators that will inform each of the research designs.

McConnell: Aren’t requests for scientifically-based practices from the federal government ahead of the research in early childhood? There just aren’t enough programs available to study.

Love: We need to use good quality research, such as studies and qualitative information, to obtain resources that will allow us to do more formal randomized experiments on practices we believe will work.

McConnell: It seems that re-
searchers look at effectiveness as programs that show big change, but from the policy/public community, what constitutes an effective program?

**Otis:** School Readiness Assessments (SRA) are being used as the beginning of a dialogue that can help parents start working on their children’s language learning. It also can be used to build a stronger, more focused relationship between the early education community and K-12.

**Nancy Johnson:** SRA set us on a path for having more appropriate goals for kids. I am concerned that only two elements of the first SRA report to the community were discussed rather than all six domains, which included social/emotional readiness of children. There should be a concern that the policy direction played a bigger role here than a true examination of the research.

**Kretzmann:** I worry about how people are going to interpret the data they read. What I think people want to know (for example, our foundation’s board) would be —
- Was the program used?
- Did people show up?
- Was it community-based?

The power of anecdote holds a great deal of power when you move into the general public and research takes a second seat.

**Nancy Johnson:** Programs are running as fast as they can just to keep up with the response for their services. We need to be realistic about what it takes to get programs to a place where they can reach their goals and not use early negative results to get rid of a program prematurely. For example, Head Start has always been about child development and helping the whole family, but when Congress decided to hold them to an early literacy agenda and then two years later said, “You’re not there yet,” this reflects poorly on the Head Start program.

**McConnell:** What is the early childhood community? Who is your constituency and, because you are not an ethnically diverse group, do you or do you not represent the children of Minnesota? How might this community respond to admonitions that early childhood should not be a priority for public policy because families should be attending to their children and making choices?

**Love:** As a researcher, it is not up to me to decide whether early childhood programs are a priority in your community. But if your community does feel it’s a priority, then it is my job to help you understand the research and apply it to early childhood programs.

**Otis:** The answer to this question should be guided by
acting as if we as a society really cared about children between 0-5 at every stage. If the focus is on the child and supporting parents, that's a good guiding light. If we're in a society that doesn't value children, we need to change society. Ready 4K is about how to make this a public policy issue. The falsest argument we encounter is, “That's not government's responsibility, but parents'.” We agree it is parents' responsibility but we shouldn't be ashamed to say, “How do we want to view ourselves?” I heard a story once about a conservative policy maker who became radicalized, pro-child, pro-family because she heard someone once say, “Well, we'll just have to forfeit some of our kids.” Is this the kind of reflection we want of our society?

**Kretzmann:** I don’t think that I can “define” the early childhood community. We're here. We have the challenge of a divided community because of our different funding streams; there isn't a comprehensive universal system. I’m here today because of where I work and my experience trying to implement programs, and I have seen the magic of commitment and vision of others as they put into place amazing programs. I can’t claim to be that expert.

**Nancy Johnson:** This panel would have been very different if it had been more diverse. As an ally for families that are not represented, next year we should have more diversity on the panel. In response to the conversation about parent vs. state responsibility, I’m reminded of ECFE in its early stages. The purpose of the program was to connect new parents with their school. The dichotomy that has grown over the years is very destructive. I feel that the real policy issue is to discuss the choices and support that families need to build the capacity of their children.

**Odom:** When we move away from clear-cut medical and health indicators for children into gray areas, we move into values. I think it is okay for us to allow our values to influence what we think is important for children, such as culturally appropriate services.

**Audience Questions**

**Audience Member:** I’m going to try and force the dichotomy for a moment. A few weeks back I gave testimony on the new academic standards being proposed by Commissioner Yecke. My question to her was why there weren’t more standards for developmental differences in the over 600 proposed standards. I was told it is a matter of philosophy and a matter of law, meaning...
the No Child Left Behind law. I believe that using only academic standards for comparing schools makes the research easier because of the uni-dimensional standards. The implication for preschool is if you take an academic approach, Head Start and ECFE are no longer necessary because only reading readiness is being measured. It is more difficult to look at and measure social adjustment, ethics, or decision-making. Parents become irrelevant because of the focus on instructional methodology and instruction. How do you approach the politics, dichotomy, and philosophy of the administration?

