

CONSIDERING A MULTISTATE APPROACH TO EARLY LEARNING STANDARDS

ELLIOT REGENSTEIN¹

Introduction/Executive Summary

The adoption of the Common Core State Standards in 2010 represented a sea change in American education. While the Common Core has its critics in the early learning community, the rationale behind the Common Core—that there are potential benefits to states of working together to develop high-quality standards—was sound. That rationale could also apply to early learning, which might benefit from having high-quality standards developed by a critical mass of states. Having multistate early learning standards developed by leading states and experts could help improve the quality of early learning standards, increase the efficiency of resource use, raise the likelihood that standards will be successfully implemented, and help early learning leaders work with K–12 leaders to improve the entire continuum of learning standards.

Of course, all of these benefits are theoretical, and the challenges to a multistate standards development process are very real. But the potential benefits of a multistate early learning standards initiative are significant enough that it is time for political leaders and the early learning community to have a serious and public conversation about the possibility of such an initiative. The purpose of this paper is to help advance that conversation by discussing what a multistate standards initiative might achieve, and how it might be executed successfully.

The Potential Benefits of Multistate Standards

The purpose of early learning and development standards is to define “what children should know and be able to do.” These are often required for state administered programs as a basis for monitoring and accountability as well as instructional improvement.² High-quality content standards can play a critical role in supporting effective adult-child interactions and instruction in early learning, because they can or do form the basis for the development of other important instructional supports like assessments and curriculum. If done correctly, a multistate standards initiative could help improve the quality of birth-to-five standards, improve the efficiency of resource use, lead to better implementation through improved curricula and assessments, help lead to work that improves K–12 standards, and strengthen the ability of states to impact federally-funded programs:

- *Raising the quality of early learning standards from birth through kindergarten entry.* Using the strong and growing research base about child development between birth and age 5, many states have already worked hard to develop excellent early learning standards—standards that are clear, developmentally

appropriate, and presented in an articulated progression. For leading states, a multistate standards initiative would offer the opportunity to push their thinking with colleagues. For states that have lagged behind, a multistate standards initiative could provide an opportunity to catch up.

- While a multistate initiative could help raise the quality of standards in many states, that will not happen if the standards produced by a multistate process are not based on the best research about how to engage and challenge young children to develop to their full potential in an age-appropriate manner. In most instances Common Core State Standards were considered an improvement over the local standards they replaced.³ To be successful, any multistate standards development process would have to be focused on raising quality, and include only states prepared to stick to that commitment. If the standards produced by a multistate initiative do not represent a meaningful improvement on existing standards, none of the other potential benefits described in this paper can be realized.
 - In some states, there is a difference in quality between birth-to-three standards and standards for three-to-five-year-olds, and having multistate standards that begin at birth and continue through kindergarten entry could help these states provide continuity and quality in all of their early learning standards.
- *Improving the efficiency of resource use in the standards revision process.* States are currently all spending resources separately on standards development and implementation, with some states having a standard cycle for updating and revising their standards. Sharing resources across states could allow each individual state to spend less money on the revision process, while maintaining or improving the level of quality.
 - Some states will appropriately be concerned with their sunk costs in existing standards. While states with brand new, state-of-the-art standards might make excellent leaders in a multistate standards initiative, politically they may feel pressure to avoid the process altogether if stakeholders are concerned about losing the fruits of a recent in-state process. This challenge will be present in some states more than others. In the case of the Common Core, some states did in fact decide that the long-term benefits of Common Core were worth the short-term price of moving away from previous in-state work—a choice that state leaders would have to repeat for a multistate early learning standards process to succeed. Of course, states with recently-developed state-of-the-art standards are the ones least likely to see major changes in their standards through a multistate process, so the impact of adjusting to new standards in their provider community might be comparatively small—and, as discussed below, may be offset by the benefits of having additional states using the same standards.
 - In addition to potentially saving money on development, having multistate standards would allow for a multistate standards validation process, which could be substantially less expensive than validating multiple sets of state standards. Indeed, very few states have had the resources to do a true validation process, but a multistate process might increase the likelihood of conducting a full-scale validation—one that would benefit all participating states.
- *Improving the alignment of processes related to standards implementation—including assessments, curriculum, and workforce development (preparation and professional development).* States are currently working individually or in small groups to develop assessments, curriculum, workforce competencies, and the preparation and professional development practices that support standards implementation. There are some national providers in those areas, but national materials currently have to be adapted to multiple different state standards. Creating multistate standards could facilitate

the development of related tools in a more aligned and cost-effective manner. Moreover, it could create new opportunities for multistate learning networks and technical assistance to support implementation.

- o Multistate standards offer the promise of improved standards implementation, but that promise is not easily realized. In the case of Common Core, implementation is an ongoing struggle.⁴ Without strong implementation, a multistate standards initiative simply cannot have its intended impact on child outcomes. The challenges of implementation are in many ways different in early learning than in K–12 because services are delivered by a workforce with varying qualifications in a wide range of settings, rather than by certified teachers in formal school settings.⁵ Nonetheless, there have been and will continue to be lessons learned in the implementation of the Common Core that should inform efforts to implement multistate early learning standards.
 - o In some states the use of standards varies across programs; for example, in some states they are used in preschool programs but not child-care programs. That is changing somewhat in states with new quality rating and improvement systems that include both child care and preschool, but in many states the use of standards is inconsistent. Having high-quality standards that are supported with high-quality implementation tools could make it easier to utilize standards in a wider range of program settings.
 - o It may be easier for states to conceptualize cross-state work on curriculum and assessments than it is to plan for cross-state work on workforce development. There are opportunities to coordinate across states on strengthening preparation and continuous learning for professionals, but a great deal of in-state work will still be required.
- *Positively impact K–12 standards.* Members of the early learning community have had a wide range of reactions to the Common Core State Standards, which—as described below—are now the English language arts and mathematics standards in the great majority of states. Many in the early learning community value alignment between early learning standards and K–12 standards. To the extent members of the early learning community want the Common Core to evolve in ways that are more reflective of research and best practice in child development, that cannot best be accomplished state by state—that influence is most likely to be achieved by coalescing around a common set of early learning standards that can form the basis for a more structured conversation about how K–12 standards should evolve.
 - o This process of mutual influence could help reinforce the notion of a birth-through-eight learning continuum. There are many significant differences in infrastructure between K–12 and early learning—for example, early learning serves a comparatively small percentage of the eligible population⁶ and has more divided governance at the state level.⁷ These differences and others have made it difficult in many states to develop coordination between early learning and K–12. But in some policy areas, states are developing policies that are meant to smooth out existing differences between early learning and K–12. For example, in many states teacher licensure includes a license that spans across both the pre-kindergarten years and the early elementary years.⁸ Although some states have worked to align standards from birth through 3rd grade, in other states standards are a policy area where the division between early learning and K–12 is stark. As described above, a multistate process could help break down that divide in the standards area—and given the centrality of standards to so many policy areas, creating a continuum of standards could be an important driver of birth-through-eight connections in other policy areas.

- *Reset the dynamic between states and the federal government.* Multistate standards would not only create a new dynamic between early learning and K–12, they could create a new dynamic between the states and the federal government. Head Start and child care are critical federal programs serving young children, and both are in the process of evolving in ways that increase their focus on higher quality. A multistate standards initiative could be a productive way for states to influence the evolution of federally-funded programs, as the content of the multistate standards could be considered by Congress and future administrations in their ongoing efforts to update the design of Head Start and child care.⁹
 - As discussed further below, Head Start and child-care providers should be involved in the development of multistate standards. This would help reinforce the importance of connectivity between federally-funded and state-funded early learning programs, and build credibility for the state efforts with regard to influencing federal policy.

It is important to acknowledge that these are only potential benefits; all of them are real possibilities if multistate standards are developed, but none are guaranteed. But these are potentially significant benefits for a field that for years has worked to strengthen alignment among programs and to build systemic infrastructure. Providing more clearly unified learning and development standards for early childhood providers across the states would give some level of continuity to a system that is otherwise fractured in delivery,¹⁰ and that serves a mobile and diverse population.¹¹

The Common Core Model

The Common Core has certainly changed the politics of standards, and for better or worse the early learning community is under pressure to produce a considered response to the new landscape. Accordingly, it is important to understand how the Common Core came to be. More importantly, however, the experience of the Common Core provides numerous lessons that the early learning community can learn from in moving toward multistate standards.