Odom: There is often a disconnect between what research tells us and the social policy that exists. If a state only looks at students’ scores, even with the best instruction, they may not measure up to a median level. The outcome is for children to do better, but it may not be detectable because children already come in performing very low. A pre-test score is the best indicator of a post-test score. On the other side of the coin, I’m pleased that there is an increased awareness of academic standards in early childhood because we can look at predictors and better prepare children for success — as long as it is done with appropriate developmental practices.

Love: I am pleased that there is a focus on academic predictors in early childhood. For too long, the early childhood community has been too focused on social/emotional outcomes and not worked with the academic side, when we need a balance across the full spectrum of desired outcomes. Head Start standards need to be based on child outcomes, however, tools for doing this are more expensive and difficult to perform. The best predictor of children’s scores on a pre-test is the parent’s socio-economic status.

Kretzmann: Eighteen hundred children in Minneapolis schools are expelled, and it’s not because they don’t know their letters.

Nancy Johnson: We need to increase our alliance with the business community because they are looking for the soft skills that early childhood programs promote: managing and getting along. We cannot lose the social emotional element of preschool.

McConnell: It seems there is relatively less agreement about what social/emotional behaviors are appropriate, and these behaviors become culturally entrenched.

Nancy Johnson: It is important
that we involve people from those cultures, and I think our behavioral ideas are closer together than we think.

Kretzmann: Our cultural values in terms of behavior are diverse and we can't ignore the issue.

Love: Cultural differences are not the major reason we can't agree on social/emotional behavior but rather because we can't measure it as accurately or objectively as we'd like.

Odom: There are evidence and scientifically-based curricula available. For example, when we reviewed the literature on prosocial behavior, we identified three dimensions of social competence: self-regulation, prosocial behavior, and prevention of anti-social behavior. We did find a preventative curriculum developed by Carol Webster Stratton that has shown good effects. It teaches children words for their emotions, how to stop before they hit, and how to think about things.

Audience Member: Where does ideology fit into practice and policy? There seems to be a dichotomy in the schools. Either you operate from an ideological point of view or a research-based point of view.

Otis: Convincing research is helpful. It leaves people with their ideology but challenges them to explain why they don't want to use proven methods. How we communicate the research is important. Ideology cannot trump research — reason is the life of law. Being able to make a case in public, you need to have research to back up your decisions.

Odom: Beliefs do affect research. Often a key variable is teacher buy-in. Ideology is a huge factor and can stand in defiance of social policy.

Audience Member: The 2000 Minnesota Household Child Care Study provided good information about choices that parents are making about childcare. Over 50% of families are using informal care and yet most research is done in formal childcare centers. How do we as researchers remember to look at the whole continuum of care? How do we direct research at this population? How do we use that for public engagement?

Kretzmann: In 2001, our board made the decision to expand child development work to wherever infants and toddlers are to be found.

Love: Current research on kith and kin care is hampered by inappropriate measurements and assessments. We need better ways of measurement.

Nancy Johnson: I think there is great potential power of involving parents and informal providers into the advocacy arena. We need to discover what are the “real” ways that parents and providers get information?
Closing Remarks

Dr. McConnell asked each panelist to share some closing remarks on the future of research and policy.

Kretzmann: This has been a hopeful day. We need to work on mobilizing people, parents, childcare providers, and advocates. We need to employ “nebbing” a way of networking through the Internet.

Nancy Johnson: Ready 4 K has a Web site. At the national level, “Every Child Matters” provides information on children’s issues. I am hopeful about leadership from legislators, CEED’s leadership for advocacy and making research accessible. I am also hopeful about the possibilities for research and relationships with public policy leaders that can be developed, especially in the off session. It is important that we continue to have these conversations with family, work mates, and in our everyday life.

Otis: I encourage everyone to have a relationship with Ready 4 K as we continue to grapple with systems change. Form relationship with legislators. Talk to all your friends about what you care about. Connect with a business person!

Odom: Minnesota has a politically committed and active group. Continue with your commitment to political activity. Think about evidence-based practice and identify what practice you do and where it comes from. Don’t shy away from values-based practices and go beyond evidence. Outcome-based practice can help kids become prepared.

Love: Research is not as helpful as we would like it to be. The research community has an obligation to find the instruments that meet the vision of those in the room and around child policy.