The Common Core began as a state-led collaboration meant to provide greater consistency in English language arts and mathematics standards across states. By the mid-2000s many state education leaders had come to believe that there was no real benefit to having 50 different sets of standards, and that there was real harm to students in states with lower standards—and high-mobility students whose moves from state to state created disconnects in their education. After several years of planning and discussion, writing teams formed with the support of the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers began work in 2009 on standards that were publicly released on June 2010. By November 2012, 45 states and the District of Columbia had adopted the Common Core in full, with Minnesota adopting only the English language arts standards.¹² Although not led by the same drivers, follow-up efforts are now underway to develop multi-state standards in science, world languages, and the arts.¹³

Part of what spurred the rapid adoption of the Common Core was the Race to the Top competition approved by Congress as part of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act in 2009. When the criteria for Race to the Top were announced by the US Department of Education in 2010, the selection criteria for applying states included a “demonstrated commitment to improving the quality of its standards by participating in a consortium of States that is working toward jointly developing and adopting, by June 2010, a common set of K–12 standards,” which were defined as “a set of content standards that define what students must know and be able to do and that are substantially identical across all States in a consortium.”¹⁴ To allow for instruction in state-specific content, “a state may supplement the common standards with additional standards, provided that the additional standards do not exceed 15 percent of the State’s total standards

for that content area.”¹⁵ The opportunity to compete for these federal dollars helped push states to rapidly adopt the new standards, and indeed all of the 46 adopting states applied for Race to the Top in either the first or second round.¹⁶

It is no surprise that a historic structural reform like the Common Core would spark important debates, and since their adoption the Common Core State Standards have come under criticism for a variety of reasons. Some critics argue that they were adopted too hastily.¹⁷ Others have argued that meeting the standards will be too expensive.¹⁸ Others have argued that the federal government has inserted itself too deeply into a matter of primarily state concern through both Race to the Top and the ESEA waiver process.¹⁹ Some critics have argued that the content of the Common Core will change teaching in ways that are bad for student learning.²⁰ And early learning critics have contended that the standards in the early elementary years did not adequately take account of the science of child development.²¹

Of course, many of these issues—particularly the quality of the standards²²—are hotly debated. But none of these criticisms strike at one of the central ideas behind the Common Core: States working together to develop one set of model standards makes more sense than having all states write and implement their own standards covering the same topics. It is this central idea that the early learning community should pick up and adapt to its current circumstances.

The Current Status of Early Learning Standards²³

All 50 states now have content standards for 3- and 4-year-olds, driven in part by the “Good Start Grow Smart” initiative launched by President George W. Bush in 2002.²⁴ These standards have some significant similarities, in part because they often draw on the same research-based principles of child development. Moreover, the standards are often modeled on each other or developed by the same consultants; states also generally seek to align them to the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework, which was updated in 2011.²⁵ The domains of learning are largely the same. That said, state standards also have some significant differences; for example, the level of detail within each standard, as shown by the number of indicators, can vary quite a bit.²⁶

Increasingly states are developing learning and development standards for infants and toddlers. As of 2010, 33 states had developed such standards.²⁷ Because of the stages of development that these standards encompass, they may be organized into age bands to reflect the ranges and variability of typical development.²⁸

Early learning standards are intentionally broad, and go beyond K–12 academic subjects to include social and emotional standards.²⁹ As described in a joint position statement issued by NAEYC and NAECS/SDE, “early learning standards must address a wide range of domains—including cognitive, social, emotional, physical, and language development; motivation and approaches to learning; as well as discipline-specific domains including the arts, literacy, mathematics, science and social studies.”³⁰ The non-cognitive domains have recently gained increased attention as educators and policymakers are beginning to understand the impact of skill development on long-term achievement.³¹ The Center for the Developing Child defines the components of executive function as: working memory, inhibitory control, and cognitive or mental flexibility.³² The foundation for these skills, although not mastered by the age of 5, begin in the first year of life and are closely tied to the social-emotional domains of the early learning and development standards.³³

While cautioning against poor development and implementation of early learning standards, NAEYC states that “clear, research-based expectations for the content and desired results of early learning experiences can

help focus curriculum and instruction, aiding teachers and families in providing appropriate, educationally beneficial opportunities for all children.”³⁴

What’s Next for Early Learning Standards?

In crafting a new strategy for developing birth-to-five early learning standards, it is important to build on the strengths of existing standards. Those existing standards must be regularly updated, and so the development of a multistate standards initiative should be seen as a potential next round of updates—which itself would then require regular updating to account for new research and experience.

The recent NAEYC-NAECS/SDE statement on standards includes four key points that should be incorporated in a multistate early learning standards initiative:

1. Early learning standards should emphasize significant developmentally appropriate content and outcomes.
2. Early learning standards are developed and reviewed through informed, inclusive processes.
3. Early learning standards gain their effectiveness through implementation and assessment practices that support children’s development in ethical, appropriate ways.
4. Early learning standards require a foundation of support for early childhood programs, professionals, and families.

A well-designed multistate standards initiative would meet all of these principles. It would likely also need to have the following characteristics:

The Content

- As discussed above, state early learning standards include many domains, such as cognitive, social-emotional, physical, approaches to learning, and discipline-specific domains like literacy and mathematics. Because high-quality early learning approaches child development holistically, a multistate initiative would have to produce comprehensive birth-to-five standards across a range of domains. In this respect the multistate early learning standards would be broader in scope than the Common Core, which dealt with only two subject areas (although a much longer age span—13 years as opposed to five). Because of the manner in which early learning is provided, rolling out multiple domains of standards piecemeal could be confusing to the field and send the wrong message about how to approach pedagogy.³⁵ The standards would also need to address language and cultural competence, an important consideration for the many states with rapidly diversifying birth-to-five populations.³⁶
 - A multistate standards initiative could help unlock new thinking about how standards can be most effective. Some experts might take an approach grounded in existing standards and proposing minor adjustments, but other experts might look at how the existing generation of standards has been used and propose more radical changes in approach. Whether the finished product represents a minor evolution from existing state standards, a dramatic departure from existing state standards, or something in between, the interplay of perspectives in the development process should help strengthen the end result.
- Any multistate early learning standards effort should consider the current state of K–12 standards (particularly K–3), and make recommendations for improvements to be made in standards at that level. This includes improvements in domains that are already shared in common between early learning

and K–12, and ensuring that early learning and K–12 share the same breadth of domains. Given the existence of Common Core and other multistate K–12 standards initiatives, at this point if there are changes needed to K–12 standards to help them align to early learning, it is most likely that those changes will be made based on the recommendations of leading states and experts—not by individual state leaders in response to local concerns. The approach to these recommendations should be to build on the strengths of existing K–12 standards, but improving their quality and creating better connectivity to early learning.

The Process

- Ideally, the effort would have bipartisan support from high-level executive branch leaders (governors and agency heads) across states. While much of the work will be done by experts, the high-level leadership buy-in is necessary to ensure that the finished product will have support. The Common Core effort had this level of buy-in, which was critical for its impact. The political leadership is needed to create space for the experts to work, and the expertise is needed for the standards to be of high quality.
 - When it comes to engaging experts, within the early learning field the term “expert” must be read to include not only leading researchers and academics but also respected practitioners from multiple settings (such as Head Start, preschool, child care, special education, and home visiting). Technical experts are necessary to ensure that the standards are grounded in the research base, and practitioners are needed to ensure that the standards are practical and useful—and credible with the people who will actually end up using them. The process would also provide an opportunity to engage experts from related fields like health and family support.
 - The process should be led by experts in early childhood, but include experts from the early elementary years as well.
 - It is likely that, for political reasons, the process of developing early learning standards would need to be more transparent than the process of developing the Common Core. This makes it likely that the initial development would be more difficult, but that collective buy-in might be greater if the process succeeds.
- The effort should be specifically conceived as the development of a “Multistate Standards Version 1.0” effort with a structured process for keeping the standards updated as new research and experience shapes the state of the art.
- While the initial development might be most effective if done by a core group of leading states, other states should be able to join the initiative through a clearly defined process. The effort might benefit from having a set of “governing states” who lead the work and “participating states” who provide a lower level of support. The states involved in the Common Core initiative did not join all at once; after some states expressed their commitment, many other states jumped in to take advantage of the opportunity.
 - Leading states would likely be those with a strong leadership commitment, a well-established early learning system, a robust academic research and academic community, and other resources that partner states would be interested in drawing upon.
 - It may be that states want to work together on standards development without even having any sort of formal adoption process. States could come together for less intensive processes such as sharing the costs of research experts or informal collaborative meetings.