Resources

CEED Web Site: http://education.umn.edu/ceed/
Childhood Research Institute on Measuring Growth and Development: http://ci2.umn.edu/cri/
Art Rolnick’s Article, Early Childhood Development: Economic Development with a High Public Return: available on the CEED Web site or at http://minneapolisfed.org/pubs/fedgaz/03-03/earlychild.cfm
University of Minnesota, President Robert Bruiniks’ Children’s Initiative: http://www1.umn.edu/pres/cyf.html
Ready 4 K: http://www.ready4k.org
Every Child Matters: http://www.everychildmatters.org/
Mary McEvoy Endowment For Children: http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/cgi-bingetbill.pl?number=HF1583&session=ls83&version=latest&session_number=0&session_year=2003
Mary McEvoy Endowment for Children

Representative Nora Slawik, Representative Jim Rhodes, and Senator LeRoy Stumpf announced the introduction of legislation that will establish the Mary McEvoy Endowment for Young Children which would move the early childhood agenda forward.

The bill does three things —

1. **Puts a constitutional amendment** onto the 2004 ballot, which shall read:

   Shall the Minnesota Constitution be amended to create a permanent endowment fund, entitled the Mary McEvoy Endowment Fund for Young Children, to enhance the development and education of young children through age five to ensure the long-term security of the state’s workforce and economy?”

2. **Gets the conversation about early childhood started** again by making every Minnesotan think about young children when they go to vote.

3. **Enhances programs like ECFE and Head Start** and will not replace state funds allocated for these programs.

   This legislation will serve as a national model for what an endowment for young children can look like! For more information or to help with the endowment effort, please contact Representative Nora Slawik by email at rep.nora.slawik@house.mn.
Excerpts from the Luncheon Address by University of Minnesota President, Robert Bruininks

‘A great soul serves everyone all the time, it brings us together again and again.’ — Maya Angelou

Mary McEvoy was this great soul, she believed deeply in linking research, practice, and policy. She was relentless in pursuing the answers to, “What do we know and how can we apply it to the welfare of young children?”

My presidential theme, Advancing Knowledge — A Partner for the Public Good, truly captures the spirit of Mary and her work. Therefore, I will be launching the President’s Initiative on Children, Youth, and Families.

Programming under this initiative will include —

**UConnects**

UConnects seeks to connect community youth with the University by providing tickets and access to University educational programs, cultural activities, and athletic events. The target audience is students enrolled in formal mentorship programs. The mentors will not only accompany the youths to the University events, but it is hoped that they will prepare the students for their visits and help them to process and interpret their experiences afterward. Through UConnects, the University hopes to play an important role in the lives of youth who are currently offered the fewest educational and cultural experiences.

**The President Goes to School**

The President will visit Minnesota schools, childcare centers, after-school programs, and community centers during community visits to show his continued commitment to children and their concerns.

**President’s Calendar**

Centers and departments across the University of Minnesota regularly hold meetings and other events to discuss challenges facing children, youth, and families. This information is vital to practitioners, community leaders, and others who care about the well being of children and families, but often the public is unaware of the University’s offerings. In order to remedy this, a President’s University-wide Calendar of Children, Youth, and Family events will be established on the Office of the President’s Web site.

University-sponsored events that address substantive children, youth and family issues of interest to both the public and to University faculty and researchers, and that are open to the public, will be included on the calendar. Centers or departments with events listed on the President’s Calendar will also be encouraged to work with the University News Service to promote their events as part of the President’s Initiative,
and highlights from the events can be posted on the President’s website. A further set of criteria and a form to request inclusion on the calendar can be found on the President’s website.

Capitol Conversations

The participation of Minnesota’s policymakers in the collaboration between the University and the community is vital. On a daily basis, lawmakers make decisions that impact Minnesota’s children, youth and families; they need access to the ever-growing research on children’s issues in order to make the best possible decisions. The Capitol Conversations were designed to bring together policymakers and University faculty in a series of breakfast conversations for an ongoing dialogue on children, youth, and family issues. The first three conversations were held January 15, 21, and 30, 2003. The desired outcomes are for University faculty and legislators to establish a two-way conversation, build trust, and discover ways to generate and use policy-relevant research.

The first three conversations focused on —
- Identifying ways for policymakers and faculty to communicate more effectively with each other;
- Evaluating the effectiveness of policies, strategies, and programs; and
- Decision-making when budgets need to be cut.

You can count on the University of Minnesota to be there as a partner for the public good.