- If a critical mass of states comes together for a multistate initiative, the process to be used for participation and adoption should be discussed and clarified up front, for the benefit of both the participating states and other states that might choose to join the initiative later.
- The leaders of the Common Core placed a high value on consistency, and prescribed that states adopt the standards wholesale (with an allowance for some additional supplemental standards). That approach has generated some after-the-fact pushback in several states, and political leaders may be wary of using it again. In any event, that model was never likely to be practical at the early learning level, given that early learning is not compulsory and that system development and investment varies so widely across states. In an early learning multistate standards initiative, one possible approach is to allow states to describe themselves as participating in the multistate standards initiative if they adopt a high percentage of the standards (with the exact percentage to be determined by the member states)—and articulate clearly the variation so that all stakeholders in the state can understand why deviations were made.
 - In early learning, states have frequently “borrowed” standards from other states. If the multistate standards are of high quality, states that did not participate in their development might still borrow some or all of them.
- One difficult consideration is how the development of multistate standards should be paid for. On this point some of the backlash against Common Core is instructive. One point of pushback against Common Core at the state level is that it represents too great a federal intrusion into state prerogatives—even though the development of the standards was led by state-based organizations that used no federal funds. Given those politics, a federally funded standards development initiative is unlikely to gain political traction with state leaders. Accordingly, a multistate early learning standards development initiative would likely have to be developed through state resources (or federal general-purpose funds allocated to the project by states) and private resources, not through direct federal investment.
 - In many states the true cost of standards development is not reflected by a single line-item in any budget. While there are frequently consulting costs to hire experts to assist with the process, much of the work is frequently done by state employees and other partners (from the provider, nonprofit, and higher education sectors, among others), who are allocating a portion of their salaried time to the work. Thus, the true cost of developing standards reflects both direct cash expenditures (using federal, state, and philanthropic funds) and the value of the time invested by numerous partners.
 - Similarly, a multistate standards effort would likely require some amount of direct expenditures, and some amount of time investment from state leaders and other leaders in the field. This would in effect represent the repurposing of money and time that would otherwise be spent on individual state standards-development and implementation efforts.
 - A multistate standards effort might be an excellent opportunity for public-private partnership. Philanthropies supported the development of Common Core, and are often interested in discrete, high-leverage funding opportunities.
 - It must be acknowledged that the dynamic of federal funding could be different in early learning than in K–12. In early learning, the Head Start program makes the federal government the largest funder of direct service³⁷—whereas in K–12, the federal government provides only a small percentage of the overall funding.³⁸ However, state leaders may be challenged to make that distinction, particularly in states where political opposition to the Common Core has gotten traction.

While this approach is ambitious, it is in many ways less ambitious than the work already completed on the Common Core, which represented a major step forward in multistate collaboration. That major step has already been followed further in the development of science and social studies standards. Early learning should consider following this path as well—in order to raise quality, use resources efficiently, improve standards implementation, and have a stronger influence on the development of what are now K–12 standards. The early learning field is one in need of significant system development and definition,³⁹ and an effort to create common standards could go a long way toward helping to provide that development and definition.

Conclusion

A multistate standards initiative could provide significant benefits to the early learning field—helping it to coalesce around a common agenda that improves the quality of standards, allows resources to be used more efficiently, facilitates the development of improved curriculum and assessments, and helps it to positively influence K–12 standards. A multistate standards initiative would not be without costs, and legitimate questions will be raised about whether it is worth the energy and focus. But the onset of the Common Core era demands that a conversation about multistate early learning standards be held publicly and thoughtfully, carefully weighing both the benefits and costs. This paper is meant to help accelerate and facilitate that public conversation.

JOIN THE CONVERSATION

Ounce Policy Conversations are published by the Ounce of Prevention Fund to stimulate and facilitate discussion on topics of interest in early learning policy. We welcome feedback on this paper, and may address that feedback in subsequent versions of this paper or in other papers. If you have comments or questions, please visit our webpage at www.ounceofprevention.org/policyconversations or contact Elliot Regenstein at eregenstein@ounceofprevention.org.

ounceofprevention.org/policyconversations

Key Discussion Questions

These discussion questions are meant to help facilitate a national conversation about whether a multistate standards development effort is worth the time and effort it would require.

- Are high-level leaders of both parties interested in leading or supporting a multistate standards effort?
- Would states with high-quality standards be willing to commit resources to leading a multistate process?
- What approach should be used for states to adopt multistate standards?
- Would states that are not interested in participating actively in a multistate process be willing to adopt the standards produced by a multistate process?
- Do the leaders and experts in areas relating to standards implementation believe that multistate standards would help improve development of implementation tools and supports?
- Are states willing to utilize standards in more early learning programs within their states?
- Do K–12 leaders understand the importance of creating a continuum with early learning standards? If not, what work is needed to help them understand?
- What processes are emerging for updating multistate K–12 standards, and what is the best strategy for the early learning community to influence those processes?
- Who would need to be at the table to successfully develop multistate early learning standards?
- Is there agreement within the field on the right role of the federal government in the development of multistate standards?

APPENDIX: What States Proposed in the Early Learning Challenge

In 2011, states had the opportunity to apply for a new form of Race to the Top money, the Early Learning Challenge. Through the Challenge, the US Department of Education has awarded \$633 million to 14 states to support the development of high-quality early learning systems.⁴⁰ In Challenge applications, states were required to discuss their level of standards implementation—and their plans for “developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.”⁴¹ Standards were not heavily weighted in scoring Early Learning Challenge applications, and accordingly were not a major focus for states.

In their Challenge responses states addressed several different issues of alignment.⁴² Some states indicated that their standards were in alignment from birth through age 8;⁴³ one indicated that its standards were aligned birth through 5;⁴⁴ and others indicated that they had aligned early standards to the Common Core.⁴⁵ Some states that did not already claim alignment articulated plans to create it, including birth-to-five alignment,⁴⁶ alignment with the Common Core,⁴⁷ and complete birth-to-eight alignment.⁴⁸ Other issues addressed by states in the Challenge focused on implementation. These issues included having standards linked to assessments;⁴⁹ standards linked to workforce competencies;⁵⁰ professional development and supports linked to standards;⁵¹ and using standards as the basis of quality rating and improvement systems.⁵² States offered some additional ideas, but these categories represented the primary thrust of state responses.

Endnotes

1. The author is grateful to his many colleagues at the Ounce of Prevention Fund who reviewed and commented on drafts of this paper, with special thanks to Ashanti Huey for her invaluable research assistance. He is also grateful to his external reviewers: Laura Bornfreund, Sharon Lynn Kagan, Thomas Schultz, Catherine Scott-Little, Kyle Snow, Amanda Szekely, and Albert Wat. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the reviewers.
2. Kagan, Sharon Lynn. “*Early Learning Standards: A Huge Problem or a Huge Possibility.*” (2005). Available online at http://www.scaeyc.net/files/kagan_play.ppt.
3. Carmichael, Sheila Byrd et al. “The State of State Standards—and the Common Core—in 2010.” Fordham Institute, 2010. Available online at <http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/the-state-of-state-of-standards-and-the-common-core-in-2010.html>.
4. Gewertz, Catherine. “Teachers Say They Are Unprepared for the Common Core.” *Education Week*, February 27, 2013. Available online at http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2013/02/27/22common_ep.h32.html; Smarick, Andy. “The Common Core Implementation Gap.” Common Core Watch (blog), February 19, 2013. Available online at <http://www.edexcellence.net/commentary/education-gadfly-daily/common-core-watch/2013/the-common-core-implementation-gap.html>.
5. Ryan, Shannon and Whitebook, Marcy. “More Than Teachers: The Early Care and Education Workforce,” in *Handbook of Early Childhood Education*, edited by Robert C. Pianta with W. Steven Barnett, Laura M. Justice, and Susan M. Sheridan. (The Guilford Press, 2012).
6. In 2012, 39% of 4-year-olds and 12% of 3-year-olds were enrolled in Head Start or state preschool. Barnett, Steven et al, *The State of Preschool 2012*, at 7 (National Institute for Early Education Research 2012). Available online at <http://www.nieer.org/publications/state-preschool-2012>.
7. Regenstein, Elliot and Lipper, Katherine. *A Framework for Choosing a State-Level Early Childhood Governance System* (BUILD 2013), at 9-13. Available online at <http://www.buildinitiative.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Early%20Childhood%20Governance%20for%20Web.pdf>.
8. Bornfreund, Laura A. *Getting in Sync: Revamping Licensing and Preparation for Teachers in Pre-K, Kindergarten, and the Early Grades.* (New America Foundation, 2011), at 10. Available online at http://www.newamerica.net/publications/policy/getting_in_sync.
9. Early learning standards could also be more meaningful to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, where K–12 standards are already an important focus of reauthorization discussions. Klein, Alyson. “NCLB Bills Split Over Federal Role in K–12.” *Education Week*, June 12, 2013. Available online at <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2013/06/12/35esea.h32.html>.
10. Kagan, Sharon Lynn and Kauerz, Kristie. “Early Childhood Has Been A Fractured Field Since Its Emergence.” “Looking Deep, Wide, and Far,” in *Early Childhood Systems: Transforming Early Learning*, edited by Sharon Lynn Kagan and Kristie Kauerz. (Teachers College Press, 2012).
11. “According to a 2005 study from the University of Carolina at Greensboro, more than 50 percent of children in poverty move every year of elementary school. These students need what they are missing the most: continuity.” Dalton, Rick. “Common-Core Momentum Is Still in Jeopardy.” *Education Week*, December 4, 2012. Available online for subscribers at <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/12/05/13dalton.h32.html?qs=rick+dalton>.
12. Common Core State Standards Initiative. “In the States.” (2013). Accessed July 1, 2013. Available online at <http://www.corestandards.org/in-the-states>.
13. More information on the standards in development is available online at <http://www.corestandards.org>, <http://www.nextgenscience.org>, <http://actfl.org>, and <http://www.arteducators.org>.
14. The deadline was later extended to August 2, 2010.
US Department of Education, “Race to the Top Fund.” *Federal Register* 74, no. 221. (November 18, 2009): 59688. Available online at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2009-11-18/pdf/E9-27426.pdf>.