More information can be obtained on the President’s Web site at http://www1.umn.edu/pres/cyf.html

Light a Candle Award

Mary McEvoy was the recipient of the first annual Light a Candle Award. The Light a Candle Award, formed by the Center for Early Education Education Development, is given to an individual or organization that successfully promotes ties between research, policy, and practice. Mary’s husband, Jamie Cloyd, accepted the award on Mary’s behalf.

Sam Odom, Christopher Watson, and Jamie Cloyd, Mary McEvoy’s husband, after the Light a Candle Award Ceremony.
Talking Reasonably and Responsibly About Brain Development — Trainer Edition

This guide has been developed to assist in training child care providers, families, parent educators, and others about myths and misunderstandings on the subject of early brain development. It is also intended for use by those who would like to incorporate early brain development information into their trainings on other topics.

The guide is divided into four modules — Overview of early brain development, How to be a savvy consumer of research about brain development (or any topic); Analysis of public messages about early brain development, and How to blend brain development information with child development information. The guide is complete with ready-to-use diagrams and overheads, active learning exercises, glossary of terms, and resource list. Cost is $25.

Questions About Kids?

If you’re a parent or professional with questions about children’s development, Questions About Kids is for you! Questions About Kids are

CEED Publications

New!
Violence Prevention and Intervention in Early Childhood: A Manual for Trainers

Written for those who provide training to early educators and parents, this training manual covers a broad range of research and offers practical information and strategies for educators of children birth to age five with a focus on the pre-school years).

Topics covered in the guide include our perceptions of violence, violence and children's thematic play (violence in media, super hero play, war and weapon play, rough and tumble play), children's social interactions (emotion regulation, problem solving, challenging behavior), and relationships with parents and other staff. The easy-to-use format contains ready made overheads and handouts for use in training. The authors include a researcher, administrator and classroom teachers. Cost is $25.

To download or order CEED publications, visit http://education.umn.edu/CEED and click on “publications,” or call 612-625-3058.
flyers that provide answers to important questions parents have about their children's development.

We're introducing a new series of eight Questions About Kids focused on infants and toddlers. They include a range of topics that address contemporary concerns and highlight the unique delights and challenges of the first years of life. They were written by experts at the University of Minnesota and in the Twin Cities community and were reviewed by experts at the University of Minnesota. For the first time, some of the Questions About Kids are available in Spanish, Somali, and Hmong. They are being distributed via the Web and through community health, social service, and parent education programs. We encourage you to use them as you see fit. The new topics are —

- How can parents and caregivers support a baby’s healthy development?
- What’s going on in my baby’s brain?
- How do I get to know my newborn?
- How can trauma affect my young child?
- Am I spoiling my baby?
- What does it mean when my young child is “assessed”?
- Do dads really make a difference?
- How can I help my young child to become a reader?


Online Courses Offered by CEED

CEED will be offering four online courses for credit or CEUs this Spring. Please contact Karen Anderson at ander352@umn.edu or 612-625-6617 for more information.

EPSY 5720: Addressing the Needs of Children with Challenging Behavior
Instructor: Shelley Neilsen
Dates: January 19–March 1
Offered for 1 Semester Graduate Credit

EPSY 5300: Relationship-Based Teaching
Instructors: Christopher Watson & Julie Nelson
Dates: January 19–March 1
Offered for 1 Semester Graduate Credit

Bridging Education & Mental Health
Instructor: Shelley Neilsen & Christopher Watson
Dates: April 5–May 14
Offered for CEUs

Foundations of Infant Mental Health
Instructor: Susan Schultz
Dates: April 5–May 14
Offered for CEUs
CEED-Affiliated Projects

Addressing the Needs of Young Children who Engage in Challenging Behavior
Contact: Christopher Watson, (612) 625-2898, watso012@umn.edu
http://ici2.umn.edu/preschoolbehavior

Minnesota Early Literacy Training Project
Contact: Angele Passe, 612-626-9393; passe008@umn.edu or Kate Horst, 612-626-9393; horst011@umn.edu
http://education.umn.edu/ceed/projects/literacy/

Minnesota Infant Mental Health Project
Contact: Christopher Watson, (612) 625-2898, watso012@umn.edu
http://education.umn.edu/ceed/projects/infantmentalhealth

Relationship-based Interventions
Contact: Christopher Watson, (612) 625-2898, watso012@umn.edu
http://education.umn.edu/ceed/projects/