15. “Race to the Top Fund.” *Federal Register* 74, no. 221.
16. US Department of Education. “Race to the Top Fund: States’ Applications, Scores and Comments for Phase 1.” (2012). Accessed July 1, 2013. Available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/index.html>.
17. Strauss, Valerie. “Why I Oppose Common Core Standards: Ravitch.” *The Answer Sheet*, Washington Post (blog), February 26, 2013. Available online at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/02/26/why-i-oppose-common-core-standards-ravitch/>.
18. AccountabilityWorks. “National Cost of Aligning State and Localities to the Common Core Standards: A Pioneer Institute and American Principle Project White Paper.” (February 2012): No. 82. Available online at http://www.accountabilityworks.org/photos/Cmmn_Cr_Cst_Stdy.Fin.2.22.12.pdf.
cf. Murphy, Patrick and Regenstein, Elliot. “Putting a Price Tag on the Common Core: How Much Will Smart Implementation Cost?” (Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2012). Available online at <http://edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2012/20120530-Putting-A-Price-Tag-on-the-Common-Core/20120530-Putting-a-Price-Tag-on-the-Common-Core-FINAL.pdf>.
19. Gewertz, Catherine. “Advocates Worry Implementation Could Derail Common Core.” *Education Week*, April 24, 2012. Available online for subscribers at <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/04/25/29cs-overview.h31.html>.
McGroarty, Emmett and Robbins, Jane. “Controlling Education from the Top: Why Common Core is Bad for America.” (Pioneer Institute, 2012). Available online at <http://pioneerinstitute.org/download/controlling-education-from-the-top/>.
20. “Controlling Education from the Top: Why Common Core is Bad for America.”
National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Department of Education. “Joint Statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education on the Common Core Standards Initiative Related to Kindergarten Through Third Grade.” (April 15, 2010). Available online at <http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/policy/NAEYC-NAECS-SDE-Core-Standards-Statement.pdf>.
21. Strauss, Valerie. “A Tough Critique of Common Core on Early Childhood.” *The Answer Sheet*, Washington Post (blog), January 29, 2013. Available online at http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/01/29/a-tough-critique-of-common-core-on-early-childhood-education/?wprss=rss_education.
22. “The State of State Standards—and the Common Core—In 2010.”
23. In early learning, the term “standards” is often used to describe program standards, which define required attributes of funded programs. Kagan, Sharon Lynn. “Early Learning Standards: A Huge Problem or a Huge Possibility.” (2005). Available online at http://www.scaeyc.net/files/kagan_play.ppt; Regenstein, Elliot. “Early Learning in State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Commitments” (EducationCounsel, 2009) at 16. Available online at <http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/SPA/BuechnerInstitute/Centers/CEPA/EdStimulusFunds/Documents/Early%20learning%20in%20SFSF.v1.0.060809.pdf>. This paper focuses solely on content standards.
24. The White House: President George W. Bush. “Good Start, Grow Smart: The Bush Administration’s Early Childhood Initiative.” Accessed July 1, 2013. <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/earlychildhood/toc.html>; Scott-Little, Catherine. “Early Learning Standards: Variations Across the States and Issues to Consider.” Presented at Listening and Learning About Early Learning Meeting, May 11, 2010. Available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/earlylearning/scottlittledeck.pdf>.
25. Scott-Little, Catherine. “On the Road to School Readiness: Aligning State Standards, The Head Start CDEL Framework, and our Work With Children and Families.” Presented at the Office of Head Start Summit, Baltimore, Maryland, February 15–17, 2011. Available online at http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/sr/quality/summit/catherine_scott-little_ohs_summit_feb2011.pdf.
26. “Early Learning Standards: Variations Across the States and Issues to Consider.”
27. Petersen, Sandra, Jones, Lynn and McGinley, Karen A. “Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers: Recommendations to States.” (ZERO TO THREE, 2008). Available online at http://main.zerotothree.org/site/DocServer/Infant-Toddler_Early_Learning_Guidelines_Factsheet.pdf?docID=11941&JServSessionIda004=12r7remp81.app33d.

28. “Early Learning Standards: Variations Across the States and Issues to Consider.”
29. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. “2013 CASEL Guide: Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs.” Accessed July 1, 2013. <http://casel.org/guide/>.
30. National Association for the Education of Young Children and National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Department of Education. “Early Learning Standards: Creating the Conditions for Success.” (November, 2002). Available online at http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/position_statement.pdf.
31. Rauner, Diana. “Make ‘Executive Function’ a Priority in Early Education,” *Catalyst Chicago*, May 30, 2012. Accessed July 1, 2013. <http://www.catalyst-chicago.org/news/2012/05/30/20148/make-executive-function-priority-in-early-education-policy>.
32. Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University. “Building the Brain’s ‘Air Traffic Control’ System: How Early Experiences Shape the Development of Executive Function: Working Paper No. 11.” (2011). http://developingchild.harvard.edu/index.php/resources/reports_and_working_papers/working_papers/wp11/
33. “Make ‘Executive Function’ a Priority in Early Education.”
34. “Early Learning Standards: Creating the Conditions for Success.”
35. National Association for the Education of Young Children. “Common Core State Standards: Caution and Opportunity for Early Childhood Education.” (2012). Available online at http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/11_CommonCore1_2A_rv2.pdf.
36. Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services. “Cultural Competence in Working with Children and Families.” Accessed July 1, 2013. <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/tta-system/family/Family%20and%20Community%20Partnerships/family%20services/cultural%20diversity/culturalcompeten.htm>; Chang, Hedy Nai-Lin. “Crafting Early Learning Standards for a Multi-Ethnic Society: Lessons Learned from Washington and Alaska.” (Build Initiative, 2008). Available online at <http://buildinitiative.org/WhatsNew/ViewArticle/tabid/96/ArticleId/119/Crafting-Early-Learning-Standards-for-a-Multi-Ethnic-Society-Lessons-Learned-from-Washington-and-Ala.aspx>.
37. In 2012, total spending on state preschool stood at \$5.1 billion, whereas Head Start spending exceeded \$6.1 billion. *The State of Preschool 2012*, at 7 and 240.
38. For the 2010–11 school year (the last year for which data is available) the federal government provided \$75.5 billion for elementary and secondary education—12.5% of the total. The remainder was provided by states (\$266.8 billion, 44.1%) and local sources (\$262 billion, 43.4%). Cornman, S.Q. (2013). *Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: School Year 2010–11 (Fiscal Year 2011)* (NCES 2013-342), at 8. US Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Available online at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
39. Kagan, Sharon L. and Kauerz, Kristie. *Early Childhood Systems: Transforming Early Learning*. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2012). Available online at <http://store.tcpspress.com/0807752967.shtml>.
40. US Department of Education. “Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge” (2013). Accessed July 1, 2013. Available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-earlylearningchallenge/applicant.html>.
41. In Challenge applications, Criteria (C)(1) notes that states are required to discuss the level of standards implementation—and their plans for “developing and using statewide, high-quality Early Learning and Development Standards.” US Department of Education. “Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge Phase 2 Application.” Available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-earlylearningchallenge/phase-2-application.doc>.
42. In the remainder of this paragraph and the following paragraph, states are listed based on their applications for the Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge. State applications are available online at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-earlylearningchallenge/awards-phase-1.html>.
43. California, Delaware, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and New York.
44. Washington.

45. Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Ohio.
46. Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, and Rhode Island.
47. Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, and Rhode Island.
48. Georgia, Maine, New Jersey, and Rhode Island indicated an intention to align between early learning and kindergarten, without specifying that they would add domains beyond the “academic” domains. But several states—Connecticut, Maine, North Carolina, and Ohio—indicated an intention to create additional K–3 standards in a broader set of domains.
49. California, Delaware, Ohio, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, and Washington claim implementation; Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Rhode Island offered plans to improve.
50. Delaware, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington claim implementation; California, Connecticut, Maine, New Jersey, and North Carolina offered plans to improve.
51. California, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington claim implementation; California, Connecticut, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, and Ohio offered plans to improve.
52. Georgia, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington claim implementation; Connecticut, Maine, and Rhode Island offer plans to improve.